CALL FOR ABSTRACTS

Urban Theory and Urban Praxis: Past, Present and Possible Futures

IV Midterm Conference: European Sociological Association (ESA) - Research Network 37: Urban Sociology

ONLINE, hosted by: University of Bologna (Italy), Department of Sociology and Business Law

27 - 29 JANUARY 2021

https://esarn37.hypotheses.org/iv-midterm-conference-bologna-2020

CONFERENCE THEME

Exactly one hundred years ago, in the year 1920, the world was finally resurfacing from a devastating global health crisis. Misleadingly, albeit too commonly, known as the '1918 Spanish Flu', this deadly influenza pandemic – arguably the most severe pandemic in modern history – lasted over two years, infected an estimated 500 million people, approximately one-third of the world's population at the time, and caused an estimated death toll of over 50 million people. Roughly one century later, in 2020, we find ourselves amidst another pandemic threat, one whose social consequences we are still to fully comprehend, and whose obvious discrepancies and all too alarming similarities to the global virulent outbreak of one century ago invites sociological questions about modernity, globalization, urbanization, and social change and persistence. Has the course of social change in the last one hundred years been such that all and any similarities between the two pandemic outbreaks are little more than flukes? Or are these similarities a manifestation of Karl Marx's contention in the *Eighteenth Brumaire* (1852) that history is set to repeat itself "first as tragedy, then as farce"?

The current year of 2020 also commemorates the 100th anniversary of the death of Max Weber. Unquestionably recognized as one of the forefathers of Western Sociology, Weber has inspired the imagination and scholarship of generations of sociologists and social scientists alike, regardless of epistemological traditions, methodological boundaries, regions of study, or fields of interest. Urban sociology and sociologists are not an exception. In fact, 2021 – the year in which this conference will be held – marks the centennial anniversary of yet another landmark: the posthumous publication of Max Weber's edited volume on *The City* (1921), a pivotal work for the (at the time) expanding field of Urban Sociology, where Weber tries to outline the foundations of his systematic theory of urbanism and urban development.

We take the occasion of these centennial landmarks – the time elapsed between these two pandemics, Max Weber's death, and the publication of Weber's *The City* – to reflect about the past, present, and future of cities and urban societies, urban theories and urban practices, *through and beyond* the works of Weber. The last century has provided us with a wealth of

theoretical perspectives on the city and its development, from the ecological theories of the Chicago School, through neo-Marxist and political economic approaches, to the more recent rise of post-structural, postmodern, and postcolonial urban studies. Cities have changed greatly in the *past* one hundred years, and so have our ways of conceptualizing theoretically, approaching methodologically, and pragmatically acting upon, cities. And, as the *present* pandemic situation shows all too well, cities keep changing every day, and will continue to do so in the *future*, creating a continuous demand for the reconsideration and redefinition of urban theories and urban practices.

We thus encourage contributions looking at past, present and prospective processes of urban transformation, at how those shifts have affected urban social structures and livelihoods, and at how urban theories (and theorists) and urban practices (and practitioners) have (or could have) addressed such changes and acted towards the promotion of more just cities and societies. Analyses of the characteristics and effects of the current global health crisis for urban areas worldwide are especially welcome. Please see information on how to submit your abstract and/or participate in the midterm conference below. We look forward to receiving your contributions!

CONFERENCE VENUE AND FORMAT

We opted to follow a stepwise process of submission for this midterm conference. We first opened a call for thematic session proposals. After reviewing all the sessions submitted, we decided to accept a total of 24 sessions for the conference. We are now opening a call for abstracts for those sessions. The final list as well as detailed descriptions of the sessions can be found below, and individually on the conference's website. Abstracts must be submitted online using a form posted on the conference's website. In that form, you will be asked to select <u>one session</u> for which you want to submit your abstract to. Decisions regarding the abstracts will be conducted primarily by the respective session chairs.

Most sessions will follow a traditional format based on an open call for abstracts and equal time allocation (expectedly 15-20 minutes, in time slots of 90 minutes) for each participating presenter. Nonetheless, there are several sessions based on other formats, such as: author-meets-critics, roundtables, and workshops. The abstracts of these sessions include information about their format (see below). In case of any doubts, please contact the chair(s) of the session you are interested in or the conference's organizing committee. Please note that each presenter may submit only one abstract for the conference as the first author, regardless of the session they are submitting to. In case a presenter submits more than one abstracts, only one abstract (the one submitted first) will be considered for review.

<u>IMPORTANT NOTE</u>: Due to the uncertainty and risks surrounding the current (and likely future) global health situation, the organizing committee has made the (hard) decision to postpone the conference from its initial date (September 2-4, 2020) to a new date (JANUARY 27-29, 2021) <u>AND</u> move the conference entirely to an <u>ONLINE FORMAT</u>.

We are working on the details and logistics of this new format, but the latest information available points to the conference being hosted by the University of Bologna (Italy) and held online using a web-conferencing platform (e.g. Zoom or Microsoft Teams). We will provide updates timely to all the (prospective) participants, as soon as we have further news.

For submitting an abstract, as well as for news and further information, please visit the conference website.

TIMELINE AND FEES

The organizing committee has decided to not charge any fees for this conference. Nonetheless, please note that all participants (presenters and not) are required to register for the conference timely. Be sure to watch out for and add the following dates to your calendar. Please note that these dates are final.

- JUNE 19, 2020: Call for individual abstracts opens.

- SEPTEMBER 6, 2020: Abstract submission deadline.

- OCTOBER 12, 2020: Notification of decision regarding the abstracts. Registration for the conference opens.

- NOVEMBER 6, 2020: Deadline for individual presenters and session chairs to register for the conference.

- DECEMBER 4, 2020: Final conference program is published.

- JANUARY 3, 2021: Deadline for non-presenters to register for the conference (this option only for ESA members).

- JANUARY 27-29, 2021: IV Midterm Conference of the ESA-RN37 – Urban Sociology (ONLINE).

KEYNOTE SPEAKERS

Ayse Caglar: Professor of Social and Cultural Anthropology, University of Vienna and Permanent Fellow at the Institute for Human Sciences (IWM), Vienna. Profile: https://ksa.univie.ac.at/institut/mitarbeiterinnen/professorinnen/caglar-ayse/

Giampaolo Nuvolati: Professor of Sociology of Environment and Territory, Vice-Rector for Public Engagement and Director of the Department of Sociology and Social Research, University of Milan-Bicocca. Also, Scientific Coordinator of the Territory Section of Italian Association of Sociology (AIS). Profile: https://www.unimib.it/giampaolo-nuvolati

Terry N. Clark: Professor of Sociology at the University of Chicago. President of ISA RC03 Community, International Coordinator of the Fiscal Austerity and Urban Innovation Project. Profile: https://sociology.uchicago.edu/directory/terry-n-clark

CONFERENCE ORGANIZING COMMITTEE:

MARTA SMAGACZ-POZIEMSKA, Jagiellonian University (Krakow, Poland)

GABRIELE MANELLA University of Bologna (Bologna, Italy)

M. VICTORIA GÓMEZ, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid (Madrid, Spain)

PATRÍCIA PEREIRA, Universidade Nova de Lisboa (Lisbon, Portugal)

RUI F. CARVALHO, Brown University (Providence, United States)

KATRIN PAADAM, Tallinn University of Technology (Tallinn, Estonia)

JAN ÜBLACKER, EBZ Business School (Bochum, Germany)

SESSIONS LIST

1. Artistic interventions in urban space

Chairs: Andrea Glauser and Barbara Kremser (University of Music and Performing Arts, Vienna, glauser@mdw.ac.at, kresmer@mdw.ac.at)

Format: Traditional (call for abstracts and individual presentations of around 15 minutes)

This session focuses on artistic interventions in urban space and explores their manifold implications in connection with urban politics. Of particular interest are the forms of (self-authorized) artistic appropriation and perception of urban space, especially artistic interventions that address the norming of public spaces, for example, by questioning and irritating prohibitions and surveillance tendencies. What forms of such interventions exist in which specific urban spaces and how is the relationship to a broader public shaped? How are different urban actors addressed and – beyond the classic notions of the public – made part of the intervention itself? On the other hand, this session sheds light on the strategies and objectives of urban authorities in their approach to art in urban space. An important question here is in which areas of the city are artistic interventions supported and encouraged by public or private funding agencies, and in which areas are they mostly obstructed. What kind of works and interventions are being supported with what justifications and which ones are being fought against as 'vandalism or 'disturbance'? Also of interest are the consequences of the respective urban policies: does the encouragement of artistic interventions in urban space open up new forms of participation and involvement (in private as well as in public)? And in this connection, what about increasing tendencies of displacement and social segregation? Last but not least, contributions are very welcome in this session that mainly deal with the methodological questions of research on artistic interventions and urban politics. Of particular interest are discussions on how sociological research can be expanded through interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary approaches and what similarities and differences can be discovered with respect to artistic research. For example, artists who make the norming of urban spaces the subject of their work often adopt similar strategies as those known in the sociological context from ethnomethodology – Garfinkel's concept of 'crises experiments' – while the practice of 'dérive', cultivated by the Situationist International, has been increasingly taken up in social urban research in the last years. Given these trends, it is of central interest in this session to explore the relationship between sociological and artistic strategies in urban research more closely.

2. We, co-walkers in the urban space

Chairs: Dorota Bazuń (d.bazun@is.uz.zgora.pl), Mariusz Kwiatkowski (m.kwiatkowski@is.uz.zgora.pl), University of Zielona Góra, Institute of Sociology

Session format: pilot study and open panel debate

According to literature, more and more social researchers are engaged in walking research. Excellent examples of this trend are the extensive collections published in recent years containing theoretical and methodological analyses and research reports (Bates, Rhys Taylor 2018; Prominski, von Seggern 2019; O'Neill, Roberts 2020). These studies were carried out by representatives of various disciplines and served multiple purposes. Their common element is that the researchers not only conduct research in motion, but they also take on the role of a co-walker. This unique experience of being a researcher and co-walker in an urban space is going to be a subject of reflection during the session.

