

Caring during crisis: navigating risk and uncertainty in health, care and beyond

SoRU

Program Midterm Conference 2025
European Sociological Association
Research Network 22
Sociology of Risk and Uncertainty

SoRU



Colophon

Caring during crisis: navigating risk and uncertainty in health, care and beyond

Program Midterm Conference 2025 ESA RN22

Publisher

Marketing & Communicatie ESHPM

Design

PanArt.nl

Table of Contents

Welcome	p. 4
Program Overview	p. 5
Keynotes	p. 6
Sessions Overview	p. 8
Sessions Abstracts	p. 12
Session 1	p. 13
Session 2	p. 19
Session 3	p. 25
Session 4	p. 29
Practical Information	p. 35

Welcome

Dear participants of the Midterm Conference of the European Sociological Association Research Network 22 (RN22) *Sociology of Risk and Uncertainty*, kindly hosted by Erasmus School of Health Policy & Management at the Erasmus University Rotterdam in the Netherlands,

This year marks the 20th anniversary of our network, a milestone that invites reflection on two decades of pioneering sociological inquiry into the dynamics of risk and uncertainty in modern societies. Since its inception, RN22 has provided a platform for scholars to examine the ways risks emerge, are communicated, and are managed across diverse societal domains. This anniversary is not only a moment to celebrate past achievements but also an opportunity to envision the future of risk sociology. As contemporary crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic, climate emergencies, and geopolitical conflicts challenge established paradigms, RN22 remains committed to addressing these issues through innovative research and interdisciplinary collaboration.

At the Midterm Conference 2025 we aim to bring together both seasoned scholars and emerging voices to reflect on the network's legacy and to chart new directions for the study of risk and uncertainty. This year's theme *Caring during crisis* delves into the intersection of health, care, and crisis within the framework of risk sociology. Health and care systems are increasingly tested by cascading crises such as global pandemics, climate change, geopolitical instability, and socio-economic inequality. By foregrounding this theme we aim to foster a deeper understanding of how risk sociology can inform policies and practices that enhance practices of care during crisis and promote equitable health outcomes.

We are looking forward to an informal and engaging event, with a diverse set of participants from all corners of Europe and beyond, fascinating key-notes and an inspiring Risk Tour. Welcome in Rotterdam!

Kind regards,

Bert de Graaff & Veronica Moretti, coordinators of ESA RN22, and Karin van Vuuren, Roland Bal and Patricia van Loo-Kemp, local organizing committee.

Program Overview

Date & Time	Activity	Location (building, room)
Tuesday 28/10: PhD Workshop		
10:00 – 17:00	Closed session	Bayle, J7-43/45
Wednesday 29/10: Midterm Conference Day 1		
09:00 – 09:30	Registration / Coffee	Theil, C2-1
09:30 – 09:45	Opening ESHPM Dean Maarten IJzerman	Theil, C2-1
09:45 – 10:45	Keynote 1: Jens Zinn	Theil, C2-1
10:45 – 11:00	Short break	Theil, C2-1
11:00 – 12:30	Sessions 1 (exact program see below)	Theil, C2-1, C2-3; C2-4
12:30 – 13:00	Lunch	Theil, C2-1
13:00 – 14:30	Sessions 2 (exact program see below)	Theil, C2-1, C2-3; C2-4
14:30 – 14:35	Short break	Theil, C2-1
14:35 – 15:30	Keynote 2: Patrick Brown	Theil, C2-1
15:30 – 18:30	Risk Tour	City center
18:30 – 19:00	No program	
19:00 – 22:00	Conference Dinner	Vessel 11
Thursday 30/10: Midterm Conference Day 2		
09:30 – 10:00	Registration / Coffee	Theil, C2-1
10:00 – 11:00	Keynote 3: Roland Bal	Theil, C2-1
11:00 – 11:15	Short break	Theil, C2-1
11:15 – 12:45	Sessions 3 (exact program see below)	Theil, C2-1, C2-3; C2-4
12:45 – 13:45	Lunch	Theil, C2-1
13:45 – 15:15	Sessions 4 (exact program see below)	Theil, C2-1, C2-3; C2-4
15:15 – 15:30	Short break	Theil, C2-1
15:30 – 16:30	Keynote 4: Marion Koopmans	Theil, C2-1
16:30 – 17:00	Closing and wrap-up	Theil, C2-1

Keynotes

Keynote 1: The Truth About ... 20 Years Sociology of Risk and Uncertainty. Looking Back, Looking Forward

Jens Zinn, University of Melbourne (chair: Bert de Graaff)

29/10, 09:45 – 10:45, Theil C2-1

This keynote combines Jens' personal experiences and views about the early days of the network, with some themes and topics which developed over time. This includes the question of what the central topic of the Sociology of Risk and Uncertainty actually is, as well as questions of modernisation and critique, amongst many others. Since SoRU established itself over the past two decades as a vibrant and interdisciplinary field of research, it has matured and diversified. However, from the very beginning, it has been under pressure from other disciplines, such as economics, psychology, and engineering, and still has to fight for its place in a competitive environment to prove its value for understanding and navigating the risks and uncertainties of our times. This has become even more important, as Ulrich Beck once suggested, when the state of exception has become the new normal.

Keynote 2: Studying uncertainty and risk in 3D: how to do it and what do we learn?

Patrick Brown, University of Amsterdam (chair: Veronica Moretti)

29/10, 14:35 – 15:30, Theil C2-1

In this keynote talk Patrick will explore what we learn about ways of handling uncertainty when we dig beneath the surface of the everyday. Garfinkel, influenced by Schütz, asserts that our more explicit and conscious social actions are merely the tip of a much deeper and taken-for-granted iceberg. When we adopt and develop methods for digging into these lifeworlds, then we can deepen our grasp of how assumptions about systems influence (dis)trust, how imaginaries influence hope, and how magical thinking operates. As we develop this deeper, more three-dimensional understanding of everyday coping amid uncertainty, we also become more aware of how these different approaches (hope, trust, magic) are intertwined with one another in everyday coping with vulnerabilities – thus building upon and extending Zinn's helpful schema.

Keynote 3: The dark side of resilience

Roland Bal, Erasmus University Rotterdam (chair: Veronica Moretti)

30/10, 10:00 – 11:00, Theil C2-1

Originally developed during the Ebola outbreak in West Africa in the mid 2010s, discussions about the concept and practice of health system resilience have gained momentum during the COVID19 pandemic. Increasingly there are calls to reconceptualize health system resilience from a focus on structures and capacities to one on practices and processes. In my presentation Roland will talk about what we have learned during and since Covid about health system resilience, focusing also on the 'dark side' of resilience thinking. Roland will end with an agenda for future research into health system resilience.

Keynote 4: Reflecting on science in action during crisis

Marion Koopmans, Erasmus MC, Pandemic & Disaster Preparedness Center (chair: Bert de Graaff)

30/10, 15:30 – 16:30, Theil C2-1

The COVID19 pandemic and its wide-ranging impact on health, healthcare and society put a magnifying glass on vulnerabilities in modern day society for emerging diseases. Handled primarily as a biomedical crisis, there was increasing scientific and societal debate about the need for incorporating more diverse perspectives into the scientific advisory groups that the different countries have put in place for such events. The unprecedented use of s(social) media and preprint publications added a dimension of “public peer-review” that had clear benefits but also created confusion and -in some instances- led to hijacking of information for intentional misuse. Marion will share some of the experiences and challenges of her role as one of the advisors of national-, EU- and international level outbreak management teams during several health emergencies (COVID19, avian influenza, pandemic influenza, Marburg, Zika, mpox), including reflections on collaborations with social science experts.

Sessions Overview

Session 1 29/10 11:00 – 12:30	
Session 1.1	Resilience and Vulnerability, Governing Uncertainty in Crisis: Theil C2-1 Theory <i>Chair: Patrick Brown</i>
	<i>Evelyne Baillergeau, University of Amsterdam & EHESS: Emotions, knowledge and the future. A phenomenological approach to agency.</i> <i>Maria Grazia Galantino, Sapienza University: Atomic Turns: Nuclear Risk between Past Taboos and Future Uncertainties.</i> <i>Jens Zinn, University of Melbourne: Risk and Convenience: Is it Time to Broaden the Socio-Cultural Perspective on Risk?</i>
Session 1.2	Resilience and Vulnerability, Governing Uncertainty in Crisis: Theil C2-3 Science <i>Chair: Roland Bal</i>
	<i>Daniel Stein, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin: (E)Valuating Risks: Traveling Judgements in Research Funding.</i> <i>Tomris Cesuroglu, Charlotte Waltz, Ferrán Castaño Rosario, Danique ten Bokkel Huinink, Anja Schreijer, Pandemic & Disaster Preparedness Center/Erasmus University Rotterdam, ESSB/VU Amsterdam, Athena: Scientific Advisory Mechanisms of Seven European Countries During COVID-19 – A Comparative Study.</i> <i>Colin van den Akker, Risk and Crisis Research Centre, Mid Sweden University: Public participation in what? Ambiguity and Energy Justice in wind turbine regulations in Flanders and the Netherlands.</i>
Session 1.3	Forced Mobility and Global Disruptions: Migration, Refugees and Risk Theil C2-4 <i>Chair: Bert de Graaff</i>
	<i>Erika Greco, Sapienza University: The Perception of Migration Between Security Policies and Hypermediation</i> <i>Francesco Rigoli, City St Georges, University of London: People's perception of polycrisis: the role of worries about global threats, ideology and political aspirations.</i> <i>Naomi Camardella, University for Foreigners of Perugia: Who Stays and Who Leaves? Gender, Risk and Recovery in Post-Earthquake Norcia.</i> <i>Sait Bayrakdar & Ayse Guveli, Warwick University: Elderly care arrangements in migrant families: A systematic review of the empirical literature.</i>

