

Call for Abstracts–
Special Issue *Kriminologisches Journal*
Sociotechnical Perspectives for Criminology

Many criminologically relevant practices are quintessentially sociotechnical interactions or hybrid contexts of action, marked by the complex interplay of human and non-human actors. In the course of these practices, each participating entity, whether human or non-human, brings in its specific capabilities, which engender genuinely emergent sociotechnical practices. For example, the daily work of police officers with body cameras can be conceptualized as a hybrid constellation. By adopting such a perspective, the corresponding contexts of action can be analyzed in a new way by asking for the sociotechnical delegation of responsibilities and the new possibilities of action which arise through this process of technification (Timan 2013: 115). With recourse to Science & Technology Studies (STS), it is important to note here that the artefacts utilized do not merely serve as passive mediators, but rather as active factors of influence, which transform their application contexts when used. They change the concrete performance of the corresponding practice and determine its social outcomes. One STS-key argument is that society and technology are inseparable and that corresponding reflections have to follow the programmatic dictum of symmetry between *all* the actors (or actants) participating in a given interaction context (e.g. Latour 1992, 1993; Bijker 1993; Bijker/Pinch 2012).

Although this connection between control practices and technological artefacts is quite obvious, with technology as a common, yet subordinated topic of criminology (see e.g. Marx 2001, 2002; Nogala 2000; Aas 2004, 2006; Zedner 2009; Neyland 2009; Lianos/Douglas 2000; Jones 2000; Lyon 1994), a determined criminological adaptation of STS-perspectives is still missing. There are already some scattered attempts to highlight the fruitfulness of this connection (esp. Linhardt 2000; Brown 2006; Kroener/Neyland 2012; Kreissl/Ostermeier 2011; Rauer 2012; van der Wagen/Pieters 2015; Robert/Dufresne 2015), but these have not resulted in an appropriate echo in terms of publications that would offer a systematic in-depth overview of the theoretical and empirical opportunities and/or pitfalls of such an amalgamation. Sheila Brown (2006) for example has submitted the most elaborated view on an adaptation in pointing out the various consequences of STS approaches for criminological theory. Nevertheless, so far, her call on criminology to deal with the theoretical challenges and opportunities generated by STS has not really been picked up yet. Similar to the material turn in the social sciences in general, STS has the potential to stimulate such a trend to more precise and profound examinations of the social role of artefacts. This may include their specific socio-material status in practices and contexts of control, may it be within the criminal justice system, law enforcement or specific security settings.

Therefore, the special issue at hand aims to present theoretical elaborations about the potentials and limits, possible contradictions and potential method(ological) frictions of an integration of STS-perspectives into criminological thought. Empirical studies are of crucial interest as well. For example, a case study of surveillance devices and the corresponding practices analysed through a sociotechnical and artefact-sensitive lens could be a suitable contribution to this special issue.

We invite contributions that engage with (but are not limited to) the following questions:

- What are the implications of analyzing control or security practices as sociotechnical?
- What is the special role of the technology in a corresponding context of interaction and what are its specific effects? How does the technology intervene and what specific

functions are taken on by the artifacts? How is the control practice shaped by the utilization of the technological artefact? What kind of network(s) emerge(s) from this?

- What are the analytical capabilities of the artefacts? In what way do they shape the corresponding control practices?
- Which values, anticipations and scripts are inscribed into the technologies?
- In what ways does the increased usage of such technologies transform control assemblages, and ultimately, society as a whole?

Please submit **abstracts** of no more than 500 words including contact details of the author(s). Contributions can be written in English or German and should be sent by March 15th 2016 to Bettina Paul (bettina.paul@uni-hamburg.de) and Simon Egbert (segbert@uni-bremen.de).

Key information for final contributions

- Manuscripts should be formatted in Times New Roman (12 pt.), 1.5-spaced, including footnotes and a works cited section.
- The entire text (including spaces, footnotes, works cited, and abstracts) should not contain more than 45.000 characters. Please state the corresponding number of characters at the end of the manuscript. The revision may be given a longer limit.
- The manuscripts will be reviewed by two anonymous referees (peer review).
- Texts should be submitted in word-format.