The purpose of the session is to create a platform for the exchange of opinions and experiences regarding conducting research walks in urban space and the role of social researchers in such activities. We invite to participation in two interrelated parts of the session.

1. "Exploratory walks in urban space" is going to be practising exploratory walk in an urban space. We want to conduct a short exploratory walk (30 minutes) for volunteers in a purposefully selected area in Bologna as a pilot study. The aim of it is to familiarise participants with the author's concept of the exploratory walk as a method of researching and co-creating local cohesion. The experience may be a reference point during the second part of the session.

2. "Social researchers as co-walkers" (The open panel debate). This part of the session would be presenting the participants' papers about their studies with the "walking methodology". During the panel, taking into account presented papers and conclusions from the pilot study, we will jointly seek answers to the questions: What are cognitive benefits and risks associated with the researcher as a cowalker in the process of learning about social life in urban space? Which research goals can be achieved using the walking method? What forms of research walks can be considered the most beneficial from the perspective of specific research goals? How can people from vulnerable environments be included in the walks? What mistakes should be avoided during research walks?

We invite to the session both people who already deal with the issues of walks and those who are interested in expanding their knowledge and research experience.

Proposing the indicated topic and form of the session, we took into account our experience and developed a research approach. That is why we assume that the term "exploratory walks" (Kwiatkowski 2016) reflects the nature of the fieldwork research in the urban space the best. However, as researchers, we go beyond the walking interview only. The role of the participants is broader than just answering researcher questions, paying attention to the participation of people from marginalised environments. The term exploratory walk refers to the mobile version of participatory action research. According to this method participants as the "co-walkers" moving together on foot in a selected space, explore the relationship between this space and community life, conduct conversations regarding observed phenomena, processes and regularities.

References
Bates Charlotte, Rhys-Taylor Alex (ed.), 2018, Walking Through Social Research, London and New York: Routledge.
Kwiatkowski Mariusz (2016), Exploratory walks as an example of networking research, "Rocznik Lubuski" n. 42, part 2, pp. 137-148.
O'Neill Maggie, Roberts Brian (2020), Walking Methods. Research on the Move, Routledge: London and New York.
Prominski Martin, von Seggern Hille (ed.), 2018, Design Research for Urban Landscapes. Theories and Methods, London and New York: Routledge.

3. Alterity in the Developing Urban Subject

Chair: Mitchell Atkinson III (The Graduate School for Social Research, IFiS PAN, atkinson.mitchell@gmail.com)

Session Format: Workshop

The field of Alterity Studies is still undertheorized. In the 21st century, eruptions of urban violence and unrest point to changes in the formation of urban identities that may indicate an internalization of social standing as "outside" of standard citizenship and the denial of access to the fruits of social participation. At the same time, an increasing professionalization of social sciences, and its attendant emphasis on quantification, can impoverish the tools of social scientists with respect to theory-building. The work of many theorists such as Guyatri Spivak, Isaac Reed, Pierre Bourdieu, Jeffrey Nealon, Jean Baudrillard, Jacques Derrida, and Immanuel Levinas speaks about the importance of understanding the other in an interdisciplinary way while maintaining focus on the pressing day-to-day privations experienced as a result of urban othering.

From whose perspective does alterity manifest? What is the relation between alterity and power? Is alterity a class, race, regional, psychological, discursive, or other type of phenomenon? In what ways do the evolving conditions in urban areas fuel the development of alterity as a constitutive feature of intersubjective dynamics? This session aims to analyse alterity as a subjective position and asks whether alterity as such can be taken as a constitutive feature of social identity.

4. From Neighbourhood to Community, or from Community to Neighbourhood?

Chairs: Marek Nowak (Adam Mickiewicz University of Poznań, marek.nowak@amu.edu.pl), Przemysław Pluciński (Adam Mickiewicz University of Poznań, przemyslaw.plucinski@amu.edu.pl)

Format: traditional (call for abstracts and individual presentations of around 15 minutes)

Issues related to the urban neighbourhood comprise one of the classic themes of sociology, as well as one of the longest-running issues in the modern urban studies (cf. Chicago School: Thomas, Znaniecki 1918-20, Blumer 1986, Abbott 1997, Merriman 2015). From the very beginning, the building of neighbourly relations in an urban context illustrated succinctly the transition from Gemeinschaft to Gesellschaft, seen as a subjective strategy for dealing with the experience of the "big change" coping with "anomy" and taming turbulent times or traumatic experiences. We therefore assume that similar – at least to some extent – premises that historically triggered interest in the urban neighbourhood should be reconsidered. Furthermore, and even more importantly, the real effects of their impact need to be taken into account and re-evaluated. Examples of these conditions are the transformation of neighbourhood relations as a result of systemic changes and radical marketization in Central and Eastern Europe, resulting in their strong individualization and mercantilization (Rykiel 2016), or the more contemporary experience of the 2008 crisis and its consequences for contemporary Southern European cities (Donald, Glasmei, Grayc 2014; Petmesidou, Guillén 2015). However, we are also interested in the experiences of other countries, societies, and communities: speaking the language of Immanuel Wallerstein's system theory, both from the countries of the capitalist "core" and its "semiperipheries" or "peripheries". We are primarily interested in specific case studies and fieldwork results in the urban environment, though not abstracted from the macrostructural and cultural context.

The session will focus on two interconnected dimensions of the analysis of neighbourhood relations: (1) neighbourhood as spatial nearness (neighbourhood) (Lewicka 2010) and (2) neighbourhood as social closeness community) (Clark 2009). Each of these contexts is well-developed in the literature of social geography and sociology of the city (Grannis 2009). Both are also interconnected through their embedded social experience and individual or collective action (Rofé, 1995; French, Foster, Wood, Giles-Corti, 2013; Cornwell, Behler, 2015). We are calling for submissions on the following topics:

- Neighbourhood as a platform of social self-organization in the city;
- Neighbourhood as a framework for conflict and ways of dealing with conflict;
- Relationships between space and social interactions in the field of urban studies;
- Case studies of urban cooperation;

- Social movements, e.g. urban, tenant movements in the perspective of neighbourly relations;

- Building a neighbourhood.

As the organisers, we do not wish to solely generate demand for specific types of empirical studies, but also work on the assumption that urban studies are a multidisciplinary and multi-theoretical space.

References

Betsy Donalda, Amy Glasmei, Mia Grayc, Linda Lobaod (2014) Austerity in the City: Economic Crisis and Urban Service Decline? "Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society", 7, p. 3–15.

Sarah French, Lisa Wood, Sarah Alexandra Foster, Billie Giles-Corti, Lawrence Frank, Vincent Learnihan (2014), Sense of Community and Its Association with the Neighborhood Built Environment, „Environment and Behavior", 46 (6), p. 677–697.

Rick Grannis (2009), From the Ground up: Translating Geography into Community Through Neighbor Networks. Princeton University Press.

Maria Lewicka (2010), What makes neighborhood different from home and city? Effects of place scale on place attachment, "Journal of Environmental Psychology" 30, p. 35–51.

Tim May, Beth Perry, Patrick Le Galès, Saskia Sassen and Mike Savage (2005), The Future of Urban Sociology "Sociology", 39 (2), p. 343-270.

Ben Merriman (2015), Three Conceptions of Spatial Locality in Chicago School Sociology (and Their Significance Today), „The American Sociologist", 46, p. 269–287.

Maria Petmesidou, Ana Guillén (2015), Economic crisis and austerity in Southern Europe: threat or opportunity for a sustainable welfare state? "OSE Research Paper", 18, available on-line:

http://www.ose.be/files/publication/OSEPaperSeries/Petmesidou_Guillen_2015_OseResearchPaper18.pdf

Yodan Rofé (1995), Space and Community - The Spatial Foundations of Urban Neighborhoods: An Evaluation of Three Theories of Urban Form and Social Structure and Their Relevance to the Issue of Neighborhoods, "Berkeley Planning Journal", 10(1), p. 107-125.

Zbigniew Rykiel (2016), Władza i panowanie w neoliberalnym mieście semiperyferyjnym. Zarys problemu, "Opuscula Sociologica", 4, p. 19-32.

Erin York Cornwell, Rachel L. Behler (2015), Urbanism, Neighborhood Context, and Social Networks, "City Soc (Wash)", 14(3), p. 311–335.

