Cultural Difference
and
Social Solidarity Network

4th International Conference
"New Directions in Reconciling
Solidarity and Difference in
Contemporary Societies"

July 2nd - July 4th, 2015

Hosted By:

Middle East Technical University
Northern Cyprus Campus

www.differenceandsolidarity.org

1 Round Table; 2.5 Days; 14 Presentations; 500 Minutes of Discussion

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

<u>Conference Programme</u>

4th International Conference of the International Research Network:
Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

New Directions in Reconciling Solidarity and Difference in Contemporary Societies

July 2 - 4, 2015

on the campus of

Middle East Technical University

Northern Cyprus Campus

Organisers and Co-Convenors:
Scott H. Boyd (Middle East Technical University, Northern Cyprus Campus)
Paul Reynolds (Edge Hill University, UK)

Conference Committee:
Scott H. Boyd (Middle East Technical University, Northern Cyprus Campus)
Paul Reynolds (Edge Hill University, UK)
Mary Ann Walter (Middle East Technical University, Northern Cyprus Campus)

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity 2015

Welcome!

A warm welcome to the 4th International Conference on Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity! (CDSS)

Whether this is your first attendance at a CDSS event or you are a returning delegate, our hope is that you both enjoy the event and gain constructive feedback on your work. We also hope this is the beginning of a fruitful intellectual relationship and that you will consider more involvement with the Network, though you are equally welcome if this is your only contact with us.

This pack provides the academic rationale for the conference, an introduction to the Network, the conference programme and abstracts and outlines of the conference outputs in respect of publications. It should provide you will all the details you need to navigate the conference, but Scott and Paul and other members of the conference team will be available to clarify any issues with you during the conference.

We have designed the conference to be a pleasurable balance of intellectual and social sessions, in the belief that as well as being an opportunity to gain from the papers you will listen to, and comment on and comments made on your paper, it is also useful to make contact with others in broader discussions in convivial surroundings. We think you will find METU NCC campus and our blend of social and academic programme a convivial space to both relax and work.

Whilst this is formally the annual conference, a dearth of acceptable abstracts and some withdrawals have reduced the conference to workshop size. In some senses, this might be disappointing, insofar as there are less participants. However, there is virtue in the 'vice'. CDSS workshops across Europe have proven fertile bases for networking, cooperation and for close scrutiny of each other's work. We expect, therefore, that the event will offer an opportunity for considerable benefit.

CDSS is a network that is always in development and we envisage it as opening a space for critical discussion and engagement and for the development of collaborative projects that enrich our understandings of the relationship between difference and solidarity in contemporary societies. Indeed, we are at that difficult 4th year of the life of a network, where initial development has yielded some growth and development, but we are now at a stage where we review that progress and what directions we might develop. The composition of this event offers particular opportunities to directly feed into the further development of the network by the end of the conference.

Scott and Paul

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity 2015

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity (CDSS)

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity was born from discussions between Scott Boyd and Paul Reynolds at different conferences between 2008 and 2010. We found we had a broad common interest in the different relationships between solidarity and difference in contemporary societies, and wanted to develop a space for critical discussion and cooperation that would have a global reach, a trans-disciplinary scope, and encourage an eclectic mix of intellectual contributions, recognising the synergies that could arise from very different contributions being brought together.

At the same time we also wanted to avoid some of the pitfalls bedevilling the conference 'circuit'. We did not want to have a network driven by commodification and profit, so CDSS is not for profit. We did not want to 'respect rank', so we were clear that we did not want the paraphernalia of status or position to impede discussion. For example, you will see we avoid the use of titles. If you are a distinguished Professor, we do respect that - we just do not want to have discussion ordered by that, and most Professors understand that! Indeed, we particularly wanted to encourage younger scholars by making the environment of the network a cordial one, and discouraging some of the worst excesses of conferences where experienced academics give young academics a hard time. At the same time we were clear that we wanted to be driven by two criteria - in selecting papers for conference or publication, or in developing projects - quality and imagination. We also wanted to encourage critical discussion in a context that was conducive to genuine exchanges and discussions, so we felt our conference, for example, had to have a well-planned social programme as well as a well-planned academic programme. We wanted people to have time to talk with each other and relax into the conference. Finally, we both made a commitment to the Network - we would build the network slowly and want to see it as a long-term development that would grow in time.

At the time, we were not sure what form the Network would take, but we very quickly determined it would have to include a web-based presence and an annual conference. This came together in 2011 with the first conference. This is the fourth. We also determined we did not simply want to be a vehicle for an annual conference, so for example in March 2013 we co-organised a seminar with Liverpool University's Lifelong Learning Centre. We have held workshops in a number of countries: Plovdiv, Bulgaria; Brno, Czech Republic; Cologne, Germany and Groningen, Netherlands. We are holding our next workshop in Brno in Czech Republic in August 2015 (in the back of this pack), and in Groningen in the Netherlands in April 2016 (CFP to be circulated shortly).

We also wanted to encourage the publication of good international research. To that end we have begun publishing edited collections with Cambridge Scholars Publishing that arise from the conference but include commissioned pieces where appropriate. We have produced two books in this series, have a third in development and a fourth might emerge from this event.

We are also launching our own annual publication - *The CDSS Record* - showcasing the work of members of the network and providing a focus on international issues of solidarity and difference. Yet we did not want to engage in an exercise in vanity publishing, so both of these involve peer review and publication based on quality and on coherence in the case of any edited collection. The 2015 edition – the first after a long gestation – will be out shortly and details circulated.