Session 2 29/10 13:00 – 14:30		
Session 2.1	Resilience and Vulnerability, Governing Uncertainty in Crisis: Theil C2-1 Networks <i>Chair: Maria Grazia Galantino</i>	
	<i>Sait Bayrakdar & Ayse Guveli, Warwick University: The Role of Social Networks on Employment and Occupational Status for Migrants.</i> <i>Beatriz Xavier, Coimbra School of Nursing: Ecologies of Care Between Tourism and Drought: The Governance of Commons in Territories Under Environmental Stress.</i> <i>Karin van Vuuren, Robert Borst, Roland Bal & Bert de Graaff, Erasmus University Rotterdam: Organizing crisis in healthcare: practicing risk and resilience in a regional acute care network in the Netherlands.</i>	
Session 2.2	Digital Dilemmas: AI and Technology in Health and Care <i>Chair: Veronica Moretti</i>	Theil C2-3
	<i>Barbara Fersch & Karoline Duus Lindegaard, Danish Centre for Rural Research, University of Southern Denmark: The role of trust in mitigating the risk of digital exclusion among older people.</i> <i>Marta Gibin, Riccardo Pronzato & Antonio Maturo University of Bologna: The risk of trust: promises and pitfalls of Artificial Intelligence in radiomics (starting from the MAMMOth project).</i> <i>Martina Consoloni, Francesco Miele, Veronica Moretti, Carmen Pellegrinelli, Ludovica Rubini, University of Bologna & University of Trieste: Hybrid Intelligence in Dementia Care: Reframing Risk through Human-Algorithm Cooperation.</i> <i>Simone Casiraghi, Niels van Dijk, Maciej Otmianowski, Gianmarco Gori, Vrije Universiteit Brussel: Systemic AI risks: from catalyst to cataclysm.</i>	
Session 2.3	Visualising Risk and (Mis)Communication in Crisis (1) <i>Chair: Roland Bal</i>	Theil C2-4
	<i>Annalisa Plava, University of Bologna: Caring with...the (comic) strips. Navigating the datafication of health and risks of online identity theft.</i> <i>Aistė Balžekienė, Kaunas University of Technology: Risk Perception, Trust and Societal resilience in Turbulent Times: Navigating Uncertainties in Lithuania.</i> <i>Marjoleine van der Meij, Tomris Cesuroglu, Charlotte Waltz, Lois van Eck, Anja Schreijer, Pandemic & Disaster Preparedness Center/Erasmus University Rotterdam, ESSB/VU Amsterdam, Athena: Communicating School Closures to Vocational Students in Times of Crisis: A Participatory Approach to Epistemic (In)justice.</i>	

Session 3	30/10 11:15 – 12:45	
Session 3.1	Art and Risk: Visualizing Uncertainty Together	Theil C2-1
	<i>Veronica Moretti, University of Bologna</i>	
Session 3.2	Care Work Under Pressure: Professions, Systems and Informality (1)	Theil C2-3
	<i>Chair: Maria Grazia Galantino</i>	
	<i>Áxel De León Marcos, Universidad de Salamanca: Urban Inequality, Uncertainty, and Self-Perceived Health: Insights from a Medium-Sized City.</i> <i>Elisa Goras, University of Bucharest: Managing Psychosocial Risk and Resilience: The Impact of COVID-19 on Frontline Social Care Workers in Bucharest.</i> <i>Nicoletta Bosco & Ester Micalizzi, Università degli Studi di Torino: Why might caring for your loved ones be risky? Food for thought on the Italian case.</i>	
Session 3.3	Visualising Risk and (Mis)Communication in Crisis (2)	Theil C2-4
	<i>Chair: Patrick Brown</i>	
	<i>Manuela Farinosi, Claudio Melchior, Alessandro Meneghini, University of Udine: Vulnerability in the Gaps: Rethinking Pub Risk Communication.</i> <i>Gulia Banfi, A. Rubin & F. Seganfreddo, University of Ferrara: Floods Risk Perception And Bottom Up Suggestions To Improve Risk Communication In Italy.</i> <i>Kirill Gavrilov, Independent researcher: Using Ai to Infer Responsibility Ascriptions from Comments on High-Consequence Risks: The Cases of the Crocus Terrorist Attack and the Kursk Offensive</i>	

Session 4 30/10 13:45 – 15:15		
Session 4.1	Resilience and Vulnerability, Governing Uncertainty in Crisis: Simulation and Learning <i>Chair: Roland Bal</i>	Theil C2-1
	<i>Bart Blokland, Pandemic and Disaster Preparedness Center: Simulation Exercises and the Practice of Integrated Scientific Advice in Dutch Pandemic Preparedness.</i> <i>Charlotte Waltz, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Pandemic and Disaster Preparedness Center: Speculating through Simulation: Engaging with Risk and Uncertainty in Pandemic Preparedness Research.</i> <i>Faiq Fatima Durrani, Quaid-I-Azam University Islamabad: Are We Prepared? A Qualitative Inquiry into the Absence of Life-Saving Skills in the Curriculum of Government Colleges in Punjab.</i> <i>Olof Oscarsson, Mid Sweden University: Educating Tomorrow's Practitioners: Strengthening Higher Education in Risk, Disaster, and Crisis Management through International Collaboration.</i>	
Session 4.2	Care Work Under Pressure: Professions, Systems and Informality (2) <i>Chair: Bert de Graaff</i>	Theil C2-3
	<i>Franziska Jentsch & Katja Knauthe, Wir Pflegen e.V., Germany, HSZG, Germany: Resilience and Care Partnerships in Long-Term Care.</i> <i>Rebecca Muir, Queen Mary University of London: Risky pregnant bodies: a critical policy analysis of how risk-logic is used to ration NHS funded IVF in England.</i> <i>Bert de Graaff & Bertien Winkel, Erasmus University Rotterdam & Dutch Health and Youth Care Inspectorate: Regulating pandemic preparedness in Dutch healthcare: an explorative case-study of the Dutch Health and Youth Care Inspectorate.</i>	
Session 4.3	Resilience and Vulnerability, Governing Uncertainty in Crisis: Communities <i>Chair: Veronica Moretti</i>	Theil C2-4
	<i>Guadalupe Ortiz, Antonio Aledo, José Javier Mañas-Navarro, University of Alicante: The AQUASOC tool: integrating social impacts and social capacities through network analysis for flood risk management.</i> <i>Charlotte Boin, Leiden University: Adaptation without easy options: How farming communities adapt to growing restrictions.</i> <i>Naomi Shulman & Lars Gerhold, TU Braunschweig: Caring for the Whole Social Body: Resilience as Vision and Value for Civil Security?</i> <i>Sophie Kolmodin, Olof Oscarsson, Mid Sweden University: Rural Risk and Disaster Management from a Relational Place approach: Insights from Northern Sweden.</i>	

Sessions Abstracts

Session 1

Session 1.1: Resilience and Vulnerability, Governing Uncertainty in Crisis: Theory 29/10 11:00 – 12:30, Theil C2-1, Chair: Patrick Brown

Evelyne Baillergeau, University of Amsterdam & EHESS: Emotions, knowledge and the future. A phenomenological approach to agency. Email: e.baillergeau@uva.nl

This paper starts from the lack of perceived agency regarding uncertain futures as a key element of the experience of vulnerability and questions care from the perspective of the social, cultural and institutional conditions of agency development. More specifically, the paper looks into the ways in which future-oriented strategies unfold and the role of knowledge and of future-oriented emotions such as anxiety and hope therein.

To this end, I consider that, in the current context, while potential futures have become pervasive and ubiquitous, there is a great deal of confusion in how we use words to depict future-oriented attitudes. Clarifying the vocabulary of potential futures allows me to situate agentic forms of future-oriented attitudes such as aspiring amidst other attitudes towards the future including anticipating, apprehending and hoping and to discuss how the power to act features across the respective attitudes towards the future (Baillergeau, 2024).

To further explore the role of emotions and knowledge in agency development I build on the phenomenology of Alfred Schutz and on the sociology of emotions (Kemper; Rebughini; Webb) and use illustrations from recent research in France, involving migrant women in a participatory action research project addressing guidance provision in the area of language proficiency and work training.

*Maria Grazia Galantino, Sapienza University: **Atomic Turns: Nuclear Risk between Past Taboos and Future Uncertainties.*** Email: mariagrazia.galantino@uniroma1.it

The revival of the debate surrounding nuclear technology and its associated risks in recent years is undeniable. Whether it emerges in the form of the specter of nuclear threat in the military domain or through the renewed push for nuclear power as a form of “clean” energy, we are witnessing a profound shift in the meanings and imaginaries attached to the atom. Once dominated by collective fears rooted in Cold War geopolitics and catastrophic accidents, nuclear discourse is now increasingly entangled with narratives of ecological transition, energy security, and technological innovation. Notably, this process of re-legitimation is unfolding not only in the realm of civilian energy but also - despite persistent fears - in the military sphere, where nuclear deterrence is once again framed as a strategic necessity.

Based on an ongoing research project, this contribution explores how nuclear risk is being reframed, re-legitimised or resisted in public discourse, and examines patterns of change and continuity in Italian public opinion. Preliminary findings invite critical reflection on the intersection of historical taboos and future uncertainties, raising new questions about how societies will imagine, negotiate and govern nuclear risk in the decades to come.

The socio-cultural theorising on risk has long been occupied with considerations about culture (Douglas), new risks and non-knowledge (Beck), governmentality and biopolitics (Foucault), voluntary risk taking (Lyng) and more recently intersecting inequalities (Giritli Nygren et al.) amongst others. The important role of "ease" or "convenience" (Nietzsche, Tierney) as a driver of sociotechnological development besides the modern desire for a "predominance over nature" (Scheler) is surprising. From the "conveniences", to the "convenience store" and the "marriage of convenience" the concept connects to fundamental social changes but also plays a crucial role for the development of technology (Tierney). For example, the automobile, the airplane, the modern kitchen appliances (e.g. washing machine, dishwasher, micro-wave) as many others relate to convenience. This is about the ease with which we can do tasks such as being quicker and more efficient in managing the household and our life more generally. However, amongst others, our lifestyles and the development of new technologies are responsible for the emergence of many risks we are struggling with today.

This presentation explores the concept of convenience in the realm of risk studies, where it might help to better understand the social perception and responses to risk. "Convenience" can at least be distinguished from related concepts such as laziness and efficiency. Epistemologically, a shift from making tasks less burdensome to managing time has been identified (Shove). More recently as will be argued, in face of a world of overburdened complexities, uncertainties, and risks, convenience might have increasingly more to do with easing cognitive and emotional burdens. It might therefore counter the "Inconvenient Truth" of climate change (Gore) amongst other complex and systemic risks of our times.

