



# What does the Covid-19 crisis reveal about interdisciplinarity in social sciences?

Marcella Corsi & J. Michael Ryan

To cite this article: Marcella Corsi & J. Michael Ryan (2022) What does the Covid-19 crisis reveal about interdisciplinarity in social sciences?, International Review of Sociology, 32:1, 1-9, DOI: [10.1080/03906701.2022.2064695](https://doi.org/10.1080/03906701.2022.2064695)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03906701.2022.2064695>



Published online: 28 May 2022.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 482



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



## What does the Covid-19 crisis reveal about interdisciplinarity in social sciences?

Marcella Corsi <sup>a</sup> and J. Michael Ryan <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Statistics, Sapienza University of Rome, Rome, Italy; <sup>b</sup>Sociology and Anthropology, Nazarbayev University, Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan

**ARTICLE HISTORY** Received 28 January 2022; Accepted 31 March 2022

*In memory of Giovanbattista Sgritta*

When the first instances of the SARS-CoV-2 virus were reported in late 2019 and early 2020, there were few people who would have imagined the magnitude of the pandemic that we have experienced up to now.

News of the virus seemed contained mostly to the epidemiological community and very few social scientists, especially those outside of health research, were raising much of an eyebrow. It was at that time that IRS editorial board decided to launch a Call for papers to stimulate a debate about the COVID-19 pandemic – the socially constructed classification of the epidemiological spread of the virus – with the aim to develop analyses within a pluralistic research community in social sciences.

The call was open to empirical, analytical, and theoretical papers on the economic, political, and social issues of the pandemic. The articles published in this Themed issue are those selected among the many which have been submitted along those lines, in the past two years. We are grateful to all authors for their patience and perseverance.

Before describing the content of the papers, it is important to distinguish between the SARS-CoV-2 virus, the COVID-19 pandemic, and other impacts the spread of the virus has had. There is a clear overlap, but also important distinctions.

One way of distinguishing between medical issues and social issues is to differentiate between issues of contagion and underlying systemic issues. Contagion refers to *how* a virus spreads, *how easily* it spreads, and *how quickly* it spreads. The concern of epidemiologists is largely focused on medical and social issues of contagion. A systemic issue, on the other hand, is one that is a broad underlying factor in how societies operate and includes issues like discrimination and inequalities. Social scientists have a history of focusing on more systemic issues. The COVID-19 pandemic, however, has blurred those distinctions (to the extent that they existed). For example, we know that underlying issues of inequality – i.e. access to healthcare, healthy living conditions, types of employment, access to information – are directly linked to contagion. We now have clear evidence of strong associations between race/ethnicity, sexual identity, social class, and geographic location and the likelihood of contracting, or at least being exposed to, the SARS-CoV-2 virus, with the unfortunately predictable outcome that those in disadvantaged positions are far more likely to be exposed, contract, and die from the virus (Germain & Yong, 2020;

**CONTACT** Marcella Corsi  [marcella.corsi@uniroma1.it](mailto:marcella.corsi@uniroma1.it)  Department of Statistics, Sapienza University of Rome, Viale Regina Elena 295, Roma, Italy

© 2022 University of Rome 'La Sapienza'

Mahajan & Larkins-Pettigrew, 2020; Moore et al., 2021; Navarro & Hernandez, 2022). In short, the COVID-19 pandemic has brought renewed attention to the fact that distinctions between medicine and social science, contagion and systemic issues, and pre-existing inequalities and medical outcomes might be overstated and that there is a strong need for medical professionals and social scientists to be in conversation.

One way of conceptualizing the health/social interaction is through the notion of a syndemic. Ryan (2021) defines a syndemic analysis as one that ‘implies examining not only the health consequences of disease interactions but also how they interact with the social, cultural, economic, political, and environmental factors that promote, and worsen, disease’ (p. 7). In short, a syndemic is the meeting between the biomedical factors of disease and the sociocultural elements that impact disease. Although for the sake of common parlance we will use the term ‘pandemic’ throughout this Themed issue, it is worth noting that the situation caused by the virus and the pandemic is perhaps better thought of as a ‘syndemic’ as health and society have perhaps never been so clearly interlinked.

The article by Ruby Bhardwaj published in this Themed issue argues that the understanding of infectious diseases requires a multi-disciplinary approach by highlighting the crucial significance of socio-cultural, political, and anthropogenic factors underlying causation, containment, and ramifications of COVID-19. The pandemic has not only altered the individual’s relationship with the others in society but has also ushered new power dynamics in society. The State’s power in curtailing individual freedom of movement and restrictions on work has impaired the economy, pushing many below the poverty line. Control and surveillance mediated by digital technology have also tilted the balance of power in the favour of the State.