5. In/exclusion in the Festival City

Chairs: Rebecca Finkel (Queen Margaret University, rfinkel@qmu.ac.uk), Briony Sharp (University of the West of Scotland, brionysharp.bs@gmail.com), Louise Platt (Manchester Metropolitan University, l.platt@mmu.ac.uk)

Format: traditional (call for abstracts and individual presentations of around 15 minutes)

Urban centres have been sites for celebration and festivity throughout time, linking communities with place. Historically, festivals were temporary escapes from the mundanity of everyday routines, which brought people out of the ordinariness of their lives to celebrate shared heritage and values (Featherstone, 1992). Along with this escapist function, special events and festivals also are considered social, economic, and political entities, constructed by societal influences of a specific place and culture. As Finkel, Sharp & Sweeney (2018, 1) state, "Special events are microcosms of society. Because they are temporary and usually bound by geographic space, they can be considered reflections of or responses to societal norms at the time they take place." Recent urban festivals now exhibit complex tensions between the socio-economic strategies of neoliberal urban policies on the one hand, and the cultural needs of diverse communities on the other. As a strategic device of the urban cultural economy toolkit, festivals have been utilized more and more by cities around the world to leverage marketing, tourism, and other socio-economic benefits. Indeed, scholars have reflected on the city as 'theme park' (Sorkin, 1992) as part of discourses surrounding the Disneyization of society (Zukin, 1993) driven by cultural consumption and the experience economy (Pine & Gilmore, 2011), of which festivals tend to be the commodified vehicle of choice (Waitt, 2008). As argued by Finkel & Platt (2020), "Festivals and cities have an ongoing relationship, which is now mainly commercialized and politicized, and this has diverse impacts on communities, urban spaces, and cultural identities." This can often create an unequal city, where urban celebrations have become exclusionary to those who do not fit in to the 'city brand'. For example, there is criticism that tourists are often prioritized over residents in such situations, with many controversies around housing, transportation, and crowding hitting media headlines in recent years. As more and more cities around the world adopt festivalization strategies, this session seeks to explore in/exclusionary policies and practices. Thus, it is expected that session papers would include interdisciplinary and international approaches to the inequalities and accessibility issues surrounding the increasing festivalization of cities. Innovative praxis at the intersection of urban, cultural, and event studies are welcome. This could include, but is not limited to, ideas involving:

- The impacts of urban festivals on local and marginalized communities.
- The festivalized city and disability rights.

- Symbolic and physical barriers to urban celebrations and experiences.

- Diversity in urban celebrations and experiences.

- Safety issues, especially related to gender, in the festival city.

- Tourism, over-tourism, and local experiences.

- Urban festival spaces as sites of disruption, subversion, protest, education, and platforms for change.

- Urban policies involving festivals and impacts on communities.

- In/exclusionary practices in the festival city.

Empirical research is preferred, but conceptual and creative approaches will be considered, especially those theorizing the topic with regard to identity, symbolic meaning, and affective geographies.

References

Featherstone, M. (1992). Postmodernism and the aestheticization of everyday life. In Lash, S., Friedman, J. (eds.) Modernity and identity, 265-290. Oxford: Blackwell.

Finkel, R., Sharp, B., Sweeney, M. (eds.) (2018). Accessibility, inclusion, and diversity in critical events studies. Oxford: Routledge.

Finkel, R. & Platt, L. (2020). Cultural festivals and the city. Geography Compass.

Pine, J. & Gilmore, J. (2011). The experience economy. Cambridge MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

Sorkin, M. (1992). Variations on a theme park. New York: Hill and Wang.

Waitt, G. (2008). Urban festivals: Geographies of hype, helplessness and hope. Geography Compass, 2(2), 513-537.

Zukin, S. (1993). Landscapes of power: From Detroit to Disney World. Oxford: Blackwell.

6. Squatting movement in Europe

Chair: Miguel A. Martinez (Uppsala University, miguel.martinez@ibf.uu.se)

Format: workshop

There has been a substantial number of publications about urban squatting in European cities over the last two decades. This workshop calls for scholars, activist-scholars and activists who want to discuss this academic production and address some critical features of the sociological analysis of urban movements such as squatting. In particular:

- What social, political and spatial dimensions help explaining the historical development of the squatting movements in European cities?
- What contextual differences and similarities are worth considering when comparing squatting practices and movements?
- To what extent squatters are locally rooted and, at the same time, transnationally connected?
- How many types of squatters, squats and forms of squatting can be identified, and what do we know about them?
- How issues related to housing and urban politics are intersecting with each other?
- What are the conditions for squatting to occur, grow and make an impact in urban capitalism?
- How are the interactions between squatters, authorities, property owners and other social groups?
- Is squatting and similar radical urban protests functional to neoliberal urbanism?
- How repression, legalisation, neutralisation, or cooptation phenomena affected the development of squatting?
- Is it possible to single out ideological views prevailing in squatting movements such as autonomy, right to the city and urban commons?

7. Housing in a post-Covid society: trends, policies and challenges

Chairs: Silvia Mugnano (University of Milan Bicocca, silvia.mugnano@unimib.it), Igor Costarelli (University of Milan Bicocca, i.costarelli@campus.unimib.it), Alfredo Agustoni (University "G. D'Annunzio" of Chieti-Pescara, alfredo.agustoni@unich.it; Alfredo Alietti, University of Ferrara, alfredo.alietti@unife.it)

Format: traditional (call for abstracts and individual presentations of around 15 minutes

The outbreak of Covid-19 in the beginning of 2020 has brought in new housing-related issues and challenges which add to and amplify pre-existing ones. Housing and health issues have always been strictly connected. Indeed, back to the beginning of 20th century, the development of social housing was also meant to tackle substandard living conditions of most urban dwellers, including newly formed urban working class. The massive state-led social housing production that started during the so called "thirty glorious years" provided access to housing on a large scale. This golden age for social housing, which had been governed almost entirely by public action, came to an end since the mid–1970s when the restructuring of the labour market and reduction in welfare investments under the influence of neo-liberal politics resulted in social housing being increasingly residual. Concerns about the growing social exclusion of its inhabitants led state actor to launch large scale urban renewal programmes aimed at increasing social mix through tenure diversification. Before the outbreak of Covid-19, the 21st century was already posing several urgent housing-related challenges for contemporary cities, including growing socio-economic inequalities reflected in rising levels of residential segregation, increasing commodification of housing, the crisis of housing affordability affecting a pool of different social categories. Facing the weakening role of social housing in responding to complex housing needs, a growing number of innovative community-led initiatives re-emerged to tackle housing affordability issues.

We invite theoretical reflections and empirical contributions on the following themes:

1) The lockdown has forced millions of people to stay in their homes. The home has then acquired a central dimension in everyday lives. How have people negotiated the internal and external domestic place? How have unequal availability of spaces and overcrowding conditions impacted the everyday life activities? How have neighbours' relationships and the use of shared space played out in times of isolation?

2) The confinement has amplified existing differences in housing conditions. Besides reflecting existing inequalities among those who can benefit from 'a roof over their head', this pandemic suggests us to reflect on the harder living conditions experienced by those who suffer from extreme housing deprivation: rough sleepers, people living in informal settlements and overcrowded places. How has the lockdown impacted the lives of

people in extreme forms of housing deprivation? Which implications for their health conditions and which impacts on the reproduction of health inequalities?

3) By forcing many economic activities to 'shut down', the lockdown has led to an increase in the number of people who are at the risk of losing their job. The rising uncertainty about households' income stability exacerbates the problem of affordability in both social and private housing sectors, reinforcing tenure insecurity and eviction as households increasingly struggle to meet the housing costs (either rent or mortgage). The crisis of affordability is likely to be widespread involving an array of different household typologies. In this light, how will the Covid-led economic crisis impact households' capacity to afford their homes? Which social profiles will be mostly affected?

4) The current crisis is also providing an opportunity for the public actor to support households in need by introducing specific measures to mitigate the impact of the lockdown on the capacity to maintain the dwelling (e.g. through rent moratorium). In a similar vein, in many national and local contexts we have observed the rise of social movements aiming to safeguard people' right to housing through bottom up strategies like rent strike. How have public policies at both national and local level addressed the new housing challenges? Which outcomes have grassroots movements achieved for the most vulnerable residents?

8. New pathways of ecological gentrification in Europe?

Chairs: Michael Friesenecker (University of Vienna, michael.friesenecker@univie.ac.at), Giorgio Osti (University of Trieste, giorgio.osto@dispes.units.it), Roberta Cucca (NMBU – Norwegian University of Life Sciences, Oslo, roberta.cucca@nmbu.no), Jan Üblacker (EBZ Business School, Bochum, j.ueblacker@ebz-bs.de), Ilaria Beretta (Catholic University of the Sacred Hearth, Brescia campus, ilaria.beretta@unicatt.it), Tim Lukas (BUW – University of Wuppertal, lukas@uni-wuppertal.de)

Format: traditional (call for abstracts and individual presentations of around 15 minutes)

The term 'gentrificaton' was introduced in the academic debate more than 35 years ago, when sociologist Ruth Glass described the changes she observed in the social structure and housing market of parts of inner London: "One by one, many of the working class quarters of London have been invaded by the middle classes – upper and lower. Once this process of 'gentrification' starts in a district it goes on rapidly until all or most of the original working class occupiers are displaced and the whole social character of the district is changed' (Glass, 1964, p. xviii).

Since then, social sciences have continued to study this process, although it has partly changed. For example, it gradually transformed from a private-induced process to a state led gentrification process (together with big financial investor). Moreover, the location of gentrification processes sometimes has moved from inner city to different urban areas, such as ex-industrial districts, ports, tourist villages and, more in general, areas close to mobility infrastructures. Finally, gentrification has also changed in its nature, and in the last few years often it has coloured 'green', in line with major indications developed by public institutions and greater attention to ecological aspects by consumers.

Within this framework, recent studies highlight new forms of urban restructuring promoted in the name of environment protection, for example:

- blue gentrification (linked to cities reshaping their relationships with waterfronts and flows (harbours, channels, riverfronts, etc.);
- transport infrastructure gentrification (linked to urban restructuring of areas around railway stations, cycle paths, and similar places of mobility);
- climate gentrification (linked to the adaptation to climate change);
- low-carbon gentrification (linked to renovation of buildings).

The session aims to collect empirical evidences and theoretical contributions, in order to paint a more comprehensive picture of the specific causes, pathways and consequence of new forms of gentrification. Empirical

investigations and more theoretical approaches focusing on social justice and urban restructuring in connection with the following topics are welcomed. Social consequences of urban projects, such as:

- the effects of uncovered channels and rivers previously covered or deviated;

- regeneration of urban harbours;

- redevelopments of railway stations and the surrounding districts;

- neighbourhood redevelopment for climate change adaptation reasons;

- low-carbon building renovation; etc.