Session 1.2: Resilience and Vulnerability, Governing Uncertainty in Crisis: Science
29/10 11:00 – 12:30, Theil C2-3, Chair: Roland Bal

Daniel Stein, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin: (E)Valuating Risks: Traveling Judgements in Research Funding. Email: daniel.stein.1@hu-berlin.de

I want to explore how risks in biomedical research proposals are presented, assessed and addressed. By analyzing research proposals and their corresponding reviews, it is possible to trace risk evaluations throughout the entire review process and thus reconstruct the rationalization of risk-taking in research funding. Furthermore, I aim to demonstrate the benefits of interpreting processes of risk evaluation as valuation constellations (Waibel et al., 2021). In this regard, documents from funding lines that promote risky research are especially valuable, since these funding lines' expectations encourage proponents and reviewers alike to consider, reflect upon and justify the risks of a project.

Accordingly, I will examine research proposals (n=35) submitted to the Reinhart Koselleck Program, their corresponding reviews (n=108) and final funding decisions (n=35). The Reinhart Koselleck Program is a funding line established by the German Research Foundation to support particularly risky and/or innovative research. Adopting a grounded theory approach (Glaser & Strauss, 2017) and the concept of valuation constellations (Waibel et al., 2021), this paper analyzes how relations between judgements are organized across different stages of the review and decision-making process and how these relations can be described in terms of their respective functions.

The analysis reveals two key insights. First, it demonstrates how different categories of evaluation (innovation and research excellence) interact to produce the notion of positive risk. Second, it shows that this very interaction does not result from a single evaluation, but is instead constructed through selective connections to previous judgments. Investigating the

construction of risk therefore means searching for the traveling judgements that shape the evaluation process over time.

Tomris Cesuroglu, Charlotte Waltz, Ferrán Castaño Rosario, Danique ten Bokkel Huinink, Anja Schreijer, Pandemic & Disaster Preparedness Center/Erasmus University Rotterdam, ESSB/VU Amsterdam, Athena: Scientific Advisory Mechanisms of Seven European Countries During COVID-19 – A Comparative Study. Email: t.cesuroglu@erasmusmc.nl

Keywords: Scientific Advisory Mechanisms, Interdisciplinarity, Crisis Governance, COVID-19, Science-Policy Interface

Background: The COVID-19 pandemic highlighted the critical role of scientific advisory mechanisms (SAMs) in shaping national crisis responses. These mechanisms varied significantly between countries in terms of structure, complexity, disciplinary composition, relationship with policy and decision-making, mandate, and overall governance. This study examines the development, structure, and functioning of SAMs in seven Western European countries during the pandemic, using the Netherlands as a base case to draw lessons for. It focuses on the extent to which these advisory mechanisms enabled the production of integrated advice—incorporating biomedical, social, economic, and behavioral sciences. Methods

Methods: We are conducting a comparative case study of Belgium, France, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. Data include policy documents, grey and white literature, and semi-structured interviews with approximately 28 key informants. Analysis draws on typologies of scientific advisory committees and a policy learning framework to assess how structural, contextual, and actor-related factors shaped advisory dynamics.

Results: Preliminary findings suggest diverse advisory arrangements across countries, with varying degrees of interdisciplinary integration, independence and adaptability. Advisory structures ranged from centralized and top-down committees to complex networks with specialized subgroups and bottom-up scientific initiatives. Modes of working ranged from consensus-seeking to documenting dissent, but no explicit integrative frameworks were found to guide interdisciplinary deliberation. While all countries established multi- or interdisciplinarity into their advisory bodies to some degree, the Netherlands emerged as a case where integration of biomedical and social/behavioral sciences was least evident.

Conclusions: While analysis is ongoing, initial insights highlight how institutional structures, the adaptability of advisory mechanisms, and national contexts shape the integration of knowledge into crisis governance. Advisory systems with more open, pluralistic, and flexible structures appear to support more integrated responses, though the presence of diverse expertise alone does not guarantee integrative advice. These findings inform the development and governance of more resilient science-policy interfaces for future crises.

Colin van den Akker, Risk and Crisis Research Centre, Mid Sweden University: Public participation in what? Ambiguity and Energy Justice in wind turbine regulations in Flanders and the Netherlands. Email: colin.vandenakker@miun.se

Keywords: Uncertainty, Legitimacy, Planning, Strategic Environmental Assessment, Acceptance

Energy Justice has emerged as the leading framework to assess the moral implications of Renewable Energy Technologies. The dominant approach to Energy Justice assesses these implications along three tenets of justice: Deliberative, Recognitional, and Procedural. Though recent contributions have problematized the underlying principles of justice as underspecified, implicit, and falsely assumed to be static and unambiguous.

One charge against Energy Justice agenda is that it does not account for the possibility of different interpretations of the same body of knowledge, the existence of multiple defensible moral positions, and the possibility of having incomplete knowledge about a phenomenon.

Drawing on the concepts of uncertainty, interpretative ambiguity and moral ambiguity from the Risk Governance literature, this article operationalizes 'recognition of ambiguity' in a comparative case study. A content analysis of 13 policy documents and 447 comments from public consultation about wind turbine regulations in Flanders and the Netherlands answers the following three research questions: Which principles of justice do members of the public and their authorities raise? How do they conceptualize the range of acceptable interpretations and moral claims? And why do they accept or reject competing claims as (il)legitimate?

Preliminary results show that openness and breadth of participation do not guarantee recognition and representation of the participants' viewpoints as legitimate. This is illustrated by a dispute about sound emission norms and their health effects. The Dutch government presents this dynamic as a conversation between experts and lay audiences, even though the experts from the Flemish government share the criticism of the Dutch norm being unmeasurable.

Session 1.3: Forced Mobility and Global Disruptions: Migration, Refugees and Risk **29/10 11:00 – 12:30, Theil C2-4, Chair: Bert de Graaff**

Erika Greco, Sapienza University: The Perception of Migration Between Security Policies and Hypermediation. Email: erika.greco@uniroma1.it

In today's global political landscape—marked by climate crises, socio-economic instability, and widespread conflicts—migration appears inextricably linked to uncertainty and instability. On one hand, those who migrate take on the "scalar risks" of the journey, undertaken as an individual, family, or collective project (Williams & Baláž, 2012). On the other hand, nation-states frame migration in terms of threat and danger, making it a catalyst for insecurity in its various dimensions: "the thesis is that immigration may compromise the material and cultural foundations of democratic solidarity, while we have lost the ability to articulate a structural critique of capitalism and inequality" (Ypi, 2025).

The Covid-19 health crisis in 2020 served as a "revealing event" of global challenges (Morin, 1976, p. 68): we entered a state of 'permacrisis,' a prolonged period of instability and uncertainty (Galantino, 2024, p. 193), which "creates fertile ground for the emergence of violence and forms of new nationalism" (Beck, 2003, p. 63). Beck's prophecy has materialized: surveillance states have turned into "fortress states, in which the military and security take precedence over freedom and democracy" (Beck, 2003, p. 44). Defensive measures and authoritarianism have prevailed over human rights. "The Enlightenment that discovered liberties also invented disciplines (Foucault, 1975, p. 242)". In the risk society, all certainties collapse. "The modern Cogito can no longer lead to the certainty of being; rather, it destabilizes it" (Lazreg, 2017, p. 54).

This paper aims to explore the relationship between the border crossings, the perception of migration and the Italian policies that have reduced funding for migrant reception, before externalizing the right to asylum. It also investigates the role of postmodern media, which, through interpassive participation, infantilize culture and critical thought (Fisher, 2009, pp. 143–144).

Francesco Rigoli, City St Georges, University of London: People's perception of polycrisis: the role of worries about global threats, ideology and political aspirations. Email: francesco.rigoli@city.ac.uk

Scholars have claimed that the world has entered an age of polycrisis, in which humanity is facing multiple daunting threats all looming simultaneously. Yet, research exploring people's perception of the various global threats taken together, rather than taken one at a time, is lacking. To fill this gap, this investigation explores people's worries about multiple global threats (e.g., climate change, pandemics, world war, and economic collapse). In four online studies, participants reported how much they worried about such threats. Using factor analysis, Study 1 and 2 reveal that worries about global threats reflect two underlying factors including Material Worry, relative to dangers about life, health, and the economy, and Social Worry, relative to risks endangering social cohesion. Study 3 shows that Material Worry is higher among left-wing supporters while Social Worry is higher among right-wing supporters. Moreover, it reveals that high Material Worry predicts security aspirations on economic matters while high Social Worry predicts conservative aspirations regarding social norms. Employing an experimental manipulation, Study 4 supports the notion that these effects are causal. The preset enquiry offers a first systematic enquiry concerning people's worries about global threats, a phenomenon which, in the not-too-distant future, may have great impact upon society.

Naomi Camardella, University for Foreigners of Perugia: Who Stays and Who Leaves? Gender, Risk and Recovery in Post-Earthquake Norcia. Email: n.camardella@studenti.unistrapg.it

Keywords: Gender and disaster, Post-earthquake recovery, Risk and migration, Feminist disaster studies, Care and community resilience

This research-in-progress explores the gendered dimensions of disaster recovery in the context of the 2016 earthquakes in Central Italy, with a particular focus on the town of Norcia. While international scientific literature has increasingly recognized women as critical agents in disaster resilience, Italian literature and policies continue to overlook their specific roles, needs, and contributions in post-emergency settings. The project adopts a qualitative and intersectional lens to investigate how women experience, navigate, and shape the long-term reconstruction process. At this early stage, the research is grounded in preliminary desk analysis and demographic mappings, with planned fieldwork in Norcia. A specific area of emerging interest concerns the dynamics of displacement and rootedness: who decides to leave the territory after the disaster, who stays, and why? Initial observations suggest gendered patterns in post-disaster migration, which may reflect broader inequalities in access to resources, social expectations, and roles in care provision. The paper offers a preliminary theoretical positioning within feminist disaster studies and risk sociology, while outlining key research questions that will guide the empirical phase. It also reflects critically on the lack of gender-sensitive disaster governance in Italy, the persistence of gender stereotypes in crisis contexts, and the risks of reinforcing exclusion in recovery policies. The aim is to open a dialogue on methodological strategies for qualitative research in post-disaster settings and to reflect on how micro-level gendered experiences can inform broader frameworks of recovery and care.

