Call for Papers

SEG/SSE Conference, Basel, 31.10.-01.11.2014
Institute of Social Anthropology (University of Basel),
Museum der Kulturen Basel, and
Centre for African Studies (University of Basel)

Social Anthropology and Global Transformations

Political, economic, ecological, cultural and social transformations are both incentives to and consequences of change in social agency. Increased physical mobility, global connectivity through internet and telecommunication, and access to more or different knowledge and consumer goods worldwide alter ways of being in the world, people's self-understandings and imaginations of how they can and want to situate themselves in the world. The rapid spread of social media like Facebook and YouTube even to places which are thought to lay outside of the 'digital communality' opened up new ways of imagining and living sociality as well as new ways of political mobilisation. Many contemporary processes of cultural creativity and expressions constitute novel processes of subjectification and self-stylization (cf. Moore 2011). At the same time, however, the apparent new opportunities and networks also involve and create cleavages and dissociations as well as inequalities.

In view of these dynamics, transitions and new research fields, social anthropologists face many new questions. Do we need to include virtual life worlds into the already complex, often multilocal research practices and how do we methodologically capture them? How can ethnographic museums deal with these virtual life worlds and with objects which are tangible material manifestations of complex global encounters? What can Social Anthropology contribute beyond concepts of differentiation to understand such new cultural (re-) configurations?

Almost 125 years ago the Commission for the Ethnographic Collection at the 'Museum der Stadt Basel' was established, 100 years ago the first lecture in Social Anthropology took place at the University of Basel, and 50 years ago the Institute of Social Anthropology was founded. These major milestones in the history of Social Anthropology in Basel invite to reflect about how university institutes and ethnographic museums adapt to and negotiate these empirical and institutional transformations. How have ethnographic museums transformed over time and how should they display these processes? How have teaching and research changed in university institutes in the last decades? Moreover, the annual conference of SEG/SES in Neuenburg in the year 2009 applied the topic "Transformations. Social Relations, Knowledge, Policy": Five years after this event, how do we reconsider and review its findings?

Panel 1

Reflections on Methodology: The Intricacies of Comparison and the Epistemologies of Field Research

There is an increase in social scientific projects with multiple researchers who hope to bring together their respective findings either in a complementary or a comparative manner. Even single-staffed projects increasingly try to compare two localities, two milieus, or two contexts. The researcher is highly mobile, a team player, or a team in her/himself. We are confronted with new methodological and epistemological challenges.

In the first part of this panel, we thus critically reflect on the practicalities of such endeavours as well on the possibilities of upholding the anthropological project under these new circumstances. In the second part, we take a step back and review the entry point of anthropological knowledge by exploring the epistemologies of the two distinct, complementary methods usually lumped together as "participant observation".

Part I: Apples & Pears? Comparative Research in Anthropology
Chairs:
Barbara Heer (barbara.heer@unibas.ch), Institute of Social Anthropology, Basel
Lucy Koechlin (lucy.koechlin@unibas.ch), Institute of Social Anthropology, Basel

Since the discipline's very beginnings (Tylor 1889), comparison has been a corner stone in the development of theories and concepts in Anthropology. Comparison between 'field' and 'home' was understood as anthropology's public responsibility (Mead 1928). The crisis of representation and postmodernism brought a strong critique of universalist, objectivist comparison as well as a move away from positivist epistemologies on which comparative methodology was long grounded (Fox and Gingrich 2002). In anthropology today, how can non-universalist, non-positivist comparative methodologies with a strong concern for inductivity and complexity look like? How can anthropology retain its strength of cultural critique (Marcus & Fischer 1986) without falling into universalist traps? How is comparison currently practiced within research projects in the broader academic and applied field of anthropology in Switzerland? What are the challenges and merits of such approaches?

For this panel, we are seeking contributions that address methodological questions in comparative research projects in anthropology. The contributions could address issues like the units and the sites of comparison (i.e. fixed units versus dynamic interconnections, processes versus outcomes, practices versus geographical units) as well as understandings of causality and comparability. The comparative gesture does not only capture comparison across cultures or geographical units, but it can also entail comparison across topics or across generations. Contributions can also stem from single case studies which implicitly or explicitly draw on comparisons to other contexts. On a more practical level, contributions could address questions like feasibility of comparative research conducted by single researchers or within research teams; or the impact of different research environments on the methodology and data.

Part II: Epistemological Explorations: Participation and observation as complementary methods
Chairs:
Till Förster (Till.Foerster@unibas.ch), Institute of Social Anthropology, Basel
Rita Kesselring (Rita.Kesselring@unibas.ch), Institute of Social Anthropology, Basel

"Participant observation" has been at the core of our discipline's identity since many decades. It has been challenged, criticised, defended and appropriated by other disciplines – but its epistemology is more often taken for granted than explored.