The relationship between the binary epistemic categories that aid in the cognition of sociological reality, such as biology and culture, *self* and the *other*, *individual* and the *collective* assume new connotations in the face of risk. With respect to disease etiology, the boundaries between biology and culture stand fuzzy. On the contrary the boundary between *self* vs the *other* were heightened and sharpened in the wake of fear and anxiety of contracting the contagion. Under normal conditions, a balance of power between the *individual* and the *collective* sustains the State but the pandemic drastically tilted the balance in favour of the latter, while upholding its legitimacy. The pandemic has deeply altered the institutional arrangements in the society necessitating an urgent need for collaborative inter-disciplinary research.

## **Pandemic impacts across the social sciences**

In response to an article by Michie and West (2020), Green and Cladi (2020) noted that

The humanities and social sciences definitely have a vast amount to contribute to resolving the massive challenges arising out of the Covid-19 pandemic. Indeed, that may be where the most critically important academic advances may arise, as vastly better understanding of human and societal behaviour is essential if truly effective strategies and policies to reduce viral transmission and maximise human safety are to be identified and implemented. (Green & Cladi, 2020, p. 370)

They are not wrong. Two papers included in this Themed issue show how social science research, as important as medical research, may offer us ways out of the pandemic.

The COVID-19 pandemic caused many countries to take strict measures in order to control the spread of the virus. Their goal was to protect the vulnerable groups and the health care systems from collapsing. The article by Costas Constantinou in this Themed issue relies on observations from several countries and focuses on Foucault's theory of biopower, to discuss how governments relied on science to guide and monitor people during the pandemic. Interestingly, in countries where biopower was applied more strictly, such as Taiwan and New Zealand, the spread of COVID-19 was better managed. Such application of biopower by governments reflects Rabinow and Rose's (2006) approach that biopower needs to have at least three components, that is, 'one or more truth discourses', 'strategies of interventions', and 'modes of subjectification'. The COVID-19 language and the practices constructed by governments eventually aimed to be adopted by people as individual tools for tackling the pandemic. However, such modes of subjectification were generated during the pandemic, but people were not prepared in advance in terms of how they should be reacting when crisis stroke. On this note, it would be advisable for governments to reflect on their biopower strategy and enrich their techniques and approach for future responses to pandemics. More specifically, one Foucauldian tool that was not central in governmental responses to COVID-19 was that of 'normalizing power', which means that people want to do what needs to be done anyway. Foucault highlighted that people cannot be free because they are an integral part of the society, and they function in the society in accordance with its rules. However, Foucault also believed that when people engage with normalizing power they may feel freer and more valued as autonomous individuals. According to Foucault, knowledge is power, and this is about empowering people well in advance. This would possibly minimize resistance and protests, as they occurred in some countries, because, as Foucault (1978) said, 'where there is power, there is resistance' (p. 95) and it seems that where there is more power there is more resistance. So empowering people early on would balance perceived power relationships between people and governments, resulting in a more fruitful collaboration between the two parties. In other words, through normalizing power people would be more involved, reflecting an approach towards the promotion of active citizenship for the development and protection of the society (Constantinou, 2020).

The article by Belayeth Hussain in this Themed issue draws our attention on the practices of social distancing adopted by many countries to limit the spread of the virus. Using a Regression Discontinuity Design (RDD) on observations for 132 countries, he argues that policy interventions' effectiveness in response to COVID-19 depends on political leaders, public health authorities, and institutions' credibility. People's trust in pandemic-like situations depends on policy makers handling of evidence-based, transparent, and fact-based intervention communications (Lewnard & Lo, 2020). Unfortunately, we have seen many political leaders try to ignore science, offer up the rhetoric of normalcy, and avoid realities in what Habermas (1988) calls a 'legitimacy crisis'.

While social distancing policies are vastly important among political leaders, public health experts, and policymakers, some studies also urge that political leaders introduce social-distancing policies that do not show bias against any population or group (Lewnard & Lo, 2020). For example, the COVID-19 pandemic disproportionately affects different groups of people depending on age, gender, and health conditions. The sweeping movement restriction policies increased employment insecurity and decreased

income and food security. In addition, they increased the risk of mental health problems, particularly for low-income households, women, families with children, older adults, and disabled persons. State policies should be socially inclusive; while restricting people's movements, they should also care for socially and economically vulnerable citizens. The reality is that the effectiveness and societal impact of social distancing largely depends on the credibility of public health authorities, political leaders, and institutions.