Sait Bayrakdar & Ayse Guveli, Warwick University: Elderly care arrangements in migrant families: A systematic review of the empirical literature. Email: ayse.guveli@warwick.ac.uk

Keywords: Migration, Elderly care, Transnational families, Intergenerational care arrangements, Systematic review

Aging migrant populations in Europe and beyond has recently been in the agenda of social researchers, policy makers and practitioners alike. Provision of elderly care for migrant

populations requires attention and a tailored approach as their preferences of care in old age and they have different care needs. Moreover, the transnational nature of many migrant families complicates the picture further.

The studies exploring migration and elderly care predominantly focus on migrant care workers. While the literature looking at the arrangement of elderly care in migration context is growing fast, it is still at its early stages. In this paper, we aim to review the empirical studies in this area, present a meta-analysis of these studies particularly in relation to their research questions, methodologies and geographies. By doing so, our objective is to provide an account of our understanding of elderly care in migration context as well as critically assessing the gaps in the field and proposing a future agenda.

Our analytic strategy follows the PRISMA reporting guidelines. We screen the online databases for 'migration' and 'elderly care' studies and include peer-reviewed social science papers with an empirical element.

Our preliminary results show that the literature on elderly care in migrant families have a strong focus on the needs and experiences of the migrant families and, partly as a result of this focus, the structural and institutional barriers are also scrutinised. The literature shows some advances in mapping transnational nature of the elderly care by exploring elder parents left in the country of origin. That said, we also identify gaps. There is limited comparative research on elderly care in migrant families, papers employing certain approaches often being limited to particular methodologies, a lack of comparison of migrant families to their comparators in origin contexts.

Session 2

Session 2.1: Resilience and Vulnerability, Governing Uncertainty in Crisis: Networks

29/10 13:00 – 14:30, Theil C2-1, Chair: Maria Grazia Galantino

Sait Bayrakdar & Ayse Guveli, Warwick University: The Role of Social Networks on Employment and Occupational Status for Migrants. Email: sait.bayrakdar@warwick.ac.uk

Keywords: Migration, Labour market outcomes, Occupational status, Employment, Social networks

While people often migrate to have access to better opportunities and outcomes for themselves and their descendants, migration is also associated with risk and uncertainty. Accessing existing opportunities in the destination context may be more difficult for migrants for reasons such as discrimination and lower economic, social and country-specific cultural capital. In this paper, we investigate the labour market outcomes of Turkish individuals in Europe and how the size and characteristics of their social networks may explain their labour market outcomes.

Using the unique 2000 Families dataset, which comprises data on Turkish migrants in Europe and their non-migrant counterparts from high-emigration regions in Turkey, we examine the social network sizes and characteristics of the Turkish migrants in Europe in comparison to those in Turkey. We then focus on only those living in Europe and examine their employment likelihood and occupational status. We use several explanatory factors to explore the effects of their social networks on these outcomes.

Our results show that the Turks living in Europe have smaller social networks (operationalised as the number of their friends and acquaintances) than Turks living in Turkey from similar backgrounds. These differences are substantial and significant for the second generation.

The network size (both close friendships and acquaintances) increases employment likelihood but it has no significant impact on occupational status attainment, suggesting that its impact on socio-economic advancement is limited. Friends with employment are positively linked to the employment of the individual, whereas it is the educational level of friends that has a positive effect on occupational status, confirming that the resources available in networks can help achieve higher occupational status. As opposed to expectations around social networks, having social networks ingrained in ethnic enclaves does not have a direct impact. However, relying on family and relatives in social networks, which can be interpreted as bonding rather than bridging networks, hampers the advancement in occupational status.

Beatriz Xavier, Coimbra School of Nursing: Ecologies of Care Between Tourism and Drought: The Governance of Commons in Territories Under Environmental Stress. Email: xavier.beatriz@gmail.com

This paper explores how environmental crises, particularly water scarcity, challenge local forms of care and solidarity in the Algarve, southern Portugal, a region heavily impacted by mass tourism, intensive agriculture, and climate change. Tourist regions are a blend of high mobility social areas which mix environmental, economic, and health risk factors, challenging local community cohesion and care institutions. Following the Tronto's definition of care (Tronto, 1993), we will analyse how this balance of care is in tension in the face of a climatic risk of drought, agricultural productivity and tourism. The Algarve illustrates how ecological risk reshapes the everyday practices of both residents and institutions. Summer droughts intensify tensions over water allocation among stakeholders: tourism enterprises, large-scale avocado

and citrus producers, and local populations. In response, the Portuguese state has implemented a series of water containment measures, enforced reductions in agricultural and tourism water use (2023–2024). These decisions, though necessary, are often contested, generating mistrust and reinforcing perceptions of injustice and exclusion. To highlight the more-than-human entanglements that connect infrastructures, policies, ecosystems, and communities, we situate these dynamics within the sociologies of risk (Beck, 1992; Zinn, 2008) and ecologies of care (Martin et al., 2015). We also discuss One Health frameworks and the idea of “situated ethics,” which advocate for integrated approaches to care that transcend anthropocentric or biomedical models. This study emphasises the potential and fragility of collective action, drawing on field observations, policy documents, and local mobilisations. Ecologies of care show that in addition to technical solutions, relational, ethical, and political responses based on equity and local mobilisations are necessary to address climate-induced crises.

Karin van Vuuren, Robert Borst, Roland Bal & Bert de Graaff, Erasmus University Rotterdam:

Organizing crisis in healthcare: practicing risk and resilience in a regional acute care network in the Netherlands. Email: vanvuuren@eshpm.eur.nl

Keywords: Resilience, Network, Risk work, Acute healthcare

Introduction: In this paper, we focus on how resilience emerges through the everyday practices, routines, and negotiations within and between organisations within a healthcare network. We do so to describe the transition between retrospective and prospective approaches to organizing risk work within and between organizations in a network.

Methods: We built on an ethnography of an acute care network in the Netherlands between May 2024 and September 2025. This case-study included observations in network meetings (120h), document analysis and interviews with actors in network related organisations.

Results: We zoom-in on the practices related to prospective risk work such as crisis simulation exercises and the creation of crisis management and risk management procedures and policies. Our analysis underscores that a.) uncertainties differ between the organisations involved due to geographical and institutional differences, b.) healthcare actors within the network negotiate these different perspectives between network and organizational risks on different layers, and c.) what the network is differs between the different organizational layers involved.

Conclusions: We argue that the network is both a.) a process, an evolving set of relationships and exchanges that emerges through shared dependencies and uncertainties that connect different actors over time and b.) an outcome of routines that were prioritized, defined, and later formed as the core of the network. Furthermore, healthcare organizations within an acute care network pragmatically engage in prospective risk work to deal with unknown future threats while aiming to strengthen their resilience through retrospectively engaging with institutional boundaries, everyday realities, and crises in the past.

Session 2.2: Digital Dilemmas: AI and Technology in Health and Care

29/10 13:00 – 14:30, Theil C2-3, Chair: *Veronica Moretti*

Barbara Fersch & Karoline Duus Lindegaard, Danish Centre for Rural Research, University of Southern Denmark: The role of trust in mitigating the risk of digital exclusion among older people. Email: fersch@sam.sdu.dk

Keywords: Trust, Digital exclusion, Digital care services, Older people

In Denmark the digitalisation of the welfare state, also in service provision vis-à-vis the citizens has been pushed in a coercive “digital-by default” way in recent decades. For a part of the

population this has created barriers for accessing health and social care, and thus creates challenges concerning universality and equality in care provision. A majority of the people at risk of this form of digital exclusion is over 70 years old.

Research in technology adoption emphasizes a lack in perceived safety and technological anxiety as important barriers for older people to start using new technologies. In this context, trust can play an important role to overcome barriers and strengthen digital inclusion. Prior research has shown that trust relations to frontline care workers using the technology together with the citizens are a promising possibility to overcome these issues. In this conceptual contribution we aim to shed light on the institutional and social arrangements, that form the respective “infrastructures” of trust (Bodó & Janssen, 2022): This includes institutionally transmitted and interpersonal trust to frontline care providers, as well as trust in technology, which are intertwined. To this end, we aim to combine the emerging literature on technology-mediated trust with a socio-material perspective. We also aim to reflect on how these insights can contribute to the implementation of inclusive digital care services for older people.

Marta Gibin, Riccardo Pronzato & Antonio Maturo University of Bologna: The risk of trust: promises and pitfalls of Artificial Intelligence in radiomics (starting from the MAMMOth project). Email: marta.gibin2@unibo.it

Keywords: AI; Radiomics; Trust; Socio-technical imaginaries

The introduction of artificial intelligence (AI) systems in healthcare has stimulated debates on their potential benefits, risks, and impacts. Different research areas, such as sociology of health (Lombi and Rossero, 2024), STS (Miele and Giardullo, 2024) and critical digital health studies (Lupton and Butler, 2024), have highlighted the need to analyse these narratives in practice. A key aspect of these narratives is trust, which can favour socio-technical and moral environments where new risk categories are created (Brown and Van Voorst, 2024). Indeed, trust and risk are inextricably linked, as risk is the flip side of trust. In this context, narratives have also been linked to “socio-technical imaginaries”, representing both collective visions of technological futures (Jasanoff and Kim, 2009) and end-users’ meaning-making processes (Bucher, 2017). Starting from the results of the MAMMOth project, this study investigates narratives surrounding AI in breast cancer detection with a content analysis of 701 online user comments responding to a New York Times article on the topic. Our findings reveal divergent visions of AI, its role in healthcare and the associated risks. Specifically, drawing on Sztompka’s trust framework (1995, 1999), we identify four forms of trust, each of which corresponds to a different type of risk: positional, segmental, organizational and technological trust. Findings show that positional trust in AI and physicians varies, with some viewing AI as complementary, others fearing dehumanization and errors. Segmental trust in the profit-driven U.S. healthcare systems negatively influences attitudes toward AI, as does low organizational trust in medical institutions and governments. Technological trust both drives optimism and skepticism. In this scenario, the study proposes a framework for the analysis of the forms of risk and trust that are in play when AI systems are utilised in healthcare settings, contributing to understanding AI adoption.

