

PLURAL SOCIETIES

SOCIAL WORK AND LIVING TOGETHER

Call for Papers AIFRIS Congress - Beirut July 2019

The present call aims to encourage communication of researchers, trainers, social work professionals and supported persons with a focus on the contribution of social work in building up and revitalizing "living together". In the face of intercultural tensions, socio-cultural discriminations, but also socio-economic inequalities or risks of territorial fragmentation, it is important to question and analyze in which ways social actions and interventions contribute to the dynamics of organization, animation and development of social links. During the 8th AIFRIS congress, this theme will be worked on Beirut, Lebanon, a country which is symbol of diversity in perpetual search for a more harmonious living-together.

Contemporary societies are distinguished by highly pluralistic contexts, from the socio-economic as well as from the ethnic, communitarian, cultural or religious point of view. These diversities and tensions that accompany them are rooted in the historicity of territories and the migratory movements which constitute them (Bolzman, 2009). Within them, groups find themselves socio-economically disadvantaged, are assigned a low social status and / or are disqualified from this or that identity trace (Saillant, 2012). When these processes of precariousness, discrimination and exclusion dominate (Bolzman and Guissé, 2017), frustration and feelings of injustice are born. Consequently, strategies of resistance and community withdrawal appear, and postures of survival and avoidance are emerging (Touraine, 1997, Paugam, 2015). What should be done with these frustrations that threaten to turn into latent violence, especially when segmentation, instrumentalization and politicization maneuvers lead one to fear all that is different and threaten social cohesion (Kanafani, 2004, Messara, 2004)?

In this complex reality, the transition from community to society (Tönnies, 1887, 2010) and the transformation of mechanical solidarity into organic solidarity (Durkheim, 1893, 2007) requires constant consolidation. It is one of the perspectives of social work **to create opportunities that transform the obligation of living side by side into a desire to live together**¹. Thus, we can consider that one of the roles of the actors involved is to transform the difference "separative and polemogenic into an integrating and pacifying opportunity" (Willaime, 2004: 5), and to "substitute the distinction for disjunction, reliance on reduction" (Morin, 2016: 127).

¹ "The" living together "is defined by the construction of reciprocal agreements, peaceful and respectful of people in their cultural and religious identities, considering the recognition of diversities as the foundation of the social cohesion of a democratic society". (Devries and Manço, 2017: 120).

In this, social work would participate in the construction of a culture of peaceful coexistence guaranteeing the reciprocity of social relations and allowing the emergence of a right of respectful integration of specificities (Le Bris, 2016: 79).

- In the context of identity flexibility and referential plurality, how can one testify **the support provided by social workers** to individuals confronted with a shifting, agonizing and vital externality (Teyssier and Denoux, 2013)?

- In order to overcome the restrictive membership - whether personal, religious, communitarian or ethnic - **what contributions can be credited to educational and social action**, especially when it comes emerging memberships that are more encompassing and inclusive (Maïla, 2017) ?

We propose to situate these questions in a broad vision of "living together" and its challenges. In fact, confrontations and negotiations between communities and groups engage culture - understood here in the full sense of the term - in a permanent process of recreation and recomposition. The management of disputes, conflicts and cultural tensions is combined with active identity strategies aimed at both personal integration and overall social adjustment (Manço, 1998). This constructive cohabitation aims at the production of a plural unit and a civic belonging marked by the acceptance to diverge without blame (Kanafani, 2004, Noun, 2004). This ambition of living together is also that which ensures that the right to difference cannot be turned down on "the ideology of the difference" (Messara, in Noun, 2004: 35).

The public power, the intermediary actors, like all of us, are involved in this (re) construction of social relations allowing any person, group or community to be assured of the continuity of their existence with dignity, to occupy a place in the same way as others and to exercise a word heard. Such a unifying dynamic requires commitment to stigmatization, exclusion and frustration stemming from limitations in access to rights and injustices experienced or felt.

What risks of fragmentation and disintegration is the "living together" really exposed today and how to deal with it? How to account for the "living together" and how to testify the diversity of forms of engagement of the social actors in this subject? How are social action professionals, students, trainers, researchers or supported persons involved in its deployment? Which new social contract sketches can we see, for which contexts and for which social projects? How to be able to act as an actor and promoter, according to which frameworks, with which practices, which resources and which partners?

All these questions will serve as keystones to guide analyses, exchanges, research and interventions around four communication axes.

Axis 1. Issues and construction of «living-together»

Revitalizing plurality and advocated otherness question the issues that are inherent in this dual purpose and the modes of action that contribute to it. How to encourage openness towards others and movement towards them? How to promote the widening of the spheres of interactions and exchanges? By which methodologies, concepts and theoretical trends, and with which partners to encourage a rapprochement of visions and a compatibility of speeches? What dialogue can be initiated to generate stories, experiences and interests that unite by safeguarding the respective specificities? What vision should we start into identity as a creative potential for new relationship opportunities? How to discern, in the individual and collective memory, the factors of distance, conflict and retreat? Through which approaches do we relativize their impacts and help to reconcile references?

