



University of Bologna
Department of Sociology and Business Law

CALL FOR PRESENTATION PROPOSALS (2nd STAGE)

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

IV Midterm Conference
Bologna, Italy, 2-4 September 2020

European Sociological Association (ESA) - Research Network 37: Urban Sociology
University of Bologna – Department of Sociology and Business Law

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

Description: The year 2020 commemorates the 100th anniversary of the death of Max Weber. Unquestionably recognized as one of the forefathers of Western Sociology, Weber's scholarship is notable for its breadth and its ability to connect the spheres of economics, politics, and culture in the study of Western and non-Western societies. Alongside his many indirect contributions to the field of Urban Sociology, Weber also focused directly on urban spaces, particularly in *The City*, a posthumously edited volume (1921) later incorporated in his *Economy and Society*, where he tried to lay the foundations for a systematic theory of urbanism and urban development.

For this conference, we take the centennial anniversary of Weber's death, and the 99 years since the publication of *The City*, as an opportunity to reflect about the past, present, and future of cities, 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 ecological theory à la Chicago School, to neo-Marxist and political economic approaches, to the more recent advent of poststructural, postmodern, and postcolonial urban studies. Different methods of analysis have accompanied these changes, from urban (ecological) modelling, to the use of quantitative, qualitative (especially ethnographic), and case-based (oftentimes comparative) approaches. And cities and urban livelihoods have themselves changed considerably in recent decades, in interaction with macro-level processes such as international migration and the commodification and globalization of cultural artifacts and economic activities.

We encourage contributions looking at urban changes, as well as focusing on recent and contemporary processes of urban development broadly conceived, in all cases with a vision towards social action and the creation of better cities and urban experiences for the future. In other words, in this conference, we are interested in uncovering: 1. What are the past, present and future developments of urban research (urban theory)? And, 2. How have cities, both in and through the multiple actors living and working in/on them, themselves develop(ed) in the past, present and future (urban praxis)?

RN37 Organizing Committee:

Marta Smagacz-Poziemska, Jagiellonian University, Krakow, Poland

M. Victoria Gómez, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Spain

Patrícia Pereira, CICS-NOVA, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal

Rui Carvalho, Department of Sociology, Brown University, USA

Gabrielle Manella (Coordinator of the Local Organizing Committee), University of Bologna, Italy

Katrin Padaam, Tallinn University of Technology, Estonia

Jan Üblacker, ILS Research Institute for Urban and Regional Development, Dortmund, Germany

Confirmed keynote speakers:

Giampaolo Nuvolati – Professor of Sociology of Environment and Territory, Vice-Rector for Public Engagement and Director of the Department of Sociology and Social Research at the University of Milan Bicocca, Scientific Coordinator of the Territory Section of AIS (Italian Association of Sociology).

Ayse Caglar - Professor of Social and Cultural Anthropology, University of Vienna and Permanent Fellow at Institute for Human Sciences (IWM), Vienna.

Terry N. Clark – Professor of Sociology at the Chicago University, President of ISA RC03 Community Research Committee, International Coordinator of the Fiscal Austerity and Urban Innovation Project.

Sessions: For this midterm conference we first opened a call for session proposals. The list of 24 thematic sessions selected as the offer for the abstract submissions is attached to this Call.

For abstract submission and further information visit <https://esarn37.hypotheses.org/2065>

Please note that submission of abstracts/papers for the presentation as the first author/presenter (also in joint-authorship) is limited to one session only.

Abstracts format: The majority of sessions follow a traditional format based on an open call for abstracts and equal time allocation (expectedly 15 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 the sessions include some basic info about the format. In case of any doubts contact the chair(s) of the session you are interested in.

Language: As a rule, English will be the official language of the conference. Please note that the organizing committee will not be able to provide translation support during the conference.

Key dates: Please watch out for the following key dates.

- February 10, 2020: Call for individual abstracts opens.
- April 03, 2020: Abstract (individual papers) submission deadline.
- April 30, 2020: Notification of abstract presenters.

	ESA MEMBERS		NON ESA MEMBERS	
	Band 1	Band 2	Band 1	Band 2
PhD or M.A. student - early bird	60	40	80	60
Regular - early bird	120	80	160	120
PhD or M.A. student	80	60	100	80
Regular	160	120	200	160

- May 2–May 31, 2020: Early-bird registration for individual participants and registration for session organizers.
- June 1–June 15, 2020: Full rate registration for individual participants.
- September 2–4, 2020: IV Midterm Conference of the ESA-RN37, Urban Sociology.