Therefore, sociological imagination regarding policies and practices is critical to see how different scientific organizations and institutions can be changed when other socio-political actors are changed. Since this strange condition presents such an immediate threat to public order, it can also powerfully influence the size, timing, and shape of the social and political response in many areas the epidemic has affected (Strong, 1990).

### **The human element: social scientists**

At the heart of the social sciences are social scientists (both current and future) themselves. It would be remiss in any analysis of the impact of the pandemic on the social sciences to not consider the human element of the impact on individual and collective lives, including those of students and faculty, as well as the staff who make everything possible. Without social scientists, there is no social science, and the impact on individual and collective lives has indeed been profound.

One of the areas where the pandemic has perhaps had its most profound impact is on teaching and learning. As students and faculty alike experienced a rapid transition to online learning (at least those lucky enough to have digital access; the digital divide has perhaps never been so obvious), there were radical changes in what it meant to be both student and teacher. Many, including students, lacked the know-how to make proper use of digital technologies. And they were the lucky ones. The unlucky ones didn't have access to digital technologies at all as was demonstrated by the sudden crowding of Starbucks and hotel parking lots with people trying to access the internet (Parsons, 2021). Bandwidth use, especially as it competed with the sudden rise in demand for streaming entertainment and gaming services, became a serious social issue (Ryan & Nanda, 2022). But even those with access and know-how of digital teaching and learning still faced difficulties in the sudden transition, the unknown factor of how long it would all last, and trying to quickly figure out the complexities of managing screen time with others in the same household as students and educators alike suddenly had a zoom-sized view into the personal spaces of their counterparts (Smith et al., 2021).

The article by Bianchi et al. in this Themed issue, reflects on how social institutions, family, and school have been reacting to the pandemic in Italy and Mexico. Both countries show a high degree of educational inequality: the reproduction of social disadvantages stemming from family origins is so strong that the chances of social mobility for the less advantaged are significantly reduced. The pandemic emphasized this peculiarity of the Mexican and Italian systems, as households and domestic space were involved in school activities to a greater extent than usual. The prolonged lockdown and consequent reliance on remote education played an important role in exacerbating existing inequalities too (Cordini & De Angelis, 2021). The long-term closure of schools reinforced the role of household resources. These resources include not only the cultural and social capital of parents, but also digital equipment, the availability of a private space in

uncrowded housing, and the time at the parents' and other family members' disposal to assist children in their learning activities.

Distance learning certainly proved to be a great resource (Pitzalis & Spanò, 2021) perhaps the only one available, and for this reason it had to be exploited to the full. At the same time, especially for girls and boys in the 6 to 14 age group, it is evident that distance learning cannot replace school, where sharing experiences with peers in the classroom is an essential part of learning (Di Iorio & Murdica, 2020). In fact, school is not only a place for academic learning, but also an arena for development, socialization, relational life, and emotional support, which are all important factors for children's psychological well-being and adjustment (Larsen et al., 2021). If educational action implies socialization and relationships with peers and adults, it should be noted that, in general, children and young people therefore missed out on important socialization opportunities while, at the same time, their growth did not stop. The process of socialization, in fact, takes place within specific and irreplaceable contexts, in the family and at school, which are dense with meaningful relationships: this is why we need to go beyond partial visions and develop a relational and systemic approach that allows children and families to grow together.

### **The research element: the social sciences**

Teaching and learning were not the only things faced with a rapid shift to moving online or not at all. Research was as well. For those relying on site visits, fieldwork, ethnographies, archival visits, and other forms of in-person research, the wave of lockdowns around the world meant a serious disruption to research. The loss of access to offices for many also meant learning to, or at least attempting to, do research from home amidst newfound childcare, loss of privacy, and the wave of other issues facing those whose living rooms had suddenly also become their offices. Grant deadlines ticked on, as did tenure clocks, but pandemic restrictions, hiccups, and uncertainties meant that many research agendas could not and, for many, still cannot.