These parameters of analysis cannot be discussed outside an approach that aims to elucidate the foundations of the living-together: What meanings to attribute to living together and how to define the meaning of such a model built on (and from) multiple experiences and meanings? What would be the contributions, but also the possible slippages of the attempts of approximation of the differences, the respect of the identities and the safeguarding of the frames of reference (way of life, values, doctrines, beliefs)? How to identify the strengths and limits of these processes and their crossing as a base for living together? How to take into account current movements, carriers of reconfigured identities (interculturality, migration, plural family realities ...) and to question them in the face of the processes of classical identity construction?

Experiences and research in Social Work help to enrich the general reflection on the processes that prevent or favour openness to the phenomena of exclusion and inclusion.

Axis 2. The fight against inequalities and the defense of minority rights

Building an inclusive living environment calls for examining the contribution of social work actors to safeguard and promote a right to exist. This right passes through the possibility of constructing courses that are not definitively dependent on a dominant system, that the latter is of an ideological, social, structural or even legal nature. While the experience of migrants highlights the magnitude of the challenges raised by this issue, examples such as the treatment of persons belonging to sexual minorities and gender minorities (LGBT) or drug addicts are also emblematic for the issues raised here.

Whether modestly or more ambitiously, many actors of social intervention manifest themselves as promoters of actions seeking to prevent and / or neutralize the sources of domination that undermine individual and collective freedoms: How does social work assert itself as a force for change vis-à-vis social subsystems (family, school, neighborhood, community, religion, state) that may reproduce relations of exclusion, subordination and victimization? Faced with the multiplicity of injustices, inequalities, discriminations, oppressions, coercions and maneuvers of social control, is social work likely to be more inclined to observing and commenting rather than acting)?

Axis 3. Formulation and implementation of public policies

To think about the positioning and the action of (the) actors of the social action in the construction of the living-together requires to cross the visions on the formulation and the implementation of the public policies. By what processes are these policies developed and how do they constitute a factor of union and solidarity? Are they built through the participation of the various parts involved and are they subject to cross-sectoral governance? Under what conditions are these policies inscribed on human rights and respect public freedoms? What new social contract would be the most fructuous?

To look into the design and implementation of such policies encourages us to study the contributions of the different actors involved, be they elected, government actors, service managers, social workers... It can also be a question of identification if they emanate from social institutions and / or if they are the result of collective mobilizations from civil society or philanthropy or even the world of business and the market economy. It is also important to examine the strategies and experiments at work in order to understand how the actions undertaken are more or less aimed at social changes at socio-economic, socio-educational and socio-cultural levels, or in terms of habitat or management of public space.

Axis 4. Training orientations and development of practice settings

The reflection initiated by the preceding axes cannot be accomplished without taking into account social work training institutions as well as the organization and development of practical environments. How do practical environments (employers' organizations, partnerships...), places of professionalism (schools, professional associations and unions, ethics commissions ...) or user's committees work as platforms for dialogue, expression and public debate on controversies and polemical topics that cross the living-together? To what extent do they manage to analyse borderline or even contentious practices? What skills do they demonstrate and with which concrete dispositions do they contribute to promote the mission of social workers and supporting a committed professional action?

What professional identities do the training dynamics hold and how are they accommodated within the employing institutions and by the practical settings? To what extent do the contents of the training and the frames of reference of practice make it possible to go beyond the sclerotic representations conveying ideologies, behaviours and policies of a conflictual and separative nature? What are the processes that promote a communicative and participative action carrying social innovations?

This reflective analysis is even more important since the mission of this disciplinary field and practice is focused on the liberation, empowerment, recognition, promotion of the right for expression and speech, the development of trust and empowerment of people and populations that are being victimized, excluded, oppressed, disappointed or jaded.

These four axes offer an opportunity to question and position ourselves on social practices, as well as modes of intervention and strategic visions that underlie them, understood here as initiators of dynamics of innovation, liberation and participation.

Bibliography

Abou, Sélim (2002). *L'Identité culturelle ; suivi de Cultures et droits de l'homme*, [4e éd. rev. et corr.]. - Beyrouth : Presses de l'Université Saint-Joseph, Paris : Perrin.

Bolzman, Claudio (2009). « Modèles de travail social en lien avec les populations migrantes : enjeux et défis pour les pratiques professionnelles », *Pensée plurielle*, 2009/2 n° 21, p. 41-51.

Bolzman, Claudio, Vagni, Giacomo (2015), « Égalité de chances ? Une comparaison des conditions de vie des personnes âgées immigrées et "nationales" », *Hommes et migrations*, N° 1309, p.19-28.