Each conference has expanded the number of people joining the network and each conference features delegates from across the globe. The conference itself is big enough for discussion to be engendered, but not so big as to become little more than a clearing house for CV fillers. Austerity has influenced the numbers of withdrawals, and as we try to encourage an international participation we are often dealing with enthusiastic delegates who simply cannot raise the money to attend. We hope that the conference and network grows to be able to support more of these delegates.

In the past, we have supported local community organisation in commissioning our conference supplies – in 2013 it was the Multi-Purpose Community Center in Dipkarpaz (you can read more about it on our website). The size of the event this time precludes that support but we hope to re-establish it.

CDSS is styled a network because we wish to develop a trans-disciplinary network of intellectuals with a global reach, across a range of disciplines and spanning theoretical, empirical, cultural and aesthetic and law/policy/politics spans (for us this is not other exclusion for creative intellectual work). The purpose of the network, facilitated by our website (http://differenceandsolidarity.org/) will be as follows:

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity 2015

- To exchange information, notification of events, new thinking and proposals for cooperation in the broad areas of solidarity and difference.
- To encourage constructive communication between different intellectuals from different disciplines, global spaces, perspectives and approaches to questions of solidarity and difference and encourage a synergy of thinking.
- To encourage collective endeavours in the production of full funded research bids for projects, publications, seminars, workshops and debates and other collaborative endeavours that enrich understandings of solidarity and difference.
- To promote what is planned as an annual conference on themes closely related to the core interests of those studying difference and solidarity, and such other activities as will promote the network and project.

It is also regarded as a project because there is a definite and specific sense in which this initiative developed – which was a sense of three responses to current scholarship on difference and solidarity:

- A concern at relative critical absences or impasses in conceptual and theoretical scholarship that explore the often contradictory or conflictual relationship between solidarity and difference in exploring communities and societies.
- A desire to explore new thinking and new initiatives on solidarity and difference within contemporary societies that both critically engage with and move beyond the conventional vocabularies of multi-culturalism, cultural conformity and cosmopolitanism.
- A desire to encourage the exploration of comparative and contrasting examples of solidarity and difference drawn from across the globe, both beyond the hegemonic assumptions of 'core-periphery' global models and equally not prone to moralising assumptions about post-modern and post-colonial alternatives.

We therefore seek to develop a network of intellectuals interested in unpicking issues and problems that arise from the juxtaposition of solidarity and difference in human societies. In doing so we welcome trans-disciplinary contributions (and also disciplinary contributions); theoretical and conceptual critiques and empirical studies; cases and comparative studies; and contributions from diverse ideological, theoretical and political positions where there is a desire for critical debate and engagement. If your aim for this conference – and of course your aims and desires for the conference are important! – is to deliver your paper, listen to others and seek a publication at the end, then we hope we'll provide a conference setting where you can do that. However, what we seek are:

- People interested in staying connected, passing on information and networking for the best possible impacts in terms of research and contributions to public argument.
- People who may see some benefit from regularly convening and discussing key themes and issues in the broad area of solidarity and difference – by conference, seminar or online forum.
- People who see the benefit of collaborative projects, whether for funded conceptual or empirical research projects, writing projects, comparative projects or other such initiatives.

The Network celebrates its fourth conference this year. We see this as an important stage in consolidating the Network but we also want to develop it further. We have something of a baseline publications and conference strategy in place. The next stage is to: explicitly encourage collaborative work amongst our global network; develop a coherent approach to seeking international funding for project and development work; expand the network to take in likeminded and creative thinkers. If this appeals, join us!

Scott and Paul

<u>Academic Rationale to the Conference</u>

The conference is envisaged as not just as a single opportunity for high quality academic discussion and debate (though we are committed to that as an immediate aim!). Whilst a conference has value in itself and can produce organic links and partnerships from delegates discussions, this initiative was launched with a clear sense of wanting to do more - to provide a critical space where we can engage and explore the opportunities that arise from intellectual discussion in a constructive and enjoyable context. At a time when too many conferences are CV fillers, with 10 minutes per paper and people waiting to speak rather than listening and responding, we wanted something different.

4

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity 2015

With that in mind, the conference rationale may be a little different to what you are used to:
- The conference programme includes both academic panels and social events that will allow discussion and debate in enjoyable settings.
- The conference structure promotes discussion. Most papers will be presented in pairs (hopefully with some common ground) in sessions of 105 minutes, where papers presentation should not last more than 20 minutes, allowing for an hour of discussion.
- There will be a roundtable and a development session that will allow summative discussion
- From the end of the network you are considered part of the network and will receive mails and invitations unless you specifically ask us to discontinue contact.

We hope you find this a sympathetic environment to share ideas, debate points, explore arguments and generally enjoy academic nourishment.