We also welcome contributions that focus on the wider effects of these processes, such as residential changes or non-residential use of space (e.g. tourism or passers-by), but also contributions that deal more generally with question how specific forms of gentrification and/or urban restructuring differ from each other.

9. The tourist city: opportunities, challenges, and conflicts

Charis: Alexandre Vaz (CICS.NOVA of Lisbon, avazphoto@yahoo.com), Paolo Giaccaria (University of Turin, paolo.giaccaria@unito.it), Frédéric Vidal (UAL - Autonomous University of Lisbon, fvidal@autonoma.pt), Maria Cristina Martinengo (University of Turin, mariacristina.martinengo@unito.it), Francesca Zanutto (University of Turin, francesca.zanutto@unito.it)

Format: traditional (call for abstracts and individual presentations of around 15 minutes)

For centuries cities have been points of arrival and departure of people, the place where different cultures and religions meet. During the modern period, tourism and tourists have been perceived and described as an important factor of urban transformation. A positive vision of tourism and tourist presence in the city have dominated: linked to the idea of modernity, economical potential, openness, cosmopolitanism and the durable transformative potential of travel and tourism in the formation of modern conceptions about urban space, urban sociability, and leisure. Over time, tourists and their selective routing of territories have left an imprint in urban planning, design, and culture. This process generated tensions and contestations (disputes) that have changed according to the evolution of nature and scales of tourism phenomena. Tourism and tourist practices have been described as source of potential conflicts and worries for the economic, environmental, and cultural or political balances with the host communities. Accelerating changes in tourism (volume, intensity and profile of tourism in circumscribed contexts or areas) brought new patterns such as "impact" of "mass tourism" and more recently "resistance" and "protest" have been stressed, creating new approaches and conceptual framework to analyse urban tourism. The growth of low-cost travel flights along with short term rentals through online APPs is drastically changing the former inner city residential neighbourhoods. The study of urban tourism is characterized also by a series of paradoxes that provide topics for more scientific investigation. Ironically, in old city centres, where cultural heritage is nowadays transformed into main touristic attraction, commodification and disneyfication processes may pave the way for a caricature stripped of the "essence" that is supposed to be preserved both for branding and cultural heritage purposes. Conflicts are key processes of city and urban identity making, and they can occur and be part of a wide variety of situations and contexts that convene social actors with different roles, positions, purposes and benefits in the tourist practices and places. Instead of a rigid dichotomy between tourists and locals, new categorizations emerge that seek to capture the new ways of mobility and living. Even if urban tourism has become extremely important for city policies, it has received little attention from interdisciplinary theoretical research and more specific contributions on practical aspects such as over-tourism management and coping with tourism resistance and protest.

This session has the aim to discuss the power of tourism and the conflicts that come attached to it in reshaping cities both real and imagined and to promote the exchange of ideas and practices around the urban tourism theme, especially concerning a sociological approach but also open to other disciplines (eg. history, geography, and anthropology). It will investigate topics such as platform urbanism, city imaging and branding, urban re-generation and gentrification, disneyfication, foodscapes and foodification, urban policies and urban functions, redefining urban citizenship, city belonging and anti-tourism movements.

10. Care Theory Meets the City: Exploring Implications for the Study of Urban Inequality

Chairs: Mare Knibbe (Maastricht University, M.knibbe@maastrichtuniversity.nl), Daniela Krüger (Humboldt University of Berlin, daniela.krueger@hu-berlin.de), Hannah Schilling (Technical University of Berlin, Hannah_Schilling@gmx.de)

Format: Workshop with selected participants, introduced and moderated by the organizers. If you are interested in participating, please contact one of the organizers with a short description of your research interests, pointing to your engagement with care theory and the urban. Two months before the conference, each participant prepares a 1-page discussion note which will be shared with all participants.

Residents in many European cities find themselves in a transforming welfare landscape. While there are local variations, many cities deal with a similar set of developments that have relocated caring responsibilities. The persons and institutions involved in care changed under the influence of neoliberal governance, shifting from state actors to private actors and reinforcing inequalities in the distribution of burdens and benefits of care. While these developments have given rise to a wide array of new care practices moving along with or against the tides, consolidating social boundaries or crossing them in new caring figurations, it raises questions about how to empirically study or theorize care practices and the city. Moreover, the concept of care or care theory have rarely been used in urban sociology.

The aim of this session therefore is to discuss how care theory and urban sociology can be conceptually and empirically brought together, i.e. how to relate care practices and different urban spaces and institutions. From this methodological and theoretical discussion, we hope to explore the implications for studying urban inequalities. Inequalities in city life have been conceptualized in a variety of ways: e.g. in the form of residential segregation, different cultural repertoires for performing in the 'theater' of public life or the socially differentiated uses of urban opportunity structures. Ideas of social class as categories people 'have' or 'come to own' have been a central perspective in urban sociology. To these static approaches of social categories in the city, 'care' adds a relational sociological perspective to the analysis of urban inequalities. While 'care' practices aim to "satisfy socially recognized needs" (Thelen 2015: 508), the actual access to care and resources are embedded in social relations and norms of deservingness. Further conceptual and empirical work on care practices in the city might help to better grasp the (re)production of relations and social categories or the negotiation of boundaries of the public or private sphere (Thelen 2015 & Tronto 2013).

We aim to facilitate an intimate discussion on these questions. Each participant prepares a 1-page discussion note which presents their standpoint (empirical and/or analytical) in the debate on care and the urban. The notes will be shared amongst all participants in the month before the workshop. We (as organizers) will circulate 1-2 core readings in before hand with the participants, as a starting point for discussion. At the workshop, we will moderate a focused discussion based on the statements and readings.

References

Thelen, Tatjana. 2015. "Care as Social Organization: Creating, Maintaining and Dissolving Significant Relations." Anthropological Theory 15 (4):497-515.

Tronto, Joan C. 2013. Caring Democracy: Markets Equality, and Justice. New York: New York University Press.

11. Innovative streets in Europe. Exploring practices and governance of alternative urbanities

Chairs**:** Giulia Ganugi (University of Bologna, giulia.ganugi2@unibo.it), Riccardo Prandini (University of Bologna, riccardo.prandini@unibo.it)

Format: traditional (call for abstracts and individual presentations of around 15 minutes)

Today's urban public spaces seem to be confronted with numerous issues and Western European countries are facing problems with respect to a decreasing quality of life of local communities in urban neighbourhoods. The urban spaces undergo a period of deep crisis, which is determined by many factors. One factor is the decline of collective spaces (Simmel 1969; Forrest and Kearns 2001; Amin and Thrift 2002), in suburbs and in central areas, in the moment of transformation of facilities and during their maintenance. A second factor occurs when citizens gradually lose their attention for the public spaces, perceiving them as nobody's or local authority's spaces, rather than everybody's or common places (Becattini 2015; Iaione 2015). A third factor is the commodification of urban collective resources by the public actors to face the "regulatory slippage" phenomenon (Foster 2013), referring to the decline of the local government control or oversight of the urban resources (Augè 2009; Sassen 2015; 2017; Blokland 2017).

Therefore, in the last decade, forms of social action are increasing, together with the tendency of re-embedding, that is to shape again territory-founded communities (Nuvolati 2014; Becattini 2015). In many cities, the growth of, and interest in, a range of spatial urban practices is reshaping urban places. Some of these practices deal with the street as the place where exploring alternative urbanities, re-appropriating public spaces and injecting them with new functions and meanings (Iveson 2003; Moulaert 2010). However, the general label of "alternative urbanities" hides a multi-faceted variety of elements, due to the hyper-diversity of contemporary urban contexts (Tasan-Kok et a. 2013; Wessendorf 2014). Therefore, some of these innovative practice conjugates community and identity concerns with claims for equality, collective consumption, and universal rights, by tackling recognition and empowerment and challenging the established distribution of power within the urban decision-making arena (Moulaert et al. 2010; Van Dyck and Van den Broeck 2013). Some others, instead, develop from individual claims for control and privatization of public spaces, or claims for personal safety in the neighbourhood, without then representing participatory and civic instances and without generating communities with collective identities and shared values about the common good (Eliasoph and Lichterman 2003; Lichterman and Eliasoph 2014).

There are many examples of socially innovative urban practices in Europe: among others, the Social Streets, mainly spread in Italy, but also in some European cities; the Living Streets European project fostering temporarily urban experiments in many cities, such as Brussels and Ghent (BE), La Rochelle (FR), Zadar and Ivanić-Grad (HR), Rotterdam (NL); the Toekomststraat (Future Street) in Antwerp (BE); the Play Streets in the United Kingdom. Even if characterized by different socio-political contexts and by different claims and concerns, all these innovative practices also need to face the issues connected to the local urban governance. Indeed, they confront with internal organization, institutional public actors, other civil organizations, existing urban regulations, market actors, etc.

This session seeks to explore, on the one hand, what types of community and individual/collective engagement take shape around these practices and, on the other hand, the dynamics between socially innovative practices concerning urban streets and the arrangements of urban governance within the spatial context of Europe. We refer mainly to the potential development of innovative models of governance, such as the bottom-linked governance (Moulaert and MacCallum 2019) and the experimentalist governance (Sabel 2019), analyzed as new forms of cooperation across territorial scales and networks in which policy and practice are not dictated from any one level of governance but transformed by the cooperation itself and routinely corrected in light of the ground-level experience of implementing them. The session aims at collecting mainly empirical contributions that analyse how the governance influences urban innovative practices and how the latter impact and, potentially, transform, the governance, by eventually reflecting on the sustainability and the scaling up/out of the innovative practices. The research carried out during the period of the Covid-19 pandemic, focusing on the reactions and re-organization of innovative urban practices to face the emergency, are also considered.