IV Mid-Term Conference Fees (€)

Fees include: attendance of conference sessions, conference materials, coffee breaks, certificate of participation

Band 1 countries: Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Aruba, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Cayman Islands, Channel Islands, Chile, Croatia, Curaçao, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Faroe Islands, Finland, France, French Polynesia, Germany, Gibraltar, Greece, Greenland, Guam, Hong Kong SAR/China, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Isle of Man, Israel, Italy, Japan, Korea, Rep., Kuwait, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Macao SAR/China, Malta, Monaco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Northern Mariana Islands, Norway, Oman, Poland, Portugal, Puerto Rico, Qatar, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Singapore, Sint Maarten (Dutch part), Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Martin (French part), Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, Trinidad and Tobago, Turks and Caicos Islands, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Virgin Islands (U.S.).

Band 2 countries: Everywhere else.

THE LIST OF SESSIONS

1. ARTISTIC INTERVENTIONS IN URBAN SPACE	6
2. WE, CO-WALKERS IN THE URBAN SPACE	7
3. ALTERITY IN THE DEVELOPING URBAN SUBJECT	8
4. FROM NEIGHBOURHOOD TO COMMUNITY, OR FROM COMMUNITY TO NEIGHBOURHOOD?	9
5. IN/EXCLUSION IN THE FESTIVAL CITY	10
6. SQUATTING MOVEMENT IN EUROPE	12
7. HOUSING IN THE 21ST CENTURY: TRENDS, POLICIES AND CHALLENGES IN POST-CRISIS CITIES	14
8. BLUE AND GREEN TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURES AS SOURCE OF A NEW GENTRIFICATION IN EUROPEAN CITIES?	15
9. THE TOURIST CITY: OPPORTUNITIES, CHALLENGES AND CONFLICTS	17
10. CARE THEORY MEETS THE CITY: EXPLORING IMPLICATIONS FOR THE STUDY OF URBAN INEQUALITY	18
11. INNOVATIVE STREETS IN EUROPE. EXPLORING PRACTICES AND GOVERNANCE OF ALTERNATIVE URBANITIES	19
12. URBAN REGENERATION: POLICIES AND EFFECTS	21
13. HOUSING INFORMALITY IN THE GLOBAL NORTH: A SOCIO-HISTORICAL APPROACH	23
14. URBAN IMAGINATION AND TECHNOLOGY OF DATA VISUALISATION IN URBAN STUDIES	24
15. REWRITING BELONGING AND IDENTITY THROUGH URBAN SPACES: EVERYDAY CITY-MAKING IN TURBULENT TIMES	25

16.	CONFRONTING URBAN REGENERATION POLICIES IN EUROPE BETWEEN NEW FORMS OF TOURISM, CREATIVITY AND EXPULSIONS	26
17.	RESIDENTIAL SEGREGATION AND THE STUDY OF SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF TOWNS AND METROPOLISES. EMPIRICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ADVANCEMENTS IN URBAN SOCIOLOGY	27
18.	WELCOMING SPACES? OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES FOR NEWCOMERS	29
19.	URBAN PRACTICES AND URBAN INSTITUTIONS: THOUGHTS ON SEGREGATION AND THE SPATIALITY OF EVERYDAY RESOURCE ORGANIZATION, SOCIAL NETWORKS AND SOCIAL CAPITAL	30
20.	UNLOCKING INTER AND TRANSDISCIPLINARY APPROACHES TO URBAN RESEARCH PROJECTS	31
21.	SOCIAL INNOVATION IN THE CITIES: POLITICS, POLICIES AND ACTORS	32
22.	RESPONSIBLE CITIES: PARADIGMS, PRACTICES AND POLICIES	34
23.	DEBATING URBAN ETHNOGRAPHY: LIMITS AND POTENTIALITIES	35
24.	MIGRATIONS, URBAN TRANSFORMATIONS AND ICT SOLUTIONS	36

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 on the one hand 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. An excellent example of this trend is 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 (30 minutes) exploratory walk 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 Donald, Amy Glasmei, Mia Gray, 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@gmu.ac.uk), Briony Sharp (University of the West of Scotland, brionyssharp.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 (Waite, 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, and one 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 surrounding 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 the 21st century: trends, policies and challenges in post-crisis cities

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)

In most Western European countries, the beginning of 20th century marked the development of social housing sectors as a response to both the growing housing needs of newly formed urban working class and the substandard living conditions of most urban dwellers at that time. During the so-called “thirty glorious years”, which started from the post-conflict reconstruction, a massive state-led social housing production contributed to define the main traits of the modern city shaping the social structure and identities of urban neighbourhoods. To different extent, in Western Europe social housing was more or less integrated to welfare state systems ensuring the right to housing and representing an important driver of social inclusion. This golden age for social housing, which had been governed almost entirely by public action, came to an end since the mid-1970s. Cities were affected by profound changes spurred by de-industrialisation processes, the restructuring of the labour market and reduction in welfare investments under the influence of neo-liberal politics. In this context, social housing became increasingly residual and subject to growing concerns about the exclusion of its inhabitants. To paraphrase Robert Castel, at this stage there is a “metamorphosis” of the housing issue wherein social housing provision became increasingly targeted to the most deprived social groups. As Harloe showed, this residual model became widespread in different countries in both Europe and the United States, despite contextual differences. To tackle the growing stigmatization of social housing and the marginalization of its dwellers, large scale urban renewal programmes driven by national governments were launched at the end of 20th century aimed at increasing the levels of social mix through tenure diversification.