Paul Reynolds for the Conference Team

Guidance for Delegates

(1) The structure of the conference comprises 6 sessions – all are roundtable plenaries – plus a closing roundtable.
(2) Each session has 2 papers in a space of 90 minutes. **Papers should be no longer than 20 minutes in presentation length**. **Chairs will be strict in keeping to this time frame**. This will allow 50 minutes for questions and discussions. This is to encourage discussion and debate around papers and encourage sessions to develop as intellectual enquiries that benefit paper-giver and delegate rather than 'cv-fillers' with no discussion.
(3) It might be useful for you to circulate hand-outs or paper summaries to facilitate keeping your talk to time – presumably you have given that some thought already. Please ensure Scott has a copy of any hand-out – preferably electronic - to ensure that we keep a complete record of the event
(4) Papers have been organized into panels according to greater or less affinities between them– it has not always resulted in a strong match in interests, but each panel has sufficient common ground for discussion across as well as to individual papers.
(5) All participants are anticipated **to be attending the entire conference** – we have avoided accepting papers from those who wished to 'parachute' into the conference and just give their paper before leaving.
(6) We have left spaces of time available to delegates as a result of our experience over the last four years. There is 75 minutes for lunch and we stop on Thursday with more than enough time in the evening to ensure people can deal with their individual business. We hope, as a result, that this ensures people do not miss sessions to send e-mails, for example, and also have enough time to schedule meetings and chat about possible affinities and cooperation in their work.
(7) The final roundtable is anticipated as being a **group discussion** with no speakers, It will also be a **network development meeting** to reflect on the network as well as the event.
(8) This programme has accommodated requested changes and we would expect it to proceed as published here. Please note however that **some changes may occur as circumstances dictate during the week**. We will always ensure up to date information is announced during the session.

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity 2015

Programme Outline

Wednesday July 1st

For people who arrive early – assemble in the Guest House Foyer at 19.30 prompt -= walk down to the local village for drinks and discussion.

Thursday, July 2nd

All sessions will be held in the seminar room on the second floor of the Culture and Convention Center on METU-NCC campus.

8:30-9:00	Registration (Meet and Greet) **Culture and Convention Center** (CCC) Foyer
9:00 - 9:30	Introduction to the Event – Scott and Paul
9:30 - 11.00	**Session 1: Issues of Conflict and Consequences** Zikri Mert Demircan (University of Lund, Sweden) *How do the Syrian refugees in Turkey affect Turkish border politics and society, particularly in border provinces?* & Martin Cyr Hicks (Boğaziçi University, Turkey) *Resistance vs. Reconciliation: Understanding Conflict Transformation in Canada* Chair: Paul Reynolds
11.00 – 11.15	Coffee
11.15 - 12.45	**Session 2: Issues of Research and Evaluation** Nur Yiğitoğlu (Middle East Technical University-Northern Cyprus Campus) *(In)Visible authorial identities in research article abstracts* & Elvan Eda Işık-Taş (Middle East Technical University-Northern Cyprus Campus) *Multi-dimensional analysis in evaluation research* Chair: Scott Boyd
12.45 – 14.00	Lunch
14.00 – 15.30	**Session 3: Thinking Solidarity and Difference I** Craig Hammond (Blackburn College, UK) *A Dynamic Utopian Praxis: Creative Liberation, Micro-Democracy & Beyond* & Scott Boyd (Middle East Technical University – Northern Cyprus Campus) *Information Communications Technology and the Limits of Solidarity in an Informationist and Neoliberal "Everyday Experience."* Chair: Paul Reynolds
15.30 – 16.00	Coffee
16.00 – 17.30	**Session 4: Thinking Solidarity and Difference II** Zuzana Klimova (Masaryk University, Czech Republic) *Re-constructions of difference through redefinition of the single-feature identity and the stereotypical ascription of value to non-qualitative characteristics* & Paul Reynolds (Edge Hill University, UK) *The Constitution of Solidarity: Critical Reflections* Chair: Scott Boyd
17.30 – 19.30	Free Time
19.30	Sunset Dinner - Guest House Gardens

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity 2015

Friday July 3rd

9.30 – 11.00	**Session 5: Solidarity and Difference in Intimate Contexts** Deniz Yucel (William Patterson University, USA) *The Effect of Work-Family Conflict on Marital Satisfaction* & Valerie Bouchard and Laudan Vaezmir (Universite Laval and University of Montreal, Quebec, Canada *The Good Wife : diversity as the new conservative weapon* Chair: Scott Boyd
11.00 – 11.15	Coffee
11.15 – 12.45	**Session 6: Thinking Culture** Zoltan Zakota (Partium Christian University, Romania) *Cohabitating Cultures – Harmonising Differences inside the European Union* & David Stoop (University of Cologne, Germany) *"To be different without fear" - From multiculturalism towards a critical and non-essentialist account of culture* Chair: Paul Reynolds
12.45 – 14.00	Lunch
14.00-15.00	Session 7: Roundtable Led by Scott and Paul
15.00	Leave for St. Hilarion Castle and Girne/Kyrenia Harbor, drinks/shopping in Harbour
20.00	Dinner at Archway Restaurant Girne/Kyrenia

Saturday July 4th

For those still at the Guest House - assemble in the Guest House Foyer at 12.00 prompt - walk down to the local village for lunch

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity 2015

Session 1: Issues of Conflict and Consequences

Zikri Mert Demircan
University of Lund, Sweden - mertdemircan@windowslive.com

How do the Syrian refugees in Turkey affect Turkish border politics and society, particularly in border provinces?