References

Amin, A., & Thrift, N. (2002). Cities: Reimagining the Urban. Cambridge: Polity.

Augè, M. (2009). Non-luoghi. Introduzione a una antropologia della surmodernità. Milano: Elèuthera.

Becattini, G. (2015). La coscienza dei luoghi. Il territorio come soggetto corale. Roma: Donzelli Editore.

Blokland, T. (2017). Community as Urban Practice. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Eliasoph, N., & Lichterman, P. (2003). Culture in Interaction. American Journal of Sociology, 108(4), 735-794.

Forrest, R., & Kearns, A. (2001). Social Cohesion, Social Capital and the Neighbourhood. Urban Studies, 38(12), 2125-2143.

Foster, S. R. (2013). Collective Action and the Urban Commons. Notre Dam Law Review, 87(1), 57   133.

Iaione, C. (2015). Governing the Urban Commons. Italian Journal of Public Law, 7(1), 170-221.

Iveson, K. (2013). Cities within the City: Do-It-Yourself Urbanism and the Right to the City. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 37(3), 941-956.

Lichterman, P., & Eliasoph, N. (2014). Civic action. American Journal of Sociology, 120(3), 798-863.

Moulaert, F. (2010). Social Innovation and Community Development. Concepts, Theories and Challenges. In F. Moualert, F. Martinelli, E. Swyngedouw, & S. Gonzalez, Can Neighbourhoods Save the City? Community Development and Social Innovation (p. 4-16).Abingdon: Routledge.

Moulaert, F., Martinelli, F., Swyngedouw, E., & Gonzàlez, S. (2010). Can Neighbourhoods Save the City? Community Development and Social Innovation. Abingdon: Routledge.

Nuvolati, G. (2014). Innovazione sociale, partecipazione e social street. EyesReg, Giornale di Scienze Regionali, 4(5), 130-134.

Sabel, C. (2019). Sovereignty and Complex Interdependence: Some Surprising Indications of their Compatibility. In A. Lever and D. Satz (eds). Ideas that Matter: Democracy, Justice, Rights. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sassen, S. (2015, November 24). Who owns our cities – and why this urban takeover should concern us all. The Guardian: http://bit.ly/2RU8hYI.

Sassen, S. (2017). The City: A Collective good? The Brown Journal of World Affairs, 23(2), 119   -126.

Simmel, G. (1969). Soziologie der Geselligkeit. In Verhandlungen des 1. Deutschen Soziologentages vom 19. Bis 22. Oktober 1910 in Frankfurt am Main (S. 1-16). Frankfurt am Main: Sauer u.   Auvermann.

Tasan-Kok, T., Van Kempen, R., Raco, M., & Bolt, G. (2013). Towards Hyper-Diversified European   Cities. A Critical Literature Review. Utrecht: Utrecht University, Faculty of Geosciences.

Van Dyck, B., & Van Den Broeck, P. (2013). Social Innovation: a Territorial Process. In F. Moualert, D. MacCallum, A. Mehmood, & A. Hamdouch, The International Handbook on Social Innovation. Collective Action, Social Learning and Transdisciplinary Research (p. 131-141). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Wessendorf, S. (2014). Commonplace Diversity: Social Relations in a Super-Diverse Context. New   York: Palgrave Macmillan.

12. Urban Regeneration: Policies and Effects

Chairs: Davide Olori (University of Bologna, davide.olori@unibo.it), Hans Thor Andersen (Aalborg University, hta@sbi.aau.dk), Veronica Conte (University of Milan Bicocca, v.conte12@campus.unimib.it), Sónia Alves (University of Lisbon, sonia.alves@ics.ulisboa.pt)

Format: traditional (call for abstracts and individual presentations of around 15 minutes)

Over the last decades, many large-scale urban areas have been dismissed, thus losing their traditional functions. At the same time, urban growth has altered the classical center-periphery dichotomy by integrating semi-peripheral large-scale sites within the more central urban areas. Today railway areas, former industrial sites, barracks play a key role in neoliberal urban policies and city branding strategies: on the one hand, their regeneration is considered pivotal to the activation of "real estate markets in so-called underperforming areas" (Savini and Aalbers, 2015); on the other hand, due to the current phase of urban austerity, their conversion represents an important tool to generate massive revenues and increase local governments' fiscal budgets.

Since the early 2000s, urban political economists have produced a wide range of accounts on large-scale regeneration projects (Swingedouw et al., 2002; Orueta and Fainstein, 2008; Kaika and Ruggiero, 2013; Guironnet and Halbert, 2014, Savini and Aalbers, 2015; Anselmi and Vicari Haddock, 2019). Analyses point to the tendency of public and private actors to treat large-scale areas as financial assets and, accordingly, question how this affects urban policy, power relationships, and urban governance. Nevertheless, the regeneration of large-scale sites is a very complex and multifaceted phenomenon. It follows different trajectories depending on a set of structural and local constraints that, altogether, define the city's attractiveness to financial capital. It moreover comprises not only property-led mixed-used flagship projects (e.g. King's Cross in London or Porta Nuova in Milan) but also experiences of housing-led developments (e.g. Tivoli Green City in Brussels, both the Harbour and former rail land in Copenhagen) and temporary regeneration projects (e.g. Les Grands Voisins in Paris, Ex Dogana in Rome, DumBo in Bologna). Inspired by Henry Lefebvre's writings, with this session we want to critically engage with state and market-led urban regeneration policies in European cities, in order to analyse processes and consequences of state and market-led restructuring of cities. Thus, the session intends to challenge the rhetorical description of these experiences as socially inclusive, innovative and sustainable. We welcome original empirical papers, from all disciplines working in the interdisciplinary field of urban studies, focusing on:

- The contradictions arising from neoliberal urban regeneration policies, namely related to the oppositions between the use value and the exchange value of housing;

- The – political and financial – logics driving urban regeneration experiences, the actors involved and resources mobilised;

- The regulation of urban regeneration;

- The relationships between such practices and the political and economic agendas of cities;

- The socio-spatial impacts of urban regeneration policies as a consequence of processes of commodification and displacement.

References

Anselmi G and Vicari S (2019) Milan Makes It to the Big Leagues: A Financialized Growth Machine at Work, European Urban and Regional Studies, DOI: 10.1177/0969776419860871.

Guironnet A and Halbert L (2014) The Financialization of Urban Development: Projects, Concepts, Processes, and Implications, Document de travail du LATTS –Working Paper, n° 14-04, December 2014.

Kaika M and Ruggiero L (2013) Land Financialization as a "Lived" Process: The Transformation of Milan's Bicocca by Pirelli, European Urban and Regional Studies, DOI: 10.1177/0969776413484166.

Lefebvre H (1991) The production of space, Oxford, Blackwell.

Orueta FD and Fainstein SS (2008) The New Mega-Projects: Genesis and Impacts, International Journal of Urban and Regional Studies, 32: 759- 767.

Savini F and Aalbers MB (2016) The De-Contextualisation of Land Use Planning through Financialisation: Urban Redevelopment in Milan, European Urban and Regional Studies, 23 (4): 878–94.

Swyngedouw, Erik, Frank Moulaert, and Arantxa Rodriguez. 2002. 'Neoliberal Urbanization in Europe: Large–Scale Urban Development Projects and the New Urban Policy'. Antipode 34 (3): 542–77. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8330.00254.

13. Housing informality in the Global North: a socio-historical approach

Chairs: Noel A. Manzano Gómez (Valladolid University/Bauhaus University of Weimar, noelantonio.manzano@uva.es), Gaja Maestri (Aston University of Birmingham, g.maestri@aston.ac.uk)

Format: Traditional format (call for abstracts and individual presentations of around 15 minutes)

Housing informality, in the sense of use of land or buildings outside the legal realm, has been widespread dwelling strategy for the urban poor in different geographical contexts and historical periods. Informality crucially shaped the "hidden history of housing" (Ward, 2002), as part of what Foucault (2013) calls "popular illegality". Still today these practices characterise the housing situation in many Global South countries, where hundreds million people live in so-called slum areas. Yet Europe is no exception: having witnessed informal housing practices in the past, they are re-emerging in present times as a diffused housing solution not only for marginalised and migrant populations, but also for the working class (see Mudu and Chattopadhyay, 2017).

This session aims to explore housing informality among urban poor, by comparing different historical periods in order to investigate the origins and developments of this phenomenon in the Global North. We believe that this socio-historical perspective can be particularly fruitful to shed light on informal housing processes that have been so far largely studied with reference to contemporary examples. Moreover, comparison of informal housing practices across different times in history can enrich the current attention to their geographical dimension, adding to the understanding of the evolution of these practices in the same cities and regions. Overall, through this approach we wish to bring to the fore the temporality of housing informality to better understand its long-lasting presence in Global North.

We welcome contributions addressing, but not limited to, the following topics:

- The transformation of materiality and everyday life of informal housing in different historical periods;
- The various forms of collective action around housing both in the present and past;
- The genealogies, developments, legacies and travelling of public policy tools to govern housing informality and control land use;
- The evolution of the relationship between the real estate market and public authorities with regard to urban planning and informal housing;
- The representations of urban informal dwellers and how they changed (or not) in history;
- The changes in global capitalism and how they affect housing informality.