Martina Consoloni, Francesco Miele, Veronica Moretti, Carmen Pellegrinelli, Ludovica Rubini, University of Bologna & University of Trieste: Hybrid Intelligence in Dementia Care: Reframing Risk through Human-Algorithm Cooperation. Email: martina.consoloni2@unibo.it

Keywords: Dementia care; Artificial intelligence; Digital technologies; Hybrid intelligence; Risk

This contribution explores how risk in dementia care can be reconfigured through cooperation between human and nonhuman actors. The analysis draws on data collected in 2024-2025 as part of the ANTICIPATE project – led by the University of Trieste and the University of Bologna – which examines digital and AI-based technologies used in both residential and home care

settings in Italy. The project adopts a mixed-methods design, including technology mapping, a national survey, semi-structured interviews with informal caregivers, ethnographic studies in nursing homes, and co-design workshops with end users.

In nursing homes, night-time monitoring systems allow staff to set personalized alarm thresholds based on their knowledge of residents. When multiple alerts occur, they must quickly decide whom to assist and how, drawing on alarm signals, video feeds integrated into the monitoring system, and their familiarity with residents' routines.

In home care, family caregivers often contend with malfunctions in GPS tracking devices – such as dead batteries, weak signals, or false alerts – but continue to rely on them because they feel safer using them. They may share app access with others and interpret the data by combining technological inputs with tacit knowledge of their loved ones' habits.

In both contexts, technologies also prove vulnerable, and partly for this reason, risks for care recipients persist. Yet cooperation between people and technologies appears to make those risks more bearable for caregivers. Rather than automating risk detection, these technologies rely on caregivers' knowledge and, in turn, generate new forms of information. Risk management thus becomes a collaborative process, redistributing responsibility across human and nonhuman actors.

This paper argues that technology should not be seen as a replacement for human cognition or labor, but as one element through which 'hybrid intelligence' can emerge, enabling humans and algorithms to learn from one another and care as best they can.

*Simone Casiraghi, Niels van Dijk, Maciej Otmianowski, Gianmarco Gori, Vrije Universiteit Brussel: **Systemic AI risks: from catalyst to cataclysm**. Email: Simone.Casiraghi@vub.be*

Keywords: Systemic Risk, AI Act, Digital Services Act, Uncertainty, Risk Governance

"Systemic" risks have become key in recent EU digital regulations. In the AI Act, systemic risks are associated with the "high-impact capabilities" of general-purpose AI models (GPAIs, e.g., ChatGPT): the higher the capabilities, like the cumulative amount of computation used for the model's training, the higher the risks. In the Digital Services Act, they concern specific online platform functionalities that rapidly amplify negative effects, e.g., on public health. In other fields, it is the complexity and cascade effects that either expand or narrow our understanding of risk, depending on the "system" considered, such as the collapse of health systems due to pandemics or the vulnerability of digital networks and cybersecurity systems. However, what makes a risk distinctively "systemic", and how AI capabilities or platform functionalities are defined, remain vague and underdiscussed.

The concept of "risk society" helps us understand not only specific instances of risk, but also how, as technological and health risks grow, our collective uncertainty about the future has made risk a political concern to be managed via institutions, processes, and regulations. By analyzing legal provisions and the literature on the sociology of risk, we question how systemic risks challenge traditional models of uncertainty and risk governance. We hypothesize that the systemic risks posed by GPAIs differ from the classical physical risks in the risk society, and not merely due to their more "immaterial harms". Classical risk paradigms framed uncertainty about future risks as a feature of the environment (e.g., the unpredictable spread of a disease) or as a result of human ignorance. In the case of (GP)AI, by contrast, uncertainty is no longer merely a matter of ignoring the environment's responses or humans' behavior, but seems to stem from the raw, domain-independent capabilities of AI systems to catalyze possible consequences of events to systemic cataclysmic dimensions.

Session 2.3: Visualising Risk and (Mis)Communication in Crisis (1)

29/10 13:00 – 14:30, Theil C2-4, Chair: Roland Bal

Annalisa Plava, University of Bologna: Caring with...the (comic) strips. Navigating the datafication of health and risks of online identity theft. Email: annalisa.plava2@unibo.it

Contemporary risks due to the datafication of health take on new characteristics and their effects are potentially unlimited. Cyberattacks on healthcare are on the rise by 74% worldwide with an average of 209 attempts per day. As user-patients we directly generate this data and consent to the storage by health professionals by interpreting the online as a prosthesis of the offline. Data monitors us in our extimacy and intimacy. Monitoring the health state by sharing our medical data with professionals and related tools, therefore, is a risk we assume even if not always aware of it. However, this personal information could be compromised or misused and impact on new forms of victimization as the Online Identity Theft (OIDT). European OIDT victims often do not report the crime, believing that the harm suffered is not significant enough or, as in the health data victims, lacking adequate resources to counteract it. With the aim of expanding awareness to prevent OIDT but also to support the victims, an interdisciplinary team (sociologists, IT experts and an artist) realized a graphic project introducing Secure and Care Comics. The narrations, practical information and emotional dynamics have been outlined by 23 semi-structured interviews with OIDT experts and 47 structured interviews with victims. Key informants' perspectives were the starting point to craft the storyboard and realize comic strips. In this scenario, comic strips which merge social research, technical insights, and art, were developed to 1) raise awareness of the risks related to health data 2) inform patient-users, victims, and health professionals about the social risks of OIDT 3) encourage health institutions to activate effective support systems to preserve patient data.

Aistė Balžekienė, Kaunas University of Technology: Risk Perception, Trust and Societal resilience in Turbulent Times: Navigating Uncertainties in Lithuania. Email: aiste.balzekiene@ktu.lt

During recent years societies are facing non-closing circle of crises, with multiple overlaying risks and uncertainties. Lithuania witnesses on the highest inflation in Europe, was severely affected by the energy crisis and is in constant uncertainty around military threats. The concept of polycrisis is becoming an important analytical lens to explore the amplification and overlaying effects of different crises and risks. There has been increasing emphasis in public discourse on the societal resilience and factors behind it. The societal resilience in polycrisis situations and contexts besides institutional capacities in crises response should include local knowledge, empower leadership of communities and NGO's, and strengthen social networks for disaster preparedness.

This presentation is exploring how risk perception of complex risks and trust in institutions are shaping the perception societal resilience for extreme situations in Lithuania. Presentation is based on the data from representative public opinion survey with 1003 respondents, conducted in October 2024, in Lithuania. Predictors of societal resilience include trust in institutions and communities; risk perception and intersecting demographic characteristics. Results of the survey indicate the low trust in government, municipalities as well as NGO's and their abilities effectively to respond in crisis situations. Trust in army, police and first responders is much higher. Societal resilience is also related to the historical memory of past crises and optimistic attitudes towards the future.

This presentation is based on the project „Socio-spatial determinants of societal vulnerability and resilience to crises and strengthening the crisis response potential of communities” (SERENITY), funded by the Research council of Lithuania, no. Nr. S-VIS-23-21.

Marjoleine van der Meij, Tomris Cesuroglu, Charlotte Waltz, Lois van Eck, Anja Schreijer, Pandemic & Disaster Preparedness Center/Erasmus University Rotterdam, ESSB/VU Amsterdam, Athena: Communicating School Closures to Vocational Students in Times of Crisis: A Participatory Approach to Epistemic (In)justice. Email: m.g.vander.meij@vu.nl

Keywords: Science communication; Epistemic justice; School closures; Participatory methods; Vocational education

The COVID-19 pandemic exposed deep vulnerabilities in education systems worldwide, with Dutch vocational education (MBO) students disproportionately affected by repeated school closures due to disruptions in their practice-based learning. The closures also undermined students' social and emotional well-being, while their voices remained largely absent from public discourse and policymaking. Building on this insight, we have proposed a pilot project—set to begin in September 2025—that aims to co-develop communication strategies and complementary measures for future school closures in the context of infectious disease outbreaks.

The project centres epistemic trust and justice by engaging MBO students and scientists (from biomedical, social, and economic disciplines) in participatory futuring workshops. Using immersive scenario-based design, mockumentaries, and facilitated dialogue formats, participants will explore the uncertainties and normative dilemmas surrounding school closures. They will co-create actionable recommendations for science communication that acknowledges their lived experiences, diverse value frameworks, and practical needs.

Although the research will not have started by the time of the conference, we seek to present our project plan to the RN22 community. We are particularly interested in gathering feedback on our participatory approach, scenario design, and our conceptual framing around epistemic justice. The session will also serve as an opportunity to reflect with fellow researchers on how young people from structurally underrepresented groups can be meaningfully included and motivated to participate in science communication and pandemic preparedness efforts. This pilot initiative will serve as a foundation for scalable, socially robust communication tools and decision-support strategies. In doing so, it contributes to more inclusive and dialogical models of science-society interaction—particularly in times of uncertainty and crisis.

Session 3

Session 3.1: Art and Risk: Visualizing Uncertainty Together

30/10 11:15 – 12:45, Theil C2-1, Chair: Veronica Moretti, University of Bologna. Email: veronica.moretti4@unibo.it

This interactive session explores how drawing can become a medium for understanding and representing risk. Participants will sketch simple visual metaphors of risk and uncertainty, whether imagined as places, objects, creatures, or everyday situations. Through a collective gallery and facilitated reflection, individual perceptions will merge into a shared mosaic of risks, highlighting both vulnerabilities and resilience. No artistic skills are required: the goal is to spark dialogue and imagination, bridging sociology and art in an inclusive and engaging format.

Session 3.2: Care Work Under Pressure: Professions, Systems and Informality (1)

30/10 11:15 – 12:45, Theil C2-3, Chair: Maria Grazia Galantino

Áxel De León Marcos, Universidad de Salamanca: Urban Inequality, Uncertainty, and Self-Perceived Health: Insights from a Medium-Sized City. Email: axeldeleonmarcos@usal.es

Introduction and guiding question: The urban environment and health are deeply interconnected, as the neighborhood where people live directly influences their health perceptions (Giles-Corti et al., 2016; Gasevic, 2014). This study examines the determinants of self-perceived health in a medium-sized city, considering key urban elements such as access to healthcare, housing quality, public spaces, and infrastructure (Buttazzoni et al., 2022; Guida & Carpentieri, 2021). A nuanced understanding of these determinants is crucial for developing targeted public policies and enhancing urban quality of life. Guiding Question: Do different socio-urban realities impact personal perceptions of health? What are the key determinants?