The Syrian migration to the neighboring countries due to its civil war constitutes a problematic issue, particularly for Turkey. Turkey hosts the largest amount of refugees by accepting more than 1.6 million ethnic Arabs and Kurds (UNHRC, 2014). While already existing border security complexities and obstacles were on efforts to be solved by implementing the Integrated Border Management System (ESYS), the emergence of the Syrian civil war caused a delay on the process and left an even more complex structure. Additionally, questions towards the Turkish government's support to the Islamic State (IS) constitute both internal and external queries. The presence of Syrians and suspicions on government's approach on IS created a fear within society whether there are IS militants in Turkey, especially after Reyhanli attack. While, on the one hand, vulnerable situations of Syrians in Turkey and the Turkish refugee law limited by geographical dimensions form a challenge for Syrians, the contra-discourse from the Turkish society maintains its position. The fear of bringing sectarian conflict in Syria to Turkey, cultural differences, economical and political reasons constitute main problems between two communities. Those social dimensions therefore reach dangerous levels. The hostility and essentialism toward those Syrians has begun to turn into anti-immigrant and anti-Arab discourses that can be observed through protests and social media. In this paper, I analyze the Turkish border security dilemmas, critiques on government politics, and the social situation in border provinces by perspectives of border politics and social psychology.

Martin Cyr Hicks
Boğaziçi University, Turkey - cyr.hicks@boun.edu.tr

Resistance vs. Reconciliation: Understanding Conflict Transformation in Canada

Canada is typically described as a nation of demure people who avoid conflict at all costs. For many, the Canadian nation itself is a mere by-product of colonial adventurism and historical tensions between America and the British Empire, and lacks the glorious conflicts that defined its southern neighbour. However, what most fail to understand is that without conflict, a nation cannot exist. If one sees the nation as a type of narrative, one understands that, as is the case with all narratives, the themes that define it are driven by conflict (whether implicit or explicit). The key to understanding a national culture is thus to understand the nature of the conflict manifest in its national narrative. Many Canadians themselves have a weak understanding of the conflicts that define them as a national community, and this misunderstanding has led Canada to the brink of dissolution. To properly understand nations, or any community for that matter, one must not only understand the nature of conflict, but also understand that conflict resolution is not actually a desired outcome. Constructing a national narrative involves transforming conflict in such a way as to create cohesion within the community. Conflict transformation, rather than resolution, redefines the protagonists and antagonists by redirecting the conflict. This paper will look at the Lafontaine-Baldwin partnership as an example of conflict transformation, which paved the way for multiculturalism. Without Lafontaine and Baldwin, Canadian multiculturalism would never have existed. The Lafontaine-Baldwin narrative must be seen as the mortar that hold the tiles of the Canadian cultural mosaic together.

Chair: Paul Reynolds

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity 2015

Session 2: Issues of Research and Evaluation

Nur Yiğitoğlu
Middle East Technical University – Northern Cyprus Campus - nyigit@metu.edu.tr

(In)Visible authorial identities in research article abstracts

Although academic writing is usually seen as an act of conveying the objective content, it also includes an act of displaying the representation of the self. Genre, as "abstract, socially recognized ways of using language" (Hyland, 2007, p. 149), is often defined as "a distinctive category of discourse of any type, spoken or written" (Swales, 1990, p. 33). Genre has become an important component of academic writing theory and practice, evidenced by its presence in the classrooms and conversations of the field (Tardy, 2011). This exploratory study focuses specifically on the genre of research article. The abstract of a research article tends to give the glimpse of the content of the article and it is the part that "sells" the article to the reader. This is especially true in today's busy world in which the readers are flooded with information through open-access and online journals.

This comparative study of theoretical articles (i.e. commentary-driven, conceptual papers) and empirical articles (i.e. data-driven, research papers) aims to explore the representations of disciplinary and authorial identities and the construction of such identities through linguistic features. The disciplinary area selected for this study is applied linguistics, an interdisciplinary field of linguistics that aims to offer solutions to language-related problems.

Two corpora were compiled from 60 research article abstracts (i.e. 30 theoretical and 30 empirical) taken from three journals in the area of applied linguistics. These journals were selected as they have high impact factors according to Journal Citation Reports (2013). All articles in the corpus were published between 2010 and 2015. The corpus was first analyzed adopting a move-analysis approach (Swales, 1990). After the moves are identified, the typical linguistic features of each move are investigated.

As opposed to the general assumption that abstracts of the articles are objective and impersonal, the study reports that authorial identity does exist in the abstracts. More specifically, the results indicate that the disciplinary identities of the authors are reflected through certain linguistic features employed in the abstracts. The results also show that there are some differences in the disciplinary identities reflected in theoretical and empirical articles.

References
Hyland, K. (2007). Genre pedagogy: Language, literacy and L2 writing instruction. Journal of Second Language Writing, 16, 148–164. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2007.07.005
Swales, J. M. (1990). Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Tardy, C.M. (2011). The history and future of genre in second language writing. Journal of Second Language Writing, 20, 1–5. doi:10.1016/j.jeap.2005.07.002