This panel aims at disaggregating the loosely defined notion of participant observation by looking at participation and observation as two profoundly different but complementary methods. It starts from the assumption that participation offers a different kind of access to the life-worldly realities of others than observation, which largely builds on the positivist history of science in Western thought. Participation is about the involvement of the researcher in another life-world by sharing social, largely non-predicative practices with others – while observation means to distance oneself from precisely these practices. The difference is, however, more than a switching between perspectives. Sharing social practice offers, for instance, insights into bodily performances. In contrast, seeing and observation help to map complex events such as rites and ceremonies that grow out of the interaction of many different actors.

The panel aims at exploring the epistemologies of the two methods and to reflect on how we make use of participation and observation. We call for empirically grounded papers that offer new analytical and conceptual insights. Specifically, we welcome reflections on the ways the two methods speak to each other, i.e. how knowledge generated through participating influences our capacities to see and observe, and vice versa.

Contact person: Rita Kesselring, Rita.Kesselring@unibas.ch
Deadline abstract: 30th June 2014
Length abstract: 300 words

Panel 2

Transnational corporations, large-scale capitalist projects and local transformations

Organizers:
Doris Bacalzo, Bettina Beer & Tobias Schwörer
Ethnologisches Seminar der Universität Luzern

The panel proposed here is a contribution to the anthropology of the encompassment of local lives by institutions of globalized capital and the frictions thereby engendered (Tsing 2005). We will discuss the effects of large-scale extractive and manufacturing industries, industrial plantations, as well as large-scale energy generation, as in biomass or dam projects. Its focus would be any of the sociocultural micro-processes relevant to the creation of novel forms of entrenched inequality under the imperatives of global capital, such as subcontracting and local business establishment, employment, gendered differences, brokerage, education, circulation of information. While we consider the direct impact of flows of capital on local cultures (Burawoy 2010), today's globalized economy also requires an understanding of the relationship between inequality and "community development" initiatives. In an officially decolonized world, national and international discourses impose global standards of moral-political adequacy on large-scale projects prior to and during their development (World Bank 2004).
Thus, the panel aims to contribute to the growing anthropological interest in large transnational corporations, their cultures and sensitivity to the demands of "corporate social responsibility", through an examination of how asymmetric linkages across social fields formerly imagined as separate are involved in the encompassment and reconfiguration of local cultures. That such encompassment occurs, and is consequential for future socio-historical trajectories, is undeniable; how it achieves its effects, in terms that are relevant to the scale of human lives is less clear. The task of clarifying such processes is the principal aim of the proposed panel. Thus contributions should address sociocultural micro-processes relevant to emerging inequalities and 'development initiatives' in the context of large-scale capital-intensive projects.

Please send your abstracts (300 words) until June 30th 2014 to bettina.beer@unilu.ch

Panel 3

'Global Aging' – New Perspectives on Social and Cultural Transformations of Old Persons' Health and Care

Organizers:
Van Eeuwijk, Piet (peter.vaneeuwijk@unibas.ch)
Staudacher Preite, Sandra (sandra.staudacher@unibas.ch)
Grolimund, Andrea Patricia (andrea.grolimund@unibas.ch)
Institute of Social Anthropology, Department of Social Sciences, University of Basel
Droz Mendelzweig, Marion (m.droz@ecolelasource.ch), Haute Ecole de la Santé La Source/HES-SO

Transformative dynamics lie at the core of growing old and are captured by different approaches to aging. From a gerontological view, aging is a biological, social and psychological process – and thus a lifelong transformation for each individual. Population studies link the aging of societies to demographic transition, and public health relates aging to epidemiological change of national health profiles. Social anthropologists look at aging as a transformation, which is embedded in and shaped by life course dynamics. As an overall term, 'global aging' embraces these various ways of transformations with regard to aging – whereby changes in health and care are only one of many characteristics. Growing discrepancies in the system of reference among members of same societies are a rather new societal challenge stemming from the life span extension. The demographic phenomenon, concomitantly with the spread of postmodern globalization processes, modifies the relationships to alterity. While ever larger numbers of individuals are willing to establish communication and collaboration over the earth without being stopped by borders and languages, the growing proportion of older olds raises new forms of alterity from within, or 'indigenous alterity'. Therefore, current notions of 'aging' detach themselves from the rather static understanding of 'age' as a distinct, homogeneous societal group with clear-cut boundaries such as numerical limits of inclusion, and thus focus on transitional, varied 'aging' instead of 'age'.