Objectives: Primary Objective: Explore determinants of inequality in self-perceived health across neighborhoods. Secondary Objectives: Analyze the role of the urban environment in shaping health perceptions, and understand how current living conditions affect diverse population groups.

Methodology: A mixed-methods approach (Dawadi et al., 2021), incorporating grounded theory for qualitative data (Engler, 2021), was used to examine four dimensions: healthcare saturation (World Health Organization, 2020), socioeconomic indicators, health data, and urban infrastructure.

Results: Gender differences: Women consistently report poorer health perceptions. Age differences: Young residents show worse self-perceived health, with one-third engaging in self-harm. Environmental impacts: Limited activity opportunities in deprived areas raise chronic disease risks. Uncertainty and mental health: Among youth in low-income neighborhoods, urban uncertainty, linked to housing instability, job insecurity, and inadequate infrastructure, emerged as a critical driver of mental health challenges (Marmot, 2022; Liu et al., 2024). This persistent uncertainty amplifies stress, intensifies anxiety and depression, and erodes social connectedness, leading to a notably poorer self-perceived health status compared to older residents (Wilkinson & Marmot, 2023).

Elisa Goras, University of Bucharest: Managing Psychosocial Risk and Resilience: The Impact of COVID-19 on Frontline Social Care Workers in Bucharest. Email: carmen-elisa.goras@s.unibuc.ro

Keywords: Risk perception; Social care workers

Frontline social care workers were exposed to significant psychosocial risks and uncertainties during the COVID-19 pandemic, yet their disaster-context experiences remain underdocumented. To capture the current state of knowledge, we first conducted a systematic scoping review of the emotional and mental-health outcomes experienced by social care professionals in crisis situations, revealing gaps in qualitative approaches and measurement tools.

Building on the Erasmus+ CARES project, we validated the Professional Quality of Life Scale (ProQOL) for the Romanian context using a national sample of 296 social care workers, confirming high reliability ($\alpha \geq .85$) and factorial validity. Based on this foundation, we are now adapting the validated instrument to specifically capture Bucharest-based social care workers' perceptions of risk, uncertainty, and well-being during the pandemic.

The adaptation process involves cognitive interviews and pilot testing to refine items for local relevance. Simultaneously, semi-structured interviews—designed with empathetic and accessible questions—will explore how these professionals perceived, managed, and mitigated psychosocial risks and governance challenges under crisis conditions.

By integrating the scoping review, national validation, local adaptation, and qualitative inquiry, this mixed-methods study illuminates mechanisms of risk perception and resilience. Our evidence-based recommendations aim to strengthen crisis preparedness, optimize governance frameworks, and develop mental-health support policies, thereby enhancing worker well-being and equity within social care systems during disasters.

Nicoletta Bosco & Ester Micalizzi, Università degli Studi di Torino: Why might caring for your loved ones be risky? Food for thought on the Italian case. Email: nicoletta.bosco@unito.it

Keywords: Caregiver, Home based care, Informal care, Italian welfare system

Family caregivers embody the diversity of 'care cultures', and observing their practices reveals deeply rooted—and often implicit—assumptions about family, welfare and responsibility. In this sense, care is a response to vulnerability and a source of risk, particularly in contexts where institutional support is unreliable and inconsistent. Care is increasingly being used as a strategy to manage the risks associated with an ageing population, health fragility and the withdrawal of public welfare systems. However, this same mobilization creates new vulnerabilities. It reinforces gendered and familial care arrangements, shifts public responsibility and transfers the risk management burden to individuals — most often women — without providing adequate support or recognition. In Italy, family caregivers are at the centre of a paradox. On the one hand, they receive limited institutional assistance, making them highly vulnerable to emotional, financial and physical exhaustion. On the other hand, there is a growing risk that policy efforts aimed at 'supporting' caregivers may, in fact, reproduce the 'familistic' nature of the Italian welfare model by legitimizing the continued withdrawal of public care responsibilities. The uncertainty surrounding the course of chronic and degenerative illnesses exacerbates this condition, amplifying the need for reliable responses that are often lacking. Consequently, family members must constantly improvise and reorganise their lives around the fluctuating needs of those they care for, which further deepens the familial nature of care. Based on data from some recent national surveys and the initial analysis of interviews conducted in three Italian regions as part of the PRIN research project 'Family Caregivers and Alzheimer's: Promoting Engagement and

Community Care in the Post-Pandemic Society', we will investigate how caregivers navigate uncertainty at the intersection of private responsibility and public neglect.

Session 3.3: Visualising Risk and (Mis)Communication in Crisis (2)

30/10 11:15 – 12:45, Theil C2-4, Chair: Patrick Brown

Manuela Farinosi, Claudio Melchior, Alessandro Meneghini, University of Udine:

Vulnerability in the Gaps: Rethinking Public Risk Communication. Email:

manuela.farinosi@uniud.it

Keywords: Vulnerable populations; Public communication; Risk; Disasters; Mass emergencies.

Emergencies constitute complex phenomena that exacerbate pre-existing climatic, political, and socioeconomic inequalities. These events undermine societal well-being, disproportionately affecting marginalized populations and further entrenching systemic vulnerabilities. A growing body of literature underscores the crucial role of communication across all phases of emergency management—prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery—in shaping both risk perception and the efficacy of mitigation strategies. Within this context, risk communication emerges as a critical arena where practices of care are defined, negotiated, and enacted. It not only conveys information but also influences how responsibilities are distributed, how trust is established, and how inclusion is practiced. Its effectiveness depends not merely on clarity but on its responsiveness to cultural and social diversity.

This contribution examines how public risk communication frames vulnerability and care during crises, drawing on recent extraordinary events in Italy. It presents a document-based analysis of materials produced since 2020 by key institutional actors—Civil Protection, Red Cross, Fire Brigade—using an analytical grid. The study addresses four questions: (1) How is vulnerability defined and represented? (2) To what extent are diverse forms of vulnerability considered in design and dissemination? (3) Which groups are prioritized or marginalized? (4) What barriers limit accessibility? Findings reveal persistent limitations: references to vulnerability are sparse and predominantly focused on physical or sensory disabilities and linguistic barriers, leaving many at-risk groups unaddressed. Accessibility features—simplified language, visual formats, intuitive apps—appear inconsistently and without strategic coherence. Communication remains predominantly unidirectional, constraining the agency of marginalized actors in preparedness and response. By reconceptualizing risk communication as a situated practice of care, the study calls for participatory strategies embedded within inclusive risk governance frameworks, contributing to a sociological understanding of care as both a communicative and political act.

Gulia Banfi, A. Rubin & F. Segnanfreddo, University of Ferrara: **Floods Risk Perception And Bottom Up Suggestions To Improve Risk Communication In Italy.** Email:

giulia.banfi@unife.it

We are currently witnessing a climate change-induced increase in extreme rainfall events, which heighten both the intensity and frequency of floods across Europe (IPCC, 2022). According to the Climate Risk Index 2025 by Germanwatch, Italy ranks third—after Pakistan and Belize—among the countries most affected by extreme weather events in 2022. A striking example occurred in the Emilia-Romagna region in Northeast Italy. Shortly after the 2022 Po River drought—the worst in two centuries (Montanari, 2022)—the region was hit by two severe floods (2–17 May 2023 and 18–19 September 2024), causing significant economic damage, displacing thousands, and resulting in 17 fatalities. These events highlight how vulnerability arises not only from the unpredictability of disasters but also from the ways people and institutions respond, influencing the social and political outcomes (Burns & Slovic, 2012). This underscores the importance of risk communication as a tool for building resilience, which requires a deeper understanding of how citizens perceive flood risk and climate change (Rollason et al., 2018; Jongman, 2018).

This paper presents findings from the Risk Communication and Engagement for Societal Resilience (SCARER) project, funded through Italy's PNRR programme. It explores how Italian

citizens perceive flood risk and how they seek and access related information. Our analysis is based on a two-wave national survey conducted via CATI and CAWI methods, involving 2,500 respondent's representative of the Italian population aged 15 and over. These quantitative data are complemented by insights from a public consultation held in Bologna in April 2025, which engaged over 80 citizens. During the conference, the findings of a survey and the results of the public consultation will be presented. The collected data measure exposure to risk information sources, awareness of risk exposure, and assess risk literacy (Ramasubramanian et al., 2019). In addition, they contribute to the development of a typology of different categories of risk awareness and sensitivity. These typologies highlight the need for innovative prevention strategies and proactive approaches to risk communication. Future comparative analyses with other European countries could also be conducted.

Kirill Gavrilov, Independent researcher: Using AI to Infer Responsibility Ascriptions from Comments on High-Consequence Risks: The Cases of the Crocus Terrorist Attack and the Kursk Offensive. Email: gavrilov@socio.msk.ru

Keywords: High-consequence risk, Responsibility ascriptions, Social media, Content analysis

This study continues our empirical investigation into the relationship between risk and responsibility – a link widely recognized at the theoretical level (Giddens, 1999; Douglas, 1990). In earlier research, we analyzed textual data (e.g., blog posts) to examine responsibility attributions in the context of terrorist attacks through manual content analysis (Gavrilov & Tolmach, 2014; Gavrilov, 2022). Our current objective was to explore the potential of social media comments as a data source and assess the feasibility of using AI to accelerate the coding process.

We analyzed YouTube comments related to two recent high-consequence risk events:

1. The terrorist attack at Crocus City Hall (Moscow) on March 22, 2024.
2. The Kursk offensive, during which the Ukrainian army launched an incursion into Russia's Kursk Oblast in August 2024.

For each case, we selected two YouTube overview videos – one reflecting a pro-government perspective and the other presenting a more critical view: Case, Video type, Views, Total Comments, Comments with >15 words, Crocus, Pro-governmental, 0.3+ million, 1,352, 866, Opposition, 1.9+ million, 5,128, 3,137, Kursk, Pro-governmental, 1.7+ million, 2,702, 1,087, Opposition, 3.5+ million, 8,520, 4,442.

Our analysis followed these steps:

1. Developing actor codifiers specific to each case.
2. Selecting comments that refer at least to one actor.
3. Creating guidelines to infer responsibility types from comments.
4. Coding responsibility types for each relevant comment.