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity 2015

E. Eda Işık Taş
Middle East Technical University – Northern Cyprus Campus - edaisik@metu.edu.tr

Multi-dimensional analysis in evaluation research

Evaluation is a broad cover term for the expression of the speaker or writer`s attitude or stance towards, viewpoint on, or feelings about entities or propositions that he or she is talking about (Hunston & Thompson, 2000). Evaluative language has many functions in spoken or written language such as expressing the speaker`s or writer`s opinion and reflecting the value system of that speaker or writer and of their community; constructing relations between the speaker and writer and their hearer or reader; and organizing the discourse. A great deal of research has so far been carried out in expressing personal assessments, attitudes or feelings in speech or writing under different labels such as modality (Halliday, 1985), evidentiality (Chafe and Nichols, 1986) and appraisal (Martin & White, 2005). These studies have produced useful lists of most frequent words and word groups used in evaluation and have identified the functions of evaluative language used by different groups. However, most of these studies have adopted corpus or discourse analysis methods, which in most cases failed to capture the complexity or the subtlety of the evaluative language in written or spoken language. As Hunston (2007) points out, research in evaluation should be able to identify "meaning groups" as well as "patterns". This requirement calls for a shift from traditional one-dimensional analysis of evaluation towards multi-dimensional analysis that draws on a sociocultural view of language. This talk will discuss the limitations of one-dimensional analysis commonly employed in studies of evaluation and will propose a multi-dimensional method of analysis employed in an on-going study of evaluation in academic writing.

Chafe, W. L.& Nichols, J. (eds.)(1986). Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
Halliday, M.A.K. (1985). An Introduction to Functional Grammar: London: Edward Arnold.
Hunston, S. (2007) Using a corpus to investigate stance quantitatively and qualitatively. in Englebretson (ed.) Stancetaking in Discourse. Benjamins. 27-48
Hunston, S. & Thompson, G. (2000). Evaluation in Text. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
Martin, J.R. & White, P.R.R. (2005). The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English. Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave Macmillian.

Chair: Scott Boyd

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity 2015

Session 3: Thinking Solidarity and Difference I

Craig Hammond
Blackburn College, UK - c.hammond@blackburn.ac.uk

A Dynamic Utopian Praxis: Creative Liberation, Micro-Democracy & Beyond

Murray Bookchin in Libertarian Municipalism poses a simple yet far-reaching challenge that any activist concerned with tackling and somehow influencing, in an alternative way, the relentless and internationalised machinery of neo-liberal consumer capitalism, must do so democratically, and in ways which pragmatically engage with micro, everyday social spaces and environments. To simply talk, or theorise about new democracy, certainly for Bookchin, is not enough; the talk and ideas must also, importantly, translate to dynamic tactics and strategies for effective action.

The theoretical frameworks of Guy Debord (1931-1994) & Ernst Bloch (1885-1977), contain symbiotic aspects, which, if flexibly explored, reinvigorate tactics for subjective empowerment, and the proliferation of personal voices of alternative possibilities. Reclaiming individual autonomies from the psychological ubiquity of the consumerist spectacle Debord developed the notions of the dérive and détournement; inciting fractured and creative and political struggles. Infused with Debordean tactics, Ernst Bloch's utopian framework, intertwines with the Traces and aches of inner-worlds; subjective awakenings of utopian possibilities can emerge through moments of astonishment and memory. Exploring these concepts and theorists in fresh academic and democratic ways can uncover creative unravelling's of subjective utopian traces. Learner collaborators, presented with space to open-up and develop not-yet-conscious and not-yet-become journeys of possibility, are liberated from the dry-bones and architectural encasement of the spiritless doppelganger of the routinised university.

The dynamic, personal creativity emergent from each collaborator challenges the traditional leadership approach to organising and managing teams and groups. In The Wisdom of Crowds Surowiecki notes that, 'under the right circumstances, groups are remarkably intelligent, and are often smarter than the smartest people in them. To shift the grade/judgement emphasis away from 'individual risk', Peer Assessment and group democracy can be implemented in such a way, whereby collaborators are liberated to produce personal-creative works, which reflect unique voices, embodying multi: gendered, cultural and class contexts.

The earlier theoretical and conceptual vehicles, exist really, to disaggregate and dissolve; the openness of the conceptual husks operate for creative departure. Initiated to micro-political principles of creative liberation, collaborators as yet, unnarrated possibilities that dwell on the horizon of the future.

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity 2015

Scott H. Boyd
Middle East Technical University – Northern Cyprus Campus - sboyd@metu.edu.tr

Information Communications Technology and the Limits of Solidarity in an Informationist and Neoliberal "Everyday Experience."

This is Part Two of a three part series. Using Gilbert Simondon's theories regarding being and objects (transindividuality), Part One mused on whether solidarity was possible in a world in which our being is increasingly constructed through interactions with memetic technologies. This paper, Part Two, focuses on the description of the "everyday experience" within which those technological objects are encountered and the possibility for the creation of solidarity within cultural contexts and communities that share these experiences. Derived from what Robert Neubauer has described as a hegemonic ideology formed from "informationism" and neoliberalism, "everyday experience" is increasingly created thorough a series of interdependent narrative and metaphoric frames (Lakoff). Information communications technology (ICT) devices are embedded within the frames we use to narrate and construct everyday experiences and thus function in a variety of contradictory roles creating oppression within the informationism-neoliberal construct as well as the illusion of escape from the ideology. As this paper zooms out to consider the ontogeny and the process integration of ICT devices within a particular description of "everyday experience," the goal is to again examine the extent and limits of the formation of solidarities.