The 21st century poses new housing-related challenges for contemporary cities. The state alone is no longer able to be a lever of inclusion and integration. Growing socio-economic inequalities are reflected in rising levels of residential segregation between different groups within cities exacerbating the stigmatization of social housing neighbourhoods. The refugees’ crisis is also posing new questions in terms of both housing provision and integration processes. In addition, increasing commodification of housing along with the effects of post-GFC austerity policies contribute to

worsen the crisis of housing affordability which involves a pool of different social categories, including urban middle classes. This session invites both theoretical and empirical contributions from different disciplines and geographical contexts to discuss trends and challenges for housing policy in the 21st century.

Topics may include:

- (i) Social housing and the welfare state in times of neo-liberalism, including cross-country analysis of the impact of global financial crisis on social housing systems and recent evolution in the position of housing as a welfare state service.
- (ii) Social innovation in housing: how new actors and new governance arrangements are addressing contemporary challenges related to housing affordability and social integration of vulnerable groups in urban environments.
- (iii) Urban renewal and housing, including studies on local experiences of public/social housing tenants affected by urban regeneration policy and the outcomes in terms of inclusion/integration.
- (iv) Informal housing, social movements and right to housing, including analysis of everyday practices of inhabitants of social/public housing against risks of vulnerability and exclusion.

8. Blue and green transport infrastructures as source of a new gentrification in European cities?

Chairs: Michael Friesenecker (University of Vienna, michael.friesenecker@univie.ac.at), Giorgio Osti (University of Trieste, giorgio.osti@dispes.units.it), Roberta Cucca (NMBU - Norwegian University of Life Sciences, Oslo, roberta.cucca@nmbu.no), Jan Üblacker (ILS - Research Institute for Urban and Regional Development, Dortmund, jan.ueblacker@ils-forschung.de), Ilaria Beretta (Catholic University of the Sacred Heart, 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 focus on blue and green transport infrastructure as sources of a new gentrification is a provocative title for highlighting new forms of urban restructuring promoted in the name of environment protection. Transport infrastructures have shaped cities ever since, but climate change mitigation policies seem to bring blue and green transport infrastructure back to European cities as key drivers of urban restructuring processes. In some cases, they may lead to displacement because of intense renovation and related rental increase, ending up in environmentally friendly, but very expensive housing.

Therefore, the social effects of the development of blue and green transport infrastructures might be framed in the general debate about ecological gentrification, but more specific perspectives and contexts that shape urban restructuring apply to both cases.

As far as blue transport infrastructures, cities have been recently redefining their relationship with the water by redeveloping defunct harbour sites into new, high-quality urban districts, strongly affected by processes of self-segregation of affluent groups in luxurious, brand-new neighbourhoods, characterised by direct access to the water and blue infrastructures. Waterfronts follow a standard formula of fast policy transfer that has gone global, including not only expensive apartments, but also creative, cultural, and technological industries and commodified leisure and entertainment spaces.

On the other side, low-carbon policies that aim on reducing individual motorized traffic in favour of local and regional public transport lead to improvements of quality of living in close proximity to train stations and other places of mobility. Additionally, the importance of individual mobility due to flexibilization of work and temporary employment relationships leads to an increasing demand for housing in these areas. Train station districts seem lately to be transformed into places that serve the needs of mobile urban middle classes.

The session aims on gathering empirical evidence to paint a more comprehensive picture of the specific causes, pathways and consequence of gentrification around blue and green transport infrastructures. Empirical investigations and more theoretical approaches focusing on social justice and urban restructuring in connection with the following topics are welcomed:

- Social consequences of blue and green transport infrastructure projects
- Effects of uncovering channels and rivers previously covered or deviated
- Effects of redevelopments of railway stations and the surrounding districts
- Specific aspects of the process, such as residential changes or non-residential use of space (e.g. tourism or passers-by)
- Specific forms of gentrification and/or urban restructuring related to blue and green transport infrastructures, and how do they differ from other forms of socio-spatial change

9. The tourist city: opportunities, challenges and conflicts

Charis: Alexandre Vaz (CICS.NOVA of Lisbon, avazphoto@yahoo.com), Paolo Giaccaria (University of Turin, paolo.giaccara@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 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 regeneration 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 invited scholars, introduced and moderated by the organizers. If interested in participating, please contact one of the chairs with a short description of your research interests

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 “theatre” 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).