Chamoun, Mounir (1997). *La diversité linguistique et culturelle et les enjeux du développement*, Actes des 1ères journées scientifiques du Réseau thématique de recherche « Cultures, Langues et Développement », sous la dir. de Sélim Abou, Katia Haddad. AUPELF-UREF, Montréal; Université Saint-Joseph, Beyrouth (Universités francophones. Actualité scientifique).

Devries, Morgane, Manço, Altay (2017). « Dialogues entre musulmans et non-musulmans », *Hommes et migrations*, n° 1316, p.119-128.

Durkheim, Emile (1893, 2007), *De la division du travail social*, Paris, PUF

Kanafani, Aida (2004). *Liban : le vivre ensemble, Hsoun, 1994-2000*, Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner S.A.

Le Bris, Catherine (2016). « La contribution du droit à la construction d'un « vivre ensemble » : entre valeurs partagées et diversité culturelle », *Droit et société* 2016/1, n° 92, p. 75-98.

Maïla, Joseph (2017). « La crise du pluralisme au moyen orient », *La crise du pluralisme au moyen orient et la gestion de la diversité*, Table-ronde organisée par L'observatoire PHAROS, l'Ordre de Malte-Liban et le département d'histoire de l'Université Saint-Joseph de Beyrouth.

Manço, Altay (2009). « A Malo Mundarum. Investigations locales pour la cohésion socioculturelle », *Pensée plurielle*, 2009/2, n° 21, p.169-177.

Manço, Altay (1999). *Intégration et identités. Stratégies et positions des jeunes issus de l'immigration*, Bruxelles, De Boeck.

Manço, Altay (1998). *Valeurs et projets des jeunes issus de l'immigration (L'exemple des Turcs en Belgique)*, Paris, L'Harmattan (Logiques Sociales).

Messarra, Antoine (2004). « Chose publique en régression et citoyenneté en alerte », *Observatoire de la paix civile et de la mémoire au Liban*, ss dir. Antoine Messarra, Librairie orientale, Beyrouth.

Morin, Edgar (2016). *Penser global*, Flammarion, Paris.

Noun, Fady (2004). « Création d'un observatoire de la paix civile et de la mémoire », *Observatoire de la paix civile et de la mémoire au Liban*, ss dir. Antoine Messarra, Librairie orientale, Beyrouth.

Paugam, Serge (2015). *Vivre ensemble dans un monde incertain*, Paris : L'aube.

Saillant, Francine (2012). « Le vivre-ensemble dans les mouvements sociaux : identités, performativités, droits collectifs », *Terrains du vivre-ensemble : émergence d'un concept*, Colloque annuel du CÉLAT, 29-31 mai 2012 Manoir du Mont-Sainte-Anne.

Temple, Caroline (2005). « Stratégies identitaires, durée d'acculturation et orientations personnelles : quel lien avec l'estime de soi ? Le cas des migrants japonais », *Bulletin de psychologie*, 2005/3, n° 477, p.369-375.

Teyssier, Julien, Denoux, Patrick (2013). « Les réactions psychologiques transitoires : interculturation et personnalité intraculturelle », *Bulletin de psychologie*, 2013/3, n° 525, p.257-265.

Tönnies, Ferdinand (1887, 2010), *Communauté et société*, Paris, PUF.

Touraine, Alain (1997). *Pourrons-nous vivre ensemble ? : égaux et différents*, Paris : Fayard.

Willaime, Jean-Paul (2004). Préface de : *Liban : le vivre ensemble, Hsoun, 1994-2000*, Aida Kanafani, Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner S.A.

Procedures and instructions

Procedures and deadlines

AIFRIS would like to receive proposals from researchers, trainers, students and professionals from social work as well as from people in care. These proposals may be based on one or more of the 4 axes mentioned above. The themes and questions proposed in each of these axes are indicative; they aim on opening reflective clues for speeches candidates.

In order to diversify the approaches, speaker will be able to choose between four forms of speeches: research report, experimentation report concerning pedagogy or social intervention, animation of a forum or presentation of a poster. The evaluation procedure and the evaluation criteria will be the same, but the exposed materials may differ between field or bibliographic data on the one, and experimental data on the other hand.

To promote access to speeches, the scientific committee is available to assist authors who wish to do so, in the formalization of their speech, as well as to ensure the translation into French of the summary written in another language (contact: csp_aifris@aifris.eu).

Proposals must be completed online, between **15 October 2018** and **31 January 2019 at the latest**, on the AIFRIS website (*after having read the instructions for use downloadable online from our site as well as general and technical instructions*).

Thus, all persons wishing to participate in a communication (authors and coauthors) must start by creating an account on the site aifris.eu. People who already have an account in the database are invited to complete the missing information.