14. Urban imagination and technology of data visualisation in urban studies

Chairs: Maciej Kowalewski (University of Szczecin, maciej.kowalewski@usz.edu.pl), Sam Stehle (Maynooth University, sam.stehle@mu.ie)

Format: Traditional (call for abstracts and individual presentations of around 15 minutes)

The aim of the session is to analyse the intersections of urban imagination, technology, and politics of data visualisation (in the form of graphs, animations, infographics, interactive maps) in the field of urban studies. Scientific visualisation, once a tool for the closed communities of advanced commercial application and academic research, has now become part of popular culture and urban policy-making. Data visualisation – in the form of maps, graphs, interactive web formats, and more – have become the canvases of artists, urban planners, and scientists alike to show changes in time and space. The range of information and the sources it comes from makes data and visualisation part of the imagination about cities and global change. Visualisation is not a "data abbreviation" but a new text, a translation of data into images. It is about more than just imagining/presenting data: a graph, a graphic becomes a source of information and a basis for urban politics and decision making. We would like to take a closer look at data visualisation as not only an indicator of socio-spatial processes, but also as 'new urban narrative', constellations of images shaping understanding of global urban change. New visual technologies make it possible to depict the processes taking place over time - both in the perspective of one day (e.g. spatial mobility) and cumulative data showing the variability of phenomena in decades (e.g. demographic changes). Visual data in urban studies may work in the same way as a tourist brochure or as an architectural visualisation, which activates the imagination and convinces the investor of the validity of the expenditure.

We would like session participants to consider one or more of the following example questions in their contributions: How do science, urban politics and urban imagination (and poetics) intersect? In which way do visualisations create the images of the city and urban narratives? How is our urban imagination is shaped by GIS and geolocation tools? What kind of (global) urban change do visualisations present? How are they disseminated? For which target groups are they created?

We welcome contributions from research in areas including, but not limited to: Scientific visualisation methods, Urban art, Data dashboard design and management, Data-driven policy-making, Geographic information science and policy.

15. Rewriting Belonging and Identity Through Urban Spaces: Everyday City-making in Turbulent Times

Chairs: Ipek Demirsu (University of Padua, ipek.demirsudibiase@phd.unipd.it), Fabio Bertoni (University of Cagliari, fabio.bertoni.88@gmail.com)

Format: Traditional (call for abstracts and individual presentations of around 15 minutes)

The proximity of city life offers a particular socio-political setting which not only accommodates but is also a product of situated everyday practices of social actors from all walks of life. City-space presents the concrete conditions in which actors construct both exclusionary privileged spaces with reserved entry as well as alternative/radical/progressive counter-spaces that renegotiate terms of membership to an imagined community. As such, the city is an open and unfinished productive process of territorialization of wider political trends, reverberating in the everyday struggles of its inhabitants, who reappropriate and rearticulate urban spaces to demarcate inside/outside. The production of contending spaces is concurrently a process of (re)producing contending identities, be it inward looking/singular/particularistic or outward looking/multifarious/porous. Given the rise of reactionary nationalisms in multiple settings in our contemporary societies, as well as novel forms of resistance that challenge such static timeless construal of belonging, everyday struggles of city life prove to be a stimulating venue of research to unearth the concrete roots of collective identities that undergird political subjectivities as relational and sited daily practices. In this sense, the city not only is the spatial and social environment, but it assumes an active role in the making of the political.

Against this backdrop, the session invites contributions that are premised on sound (preferably interdisciplinary) theoretical grounds and rich empirical research, investigating everyday territorialization practices of social actors in the city-space that produce multiple and often contending place-based identities, as well as how such constructions of belonging in turn are translated into acts of city-making. Research that integrates new conceptual tools for understanding place-based identities in the city-space, novel methodological approaches that bring together a variety of data and methods (including visual methods), and case studies or comparative studies that demonstrate how wider political trends play out in everyday settings are welcome.

In an attempt to explore the often overlooked nexus of everyday spaces and subjectivities (and the ways in which they are mutually constructed), the session attempts to examine interconnected themes that include but are not limited to the following:

a. everyday situated practices of identity construction,

b. acts of territorialization to reframe the city and belonging to the city,

c. social conflict between contending belongings in the city-space,

d. emotional and embodied dimensions of urban identities,

e. the interaction of place-based identities with wider socio-political trends,

f. as well as how local struggles in shared urban spaces reach out to the national, international, and transnational levels.

16. Confronting urban regeneration policies in Europe between new forms of tourism, creativity and expulsions

Chairs: Letizia Carrera (University of Bari "Aldo Moro", letizia.carrera@uniba.it), Antonietta Mazzette (University of Sassari, mazzette@uniss.it), Sara Spanu (University of Milan Bicocca, sara.spanu@unimib.it)

Format: Traditional (call for abstracts and individual presentations of around 15 minutes)

Forty years after the first urban regeneration policies, it is time to carefully consider the social effects generated by these policies that have led to profound transformations of form and content. Such transformations are today questioning the very meaning of the city and the urban, and thus a new epistemological status appears to be increasingly necessary. Following the crisis of Fordism, cities mobilized to: 1) turn historical-artistic heritage into economic assets; 2) renew the image of the city through new architectures; 3) revitalize former industrial parts of the city, by converting them for cultural and recreational purposes; 4) host national and international events. Within this framework, attracting more users and consumers is at the heart of the urban regeneration policies. We refer to a particular individual with several social garments, that daily interact with different parts of the city and performs in as many activities, such as working, visiting a museum, eating, entertaining during daytime and night-time, and so on. If cities manage to welcome visitors/tourists/temporary inhabitants, in whatever guise, their chances of success can improve.

The possibility to access and walk in the city, as also the possibility to have suitable areas for walkability, have become a goal for urban marketing policies aiming at revitalizing and increasing the tourist attractiveness of places. Moving on foot can represent a multisensory experience that allows urban subjects, citizens or tourists, to feel part of the places they are walking through, savouring signs, images and immaterial elements making up the atmosphere of the city. On the other hand, some citizens may take advantage from these urban policies, i.e. policies on walking in some historical areas as in suburbs, taking care of some problems referred to the presence of unsafe areas. Therefore, residents can be part of this entertainment and consumption system, even though their social role may conflict with the very assumptions of the urban revitalization policies. For instance, the needs of temporary and resident populations can be mutually incompatible, starting with housing costs. The renovation of buildings traditionally occupied by low-income populations has led to an exponential increase of purchasing and renting costs, thus pushing pre-existing populations to move to cheaper neighbourhoods. Furthermore, due to the growing urban attractiveness, short-term rentals for temporary populations have become more profitable. This twofold process is having an impact both on the social morphology of the cities that are undergoing such changes, and on the very nature of urban life that is gradually losing its primary

functions – housing and material production – and consequently the strong social ties that these functions give rise to.

This session invites submissions that focus on theoretical and empirical discussions on new forms of tourism, with particular attention to proposals focused on walkability as social practise and urban experience, creativity and expulsions in contemporary cities and on the social and territorial effects arising from urban regeneration policies within urban neighbourhoods, integration between tourism policies and urban policies, mediating between the city of citizens and that of tourists.

17. Residential Segregation and the Study of Social Structure of Towns and Metropolises. Empirical and Methodological Advancements in Urban Sociology

Chairs: Niccolò Morelli (University of Bologna, niccolo.morelli@unibo.it, Matteo Piolatto (University of Brescia, matteo.piolatto@inventati.org), Jonathan Pratschke (University of Naples "Federico II", jonathan.pratschke@unina.it), Tommaso Vitale (Sciences Po - Paris, tommaso.vitale@sciencespo.fr)

Session format: Traditional (call for abstracts and individual presentations of around 15 minutes)

The study of residential segregation is a fundamental research topic in the field of Urban Sociology. Research has flourished over the last century due to the interest of scholars and policy-makers in understanding the causes, forms, and effects of segregation (Oberti & Préteceille, 2016). American cities were the first to be analysed extensively, and a huge body of research subsequently developed on residential segregation mainly by ethnicity (Massey & Denton, 1989) and income (Bischoff & Reardon, 2014). In European countries, the studies on urban segregation focused mainly on the socio-professional dimension (for instance in France), on foreigners (for instance in Italy) or on other individual characteristics according to the priorities of the political agenda and depending on available data. Due in part to the difficulties involved in obtaining small area data on income and/or professional position, segregation by social status has not received enough attention in many national contexts. segregation. Another aspect that has been neglected is the relationship between urban segregation and housing prices. Recently, with the spread of Covid-19, the importance of relating epidemiological data to the structural characteristics of residential areas has also become more evident (Morelli & Sampson, 2020).

Broadly speaking, house prices have profound direct and indirect effects on the reproduction of inequalities and can exert a powerful impact on the distribution of life chances (Pierson, Le Galès, 2019). While housing prices have consequences in sorting individuals in the urban space, urban segregation also influences the differentiation of housing prices within the metropolis. Similarly, characteristics such as the reputation of the neighbourhood, of nearby schools, and crime levels, are sometimes studied in relation to the dynamics of housing prices but are rarely triangulated with social segregation (Seo, Simons, 2009). Moreover, ethnicity and socioeconomic position are not the only variables that are involved in processes of residential segregation and other dimensions require attention (Barbot, Percoco, 2019). Most scholars agree that the economic crisis of 2008, set against the backdrop of longer-term trends, has led to an increase in multidimensional inequalities with a pronounced spatial dimension (Leal et al., 2016). The study of these spatial inequalities has become more urgent in the last decade, a period dominated by the strong effect of financial and public debt crises. In fact, since the 2008-09 and 2011-13 crises the rapid growth of financial capital and low growth in the real economy, combined with low interest rates, have created asset bubbles in housing in many cities, not only in

the most attractive and booming urban areas. This is also related to the unwillingness or inability of local and national government to tackle segregation through public policies. In both Europe and the US, commentators have drawn links between social inequalities, residential segregation, social cohesion, and political instability. This panel invites empirical investigations with the potential to advance our understanding of spatial relations between segregation dynamics and the social structure of neighbourhoods in metropolitan areas, as well as in middle-size cities and small towns. It will also seek to include research on relatively unexplored dimensions such as generational segregation or the relationship between segregation, valorisation processes, real estate prices. Abstracts must be sufficiently detailed to allow the organisers to assess the characteristics of each paper, including its theoretical framework, use of empirical data, time frame and research methods, and should highlight original findings and implications for Urban Sociology.