Even for those who could maintain their research agendas by one means or another, there has also been growing employment, and institutional uncertainty, especially for social scientists. As universities have faced tightened budgets, they have reduced new hires, cut research funding, and, in some cases, shut down entire departments, with the social sciences constituting nearly all of those reductions. The increased attacks on universities in general has also not helped, with a recent international poll by the World 100 Reputation Network indicating that only 46% of respondents felt that universities had been important in tackling the pandemic and a full one-fifth indicating that universities had been 'unimportant'. Alongside our healthcare colleagues, social scientists, and really science in general, have been laid out to the wolves by many, especially by vote-seeking conservative politicians.

At the same time, there have been a growing number of social scientists for whom pandemic related research has become a full-time career shift and, even for those who have not taken it on full-time, the pandemic has become an inescapable factor in nearly all social scientific research. In fields where human beings, social interactions, and this broader thing we call 'society', lie at the centre of our disciplines, this is not unexpected. Even beyond the social sciences, the impact of the pandemic is being explored across the

academy including in fields like architecture (Spennemann, 2021), engineering (Vergara et al., 2022), and veterinary medicine (Ferri & Lloyd-Evans, 2021). Indeed, the pandemic has become a sort of blanket, or perhaps better thought of, an eclipse, hanging over not just our lives, but also our scholarship.

Perhaps one silver lining of the pandemic impact on scholarship is that it has brought much-needed renewed attention to some of the most pressing concerns of our contemporary world. Inequalities of various forms have been given renewed interest as disparities based on race and ethnicity (Lee & Waters, 2021), sexuality (Skinta et al., 2021), citizenship (Ramsari, 2021), and digital access (Ryan & Nanda, 2022) have all become undeniable factors in pandemic survival.

In this context, the paper by Mathieu Deflem in this Themed issue concentrates on the enduring relevance of problems surrounding racial justice, sociologically as well as socially, as addressed by celebrity activism in the United States during the COVID-19 pandemic.

In the development of celebrity activism on racial justice, the causes surrounding race and racial justice themselves become the subject of a celebritization, that is, as matters to be 'celebrated', not in the sense of being enjoyed or favourably received, but as being subject to presentation and reception in the terms of celebrity culture (Driessens, 2012). Analysing the intersection of race and celebrity in the United States during the COVID-19 pandemic reveals the complex ways in which narratives and practices on racial justice are engaged with among celebrities, the media, and the public.

The pandemic itself as well as the social and political issues that came to the foreground during the period have intensified these developments. Celebrities from all kinds of areas of pop culture, whether it be music, TV, sports, or any other domain of entertainment, actively responded to the pandemic. They engaged with a wide variety of causes, including concerns more and less closely related to the coronavirus and their identity, background, and lived experiences. The pandemic also accelerated a process whereby today's news media are more likely than before to treat celebrities who engage in advocacy favourably, without (m)any of the risks they once faced from being outspoken (Duvall & Heckemeyer, 2018). Even though today's media spend more time reporting on the celebrity activist rather than their causes (McCurdy, 2013), they are also more likely to embrace the terms in which those causes are phrased and present them as valid.

The expanded activist role of celebrities during COVID-19 reveals the role of celebrity culture as a ubiquitous force in contemporary social life, in which sense celebrity itself can be described as a pandemic (Marshall, 2020). Whether or not celebrity activism will become endemic in nature remains to be seen and depends not only on celebrities' inclination to engage in activism but also on the public's willingness to engage with it or, at least, to tolerate it for the time such advocacy is practised and not abandon celebrities when they return to their usual entertainment activities. In any case, by responding to the various public concerns that transpired during the pandemic, celebrity culture sustained its influence regardless of the issue involved and the more or less favourable reception thereof among the public. As celebrities have been able throughout the COVID-19 pandemic to strengthen their privileged position by having been active and activist on race and other important social matters, celebrity culture is well on track to continue to thrive in the post-pandemic new normal.



## The post-COVID-19 future of the social sciences

There is little debate that the COVID-19 pandemic has heavily impacted the social sciences. What is still left to debate, however, is just how profound, and potentially long-lasting, those impacts might be. As we have grown accustomed to Zoom and working in our pyjama pants, will it be difficult to transition back to in-person learning and teaching? As the number of webinars has exploded, proving in many ways easier (even if perhaps not as fulfilling) than in-person conferences, will budgets for the latter resume again? Will funding for social science departments, and social scientific research, continue to shrink? And, even if not, will political decisions continue gaining ground in dictating where funding is allocated? These are all discipline, indeed, institutional altering questions that many of us sit anxiously awaiting to be answered.