Speeches can be presented by a team of up to 3 people, but regardless of the number of speakers, the time allowed is 20 minutes per communication. The same person can only present a maximum of two communications, alone or in a team.

Speech proposals are subject to anonymous evaluation by at least two members of the Permanent Scientific Council. The evaluation feedback (acceptance, desired adjustments or refusals) will be communicated no later than one month after the transmission of the proposal to the CSP.

All speaker must be registered and have paid their registration fees **before June 3, 2019**.

For the good functioning of the congress and the online registration of the workshops, the speakers, whose proposal have been selected, but who have not paid the registration fees until that date will see their proposal switch to a proposal "Out of Congress". They will not be able to communicate at the congress.

In case of withdrawal, any proposal retained by the Scientific Committee remains on the site, but switches to a "Out of Congress" proposal. As such, it can be improved by addressing the summary changes in a Word file to the database manager, and it can be completed by submitting an article in PDF.

AIFRIS aims to make visible research and innovation work in the field of social intervention in the French language. It is requested that any speaker uploads, the complete text of its communication of 8 000 to 10 000 signs approximately, in text format to the website **before June 3, 2019**. The latter will be posted on public access instantly, available especially for workshop leaders and the participants of the Congress.

Speakers wishing to submit a larger article (approximately 30,000 signs) before or after the conference can do so online through the same process. This article in PDF will complete the full article and will be instantly visible in public online access. It thus participates in the implementation of the will of solidarity and the sharing of knowledge.

Technical conditions to submit a speech

The proposal must have a **maximum of 4 000 characters (including spaces)** and be included in the frame provided for this purpose on the site. The proposal must be accompanied by a **bibliography** of a maximum of 2 000 characters and a **presentation** of the author (s) of the proposal, in a maximum of 300 characters.

This proposal constitutes a **summary of the speeches in French**, which, if accepted, will be published, **as it is**. These summaries will be posted on public access on the AIFRIS website, as are those of previous congresses.

Speakers wishing to submit a larger article (approximately 30 000 characters) can do so online using the same process in PDF format. This article will be instantly visible in public online access. It thus participates in the implementation of the will of solidarity and the sharing of knowledge.

Once this French-language article is posted on the site, all speakers have the possibility of uploading the article in the language of their choice, even a slide presentation, however always in PDF format.

General conditions to submit a speech

All texts uploaded by speakers in the AIFRIS database become the property of the association. Anyone who submits a speech accepts this clause. However, this clause is

not exclusive. The person who uploads keeps the co-ownership of her or his text and can make any use that suits her or him.

The texts, property of AIFRIS, remain included even after death of the author. Similarly, as soon as a text is uploaded, the account created for the upload can no longer be deleted.

As the author cannot request the deletion of this text at any time, he may, however, request a modification, a correction or the submission of a longer improved text. The author can correct the text of the abstract of the paper himself until he proposes it for the evaluation of the scientific committee. Then, once the summary is proposed, the author can request a modification by contacting the database manager, postmaster@aifris.eu.

The author has access to her or his personal account and can modify all the contents at any time, with the exception of the correction of the email that was used to create the account whose modification must be requested at the database managers.

Anyone who creates an account automatically subscribes to the AIFRIS newsletter. She or he can access her or his account at any time to delete this subscription.

Criteria for evaluating a speech proposal

The evaluations are carried out according to the "double blind" method by the scientific committee as the abstracts are submitted and the results are communicated individually by email, approximately one month after the date of submission of the complete proposal.

Any recasting recommendations or improvements are discussed by the evaluators.

The evaluation of the proposal is based on the satisfaction of **6 criteria for the content and 2 criteria for the form**. Each of them is weighted by each of the two evaluators.

Content criteria

- * Relevance to the conference topic

*Is the link made by the communicator between his object and the topic of the Congress?
If not, can the evaluator see it directly enough?*

- * Explanation of the context, the purpose of the research work and / or the practice

Does the proposed object appear clearly? What, when, where, with and by whom ...?

- * Explanation of the framework, theoretical foundations, methodology and / or practice exposed:

*Are the main dimensions that will constitute the object explained:
institutional and / or sponsorship – action field- ambition, objectives, strategy-
Research method or project-supposed and theoretical foundations - deadlines and steps
...?*

- * Analysis of the corpus, research data and / or practice exposed

*Does a body of data exist? If you are upstream of an approach,
Does the Proposal Demonstrate a Will for Research, Rigor and Analysis?
going beyond the sole conviction that the truth is in the utterance? (example of professions
of faith not supported by distant argument)*

- * Presentation of expected interests of research, training, or professional practice

- * Innovative or original character of research and / or practice exposed

Optional but appreciated

Formal criteria

- * Clarity and coherence of the proposal

- * Editorial quality (general structure, bibliographical references ...)

Absence of scientism. Articulated demonstration. Keeping the thread of thought.