18. Welcoming spaces? Opportunities and challenges for newcomers

Chairs: Maurizio Bergamaschi (University of Bologna, maurizio.bergamaschi@unibo.it), Maxime Felder (EPFL – Federal Institute of Technology Lausanne, maxime.felder@epfl.ch), Pierluigi Musarò (University of Bologna, pierluigi.musaro@unibo.it), Luca Pattaroni (EPFL- Federal Institute of Technology Lausanne, luca.pattaroni@epfl.ch), Joan Stavo-Debauge (Federal Institute of Technology Lausanne, joan.stavo-debauge@epfl.ch)

Session format: Traditional (call for abstracts and individual presentations of around 15 minutes)

Current migration scholarship documents conflicting and probably correlated trends. On the one hand, restrictive migration policies, anti-homelessness and anti-begging regulations restriction and privatisation of public space, disappearance of interstitial spaces and repressive measures against undeclared work has made life harder for newcomers. On the other hand, scholars also noted a proliferation of initiatives and NGOs aimed at welcoming newcomers. Initiatives aimed at (co-)creating 'welcoming spaces' are often citizen-driven but can equally be the outcome of initiatives by local governments, NGOs, businesses, or they can be migrant-initiated. Going against 'anti-migration' currents, such initiatives are often highly contested. Their success seems to depend on combinations of collective action, multi-stakeholder collaboration and institutional innovations. However, given the local scale of most of these initiatives, the dispersion in space and political sensitivity, much of what is happening around these 'welcoming spaces' remains under the radar. Also, such initiatives are well documented in large metropolitan areas. This session focuses instead on the development of the welcoming capacity of secondary cities, of towns, of villages, or of 'shrinking regions' that are undergoing demographic and economic decline.

In this session, we welcome papers analysing these trends over time, focusing on the evolution of policy or of infrastructure targeting newcomers or used by newcomers. How do 'welcoming spaces' appear and evolve? How can local initiatives be upscaled? Have some categorical differences (of age, gender, status, etc.) become more or less relevant in shaping these 'welcoming spaces'? Finally, do revitalisation, inclusive and sustainable development of shrinking regions or less urbanised areas improve hospitality towards newcomers and increase opportunities for migrants to build meaningful lives?

The session is related to two distinct research projects. The first is the Horizon 2020 project WELCOMING SPACES, composed of different universities, stakeholders and research centres located in five European countries. The second is named 'Urban (In)Hospitality: What place for precarious newcomers in European cities' and is funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation.

19. Urban Practices and Urban Institutions: Thoughts on Segregation and the Spatiality of Everyday Resource Organization, Social Networks and Social Capital

Chairs: Talja Blokland (Humboldt University of Berlin, talja.blokland@sowi.hu-berlin.de), Daniela Krüger (Humboldt University of Berlin, daniela.krueger@hu-berlin.de), Henrik Schultze (Humboldt University of Berlin, henrik.schultze@hu-berlin.de), Robert Vief (Humboldt University of Berlin, robert.vief@hu-berlin.de)

Session format: Traditional (call for abstracts and individual presentations of around 15 minutes)

Spatial residential inequalities are becoming more and more complex. While we observe overall rising socio-economic inequalities, combined with rising socio-economic segregation, spatial disparities by race and/or ethnicity seem to converge. At the same time, more research challenges assumptions about the importance of where people are actually registered, most often the main criteria to measure segregation developments. Residents in cities both in the Global South and North have, overall, increased access to better mobility structures and digital means of communication to connect with others and to manage their daily routines. Does this change the way *where* urban residents organize their everyday lives? And if so, how? Does spatial segregation and the local neighbourhood still matter at all today? Studies investigating neighbourhood effects argued, most often, along a line of spatial determinism (van Ham and Manley 2012). Explicitly, or implicitly, researchers often underline that the neighbourhood becomes relevant through place-specific social networks and social capital. However, we do not know enough to what extent the organization of resources is spatially mediated. Some emphasize that disadvantaged residents depend on the local scale while the cosmopolite urban middle- and upper-class accesses their social support more and more independently from physical proximity. In contrast, others find that the urban poor are significantly more mobile within cities than affluent counterparts. What is more, studies on social mix of neighbourhoods showed that residential mix *might* converge with social mix. Physical proximity does, however, not automatically produce social exchanges. Neighbourhood institutions may feature interactions among neighbourhood residents, but when and why an encounter builds up to be a resourceful exchange, and whether this necessarily has to be a *neighbourhood* institution is rarely discussed or empirically shown. Questions remain open, where people actually use urban institutions and if the neighbourhood level is actually that crucial to organize people's everyday lives. To sum up, where residents organize their everyday lives might be related to the study of practices and urban institutions.

For this session, we invite scholars to engage with perspectives that advance the study of social network and social capital theory to complement the research agenda of neighbourhood effects and spatial segregation. We think that urban sociology might gain explanatory depth in the study of urban inequalities by studying practices and daily routines of people, and we suggest to rather follow the *routes* instead of *roots* of urban residents

(Blokland, 2018). Submissions discussing the role of urban institutions, (local, city-wide or even trans-local) spatial routines as well as the role of belonging and/or public familiarity (e.g. Blokland and Nast, 2014) are especially welcomed. We invite quantitative, qualitative as well as mixed-methods approaches.

References

Van Ham, Maarten and David Manley. 2012. "Neighbourhood Effects Research at a Crossroads. Ten Challenges for Future Research Introduction." Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space 44(12): 2787-2893.

Blokland, Talja. 2018. "On Roots and Routes." In Moving Cities – Contested Views on Urban Life, edited by Lígia Ferro, Marta Smagacz-Poziemska, M. Victoria Gómez, Sebastian Kurtenbach, Patrícia Pereira and Juan José Villalón, 29-42. Wiesbaden: Springer.

Blokland, Talja, and Julia Nast. 2014. "From Public Familiarity to Comfort Zone: The Relevance of Absent Ties for Belonging in Berlin's Mixed Neighbourhoods." International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 38(4): 1142-1159.

20. Unlocking action/research on urban transformations

Chair: Roberto Falanga (University of Lisbon, roberto.falanga@hotmail.it)

Format: roundtable

Academic has increasingly become an anchor source of inter and transdisciplinary knowledge on urban transformations. While action research has helped shift the paradigm of scientific knowledge production by engaging with local actors, its application is often oriented – and/or constrained – by dominant political narratives and overarching policy goals of urban transformations that influence research funding schemes. The mushrooming of initiatives led by partnerships composed of public and private agencies, including universities, testifies that action/research is currently framed within a new transnational and multi-layered space where different – opposite, at occasion – views on urban transformations create new fields of forces. Action/researchers are expected to produce highly qualified evidence-based knowledge at the intersection of these forces, which raises new interlocked issues in the light of the impacts of the Covid19 pandemic.

Is it always possible to conduct genuine interdisciplinary investigation within certain policy-oriented funding schemes today? How to ensure that the ethical requirements of action/research are appropriately observed and accomplished when considering the exacerbation of urban problems and inequalities occurred in the last few weeks? And, regardless the duration of confinement and social distancing measures, how to effectively implement transdisciplinary approaches to engage with multiple publics and make findings available to social and policy-based purposes in the light of the dramatic socioeconomic impacts of the pandemic?

At the edges of these issues, the *realpolitik* of everyday life of researchers matters more than ever. The accelerated course of events related to the spread of the covid19 has worsened, in many cases, life and labor conditions of precarious workers, with a negative impact over the practical chance (and availability of time) to make a significant meta-reflection on work. From a broader angle, action/research requires situated practice that may end up blurring the agendas in place. In some cases, research and policy agendas may overlap – or conflict – and widen the gap with social needs. This raises, furthermore, ethical concerns as to the role of the academic in the pasteurization of proper state and/or market functions with local communities. Last but not least, the legitimate ambition to publish research outputs in top-ranked peer-reviewed journals may lead academics to face the dilemma on whether and how local participants will ever read and have the ownership over their original contributions.

This roundtable is open to researchers and practitioners that wish to address some or all the issues above to unfold a collective meta-reflection on action/research and urban transformations.

21. Social Innovation in the Cities: Politics, Policies and Actors

Chairs: Adriano Cirulli (University of Rome "La Sapienza", adriano.cirulli@uniroma1.it), Chiara Davoli (Istituto di Studi Politici "S. Pio V" of Rome, chiaradav@hotmail.it), Luca Raffini (University of Genoa, luca.raffini@unige.it)

Format: traditional (call for abstracts and individual presentations of around 15 minutes)

The theme of Urban Social Innovation is today pivotal to rethink forms and contents of the urban governance of social services, integrating in a unitary framework the debate on the transformation of democracy and the Welfare State, the relations between State, Market and the Third Sector, finally the relationship between institutional vs bottom-up action on the territories. At the same time, the concept of Social Innovation risks to become a passe-partout and ambiguous concept. It can refer: 1) to new urban and territorial movements, generating alternative discourses, performing new practices, and rethinking new types of relationship with the local authority to answer social demands that neither the market nor the State have responded; 2) to a renewed equilibrium between the "institutional" and the "non-institutional field", as the public actor engages itself in promoting citizens' activism, with the result of widening public institutions' sphere, and inverting the privatization of public sector; 3) to a laissez-faire strategy, rather than being part of a new season of collaborative governance. By this way, the final effect would be exacerbating, rather than reducing, the gap between those who have the resources to act and those who are deprived of it, and then being placed in conditions of marginality. Social Innovation can be defined as an answer to the erosion of social capital, and as an instrument for building a new urban welfare that focuses on the activation of civil society, but also as a framework for the expression of new forms of grassroots participation and as the experimentation of direct democracy and self-organization practices, in response to the crisis of traditional forms of representation. Although, under the umbrella of Social Innovation we can identify also practices that act "legitimizing" neoliberalism by "softening" it and activating individuals in order to compensate the weakening of public intervention through a sort of "caring neoliberalism", in which the inclusion of civil society serves to partially balance the retreat of the State, offering cheaper services.