Starting from a Medical Anthropology perspective this panel asks how we grow old in different contexts and focuses on two major topics: A) aging, health and body/mind and B) cultural perspectives on aging, care and intergenerational relationships:

A) Becoming old has a distinct impact on body and mind of each individual. With increasing age, the risk to suffer from non-communicable diseases (e.g. diabetes, cardiovascular diseases, rheumatism, and cancer) and from aging impairments (e.g. visual/hearing problems, dementia) increases also. But what does it mean to be an elderly diabetic in an African rural area – and how do older diabetics cope in Switzerland? How does an aged person with a low ability to see get along in an Asian megacity? Moreover, we do not know much about aging in middle and upper class households in the 'Global South'. Will powerful new global health discourses of Western origin such as 'active/healthy/successful ageing' become the leading imaginations of 'becoming old, but not frail'? Is active illness prevention (e.g. through sport, nutrition, no addictions, health check-ups) – as promoted in public health discourses – also an appropriate solution for older persons in the 'Global South'? Is an increasing pharmaceuticalization and biomedicalization of old frail bodies and

minds a blessing or a curse? Can new technologies (e.g. mobile phones, laptops) provide new health assistance for older persons and sustain their social agency? What do we know about elderly people's self-care? Are therapeutic practices of older persons becoming increasingly transnational and global itineraries? How meaningful are gender and religious aspects for aging and health?

B) Care as social and professional practice for persons who are in need of support is at the core of a society's ethics – or at least of an idealized morality – that is how it deals with frail, disabled and ill members. Worldwide rapid aging and its health effects lead to a remarkable shift 'from cure to care'. Therefore, provided (or failed) eldercare becomes a prominent marker of old-age vulnerability, which implicates a shift of analytical perspectives from 'living arrangements' to 'care arrangements'. Are there different types of caregivers, and which are their care activities and manifold burdens of care? And how much gendered is care (in the Global South and Global North)? How about transnational care by kin? Why is intergenerational care the most favoured support – and how is intragenerational care considered? How about migration and eldercare? How do global care chains influence eldercare in Switzerland? When does eldercare become a commodity? How do lay caregivers cope with dying and death? And how about eldercare institutions (e.g. old people's homes) in non-Western contexts? How is common meaning being constructed in (health) care for the oldest older people in a context of expansion of the systems of reference and of belonging due to the extension of the life span?

We invite speakers who are concerned with one of the above mentioned topical fields of 'aging and health' or related topics. Presenters with an applied experience (e.g. working in eldercare institutions or conducting applied research including in Switzerland) are very welcome. Finally, this panel focuses also on methodological approaches and encourages participants to critically reflect their research methods in their presentations.

Summary
Transformations lie at the core of becoming old in each community. Aging is intrinsically connected with changes and alterations in every individual's life course. With the extension of our life span, discrepancies and distinctiveness within societies composed of a growing number of older olds shape increasingly new forms of their alterity. These many varying dynamics are captured in the notions of 'global aging' where aging – and not the static understanding of age – places emphasis on transitions and variations with regard to older persons and very old people. The starting point of this panel refers to the broad, but basic question how we grow old in varying contexts including the extension of our life span. The following two transversal topics represent meaningful fields how to capture this multifaceted aging process: (A) aging in respect of health and body/mind (e.g. from pharmaceuticalization of old frail bodies to old persons' self-care, elderly people and chronic diseases in the Global South and to powerful global discourses of 'active/successful aging'); and (B) aging in reference to care and intergenerational relationships (e.g. from transnational eldercare relations to commodification of eldercare work, kinning by care for old people and to care practices for/of the oldest older persons). This panel addresses interested colleagues who are engaged in fields of 'aging' in the Global South or in Switzerland (or the Global North) and who work in an applied field or conduct basic research on such or related topics.

Zusammenfassung

Transformationen liegen dem Altwerden in jeder Gemeinschaft zugrunde. Altern ist an sich mit Wechseln und Veränderungen im Lebensverlauf von jedem Menschen verbunden. Mit der Verlängerung unserer Lebensdauer prägen zunehmend Abweichungen und Verschiedenheiten innerhalb von Gesellschaften mit einer steigenden Anzahl an sehr alten Menschen neue Formen ihrer Andersartigkeit. Diese vielen verschiedenen Dynamiken werden durch die Begrifflichkeit vom ‚globalen Altern' erfasst, in der das Altern – und dabei nicht das statische Verständnis von ‚Alter' – Übergänge und Unterschiede bezüglich alten Personen und sehr alten Menschen betont. Der Ausgangspunkt dieses Panels bezieht sich auf die breite, aber grundlegende Frage, wie wir in verschiedenen Kontexten alt werden einschliesslich der Verlängerung unserer Lebensdauer. Die folgenden zwei Querschnittthemen stellen bedeutende Felder dar, wie wir diesen vielfältigen Prozess des Alterns erfassen können: (A) Altern in Bezug zu Gesundheit und Körper/Geist (z.B. von der Pharmazeutikalisierung alter schwacher Körper zur Selbstpflege von alten Leuten, alten Leuten und chronischen Krankheiten im Globalen Süden und zu machtvollen globalen Diskursen vom ‚aktiven/erfolgreichen Altern'); und (B) Altern im Zusammenhang mit Pflege und intergenerationellen Beziehungen (z.B. von transnationalen Alterspflege-Beziehungen zur Kommodifizierung der Alterspflege-Arbeit, Schaffen von verwandtschaftsähnlichen Beziehungen durch Pflege von alten Leuten und zu Pflegehandlungen für/von sehr alte/n Personen). Dieses Panel richtet sich an interessierte KollegInnen, die sich mit Gebieten des ‚Alterns' im Globalen Süden oder in der Schweiz (oder im Globalen Norden) befassen und die zu solchen oder ähnlichen Themen im angewandten Bereich arbeiten oder dazu Grundlagenforschung betreiben.