Chair: Paul Reynolds

Session 4: Thinking Solidarity and Difference II

Zuzana Klímová
Masaryk University Czech Republic - 145169@mail.muni.cz

Re-constructions of difference through redefinition of the single-feature identity and the stereotypical ascription of value to non-qualitative characteristics

In the struggle for the dissolution of boundaries between communities it seems to be a matter of the construction of the categories of difference and its promotion by dominant part of a society. Part of the problem are questions of representation of one's identity by others as well as self-representation of an individual, but most prominently of a particular group. I believe that one of the greatest issues in question is the idea of creating identity and the definition of the boundaries between individual identities. If we are to focus on the representation of a particular group, it is often a single-aspect identity that leads to the problem of alienation and marginalization of a community at the expense of the hegemonic privileged one. This "identity segregation" uses the strength of the stereotypical division of people into groups based on the single identity trait and by ascribing this identity a particular value even though these characteristics are non-qualitative in their very essence. Apart from the question of the categories of difference, we should therefore also have a look at the aspect of identity formation and its stereotypical representation.

Making solidarity in the context of difference would therefore mean to change our perception of difference into something we could perceive only as a form of variety without ascribing qualitative value to the characteristics describing it. By doing so, difference will stop being a dividing factor and became an enriching factor for our society.

Role of art, in this respect, can therefore focus on the re-presentation of difference and transformation of our understanding of the problematic evaluation of characteristics that are very often completely unchangeable (inborn characteristics such as sex, skin colour, physical features, ...) for the individuals that are identified through them. As long as these characteristics are perceived qualitatively they inevitably belittle an individual or a group based on a trait they have no control over thus leading to denigration of that person/group on the basis of a feature irrelevant to their personalities, skills, abilities and any other achievements which might prove their personal worth. This is a downright denial of basic human right for dignity.

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity 2015

Paul Reynolds
Edge Hill University, UK - reynoldp@edgehill.ac.uk

The Constitution of Solidarity: Critical Reflections

It is not our differences that divide us. It is our inability to recognize, accept, and celebrate those differences.
Audre Lorde

The challenge Lorde sets us to is envisage a society where difference is recognised, accepted and celebrated, yet at the same time retains and maintains social solidarity. A key feature of this challenge is what constitutes solidarity in such a society? What takes on the task of providing the glue that sustains social cohesion and enables mutually appreciated difference. Since difference is often expressed culturally, and culture often evokes emotional responses and intense feelings of belonging, it would seem that some sort of common cultural constructs would be a good balance with recognising cultural difference. Cosmopolitans and democratic thinkers have often put the onus on law, political discourse and the working of democratic participative forms with varying degrees of persuasiveness. Radical thinkers have often stressed the need to address more universal questions, such as those of gender and class, in arguing for solidarity through economic transformation and political discourse.

In this paper, I want to explore how these different perspectives might be enriched through an approach that privileges practice as a meaningful and ontologically primary concept in conceiving how contemporary societies work.

Chair: Scott Boyd

Session 5: Solidarity and Difference in Intimate Contexts

Deniz Yucel
William Paterson University, USA - yuceld@wpunj.edu

The Effect of Work-Family Conflict on Marital Satisfaction

This study analyzes 1,726 married individuals in the United States from the 2008 National Study of the Changing Workforce (NSCW) to explore the effect of work-family conflict on marital satisfaction. This study also tests whether this relationship is mediated by psychological distress. Lastly, this study asks whether this relationship varies by gender. The results suggest that work-family conflict has a significant and direct negative effect on marital satisfaction. Results also suggest that work-family conflict has an indirect effect; that is, the effect of work-family conflict on relationship satisfaction is mediated by increased psychological distress. Finally, the negative effect of work-family conflict on relationship satisfaction was found to be stronger and more significant among married women.

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity 2015

Valerie Bouchard and Laudan Vaezmir
University of Quebec at Montreal, Canada - valerie.bouchard@fd.ulaval.ca & laudanvaez@gmail.com

The Good Wife : diversity as the new conservative weapon

By their second year, the law students are to take part in events and cocktails hosted by the big law firms in order to try to secure an articling position for themselves. The information sessions offered in preparation of these flirting sessions are meant to teach the students the way to success: what to say, what to do, and how to present oneself. For women, the "power-suit" and the "fuck-me-boots" are a must! Thus, starting with the first contacts, the judicial profession emphasises the sexualised image of the woman in the practice of law.

The Good Wife, the "fuck-me-boots" of American "legal-political" TV dramas, is in general regarded as a program that depicts an array of diverse women who are powerful, sexually liberated and financially independent. Women who have liberated themselves by integrating into the professional world and who still enjoy the female social-consciousness that is contrary to their male counterparts. However, the end result is the depiction of multitude of female protagonists who are slaves to their sexual desires or who are dominated sexually, and who are put to work through sex to serve the law in a justice system controlled by men. This sexuality that brings about power and allows for influence in the judicial system is curiously enough necessarily heterosexual regardless of whether the character is identified as bisexual or heterosexual.

Television, as Bourdieu puts it "enjoys a de facto monopoly on what goes into the heads of a significant part of the population and what they think." And what is "just an image" comes to influence "the just image". In this paper we argue that through an overwhelming number of popular TV programs on the subjects of law and justice, a new jurisdiction is created, a new normative judicial message is circulated and, subsequently, the practice of law and at times the nature of law itself are transformed. Thus, The Good Wife becomes an instrument of the reinforcement of the conservatism of law. The program normalises and moreover prescribes the sexual image and behaviour expected from women. This message is subsequently interiorised by law practitioners as well as law students and is presented as the idealised model for women lawyers.