(for more details see the mandatory submission guidelines: http://www.krimj.de/images/Einreichungsmaterialien/2015_Journal_Manuscript_submission_guidelines.pdf)

Dates and deadlines

Deadline for the submission of abstracts: 15th March 2016

Notification of acceptance/rejection: 15th April 2016

Deadline first draft submission: 15th October 2016

Feedback of peer reviews and editors: 31st December 2016

Deadline final version submission: 15th February 2017

Planned publication date: July 2017

If you have any further questions, please contact the Special Issue Editors:

Bettina Paul & Simon Egbert

References

- Aas, Katja Franko (2004): From narrative to database: Technological change and penal culture, in: *Punishment & Society* 6 (4), 379-393.
- Aas, Katja Franko (2006): 'The body does not lie': Identity, risk and trust in technoculture, in: *Crime, Media, Culture* 2 (2), 143-158.
- Bijker, Wiebe E. (1993): Do not Despair: There is Life after Constructivism, in: *Science, Technology, & Human Values* 18 (1), 113-138.

- Bijker, Wiebe E./Pinch, Trevor (2012): Preface to the Anniversary Edition, in: Bijker, Wiebe E./Hughes, Thomas P./Pinch, Trevor. (Eds.): *The Social Construction of Technological Systems: New Directions in the Sociology and History of Technology*. Anniversary Edition, Cambridge, xi-xxxiv.
- Brown, Sheila (2006): The criminology of hybrids: Rethinking crime and law in technosocial networks, in: *Theoretical Criminology* 10 (2), S. 223-244.
- Jones, Richard (2000): Digital Rule: Punishment, Control and Technology, in: *Punishment & Society* 2 (1), 5-22.
- Kreissl, Reinhard/Ostermeier, Lars (2011): Wer hat Angst vorm Großen Bruder? In: Hempel, Leon/Krasmann, Susanne/Bröckling, Ulrich (Eds.): *Sichtbarkeitsregime. Überwachung, Sicherheit und Privatheit im 21. Jahrhundert*. Sonderheft Leviathan 25, 281-298.
- Kroener, Inga/Neyland, Daniel (2012): New technologies, security, and surveillance, in: Ball, Kirstie/Haggerty, Kevin D./Lyon, David (Eds.): *Routledge Handbook of Surveillance Studies*. London/New York, 141-148.
- Latour, Bruno (1992): "Where are the Missing Masses? The Sociology of a Few Mundane Arte-facts", in: Bijker, Wiebe E./Law, John (Eds.): *Shaping Technology/Building Society: Studies in Sociotechnical Change*. Cambridge 225–258.
- Latour, Bruno (1993): *We Have Never Been Modern*. Cambridge.
- Lianos, Michaelis/Douglas, Mary (2000): Dangerization and the end of deviance, in: *The British Journal of Criminology* 40 (2), 261-278.
- Linhardt, Dominique (2000): Demokratische Maschinen? In: *Kriminologisches Journal* 32 (2), 82-107.
- Lyon, David (1994): *The Electronic Eye. The Rise of Surveillance Society*. Minneapolis:.
- Marx, Gary T. (2001): Technology and Social Control, in: Smelser, Neil J./Baltes, Paul B. (Eds.): *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*. Amsterdam et al. 15506-15512.
- Marx, Gary T. (2002): What's New About the "New Surveillance"? In: *Surveillance & Society* 1 (1), 9-29.
- Neyland, Daniel (2009): Mundane terror and the threat of everyday objects, in: Aas, Katja Franko/Gundhus, Helene Oppen/Lomell, Heidi Mork (Eds.): *Technologies of InSecurity. The surveillance of everyday life*. Abingdon/New York, 21-41
- Nogala, Detlef (2000): Der Frosch im heißen Wasser, in: Schulzki-Haddouti, Christiane (Ed.): *Vom Ende der Anonymität: Die Globalisierung der Überwachung*. Hannover, 139-155.
- Rauer, Valentin (2012): Interobjektivität: Sicherheitskultur aus Sicht der Akteur-Netzwerk-Theorie, in: Daase Christopher/Offermann, Philipp/Rauer, Valentin (Eds.): *Sicherheitskultur. Soziale und politische Praktiken der Gefahrenabwehr*. Frankfurt a.M./New York: Campus, 69-91.
- Timan, Tjerk (2013): Surveillance in Urban Nightscapes. A STS-Informed Perspective, in: *Tecnoscienza* 4 (2), 93-124.
- van der Wagen, Wytse; Pieters, Wolter (2015): From Cybercrime to Cyborg Crime: Botnets as Hybrid Criminal Actor-Networks. In: *The British Journal of Criminology* 55 (3), 578-595.
- Zedner, Lucia (2009): Epilogue: The inescapable insecurity of security technologies? In: Aas, Katja Franko/Gundhus, Helene Oppen/Lomell, Heidi Mork (Eds.): *Technologies of InSecurity. The surveillance of everyday life*. Abingdon/New York: Routledge-Cavendish, 257-270.