Résumé

Dans toutes communautés le vieillissement s'accompagne de transformations. Prendre de l'âge induit intrinsèquement des changements et des altérations des parcours de vie individuels. Avec l'allongement de notre espérance de vie, des décalages et distinctions apparaissent au sein des sociétés composées d'une proportion grandissante de personnes très âgées, modifiant de plus en plus les rapports d'altérité. Ces dynamiques variées sont exprimées dans la notion de «global aging» où le vieillissement – et non pas la notion statique d'âge – met l'emphase sur les transitions et les variations relatives aux personnes âgées et très âgées.

Le point de départ de ce panel porte sur la question large, mais de base: comment devient-on âgé dans différents contextes, y compris dans des situations d'allongement de l'espérance de vie? Les deux axes transversaux suivants sont proposés pour aborder de manière critique ces processus variés de vieillissement: A) le vieillissement en regard de la santé et du rapport corps/esprit (par ex. de la médicalisation des corps âgés fragilisés à l'auto-soin des vieilles personnes, personnes âgées et maladies chroniques dans les pays du Sud, les discours dominants autour des notions de vieillissement «actif»/«réussi»; B) le vieillissement et les relations au «care» et aux rapports intergénérationnels (par ex. des soins transnationaux aux personnes âgées à la marchandisation des soins aux personnes âgées, des rapports de parenté dans les soins aux personnes âgées aux pratiques de soins pour/des personnes très âgées). Ce panel s'adresse aux collègues intéressé-e-s travaillant sur des domaines du vieillissement dans les pays du Sud ou en Suisse (ou dans les pays du Nord), engagé-e-s dans des champs de pratique ou menant des recherches théoriques sur de tels sujets ou apparentés.
Please submit your abstract (300 words) to the panel organizer by 30 June 2014.

Panel 4

Global Discourse, National Legislation and Local Realities of Indigenous Communal Land Titling

Organizers:
Esther Leemann (University of Lucerne) and Irina Wenk (University of Zurich)

Abstract Deadline: 30 June 2014

The global movement to protect indigenous peoples' rights to land and resources has gained momentum over the last few decades. The use of the term indigenous peoples has flourished in the writings, conferences and policy papers of academia, activists, international politics, and among indigenous peoples themselves. The efforts culminated in influential and widely circulated international definitions of, and conventions on, indigenous peoples that lend legal and discursive support to self-identifying groups in their struggles for land rights and self-determination. In 2007, the UN General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), which represents a significant extension of the international human rights protection system to collectivities. While the political reality of "being indigenous" originates in the terminology of international law (Niezen 2000), the translation into national contexts is prone to a number of cultural and social misrepresentations and misunderstandings. Anthropologists have questioned the creation of an indigenous 'tribal slot' (Li 2000) while recognizing that the discursive shift in global development circles and international law created new opportunities for indigenous peoples for strategic positioning in order to secure rights to land and resources.
Donors and international organizations have spent countless millions on indigenous land titling programs. Typically, emerging indigenous land tenure frameworks strongly emphasize *collective* rather than *individual* rights. This may reflect the desires of indigenous representatives but even more so idealized notions about homogeneous and united communities held by advisors involved in developing such legal frameworks (e.g. for Cambodia see McAndrew and Il 009). At national level, indigenous land rights are thus very often conditional upon communal and traditional land use, following what Li (2010) refers to as the 'communal fix' – a familiar yet arguably paternalistic or colonial response to dispossession (Milne 2013).

We invite contributions to this panel, which enhance the understanding of the transformations local people undergo when enmeshed in indigenous peoples rights discourses and when their rights to land, resources and self-determination are mainstreamed and implemented at national levels. We are interested in contributions that highlight cleavages, inequalities, obstructions but also alignments and cooperation fuelled by new connectivities through internet and mobile phones within and among the various social and political actors involved in communal land titling efforts (indigenous communities, IOs, NGOs, government officials, scholars, etc.). Our interests particularly concern the often paradox outcomes of indigenous communal land titling efforts, especially when faced with outside parties – be they companies, government officials or others – interested in the land. We also invite reflections on the particular role and methods of social anthropologists who critically engage with these topics. We thus follow Dove (2006: 202) in saying: „That the topics of anthropological interest have

become the tools by which indigenous peoples articulate their identities, stake claims to local resources, and fight for their rights in regional, national, and international arenas poses moral and ethical challenges to anthropologists – challenges that require new responses."