Chair: Scott Boyd

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity 2015

Session 6: Thinking Culture

Zoltan Zakota
 Partium Christian University, Romania - zzakota@gmail.com

Cohabitating Cultures – Harmonising Differences inside the European Union

My paper aims to present, from a rather constructivist point of view, the conflicting situation which seems to escalate nowadays between national identity, on one side and other forms of identity, such as: local, regional and, especially, the European one, on the other. The fall of Communism has not brought the expected wealth for the recently liberated nations, which seem to compensate this lack of economic success by the revitalisation of national feelings. Some of them have turned back to a kind of pre-World War II identity construction and declared a "freedom fight" against Brussels, while some others have turned against immigration, or even internal migration. The process of globalisation, which appeared to be one of the main coagulating factors of the Union, now is subject of vehement criticism due especially to the financial crisis. On the other hand, the Nation State seems to suffer from an increasing insecureness, being caught between two antagonist forces: a centripetal, integrating one, at continental level and a centrifugal, disintegrating one, at regional and local level. This is the battlefield of four kinds of identity and the fight is far from being closed down. I intend to outline some of the most important social, political and economic identity-related constructs that populate the actual European political landscape, and the future trends that outline the dynamics of relations between European, national, regional and local identities. I also aim to present some ideas related to the possibility of rescaling these interacting fields of forces that characterise the EU, the nation states and the regions, without generating new tensions. I try to sketch out a way that could lead to a compromise between diverse regional and/or local group identities, national interest and European harmonisation, in order to face global challenges and to avoid deeper conflicts.

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity 2015

David Stoop
University of Cologne, Germany - mail@david-stoop.de

"To be different without fear" - From multiculturalism towards a critical and non-essentialist account of culture

Although sociologists have been depicting the diversity and hybridity of modern societies since the seventies (e.g. Berger, Berger and Kellner 1973), simplistic accounts of culture are still widespread today. The traditional image of cultures as enclosed entities or "circles" has been partly renewed by political theorists such as Samuel Huntington or Bassam Tibi, predicting a "clash of civilisations". Proponents of intercultural and multicultural theories attempted to overcome the conflict-oriented model of separated cultural entities by stressing the multicultural nature of modern immigration-societies and by promoting a politics of intercultural communication and mutual acknowledgement. Multiculturalism is anti-universalist insofar as it questions the universality of Western values and defends the right of cultural minority-groups to maintain their traditions and habits. Although they are directed against conflict-oriented interpretations of cross-cultural encounters, multi- and intercultural theories often reproduce the traditional image of cultures as more or less stable entities. This static notion of identifiable cultural groups, however, is incompatible with the diversity and the multiplicity of individual belongings in modern societies. Moreover, as Wolfgang Welsch argues, the "external" hybridity of societies is mirrored inside each individual: Subjects themselves are always "hybrid" or "transcultural".

In this paper, different non-essentialist accounts of culture will be analyzed in respect to the question how they conceptualize the relation between universalism, individualism and cultural (minority-)groups. It will then be discussed in how far these accounts of culture are "critical" in the sense that they question existing hegemonies and forms of domination, pointing towards a state in which "everyone can be different without fear" (Adorno).

Chair: Paul Reynolds

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity 2015

Session 7: Closing Roundtable

This session will be a concluding roundtable that will seek to draw out relevant themes and ideas from the conference papers and discussions. Two speakers chosen during the conference will be asked to 'lead off' this session with no more than 3-5 minutes of sharing one or two observations, before the floor is opened for group discussion. We hope that this will allow some reflection and drawing together of themes, strands and arguments from the conference (and perhaps set the agenda for next year)

And **Closing Remarks**:

Scott Boyd and Paul Reynolds

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity 2015

Conference Outputs:

Two of our conferences have yielded edited volumes:
- The 2011 conference resulted in the publication of *Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity: Critical Cases*, edited by Scott Boyd and Mary-Ann Walters, published by **Cambridge Scholars Publishing**.
- The 2012 conference has resulted in the publication *Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity: Solidarities and Social Function* edited by Scott Boyd and Mary-Ann Walters, to be published by **Cambridge Scholars Publishing** early in 2014.

We are in discussion over a third conference publication from the 2013 Conference.

Publication options

An edited collection:

Depending on the quality and coherence of the papers at the conference, we will consider a further edited collection with Cambridge Scholars to add to the emerging series. The collection would comprise those papers that suit a coherent edited collection plus perhaps one or two commissioned pieces. This collection will only be proposed if there is a body of papers that are both of the appropriate quality and, and this is important, cohere together to suggest a collection that would be thematic. Hence it may be that a very good paper is still omitted because it does not fit with the collection. If selected, all contributions go through peer review and final acceptance for publication is only confirmed after peer review, to preserve the quality and integrity of the publication.

More details, including notification of inclusion, the deadlines for submission, and formatting guidelines will be discussed during and after the conference. This book will have a fast turnaround time. It is expected that final chapters will be due from authors in mid-September. Authors will be responsible for their own editing. The book editors will NOT edit for grammar, punctuation, spelling, content, etc. The text the author submits is the text that will be published.

Please note: The quality of the papers presented and coherence of the collection as a whole will determine whether or not an edited book is accepted by our publishers. Submission and presentation of a paper does not guarantee publication. We will not publish poorly written, argued, or researched papers.