If nothing else, this pandemic has hopefully been a wake-up call that social scientists have a valuable voice to add to the world, even when the issue might not be so obviously social. We have a particularly powerful role to play in understanding how, and why, ‘hard science’ innovations, like a vaccine, can be best understood, implemented, and effective. Medical professionals are better positioned to determine R-naught indicators, but social scientists are better placed to help understand vaccine hesitancy and cultural resistance. Together, and only together, can we ever hope to advance our way out of this, and future, societal dilemmas. As Ryan (2021) notes, ‘[i]t is imperative that academics take their rightful place alongside medical professionals as the world attempts to figure out how to deal with the current global pandemic, and how society might move forward in the future’ (p. 2). The value of the social sciences has perhaps never been so clear, nor so needed.

At the heart of these questions and imperatives lies the bigger picture of the future of the social sciences in a post-COVID-19 world (assuming we will ever get to such a thing). It is perhaps still too early to tell if the pandemic will become a subject area, perhaps even its own sub-discipline, or a lens that will colour the social sciences for at least some years to come, or perhaps even a multi-disciplinary pivot, sending the social sciences down entirely new pathways. Given the broad reaching cultural, political, and technological impacts of the last two years, it is not difficult to imagine any of the above as a possible outcome. One thing for certain is that any question of ‘returning to normal’ should be left in the dustbin; things will never be the same and that is not necessarily a bad thing.

### Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

### Notes on contributors

*Marcella Corsi*, Ph.D., is Full Professor of Economics at Sapienza University of Rome, Italy. She is the editor of the International Review of Sociology since 2017. She is among the founders of the web-magazine inGenere.it and the association *Economia civile*.

*J. Michael Ryan*, Ph.D., is Assistant Professor of Sociology at Nazarbayev University, Kazakhstan. He has previously held academic positions in Portugal, Egypt, Ecuador, and the United States of America.



## ORCID

Marcella Corsi  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5693-6236>

J. Michael Ryan  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7207-6918>

## References

- Bhardwaj, R. (2022). Risk, causation and containment of Covid-19 pandemic in India: A sociological interpretation. *International Review of Sociology*, 32(1), 10–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03906701.2021.1996758>
- Bianchi, F., Martínez Núñez, M. T. D. J., Nájera, E. V., & Calderón Garza, O. C. (2022). Effects on and adaptation of the family context during the COVID-19 pandemic. Some remarks from Italy and Mexico. *International Review of Sociology*, 32(1), 88–106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03906701.2022.2028401>
- Constantinou, C. S. (2020). People have to comply with the measures: Covid-19 in risk society. *Journal of Applied Social Science*, 15(1), 3–11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1936724420980374>
- Constantinou, C. S. (2022). Responses to Covid-19 as a form of 'biopower'. *International Review of Sociology*, 32(1), 29–39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03906701.2021.2000069>
- Cordini, M., & De Angelis, G. (2021). Families between care, education and work: The effects of the pandemic on educational inequalities in Italy and milan. *European Journal of Education*, 56(4), 578–594. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12483>
- Deflem, M. (2022). Celebrity activism and racial justice during Covid-19: On the celebritization of race in pandemic times. *International Review of Sociology*, 32(1), 63–87. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03906701.2022.2052457>
- Di Iorio, T., & Murdica, R. (2020). La scuola dopo il Covid, in *Genere*, October 15 <http://www.ingenere.it/articoli/la-scuola-dopo-il-covid>.
- Driessens, O. (2012). The celebritization of society and culture: Understanding the structural dynamics of celebrity culture. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 16(6), 641–657. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367877912459140>
- Duvall, S., & Heckemeyer, N. (2018). #Blacklivesmatter: Black celebrity hashtag activism and the discursive formation of a social movement. *Celebrity Studies*, 9(3), 391–408. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19392397.2018.1440247>
- Ferri, M., & Lloyd-Evans, M. (2021). The contribution of veterinary public health to the management of the COVID-19 pandemic from a One Health perspective. *One Health*, 12, 100230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.onehlt.2021.100230>
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality, vol. 1: The will to knowledge*. Penguin.
- Germain, S., & Yong, A. (2020). COVID-19 highlighting inequalities in access to healthcare in England: A case study of ethnic minority and migrant women. *Feminist Legal Studies*, 28(3), 301–310. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10691-020-09437-z>
- Green, S., & Cladi, L. (2020). COVID-19: The humanities and social sciences have much to contribute to this pandemic and the next. *BMJ*, 370, m3523. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m3523>
- Habermas, J. (1988). *Legitimation crisis*. Polity Press.
- Hussain, B. (2022). Social distancing in risk society: A cross-national analysis of policy responses to the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Review of Sociology*, 32(1), 40–62. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03906701.2022.2051981>
- Larsen, L., Helland, M. S., & Holt, T. (2021). The impact of school closure and social isolation on children in vulnerable families during COVID-19: A focus on children reaction's. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-021-01758-x>
- Lee, S., & Waters, S. F. (2021). Asians and Asian Americans' experiences of racial discrimination during the COVID-19 pandemic: Impacts on health outcomes and the buffering role of social support. *Stigma and Health*, 6(1), 70. <https://doi.org/10.1037/sah0000275>
- Lewnard, J. A., & Lo, N. C. (2020). Scientific and ethical basis for social-distancing interventions against COVID-19. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 20(6), 631–633. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30190-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30190-0)