Responsibility attribution was coded both manually (for a sample of comments) and using AI. In the paper, we will present not only the substantive findings – such as the distinct patterns of responsibility attribution across the two cases and between pro-government and opposition narratives – but also the methodological implications. Special attention will be given to intercoder reliability between human and AI coders, as well as the repeatability and consistency of AI-generated coding. These findings aim to assess the practical benefits and limitations of applying AI in responsibility attribution research.

Session 4

Session 4.1: Resilience and Vulnerability, Governing Uncertainty in Crisis: Simulation and Learning

30/10 13:45 – 15:15, Theil C2-1, Chair: Roland Bal

Bart Blokland, Pandemic and Disaster Preparedness Center: Simulation Exercises and the Practice of Integrated Scientific Advice in Dutch Pandemic Preparedness. Email:

b.blokland@erasmusmc.nl

Infectious disease outbreaks demand rapid, credible, and actionable policy advice. Yet pandemic advisory bodies often underrepresent social and behavioural sciences, narrowing the scope of scientific advice. This ongoing study investigates how simulation exercises can function as critical method for fostering interdisciplinary collaboration and delivering integrated scientific advice. It centres on simulation scenarios involving "Disease X", an unknown zoonotic pathogen, conducted within the Netherlands' Pandemic & Disaster Preparedness Center (PDPC). The simulations bring together experts from biomedical, behavioural, and social sciences as well as the humanities, working alongside policymakers to co-develop advice under conditions of optimal preparedness. Policy-relevant questions are generated in collaboration with interdepartmental policy tables, and expert teams draw on real-time dashboards including behavioural data and transmission models. Policy advice is structured using the WHO-INTEGRATE framework. We've conducted a literature review and organized pressure cooker workshops with scientists and policymakers. During the session notes were taken, followed by reflection sessions and surveys to assess the process.

Preliminary findings show that integrated advice is both feasible and beneficial when preparedness infrastructure supports cross-disciplinary knowledge exchange. So far, participants reported that the interdisciplinary setup enriched the discussions and led to more inclusive deliberation processes. Scientific advice developed during the simulations was perceived as clearer, more transparent, and more broadly supported across disciplinary fields. Key success factors seem to include shared language, prior collaboration experience, and structured deliberation formats.

Beyond practical insights, the study frames simulations as diagnostic spaces where the politics of expertise, trust, and knowledge are enacted and negotiated. It argues that improving pandemic preparedness in the Netherlands requires not only better technical capacity but also more inclusive and reflexive advisory cultures that can navigate uncertainty and difference before, during, and beyond crises.

Charlotte Waltz, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Pandemic and Disaster Preparedness Center: Speculating through Simulation: Engaging with Risk and Uncertainty in Pandemic Preparedness Research. Email: waltz@essb.eur.nl

The role of simulation in anticipating and managing crises has been widely debated in fields such as risk sociology, science and technology studies (STS), and policy sciences, with scholars like Sheila Jasanoff, Frédéric Keck, Andrew Lakoff, and Limor Samimian-Darash examining how exercises mediate between imagined futures and institutional realities. However, these perspectives have not adequately addressed the socio-material and affective dimensions of simulation exercises, particularly how they shape imaginaries of care, trust, and governance amid structural vulnerabilities. My paper addresses this gap by analysing simulation exercises not merely as technical tools for preparedness, but as speculative methods that actively construct

futures, structure accountability, and mediate uncertainty. Specifically, I examine case studies from the Pandemic & Disaster Preparedness Center (PDPC), focusing on interdisciplinary simulations of virus outbreak scenarios to reveal how these exercises negotiate uncertainty, mobilise affect, and foster institutional reflexivity. I argue that simulation exercises serve a dual function: they are sites where care practices and preparedness strategies are reimagined under crisis conditions, but they also risk reinforcing existing institutional inequalities and exclusions. This project closely examines simulation exercises as sociological objects, demonstrating how they function as sites where institutional responses to crises are not only tested but also constituted - foregrounding the role of speculative practice in shaping risk imaginaries, negotiating uncertainty, and enacting futures of care and governance.

Faiq Fatima Durrani, Quaid-I-Azam University Islamabad: Are We Prepared? A Qualitative Inquiry into the Absence of Life-Saving Skills in the Curriculum of Government Colleges in Punjab. Email: ffdurrani@soc.qau.edu.pk

Keywords: Disaster preparedness, Curriculum analysis, Qualitative research, Life-saving skills, Government colleges, Punjab, Teacher perspectives

In a province prone to floods, earthquakes, industrial fires, and health emergencies, the ability of students to respond effectively to disasters is a critical public concern. Yet, Pakistan's education system continues to prioritize theoretical content over practical preparedness. This study explores whether life-saving skills, such as first aid, survival techniques, fire safety, and emergency response drills; are incorporated into the curriculum of government colleges in Punjab, and how college educators perceive the importance and feasibility of integrating such skills into academic programs. Using a qualitative methodology, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 15 faculty members across five public sector colleges in urban and semi-urban areas of Punjab. Participants were asked about the presence of disaster management content in their courses, their personal preparedness, and institutional readiness to implement practical training. Thematic analysis of interview transcripts revealed a unanimous acknowledgment of the importance of disaster preparedness, yet widespread concern about its absence in current syllabi. Findings indicate that while some institutions conduct occasional fire drills or invite external trainers, these efforts are sporadic and not embedded in the curriculum. Barriers identified include lack of policy directives from educational boards, insufficient training for teachers, and a rigid exam-oriented culture that undervalues applied knowledge. Participants strongly recommend formalizing disaster management training as a mandatory component of college education. The study concludes that meaningful curriculum reform is needed to equip students with essential life-saving competencies. It calls on policymakers, curriculum developers, and educational institutions to bridge this critical gap through structured integration of disaster preparedness education at the college level.

Olof Oscarsson, Mid Sweden University: Educating Tomorrow's Practitioners: Strengthening Higher Education in Risk, Disaster, and Crisis Management through International Collaboration. Email: olof.oscarsson@miun.se

In recent years, the Students Barents Rescue (SBR), a student-focused spin-off of the Barents Rescue, has been implemented at universities in Sweden, Finland, and Norway. This exercise is specifically designed for students enrolled in programs related to risk and crisis management studies. Barents Rescue itself is a civil international crisis management exercise aimed at developing the capacity for cross-border collaboration in response to disasters, accidents, and other emergencies in the Barents region. Through table-top emergency scenarios, the exercise fosters cooperation between participants from different countries and disciplines, emphasizing the importance of coordinated crisis management in a region where cross-border cooperation is essential.

The SBR exercise is designed to engage university students in a hands-on, collaborative environment where they can experience first-hand the complexities of cross-country cooperation during times of crisis. SBR provides a unique opportunity to develop essential skills in communication, teamwork, and crisis management, while also gaining a deeper understanding of how national and cultural differences can influence decision-making in a collaborative setting.

We argue that exercises like SBR can improve students' learning and understanding of cross-country collaboration. While we will touch on the exercise's aims and learning objectives, the focus will be on student evaluations, which provide valuable insights into how participants perceive the exercise's effectiveness. In addition, we will examine how the development of case scenarios within the exercise has evolved over the years. These case scenarios are an essential component of the exercise, providing students with realistic, real-world situations to respond to, further enhancing the learning experience and preparing them for future roles in crisis management.

Session 4.2: Care Work Under Pressure: Professions, Systems and Informality (2)
30/10 13:45 – 15:15, Theil C2-3, Chair: Bert de Graaff

Franziska Jentsch & Katja Knauth, Wir Pflegen e.V., Germany, HSZG, Germany: Resilience and Care Partnerships in Long-Term Care. Email: fjentsch@wir-pflegen.net

Keywords: Resilience, Informal care, Long-term care, Protective factors, Care partnerships

Crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic, workforce shortages, and demographic ageing are intensifying the pressures on informal and professional caregivers. The EU-funded WELL CARE project seeks to improve resilience and mental wellbeing among long-term care (LTC) workers and informal carers by developing care partnerships as an integrated support strategy. This paper presents key findings from systematic reviews of scientific and grey literature, identifying cross-cutting risk and protective factors. In parallel, a catalogue of Good Practices and insights from participatory Blended Learning Networks (BLNs) in five countries offer a basis for understanding enablers and barriers to resilient care ecosystems. Prototype development is about to begin and will be guided by these insights. Prototypes will be co-created with BLN participants, drawing on their lived experiences, priorities, and local contexts. By combining literature-based evidence with stakeholder knowledge, the project prepares for practice-oriented and sustainable interventions. The paper contributes to debates on how shared responsibility and integrated care strategies can strengthen caregiving resilience in times of systemic uncertainty.

Rebecca Muir, Queen Mary University of London: Risky pregnant bodies: a critical policy analysis of how risk-logic is used to ration NHS funded IVF in England. Email: r.l.muir@qmul.ac.uk

The risk factors which women are responsabilised to anticipate and reduce are wide-ranging and ever-expanding into new domains. Using Carol Bacchi's 'What is the problem represented to be' (WPR) poststructural policy approach, my study focusses on how women's access to NHSIVF is governed in England. I analysed key fertility policy documents and 35 participant perspectives (fertility doctors, GPs, policymakers, and people impacted by BMI/age/ovarian reserve restrictions). My analysis found that obese bodies are positioned as too risky to reproduce. From clinician/stakeholder transcripts and policy document analysis, it was clear that NHS-IVF access is shaped by anticipatory risk governance – beyond just IVF risk. For example, anticipated risks included; risk of pregnancy complications, risk to the NHS, and risk of transmitting obesity to future generations. By broadening the timeframe in which larger bodies are deemed problematic, justification for BMI IVF restrictions are solidified. Risk-logic is extremely difficult to challenge: as risk is extended into an ambiguously dangerous pregnant future. Through

biographical interviews with 12 women, I also explored the lived, embodied experience of restrictions. These participants viewed the experience of NHS-IVF restriction through significantly different temporal risk rationalities compared to the clinical risk logic described above; reflecting their own internal logic and values about what was being risked. While rationality-based risk approaches exemplified in the section above take individual behaviour and control as a starting point, sociological risk approaches consider how individuals are positioned in a social world (Heidenstrøm, 2022). In this part of the study, I explored how the lived body as a site of meaning and experience; helping explore why 'rational' risk-logic does not translate easily into people's lives (Heading, 2008). Overall, my work draws attention to how evidence-based health policies reproduce and intensify risk-logic.