Interested authors should submit a 300-word abstract (with paper title and full contact information for the primary author) to Esther Leemann (<u>esther.leemann@me.com</u>) by 30 June 2014.
Any questions about this call for papers should be directed towards the panel organizers, Esther Leemann (<u>esther.leemann@me.com</u>) and Irina Wenk (<u>irina.wenk@uzh.ch</u>).

Panel 5

Material and Visual Culture in Postcolonial Times: Anthropological Museums and Global Cultural Dynamics

Organizers:
Alexander Brust, Museum der Kulturen Basel
Karin Renold, School of Museum Studies, University of Leicester

In the last two decades, the perception of anthropological museums has changed profoundly. Transdisciplinary critical museum studies have analysed the museum from multiple perspectives (f. e. Baur 2010). Main research topics included the colonial past, the entangled histories in the creation of collections (Thomas 1991), their role in the creation and affirmation of otherness as well as the relationship between museums and academic anthropology. In the beginnings, anthropological theory was based on the study of ethnographic collections. With fieldwork becoming the hallmark of university social and cultural anthropology, academic anthropology and the museum drifted apart (Bouquet 2001). Fieldwork was associated with people and theories, museums with things. New theoretical and methodical approaches of material culture studies (f. e. Tilley et al. 2006) entered anthropological institutes in the last two decades. Comparative approaches in visual culture have impacted the ways of seeing museums, including exhibition display and museum architecture. Indigenous stakeholders reclaimed their participation in representational practices and decision making processes in museums.
On the other hand, museums themselves pushed the transformation of the institution towards new directions. Recently re-opened anthropological museums voted for more thematic orientated instead of cultural history or geographically orientated approaches which dominated museum narratives in the 20th century. Collaborations with stakeholders from source communities are becoming more important for museums to develop postcolonial curatorial practices (Peers et. al. 2003, Van Broekhoven et al. 2010). This means at the same time bringing the study of things and people closer together (Suhrbier 2000). Bouquet (2012) points out the importance of museums in understanding global cultural dynamics because of how they transform objects, images, texts and people through their curatorial practices.
The museum is one sensible place to study the changing perceptions and constructions of objects (Dudley et al. 2011), images, meanings, and to study changing power relations.

Starting from new perspectives of material and visual culture as well as postcolonial studies we will discuss museums as key cultural loci (Macdonald 1996) to reflect on cultural dynamics, processes of transformation and agency. Finally, we will reflect on the possibilities to enhance the connections between academic anthropology, museums and indigenous interests via new research approaches in material and visual culture studies. The panel invites papers in English, French and German that reflect on the understanding of cultural dynamics through the studies of museum displays or collections made with a material, visual culture studies, historic and/or a postcolonial approach. We are looking also for papers that deal with the intertwined history and/or possible futures of anthropological museums, anthropological institutes and indigenous stakeholders.

Please send your abstracts (300 words) until June 30th 2014 to: kre5@le.ac.uk

Panel 6

Panel der AG „Anthropologie und Bildung"

Das Panel der AG „Anthropologie und Bildung" will eine Plattform für die steigende Zahl von AnthropologInnen bieten, die sich mit Bildungsfragen im weitesten Sinn beschäftigen und ihre Forschung aus einer spezifisch anthropologischen Perspektive diskutieren möchten.

Das Panel teilt sich in zwei Blöcke auf:
Block I gilt der Thematik „*Transnational Eduscapes*"; Block II soll im Sinne eines „*Tour d'Horizon*" offen sein für Beiträge am Schnittpunkt von Anthropologie, Bildung und Ethnografie. Es sind Abstracts sowohl zu Block I wie Block II willkommen.

Ausschreibung zu Block I
„Transnational Eduscapes"

Chair:
Judith Hangartner, Kathrin Oester, Angela Stienen

In den letzten Jahrzehnten haben sich nationale Bildungssysteme im Zeichen des Neoliberalismus zunehmend transnationalisiert, sich scheinbar vereinheitlicht und von lokalen Lebenswelten abgekoppelt. Bildungsstandards wurden über nationale Grenzen hinweg implementiert und Bildungssysteme sowie lokale Bildungseinrichtungen nach den managerialen Kriterien von Effektivität und Effizienz zueinander in Wettbewerb gesetzt. Damit einher geht einerseits eine weltweite Bildungsexpansion und andererseits wachsende soziale Ungleichheit zwischen den Studierenden, Schülerinnen und Schülern wettbewerbsstarker und wettbewerbsschwacher Bildungseinrichtungen. Vor diesem Hintergrund erwächst den transnationalen Vereinheitlichungsprozessen des Bildungssystems (lokaler) Widerstand.