Within such a theoretical frame, we wonder if Social Innovation refers to grassroots mobilization and community self-organization, practiced by the subalterns. Is it expression of a form of bottom-up re-politicization? Or, on the contrary, behind the rhetoric of Social Innovation we find an adaptation and a fully acceptance of the dismantling of social rights and the end of the "public city"?

Far from aiming only at questioning the widely argued negative effects of neoliberal urban policy, the panel is open to papers that, focusing on the relations between grassroots practices and institutional change, critically

investigate a plurality of practices of innovation, adaptation and resilience. We are interested both on theoretically contributions – focusing on how practices of social innovation express an alternative (or end up to comply with) to the neoliberal model grounded on commodification, privatization, and competition – and empirically research on experiences of alternative models of cooperation, aimed to recreate public spaces and services, opposing (or going along) the processes of gentrification, privatization, and commodification. Both case-studies and comparative papers are welcome.

22. Responsible cities: imaginaries, practices, and policies in a challenging Era

Chairs: Giulia Allegrini (University of Bologna, giulia.allegrini2@unibo.it), Stefano Spillare (University of Bologna, stefano.spillare2@unibo.it)

Format: traditional (call for abstracts and individual presentations of around 15 minutes)

The purpose of this session is to use the dimension of responsibility as an analytical framework of current cities, taking in consideration multiple levels of analysis: imaginaries, theoretical paradigms, practices, policies, and forms of governance. The dimensional growth and the complexification of the urban sphere and environment recall the urgency to improve the studies and researches around this concept.

If there is no real definition of the concept of responsible city today, still it is possible to identify some prevailing interpretations in the current debate that call into question three crucial dimensions: 1) sharing, 2) collaboration and 3) sustainability.

On one hand, these dimensions seem nowadays to outline the semantic framework of different policies, which try to redesign the dialogue and relationship among citizens and institutions, as well as to reformulate the paradigms of local and economic development. On the other hand, those dimensions define a field of practices that move "from the bottom" and within the social fabric of the cities.

In this perspective, some emerging paradigms might be identified: the ones of "sharing cities" and "collaborative cities" - this latter is often alternatively declined as "common city"- and, finally, the one of the "circular city". Each of these paradigms shed light on several elements which are useful to redesign more fair, inclusive, sustainable and common's-oriented cities, where it is possible to enact forms of shared social responsibility.

However, it seems more and more necessary to overcome a reductive perspective, "flattened" on the "technological" element – such as in the variation of the "smart cities" as well as sometimes in the circular and sharing cities frames – towards a more "substantial" reading, which focuses not only on "how", but also on the purpose of the change that we want to produce on the social, economic and environmental level.

Technology is certainly an enabling factor, although never neutral. Technological innovation should rather be framed within socio-technical systems, taking in consideration the different cultural aspects and the nature of the economic system within which innovation is produced and do operate.

More recently, also the current pandemic crisis is calling for a responsible approach to globalization, reminding us the need to constantly balance the relationship among social justice and urban, environmental, and technological development.

Therefore, without the intention of defining in a normative sense what a responsible city is or should be, in this session we want to discuss and explore some issues: which kind of imaginaries, paradigms, practices and policies might reshape and foster the co-construction of responsible cities? Which new narratives and practices as well as urban, social, and cultural challenges for a "responsible city" are emerging from the "Covid-19 crisis"? Which ambivalences do we need to overcome, in order to make this concept substantial, getting it back to its political dimension?

This call intends to invite for any proposals that help to compare these questions with some theoretical as well as empirical contributions in relation to different spheres of urban life. Among the many issues that may be investigated, the following ones are an example of the areas of interest:

- Collaborative consumption.

- Circularity of production and consumption (reduction, reuse, and recycling).

- Solidarity economy.

- Responsible tourism.

- Urban commoning.

- Community and new forms of proximity.

- Collaborative governance and bottom-link governance.

- Socially innovative policies for sustainable cities.

23. Debating Urban Ethnography: limits and potentialities

Chairs: Patrícia Pereira (NOVA University of Lisbon, patricia.pereira@fchs.unl.pt), Lígia Ferro (University of Porto), Rita Cachado (ISCTE – University Institute of Lisbon, rita.cachado@iscte-iul.pt), Renata Sá Gonçalves (Fluminense Federal University, renatagoncalves@id.uff.br)

Format: Roundtable

Magnani's suggestion of a qualitative urban approach through the use of ethnography is seeing "social actors not as isolated elements… but that, through the vernacular use of the city (of space, equipment, institutions) in the spheres of work, religiosity, leisure, culture, and strategies of survival, they are responsible for its daily dynamics." (2002: 18) Hence, we believe that urban ethnography, through individuals' lenses, and by analysing the present (or the past through testimonies and life trajectories) can contribute to better understand urban contexts, processes, and dynamics. There are three main questions that we want to approach in this session: Thinking of urban ethnography as a qualitative method, how is it used by different social sciences? What skills do urban ethnography courses offer to researchers?

Therefore, we invite urban researchers that have formerly included ethnography in their methodological approaches; other researchers that specifically identify themselves with urban ethnography as a qualitative method that lives by itself as a branch in the tree of socio-anthropological; researchers that wish to discuss the limits and potentialities of urban ethnography; other researchers and teachers interested in this kind of urban approach.

Specific topics may include:

- Urban ethnography and interdisciplinarity;
- Urban ethnography practiced by sociologists and other social scientists;
- Urban ethnography and social responsibility;
- Urban ethnographic records and archives;
- Network analysis resulting from urban ethnographies;
- Ethnographic short incursions and its usefulness.

Additionally, because we could not ignore the challenges the world currently faces, we propose to debate how Urban Etnography can contribute to make sense of the different urban realities lived during and after the 2020 pandemic.

This session is organized by the coordinators of ETNO.URB (Urban Ethnography Network), an international network of researchers, mostly sociologists and anthropologists but also historians and architects, working

mainly in Portuguese speaking contexts. The session is an opportunity for us to debate with other urban researchers and to share the history of our network in two dimensions: (i) the process of making this network a formal one, and (ii) describing the diversity of researchers and disciplines among members.

24. Migrations, urban transformations and ICT solutions

Chairs: Alice Lomonaco (University of Bologna, alice.lomonaco@unibo.it), Carolina Mudan Marelli (University of Bologna, carolina.marelli@unibo.it), Teresa Carlone (University of Bologna, teresa.carlone2@unibo.it), Hanne Apers (University of Antwerp, Hanne.Apers@uantwerpen.be), Lore Van Praag (University of Antwerp, Lore.VanPraag@uantwerpen.be), Marie Malchow (HafenCity University of Hamburg, marie.malchow@hcu-hamburg.de), Rosa Thoneick (HafenCity University of Hamburg, rosa.thoneick@hcu-hamburg.de), Javier Lorenzo Rodriguez (University Carlos III of Madrid, jlorenzo@polsoc.uc3m.es)

Format: On-line roundtable

This round table aims to analyze the points of convergence between migration studies and those devoted to cities and technological services. On the other hand, it aims to create a dialogue between specialists in migration, citizen sciences and ICT solutions.

As an urban fact, immigration participates in the reproduction and transformation of the city not only by stimulating the processes of city renovation and rehabilitation, but also by redefining the relationship between the needs of migrants and public services, as well as the relationship between para-institutional actors (associations, cooperatives, etc.) and public authorities. The need for profound changes in the relationships between actors, services and the urban space is thus emerging. Indeed, to the migratory flows of previous decades must be added the high influx of asylum seekers and refugees in Europe from 2015 onwards.

These processes have thus generated questions relating to the integration of migrant population (legal status procedures, legislative and policy changes, and longer-term issues relating to integration policies, etc.). In addition, there has also been an increased interest in social inclusion measures within the EU and Member States (Eurofound, 2018).

As a result, the presence of migrant populations participates in the redistribution and creation of new urban functions (social centres, listening centres, hubs, etc.) and their spatial integration. At the same time, this transformation of the urban space and its population increasingly requires a capacity to coordinate the actions of the different actors in the city who deal with migration, especially those involved in the integration process of migrant populations. On the other hand, these transformations generate a new demand for comparable and above all shared data between different actors, as well as a facilitation of the relationship between migrants' needs and public services. In this sense, the role that ICT solutions can play is central and is increasingly at the heart of research programs and projects and actions funded at different levels of governance. ICT solutions,

with their potential in data analysis and integration on the one hand, and with user interfaces that are increasingly easy to access, can thus respond to the new challenges facing European cities.

This round table therefore wants to discuss the relationship between the migration phenomenon, the transformations it brings about in contemporary cities, and the role of ICT solutions in the responses that are put in place. In this discussion, contributions will be accepted on the following topics:

1. Theoretical debates on the relationship between migration, urban transformation and new technologies.

2. Experimentation with new technologies aimed at facilitating the integration of migrants in different sectors, such as housing, education, health, and work.

3. Implementation of technological solutions aimed at promoting and innovating coordination and communication between the different actors operating in essential services for migrants.

On this topic, which is still in its experimental stage, the session would like to promote dialogue between the knowledge being built up by field actors and researchers.

The expected contributions could be of a theoretical nature, although preference will be given to contributions based on empirical knowledge.