*Bert de Graaff & Bertien Winkel, Erasmus University Rotterdam & Dutch Health and Youth Care Inspectorate: **Regulating pandemic preparedness in Dutch healthcare: an explorative case-study of the Dutch Health and Youth Care Inspectorate.** Email: degraaff@eshpm.eur.nl;*

Keywords: Regulation, Regulatory objects, Resilience, Healthcare system, the Netherlands

During the COVID-19 pandemic the organization of healthcare in the Netherlands showed strong adaptability, as did the supervision of healthcare. Existing field standards and quality of care frameworks were discussed and professionals and organizations were given space and confidence to deal with the pandemic. As a result of the pandemic there is growing attention for the preparedness and resilience of healthcare systems. However, it is not yet sufficiently clear how and whether the (pandemic) preparedness and resilience of the organization of healthcare can be regulated and monitored. Existing literature into the COVID-19 pandemic, for example, emphasizes the need for a dynamic view of pandemic preparedness and resilience of healthcare systems; not (only) as measurable properties or outcome of a system, but as a resilient practice. Using this perspective we have engaged in a) a scoping review of relevant literature, b) a retrospective analysis of the work of the Dutch Health and Youth Care Inspectorate (IGJ) during and after the pandemic on regulating preparedness, and c) a qualitative formative analysis of current practices of the IGJ to develop such regulation, specifically in relation to the thematic regulation of laboratories and European regulatory developments. Our analysis emphasizes the concrete work from a regulator to arrive at a regulatory object (de Kam, 2020). That is, regulators such as the IGJ must work to translate the social appreciation and political-administrative discussion of, in this case, pandemic preparedness into concrete practices of supervision. The work involves, for example, identifying the risk, distinguishing and encouraging relevant field-standards, and defining relevant addressees (Grit et al., 2016). We discuss how such work is not an unambiguous task, in particular in case of high uncertainties and amidst a healthcare system already facing many more or less creeping crises.

Session 4.3: Resilience and Vulnerability, Governing Uncertainty in Crisis: Communities
30/10 13:45 – 15:15, Theil C2-4, Chair: Veronica Moretti

*Guadalupe Ortiz, Antonio Aledo, José Javier Mañas-Navarro, University of Alicante: **The AQUASOC tool: integrating social impacts and social capacities through network analysis for flood risk management.** Email: guadalupe.ortiz@ua.es*

The rising frequency and intensity of flood-related disasters due to climate change place vulnerable populations at high risk of experiencing severe impacts on their living conditions. The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction emphasizes the need for detailed attention to the social consequences of disasters, as well as the development of capacity-building strategies in local communities. The AQUASOC project – funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation – provides a significant contribution to this demand by analyzing the social impacts of disasters for the identification of strategic lines of action aimed at building resilient

communities. This communication presents the project's achievements in exhaustively identifying and categorizing social impacts and linking them to the necessary social capacities for flood impacts' prevention, mitigation, and recovery. Employing extensive qualitative fieldwork, including 115 qualitative interviews with key stakeholders across four case studies, and utilizing Social Network Analysis assisted by Gephi software, the project has successfully mapped a network of social impacts and their connection to social capacities. This network facilitates the identification of critical nodes and, consequently, priority capacitation areas for effective social planning and management of flood risk. This network has been the main informational input for the AQUASOC online tool (www.aquasoc.org) for the assessment of social impacts and capacities aimed at local risk managers, which provides users with a ranking of priority lines of action for social capacity-building to prepare for and confront flood disasters.

Charlotte Boin, Leiden University: Adaptation without easy options: How farming communities adapt to growing restrictions. Email: c.h.boin@fgga.leidenuniv.nl

Keywords: Adaptation; Sacrifice; Uncertainty; Risk; Threat

In 2021, Dutch farmers made headlines when took to the highways in their tractors during the "farmer protests". These protests were sparked by a sudden new political priority: reducing the Netherlands' nitrogen emissions. To do so, a large amount of farmers will be required to close up shop altogether or do away with large amounts of livestock. Requiring perhaps half of Dutch farmers to stop farming is an example of what I call "radical adaptation": the collective sacrifice of a practice, livelihood or land so that the collective can become less vulnerable to a chronic threat. It is a genre of (painful) adaptation that many climate measures will likely require. Radical adaptation is difficult for many reasons, not the least of which being that it takes place under conditions of deep uncertainty. This uncertainty is twofold: people have no guarantee that their sacrifice will pay off. They also have no true guarantee that their current situation will become truly untenable (maybe the restrictions will just go away?).

This research investigates how two farming communities respond to the restrictions they face and the possibility of accepting buyouts. In doing so, this research will attempt to untangle how farmers, and those around them, make sense of the risks posed and the options available to them – and the ways in which this process is influenced by a community's history. I present preliminary conclusions from fieldwork in two farming communities, which each face similar restrictions but have reacted in entirely different ways – with Barneveld for the most part resisting change, and Venray largely embracing buyouts. This research contributes to our understanding of why and when people accept and cooperate with painful measures, when said measures demand they sacrifice something they personally value.

Naomi Shulman & Lars Gerhold, TU Braunschweig: Caring for the Whole Social Body: Resilience as Vision and Value for Civil Security? Email: naomi.shulman@tu-braunschweig.de

Questions of civil security are highly political. Public discourse around them emerges from a "culture of security" (Daase 2014), which shapes what a society views as risks and threats and how it seeks to address them. This "culture of security" changes over time, exhibiting shifting societal and political understandings of risks and how to avert them.

One paradigmatic concept of the current culture of security is that of resilience as an anticipatory safeguard against the entire spectrum of risks facing society. In my talk, I will consider how the concept of resilience is politicized as a normative goal of security, underwriting attendant visions of societal care. I will look at how claims about a resilient society as a prerequisite for civil security construct resilience as a form of care-taking that operates both at the material and the ideal level, entwining questions of societal survival with those of societal values.

This understanding of resilience as a fundamental form of care, aiming to preserve the social body, melds societal and political concerns in normative visions. This is evident in Germany's first National Security Strategy, which commits the country to a systemic "integrated security". Here, resilience figures as a way to maintain civil society as a source of national identity based on shared values. I will discuss how the concept of an integrated security, particularly in its focus on resilience, seeks to institute care as a societal resource to deal with risk and crisis. Ultimately, examining the concept of resilience through the lens of care allows us to reflect on the irresolvable tension between the facets of preservation and of transformation that structure systemic understandings of resilience. It also enables us to critique the limits of resilience as a form of societal care-taking, interrogating issues of agency and responsibility.

Sophie Kolmodin, Olof Oscarsson, Mid Sweden University: Rural Risk and Disaster Management from a Relational Place approach: Insights from Northern Sweden. Email: sophie.kolmodin@miun.se

This presentation highlights the importance of relational concepts for understanding disaster management (DM) in rural areas. Specifically, we turn to the concept of relational place to illustrate how places derive meaning from their relationships with other places and argue for a deeper understanding of how these dynamics influence DM professionals' experiences. Despite extensive research on DM, place is often treated as a neutral backdrop rather than as an active agent that shapes professionals' work. To explore the role of place in DM, we draw on interviews with professionals from four municipalities in northern Sweden, characterized by expansive geographies, declining populations, and a decreasing tax base. By employing the concept of relational place, we show how DM professionals perceive laws and regulations as ill-adapted to their contexts and their work as diverging from broader societal norms. We also illustrate how feelings of peripheralization, understood as a process rather than a static condition, are linked to the political, financial, and social dimensions of DM. Through this, we aim to broaden the discourse on DM by providing insights into the unique challenges faced in rural contexts, emphasizing how these intersect with professionals' understandings of place.

Practical Information

Contact and information:

Email: caringduringcrisis@eshpm.eur.nl

Phone number: +31(0) 10 408 8555 (ESHPM Front Office)

Website: <https://www.eur.nl/en/eshpm/events/esa-midterm-conference-2025-10-29>

Venue

Erasmus University Rotterdam, Campus Woudestein:

<https://www.eur.nl/en/eshpm/campus/locations/campus-woudestein>.

We will meet in the **Theil-Building**. See the Program Overview for specific rooms in the building. The campus is easily accessible with public transport.

Information on presentations

We kindly ask each presenter to prepare a presentation of **no more than 15 minutes** to leave enough time for discussion. This especially holds for the sessions in which we have 4 papers to discuss. You do not have to stick to a 'classical' format for presenting your work, but can also more directly engage with participants if you so desire. Please prepare your own slides and sent them in advance to the email address mentioned above, or bring your own laptop and, when necessary, extension-chords etc. to connect to HDMI.

Coffee-breaks & Lunch

At the start of the day and in the short breaks we will serve you coffee, tea, fruit and cookies in the Theil C2-1 area. Lunch will also be provided. All foods are vegan or vegetarian. On the campus and at the ground floor of the Theil-building itself there are also other food and drink opportunities.

Conference Dinner

We very much welcome you to our Conference Dinner at Vessel 11 ([Home - Vessel 11](#)) for an all-vegan walking dinner. We are welcome from 19:00 until 22:00, with the dinner starting from 19:30. Please note that you are expected to have paid the separate conference dinner fee in advance. If you would still like to join us, please sent us an email and pay the fee as soon as possible through this [link](#).

Risk Tour

During this Risk Tour of our Midterm a group of visitors from the Pauluskerk (St. Paul's Church) who know what it is like to be homeless will take you through the streets of Rotterdam. They will share their stories about becoming homeless, being homeless, and trying to get their lives back on track. A unique experience that will give you a better understanding of what it is like to live on the streets. We will be guided in groups, and travel together from the campus to the city center. We will provide direct translation from Dutch when necessary. You can find more information here: [CITY TOUR | Pauluskerk Rotterdam](#). Important, please prepare suitable footwear and (depending on the weather) protection from rain and cold.

PhD Workshop (28/10)

Participants of the PhD Workshop will be informed separately of the schedule and program.

Erasmus University Rotterdam

Erasmus School of Health Policy & Management

Bayle Building

Burgemeester Oudlaan 50

3062 PA Rotterdam, The Netherlands

T +31 10 408 8555

E communicatie@eshpm.eur.nl

W www.eur.nl/eshpm