Mit der Verbreitung der digitalen Medien haben sich zudem Produktion und Umlauf von Wissen und damit Lernprozesse verlagert und finden vielfach ausserhalb formal anerkannter Bildungseinrichtungen, im Rahmen sozialer Netzwerke statt, die oftmals fluide und transnational organisiert sind. Dadurch geraten die konzeptuelle Bestimmung

und das Zusammenspiel formaler, nicht formaler und informeller Dimensionen sowohl von Bildungs- und Lernprozessen als auch von Bildungs- und Lernorten neu in den Blick und ihre soziale und politische Bedeutung erlangt empirisch und theoretisch einen neuen Stellenwert. Dies einerseits im Sinne der unter dem Label *lifelong learning* bekannten neoliberalen Prämisse, dass formal anerkannte (nationale) Bildungssysteme und (lokale) Bildungseinrichtungen den Anforderungen spezifischer Kompetenzen für ein globales Wirtschaftswachstum nicht mehr nachkommen können und deshalb durch zusätzliche Bildungspraktiken gestützt werden müssen. Andererseits gewinnen frühere Debatten darüber erneut an Bedeutung, inwiefern und in welcher Weise scheinbar unstrukturierte und zufällige Lehr-, Lernprozesse, die weder formalisierbar noch standardisierbar sind, sowie die Entstehung informeller und spontan hervorgebrachter Lernorte herkömmliche Bildungsideale und dominante Bildungspolitiken unterwandern und erneuern.

Das Zusammenspiel von formalen und nicht formalen Bildungs- und Lernprozessen gilt es unter diesen Voraussetzungen mit neuen theoretischen Ansätzen und Methoden zu erforschen. Ein möglicher Ausgangspunkt bildet dabei eine kritische Diskussion über die analytische Produktivität des Konzepts „eduscapes". Mit diesem an Arjun Appadurais entterritorialisiertem Raumbegriff angelehnten Konzept scheinen gerade durch (trans-)lokale Vernetzung entstandene Bildungsräume und ihre Reichweite erfasst werden zu können.

Für das Panel stehen folgende Fragen im Zentrum:
1) Wie verändern sich Rahmenbedingungen und Praktiken von formaler bzw. informeller Bildung – vom Kindes- bis ins Seniorenalter im Kontext des neoliberalen Einflusses? Inwiefern zeigen sich widerständische Praktiken? Inwiefern tragen die neuen Bedingungen zur Transformation herkömmlicher Bildungsideale bei und welche neuen Wissensformen entstehen dabei?

2) Wie lassen sich solche transnationalisierten Lehr-, Lernpraktiken und –orte empirisch erfassen und anthropologisch konzeptualisieren?

Abstracts für Beiträge auf Deutsch, Französisch oder Englisch (max. 300 Wörter) sind bis am 30. Juni 2014 an folgende Adressen zu senden:
Judith Hangartner (Judith.Hangartner@phbern.ch)
Kathrin Oester (Kathrin.Oester@phbern.ch)

Ausschreibung zu Block II
Tour d'Horizon: Aktuelle Zugänge zu pädagogischen Feldern in der Kultur- und Sozialanthropologie

Chair:
Anja Sieber Egger und Gisela Unterweger

Block II setzt sich zum Ziel, eine Diskussionsbasis für die neu gegründete Arbeitsgruppe zu schaffen. Willkommen sind alle Beiträge, welche sich mit dem Feld der Bildung und Pädagogik aus anthropologischer/ethnologischer Perspektive beschäftigen. Es können sowohl theoretische, methodologische und epistemologische Verortungen wie auch

ethnographisch-empirische Zugänge zu Praktiken im Feld der Bildung und Pädagogik diskutiert werden.

Abstracts für Beiträge auf Deutsch, Französisch oder Englisch (max. 300 Wörter) sind bis am 30. Juni 2014 an folgende Adressen zu senden:
Anja Sieber Egger (anja.sieber@phzh.ch)
Gisela Unterweger (gisela.unterweger@phzh.ch)

Die Arbeitsgruppe Anthropologie und Bildung wurde im April 2014 gegründet von:

Judith Hangartner (Judith.Hangartner@phbern.ch)
Kathrin Oester (Kathrin.Oester@phbern.ch)
Anja Sieber Egger (anja.sieber@phzh.ch)
Angela Stienen (Angela.Stienen@phbern.ch)
Gisela Unterweger (gisela.unterweger@phzh.ch)
26.5.2014

Panel of the working group "Anthropology and Education"

The panel of the SEG working group "Anthropology and Education" aims at providing a platform for an increasing number of anthropologists engaged in questions of education in the broadest sense to discuss their research from an anthropological perspective.