- Mahajan, U. V., & Larkins-Pettigrew, M. (2020). Racial demographics and COVID-19 confirmed cases and deaths: A correlational analysis of 2886 US counties. *Journal of Public Health, 42*(3), 445–447. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pubmed/fdaa070>
- Marshall, P. D. (2020). Celebrity, politics, and new media: An essay on the implications of pandemic fame and persona. *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society, 33*(1), 89–104. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10767-018-9311-0>
- McCurdy, P. (2013). Conceptualising celebrity activists: The case of tamsin omond. *Celebrity Studies, 4*(3), 311–324. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19392397.2013.831627>
- Michie, S., & West, R. (2020). Behavioural, environmental, social, and systems interventions against covid-19. *BMJ, 370*, m2982. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m2982>
- Moore, S. E., Wierenga, K. L., Prince, D. M., Gillani, B., & Mintz, L. J. (2021). Disproportionate impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on perceived social support, mental health and somatic symptoms in sexual and gender minority populations. *Journal of Homosexuality, 68*(4), 577–591. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2020.1868184>
- Navarro, S., & Hernandez, S. (2022). *The color of COVID-19: The racial inequality of marginalized communities*. Routledge.
- Parsons, R. (2021). Business as usual: Poverty, education, and economic life amidst the pandemic. In J. M. Ryan (Ed.), *COVID-19: Global pandemic, societal responses, ideological solutions* (pp. 138–149). Routledge.
- Pitzalis, M., & Spanò, E. (2021). Stay home and be unfair: The amplification of inequalities among families with young children during COVID-19. *European Journal of Education, 56*(4), 595–606. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12481>
- Rabinow, P., & Rose, N. (2006). Biopower today. *BioSocieties, 1*(2), 195–217. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1745855206040014>
- Ramsari, A. (2021). The rise of the Global COVID-19 pandemic and the decline of Global citizenship. In J. M. Ryan (Ed.), *COVID-19: Global pandemic, societal responses, ideological solutions* (pp. 94–106). Routledge.
- Ryan, J. M. (2021). Global pandemic, societal responses, ideological solutions. In J. M. Ryan (Ed.), *COVID-19: Global pandemic, societal responses, ideological solutions* (pp. 1–7). Routledge.
- Ryan, J. M., & Nanda, S. (2022). *COVID-19: Social inequalities and human possibilities*. Routledge.
- Skinta, M., Sun, A., & Ryu, D. (2021). The impact of COVID-19 on gender and sexual minority people. In J. M. Ryan (Ed.), *COVID-19: Social consequences and cultural adaptations* (pp. 229–243). Routledge.
- Smith, S., Sanford, A., & Blum, D. (2021). Spotlighting hidden inequities: Post-secondary education in a pandemic. In J. M. Ryan (Ed.), *COVID-19: Global pandemic, societal responses, ideological solutions* (pp. 123–137). Routledge.
- Spennemann, D. H. (2021). Residential architecture in a post-pandemic world: Implications of COVID-19 for new construction and for adapting heritage buildings. *Journal of Green Building, 16*(1), 199–215. <https://doi.org/10.3992/jgb.16.1.199>
- Strong, P. (1990). Epidemic psychology: A model. *Sociology of Health and Illness, 12*(3), 249–259. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9566.ep11347150>
- Vergara, D., Fernández-Arias, P., Extremera, J., Dávila, L. P., & Rubio, M. P. (2022). Educational trends post COVID-19 in engineering: Virtual laboratories. *Materials Today: Proceedings, 49*, 155–160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matpr.2021.07.494>