## Reconceptualizing social care in the 21<sup>st</sup> century: new policies, politics, and beneficiaries

Much of the current comparative literature on social care is concerned with "classical" care policies such as elderly care and early childhood care. Though indisputably a significant research area, it offers a narrow account that fails to examine important aspects of the field. Not least the COVID19-pandemic and its social and healthcare consequences have re-directed the attention towards other groups of beneficiaries and forms of social care, called here "contested care policies." This includes, for instance, palliative care for terminally ill people, care for homeless people, drug addicts, migrants, or victims of domestic violence. Moreover, the pandemic has shifted our attention back to the relationship between paid and unpaid care provided by family, close relatives, friends, and neighbors. In many countries, the state withdrew from being a provider of social care and initiated a process of economization, which brought new profit- and non-profit-oriented actors on the agenda and promoted informal care arrangements by community actors. Seen in relation to contested care policies, these shifts draw the attention to different challenges, actor constellations, groups of beneficiaries and inequalities, new forms of governance and causes of policy change. Explored from an internationally comparative perspective, this change of focus will substantially complement existing research on "classical" care policies.

We thus argue that a reconceptualization of social care is necessary that takes into account classical as well as non-classical care policies and analyze them from three perspectives: (1) shifts in the **regulation and provision of social care policies** within as well as across different countries and providers (e.g. family, state, market, charity/community). (2) **consequences of policy reforms** for **beneficiaries** with different social identities in terms of **gender**, **race**, **ethnicity or religion**. And (3), the dynamics of the **politics of care** (e.g., politicization of social care by political parties, lobbying activity of interest groups).

An **intersectional perspective** is particularly promising in the analyses of social care, as gender, religion, race and ethnicity seem to matter for policy reforms as well as in the implementation stage. For instance, **migrants** lacking citizenship rights face particular hardship in current times but the provision of social services for these particular group of people is particularly contested. While **gender inequalities** in the provision of paid and unpaid child-and elderly care and their economic consequences are extensively researched, we need more insights on women's role in **faith-based organizations**, gendered patterns of informal care in times of crisis and unexpected consequences of policy reforms for beneficiaries belonging to different **ethnic or religious minorities** (e.g. Muslims, Roma).

Clearly, these factors (i.e. gender, religion, race and ethnicity) also matter in the realm of contested care policies and the changing constellations within the "care diamond." More systematic and country-comparative research in that regard will significantly enhance our understanding of the impact on care. Accordingly, exemplary research questions are:

- How can contested care policies be integrated conceptually and empirically in the analysis of social care? What are similarities and differences in terms of regulation, provision, politics, and consequences across care policies?
- How are contested care policies regulated? And do their reforms underlie different politics than classical ones?
- How are classical as well as contested care policies implemented and how can we explain variation in the provision within as well as across geographical identities (i.e. cities, countries)?
- How did the "care diamond" change more recently? Which role do faith-based organization take over? And to what extent did informal care by the family or close relative gained prominence again?
- Finally, what are the consequences of policy reforms for beneficiaries of different gender, ethnicity, religion, or race? Do we find inequalities in social service provision among beneficiaries?

All these underexplored but highly topical research questions will be investigated during a workshop, which takes place from the 24-26<sup>th</sup> of February 2021; if possible, in person at the Akademie für politische Bildung Tutzing (near to Munich). We welcome papers from different social science disciplines (e.g. political science, sociology, economics or social work), being of empirical or rather theoretical nature as well as single case or comparative studies of different geographical or organizational entities (e.g. countries, cities, faith-based organizations). We opt for diversity in the methodological approach, including qualitative as well as macroquantitative methods or experiments.

The Akademie is co-funding accommodation and food, and we are planning to offer travel grants for junior scholars in addition. The AK/Standing Group of "Religion and Politics" of the DVPW and the ECPR is supporting the workshop in ideational terms. Furthermore, we are eager to put together a Special Issue in a high-ranking international journal (e.g. European Journal of Social Policy). If you are interested to contribute, please send us your abstract of up to 500 words to both agnes.blome@fu-berlin.de and eva-maria.euchner@lmu.de no later than 15<sup>th</sup> of October 2020. We will notify the selected participants no later than 31st October, 2020 and ask them to submit a full paper no later than the 15<sup>th</sup> of February 2021. It is important that the abstracts are very sharp to increase our chances for applications at excellent international journals.

## Most important details:

- Deadline abstracts: 15<sup>th</sup> of October 2020
- Notification: 31st of October 2020
- Deadline full papers: 15<sup>th</sup> of February 2021
- Date of workshop: 24 26th of February 2021
- Place and collaboration partner: Akademie für politische Bildung Tutzing, Buchensee 1, DE-82327 Tutzing (close to Munich and the wonderful Starnberger See!!)
- Costs: **75 Euro** per person which covers accommodation and food within the Akademie; additionally, we will most likely organize travel grants for junior scholars.
- Contact workshop organizers:
  - o Dr. Agnes Blome, FU Berlin, Agnes.Blome@fu-berlin.de
  - o Dr. Eva-Maria Euchner, LMU Munich, eva-maria.euchner@lmu.de