The panel is organised in two parts:
Part I is dedicated to the subject "*Transnational Eduscapes*". Part II, "*Tour'd'Horizon*", is open for contributions at the intersection of Anthropology, Education and Ethnography. Abstracts to both parts are welcomed.

Call for contributions - Part I "Transnational Eduscapes":

Chair:
Judith Hangartner, Kathrin Oester, Angela Stienen

In the wake of neoliberal transformations, national education systems have been increasingly transnationalised, seemingly standardised, and disconnected from local contexts. Standards-based education reforms and the managerial requirements of effectivity and efficiency spread across national borders and pushed educational institutions into competition with each other. The reforms are accompanied both by worldwide educational expansion as well as increasing social inequality between students of competitive and uncompetitive institutions in the global education market. Meanwhile, the processes of transnational standardisation increasingly evoke (local) resistance.
With the proliferation of digital media, the production and circulation of knowledge and learning processes are shifting. They transgress formal institutions and often take place within fluid, (transnational) social networks. With these digital innovations, the social and political significance of the interaction of formal, nonformal and informal education in their particular settings attract new attention both as empirical phenomenon and theoretical question. The study of the intersection of different, formal and informal, modes of learning points to the neoliberal assumption of "lifelong learning", implying

that formal national and local educational institutions are no longer able to fulfil the demands of a growing global economy and thus must be supported by additional educational practices. Furthermore, the new focus revives earlier debates on how ostensibly unstructured and accidental teaching and learning processes, which are neither formalisable nor standardisable and which constitute spontaneous learning spaces, can infiltrate and renew traditional educational ideals and dominant educational policies.

The study of the interplay of formal and non-formal education and learning within the context of transnational education reforms calls for new theoretical and methodological approaches. A critical discussion of the analytical productivity of the concept "eduscapes" is one possible starting point to do so. This notion, which is informed by Appadurai's deterritorialised concept of space, seems capable of grasping educational settings which emerge through translocal networking.

Questions such as the following are of particular interest:

1) How do conditions and practices of formal and informal education from early childhood to old age change in the context of neoliberal influences? How far do the changes provoke resistance? How do the new conditions contribute to the transformation of conventional educational ideals and what kind of new knowledge arises?

2) How can we empirically trace and anthropologically conceptualise such transnationalised teaching and learning practices and the spaces in which they emerge?

Abstracts for contributions in German, French or English (max. 300 words) are to be sent until 30. June 2014 to:

Judith Hangartner (Judith.Hangartner@phbern.ch)
Kathrin Oester (Kathrin.Oester@phbern.ch)

Call for contributions - Part II: Tour d'Horizon: Contemporary anthropological approaches to the field of education

Chair:

Anja Sieber Egger und Gisela Unterweger

Part II of the Panel "Anthropology and Education" aims at providing a discussion forum for the new working group. Contributions which discuss the field of education from an anthropological perspective are welcomed. The presentation might discuss theoretical, methodological or epistemological questions as well as provide empirical analyses of practices in the field of education.

Abstracts for contributions in German, French or English (max. 300 words) are to be sent until 30. June 2014 to:

Anja Sieber Egger (anja.sieber@phzh.ch)
Gisela Unterweger (gisela.unterweger@phzh.ch)

The working group „Anthropology and Education" was founded in April 2014 by:

Judith Hangartner (Judith.Hangartner@phbern.ch)
Kathrin Oester (Kathrin.Oester@phbern.ch)
Anja Sieber Egger (anja.sieber@phzh.ch)
Angela Stienen (Angela.Stienen@phbern.ch)
Gisela Unterweger (gisela.unterweger@phzh.ch)
26.05.14

Panel 7

Kinship on the Move: Assisted Reproductive Technologies in a Globalized World

Organizers:
Nolwenn Bühler, Universität Zürich, Schweiz/University of California Berkeley, USA
Anika König, Freie Universität Berlin, Deutschland

Kinship continues to be one of the core concepts of contemporary life. However, like many other aspects of the present-day world, kinship, too, is subject to a range of social, cultural, political, and legal transformations. Among other things, one important reason for some of these changes is the introduction and continuous further development of new medical procedures which are subsumed under the term Assisted Reproductive Technologies (ARTs). These technologies include procedures ranging from artificial insemination, cryopreservation of gametes, *in vitro* fertilization (IVF), donation of gametes, surrogacy, pre-implantation genetic diagnostics (PGD), etc.

Since the birth of the first so-called 'test-tube baby' in 1978 in Great Britain, ARTs have become extremely multifaceted. From a medical procedure helping women with blocked tubes to conceive, they have transformed into to a major industry within the health sector and related bio-industries, including genetics and stem-cell research. By decoupling sexual intercourse from procreation, they have opened up new possibilities of building families and reached new target groups, including not only women and men who are infertile due to medical conditions, but also same-sex couples, single parents, and post-menopausal women. Moreover, ARTs have become increasingly transnational. Patients travel and cross borders to access reproductive treatment, gametes are shipped internationally, medical expertise is exchanged, and information circulates widely on the internet and beyond. Under certain circumstances, these movements can lead to inequalities, for example when the making of a family in Switzerland relies on the provision of reproductive serviced by a woman who acts out of financial need and distress.