CDSS Record:

From the beginning of next year CDSS will be publishing an annual called the CDSS Record. The purpose of the CDSS Record is to make a scholarly contribution to the understanding of international issues and problems of cultural difference and social solidarity. We envisage it being published in January/February each year in print and electronic form. The first issue is due to be published in late summer 2015. All contributions, whether articles, reports, review articles or book reviews, are peer reviewed. The editor in chief of this publication is John McSweeney, who regrettably cannot be at the conference. The editorial board includes Scott Boyd, Zuzana Klimova, Paul Reynolds and David Stoop, and interest in the CDSS Record at this conference should be directed to Paul. We may commission specific pieces for the CDSS record, but by all means let us know if you wish to submit for publication.

As with the book, authors will be responsible for their own editing. The editors will NOT edit for grammar, punctuation, spelling, content, etc. The text the author submits is the text that will be published.

Of course, it may be that neither option is appropriate.

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

A CULTURAL DIFFERENCE AND SOCIAL SOLIDARITY NETWORK WORKSHOP

THE PROMISE AND POSSIBILITIES OF CRITICAL PEDAGOGIES:
PEDAGOGIES OF DIFFERENCE AND SOLIDARITY IN CONTEMPORARY SOCIETIES

Hosted by
Masaryk University, Department of Department of English Language and Literature,
Brno, Czech Republic

29th August – 30th August 2015

The last four decades has seen a resurgence in interest in pedagogies and pedagogic forms, strategies and practices. Traditionally associated more directly with schooling, the 'pedagogic turn' in social theory, headed by Foucault's critical analysis of the constitution of normativities and orthodoxies and Illich, Friere, Giroux and hooks engagement with emancipatory pedagogies, has encouraged a broader understanding of pedagogy in society. Pedagogy appears to encapsulate both the reproduction and sustaining of the 'status quo' in political and cultural discursive strategies and hegemonies, and the developing of coherent and effective oppositions to existing orthodoxies and for ethical and political change.

Pedagogy may well be a popular focus because it allows the possibility of change by discursive politics and ethical debate against the more daunting task of radical restructuring and more persuasive than the term of political debate within particular national political cultures. They suggest the promotion of participation and democratic debate in public affairs, with the possibility of finding solidarities in culture and norms with the space for recognition and appreciations of difference. At the same time, pedagogic strategies are effective in the constructions of exclusion, marginalisation and pathology. In addition, there are concerns that a focus on pedagogies may well push the terms of opposition into cultural rather than political domains, and the tool of analysis might not provide the critical basis for open political argument

This workshop – occupying the weekend of the 29th and 30th August - invites papers from both within and across disciplinary divides in the humanities and social sciences that extend the analyses of pedagogic forms, strategies and practices and explore how they contribute to the making, breaking and remaking of settlements of solidarity and difference in contemporary societies. Papers might focus on the following, although the list is not exclusive:

- Explorations of the scope and limitations to theories of critical pedagogy in shaping societies of difference and solidarity

- Analyses of the scope and limits of pedagogic practices within educational contexts – from infant through to universities - which address issues of difference and solidarity in societies

- Evaluations of pedagogic strategies by political parties, movements and interests in propagating their ideological positions and political programmes

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity 2015

-Evaluations of dissident and oppositional pedagogies and pedagogies of authority and oppression

- Analyses of the pedagogic practices of professionals and authorities in constituting the representation of solidarity and difference in everyday life

-Explorations of pedagogies constituted in language, discourse and culture and their influence on the constitution of difference and solidarity in everyday life.

- Explorations of inter-cultural pedagogies, language and discourse and the issues they raise for difference and solidarity in societies

Other related topics discussing cultural difference and social solidarity are welcome.

Panel suggestions, alternate forms of intellectual presentation and papers (both polished and in progress), which should be aimed at 20 minutes maximum presentation as well as shorter presentations and contributions are welcomed. The workshop will be organised around paper presentations that allow for discussion as well as exposition and roundtable plenary consolidation of the paper themes and discussions. We expect to publish from the workshop in both an established book series and a special issue of a journal and/or the annual publication of the Network, *CDSS Record*.

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity Network (CDSS) is an international organisation focused broadly on fostering collaboration and debate around the broad issues of difference and solidarity in human societies. The network organizes an annual conferences, as well as periodic seminars and collaborative projects (see www.differencesolidarity). It has a particular interest in supporting international research collaboration and younger researchers entering the international stage. The network works towards the development of trans-disciplinary and trans-national understandings of and interventions in questions of solidarity and difference. This event is the first collaboration between the network and the Department of English Language and Literature at Masaryk University, in Brno, the Czech Republic.
Prospective participants should submit an abstract of no more than 200 words by filling out the electronic submission form on our website: www.differenceandsolidarity.org. We operate a rolling programme of considering and accepting paper proposals as they are submitted so as to facilitate those who need to apply for funding.

The workshop fees, which include workshop packs and administrative organisation, refreshments, lunches and an evening reception on the evening of the 29th August, are:
Waged/Full time Faculty – 200 Euros
Postgraduates/Part-time Faculty – 120 Euros

Workshop organisers:
Zuzana Klimova, Department of English Language and Literature, Masaryk University, Czech Republic
Paul Reynolds, Reader in Sociology and Social Philosophy, Edge Hill University, UK (and co-director, CDSS)

You may follow us on facebook:
https://www.facebook.com/pages/Cultural-Difference-and-Social-Solidarity-Network/624218300958957

or on CDSS webpage:
http://differenceandsolidarity.org/cdss_seminars

PEDAGOGICKÁ FAKULTA
Masarykovy univerzity