We invite scholars in the fields of urban sociology and care theory to participate in a small workshop and to give their perspectives on the intersections between these fields on theoretical and empirical levels. Based on our own research, we (as organizers) will introduce the conceptual and methodological questions about care theory, care practices and urban inequalities and moderate a focused discussion about these topics.

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 al. 2013; Wessendorf 2014). Therefore, some of these innovative practices conjugate 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.

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), 571-33.
- 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. Moulaert, 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., & González, 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/2RU8hYl>.
- 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. Moulaert, 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 and Prêteceille, 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 and Denton, 1989) and income (Bischoff and 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. Another aspect that has been neglected is the relationship between urban segregation and housing prices. 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 and 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 and 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 2008-2009 and 2011-2013 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 and 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 Bergamaschi¹ (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-Debaugue (Federal Institute of Technology Lausanne, joan.stavo-debaugue@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, ...) 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 translocal) 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 Lúgia 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 inter and transdisciplinary approaches to urban research projects

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

Format: roundtable

As a transnational space is being created for the academic to become an anchor source of inter and transdisciplinary knowledge on urban changes, the rise of new opportunities is paired by emerging concerns. While the role played by the universities is often framed and conditioned by overarching political and policy aims (e.g. Sustainable Development Goals, New Urban Agenda, etc.), research projects are often partnership-led and variably funded by local authorities, international

organisations, and/or the universities themselves to achieve their goals in the short, medium or long run. This sort of multi-actor and multi-layered ecosystems wherein urban researchers can find themselves to develop their investigation is a privileged space to unfold a meta-reflection about the negotiations of meaning-making among multiple interests and claims at stake, and the practical implications of inter and transdisciplinary approaches on urban research. Whereas researchers are expected to produce highly qualified evidence-based knowledge in synergy with other scientific and non-scientific actors towards purposes generally based on urban changes, a set of interlocked issues is brought to light. How to pursue high quality of the interdisciplinary investigation within policy-framed, and often constrained, research projects? How to ensure that the ethical requirements of the research project agenda are appropriately observed and the actors' needs and interests respected? And how to effectively translate findings from transdisciplinary research in order to improve their accessibility to multiple publics and the usability for policy purposes? At the edges of the questions above, issues that can be perceived as lateral to core investigation rather dictate the realpolitik of everyday life in research projects. From a broader angle, urban researchers often work in precarious conditions, like a growing amount of researchers in all disciplinary fields today, that necessarily have an impact over the decisions to be made either at the outset of, or during, their involvement in a research project. From a more situated angle, inter and transdisciplinary research projects often require situated interventions that tend to blur the distinction between research and policy agencies, which rises ethical concerns as to the pasteurization of proper state and/or market functions on the field. Last, the paramount ambition to publish research in top-ranked peer-reviewed journals can lead academics to face the dilemma on whether and how local participants will ever read and have the ownership over their original contributions. The roundtable is open to researchers and practitioners that wish to address some or all of the issues above to unfold a collective reflection on the experience with research projects that aim to have an impact over urban changes.

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 theoretical 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: paradigms, practices and policies

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 - differently declined - as an analytical framework of current cities, taking in consideration multiple levels of analysis: 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 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 in the current debate, some prevailing interpretations that call into question three crucial dimensions: 1) sharing, 2) collaboration and 3) sustainability. On one hand, these dimensions seem to outline nowadays the semantic and discursive framework of different policies, which try to redesign the ways of dialogue and relationship between citizens and institutions, as well as to reformulate the paradigms of local and economic development. On the other hand, the same above mentioned three dimensions define a field of practices that move "from the bottom" and within the social fabric of the city. In this perspective, some emerging paradigms can be identified: the ones of "sharing cities" and "collaborative cities" - this latter often alternatively declined as "common city"- and, finally, the one of the "circular city". Each of these paradigms can help to highlight useful elements to rethink cities as more fair, inclusive, sustainable and as a space for the re-generation of commons and where enact forms of shared social responsibility, however it seems more and more necessary - without the intent of defining in normative sense what a responsible city is or should be - to try to highlight some coordinates that help 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 gives the attention not only to the "how", but also to the purpose of the change that we want to produce on the social, economic and environmental level. Technology is certainly an enabling factor, however never neutral. Technological innovation should rather be framed within socio-technical systems declined

according to the different cultural aspects and the nature of the economic system within which innovation is produced and operate. Which kind of imaginaries, paradigms, practices and policies can reshape and foster a co-construction of responsible cities, meanwhile making substantial this concept and getting back also its political dimension?

This call intends to invite for proposals that help to confront with this question with theoretical as well as empirical contributions in relation to different spheres of urban life. Among the many issues that may be investigated, the following are an example of 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.pererira@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.

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: Roundtable

This round table aims to analyse 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 programmes 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 round table, 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 round table 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.