In addition, new communication technologies play a crucial role in these developments. They can be seen as a prerequisite for the existence of the global networks of reproduction as they enable easy access to information about ARTs and information exchange with professionals such as agencies, clinics, and lawyers. The internet, and especially discussion forums and social media, also serves as a platform for the communication between persons in search for ARTs. Here, based on a shared experience of infertility, they discuss experiences, share affects, and exchange advice and tips with like-minded people – a form of communication which creates new kinds of digital biosocialities (see Rabinow 1996; Gibbon and Novas 2008; Hagen 2012).

This panel aims to discuss the implications of these developments for the making, maintaining, and imagining of kinship and the transformations related to these processes in the context of globalization. We are interested in questions such as: In what way is kinship transformed when a child has more than two 'parents', for example when a sperm donor and/or egg donor, or a gestational surrogate are involved, and who possibly live at very distant locales? And what does it mean if the time frame of women's fertility can be prolonged by medical means – through (transnational) egg donation or

egg freezing? What may be alternatives to the heteronormative model of family which can be made possible through ARTs? And what role is played by so-called 'reproductive travel' which in many cases is a result of strict legal regulations in countries such as Switzerland, as well as by the increased globalization of ARTs? How do global inequalities come into play when families are made through the use of ARTS? And what is the role of Internet and social media in the making of kinship through ARTs?
We welcome papers addressing these questions by combining theoretical analysis with ethnographic material.

Please submit your abstract to anika.koenig@fu-berlin.deby 30 June 2014.

Panel 8

"Mixed methods – capturing global health transformations

Organizers:
Medical Anthropology Switzerland (MAS) / Interdisziplinäre Kommission für Medizinethnologie / Commission Interdisciplinaire d'Anthropologie Médicale / Commissione Interdisciplinare d'Antropologia Medica

In times of rapid transformations researchers engaged in health sciences are increasingly confronted with complex health problems. The context and determinants of health and illness cannot be understood and addressed by research approaches restricted to single scientific disciplines. Hence, individual scientists often work at the intersections of public health, technology, social sciences, development and other fields or alternatively, have to engage with other scientists from different disciplines and backgrounds in interdisciplinary collaboration.
Health researchers have increasingly made use of study designs that combine qualitative and quantitative methods, so called mixed methods. Qualitative approaches therefore become more common in clinical medicine and health service research. It has been acknowledged, that qualitative approaches can add insights to quantitative research. Moreover, social sciences can complement epidemiological and public health studies. Their integration into public health studies has also been increasingly encouraged by funding programs, recently for example by the EU "Horizon 2020".
Reviews on the quality of mixed method studies in health show, however, that many mixed method studies in health lack integration of the two components, which limits the amount of knowledge that could potentially be generated (Bishop and Holmes 2013, O'Cathain et al. 2008). In this way, the "added value" of mixed methods is often lost, and knowledge yield is equivalent to that from a qualitative study and a quantitative study undertaken independently (O'Cathain et al. 2010). The reviews also show that the qualitative component of mixed method studies is often of poorer quality than the quantitative component, and the latter is often prioritized over the qualitative component. Moreover, epistemological tensions inherent in mixed method approaches are hardly discussed.
The aim of this moderated panel is to discuss the strengths and limitations of mixed method designs in health research from a medical anthropology perspective. On the basis of selected case studies and individual experiences with mixed methods we would like to explore the following questions:

How can qualitative research make a strong contribution to mixed methods? How can integration of qualitative and quantitative components be guaranteed? How do we ensure maximum benefit in using mixed methods? What are potential pitfalls when designing and conducting a mixed method study and how can they be avoided?

We feel honored to welcome **Alicia O'Cathain** as a **key note speaker** and discussant. She is a Professor for Health Services Research at the School of Health and Related Research at the University of Sheffield and has a special interest in mixed methods. We are also pleased to have Brigit Obrist, Professor for Anthropology at the Institute of Social Anthropology, University of Basel, and the Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute as a second discussant. She is an expert in medical anthropology and has a profound knowledge in qualitative research.

With this call for abstracts we would like to encourage in particular young researchers (PhD students and post-docs) who are involved in the planning or conduct of a mixed method study, to present a paper on their research. We invite them to discuss these methodological issues from a medical anthropological/social science perspective. The abstracts should be no longer than one A4 page and contain the following information: subject of research, stage of work, short summary of presentation, affiliation. We suggest contributions to be held in English, but German and French is also possible. The discussion will be held in English.

Please submit your abstract to <u>panel2014@medicalanthropology.ch</u> by 30 June 2014.