

Stefan Janković¹
Faculty of Philosophy,
University of Belgrade
Milena Toković²
Faculty of Philosophy,
University of Belgrade

Original scientific paper
UDK 177.9:342.72/.73(497.11)
316.752:316.334.56(497.11)
Submitted: 19.03.2021.
Accepted: 10.06.2021.



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2298/SOC2102236J>

WHY ARE THE INSTITUTIONAL INJUSTICE AND THE LACK OF FAIRNESS OMNIPRESENT IN SERBIA? A PRAGMATIC ASSESSMENT OF PLURAL ORDERS OF WORTH

Zbog čega su institucionalna nepravda i manjak pravičnosti sveprisutni u Srbiji? Pragmatička procena pluralnih poredaka vrednosti

ABSTRACT: Recent results from Round 9 of the European Social Survey (ESS) indicate that Serbia differs from other European countries in terms of justice and fairness. Whereas the Serbian people's dissatisfaction relating to unjust income distribution, unfair employment chances and political institutions may not be surprising, these findings still raise a dozen questions. Situated within contemporary discussions on normativity in sociology and survey methodology, this paper aims to reassess the moral grammar of these judgments. By endorsing tenets of pragmatic sociology and its principal aim to recognize the plural modes of valuation and criticism and reflective capacities of social actors to judge and evaluate, this paper develops around few major points. First, we underline how most major approaches to axiology remain stuck in a co-determinist framework, thereby renewing a number of dualisms. Instead, we opt for a relational approach and further present how the theoretical model of Boltanski and Thévenot enables the locating of different assessments of worth. After setting our methodological framework against the "externalist" epistemology, we explore our key assumption that the above-mentioned high rates come as a problem of a feasible "truce" between the domestic regime and the civic polity, ruled by proclaimed legality, representativeness and impersonal character. We trace the problem of incorporating multiple arrangements as a problem of generality, by relating these to two layers of information acquired through the ESS. One involves the analysis of the domestic polity covering the household situation in terms of organization and unveiling the specific worth given to care and protection. Another layer is derived from regression

1 stefan.jankovic@f.bg.ac.rs

2 milena.tokovic@f.bg.ac.rs

analysis which affirms that the absence of fairness in civic polity correlates with a higher degree of worth given to the domestic one, but also that the latter situation depicts a deeper ontological puzzle about making a mild transition to the assumed “horizontality” of civic matters.

KEYWORDS: *justice, fairness, worth, axiology, pragmatic sociology*

APSTRAKT: *Najskoriji rezultati od IX runde Evropskog društvenog istraživanja izdvajaju Srbiju od drugih evropskih zemalja u pogledu pravde i pravičnosti. Dok učestali utisci o nepravednoj raspodeli dohotka, ekstremnom nezadovoljstvu nepravičnim šansama za zapošljavanje i pretežno pesimističnom pogledu na političke institucije, u slučaju Srbije možda nisu iznenađujući, ovi nalazi i dalje postavljaju nekolicinu pitanja. Smešten u savremenim diskusijama o normativnosti u sociologiji i metodologiji anketnih istraživanja, ovaj rad ima za cilj da preispita moralnu gramatiku ovih sudova. Odbacujući „eksternalističku” epistemologiju i približavajući se principima savremene pragmatičke sociologije i njenog glavnog cilja da se prepoznaju pluralni načini evaluacija i kritika i reflektivni kapaciteti socijalnih aktera da presuđuju i procenjuju, ovaj rad se razvija oko nekoliko glavnih tačaka. Najpre, podvučićemo nedostatke u glavnim pristupima aksiologiji, raspravljajući kako ostaje u okviru ko-determinističkog okvira, koji ponovo obnavlja brojne dualizme. Umesto toga, birajući relacioni pristup, dalje predstavljamo kako teorijski model Boltanskog i Tevenoa omogućava lociranje različitih poredaka vrednovanja u onome što nazivaju polisima. Nakon postavljanja metodološkog okvira dalje od „eksternalističke” epistemologije, ispitujemo našu osnovnu pretpostavku da gore pomenute visoke stope proizlaze kao problem postizanja „primirja” između domaćeg režima i građanskog polisa, karakterisanog navodnom univerzalnosti zakona, predstavljanja i impersonalnosti. Ovaj problem inkorporacije više aranžmana kao problema opštosti, pratimo kroz dva sloja informacija dobijenih putem EDI. Jedan uključuje analizu domaćeg polisa u pogledu organizacije domaćinstva u pogledu organizacije i specifične vrednosti pripisane brizi i zaštiti. Drugi se razvija iz regresione analize koja potvrđuje da odsustvo pravičnosti u građanskom polisu koincidira sa višim stepenom vrednosti pripisanih domaćem, ali i da potonja situacija prikazuje dublju ontološku zagonetku povodom pravljenja “blage” tranzicije u pretpostavljenu “horizontalnost” građanskih stvari.*

KLJUČNE REČI: *pravda, pravičnost, vrednost, aksiologija, pragmatička sociologija*

Introduction: A Matter of Calibration

Recent results from the Round 9 of the European Social Survey (ESS), and more precisely the “Rotating Module” that dealt with issues of justice and fairness, largely distinguish Serbia from other European countries.³ From a comparative perspective, in Serbia impressions about unjust income distribution, dissatisfaction relating to unfair chances for employment and predominantly

3 For more thorough overview and descriptions of variables used in this Rotating Module, see: <https://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/data/themes.html?t=justfair>

pessimistic views on political institutions deviate from other countries. Estimates of whether the political system equally satisfies the interests of citizens appear to be negative for almost half of Serbia's population. Particularly strong dissatisfaction concerns the unjust income distribution in the country. As the data show, two thirds of respondents see both net and gross pay as highly unfair. In addition, the differences in terms of wealth in Serbia are conspicuous, with 39.8% of the respondents indicate these as highly unjust. Probably the most important aspect, however, is that many Serbians see personal knowledge, education and skills as devalued, and instead concede to personal ties for job opportunities. The moral architecture registered here for some might not be surprising. After a short comparative reflection of bits and pieces of "country-specific" indicators included within a dose of statistical inquiries, these findings can easily be incorporated into a landscape of classical sociology: its tranquil presentation of collective features, coalesced with some background attributes, goes uncorrupted as long as the methodological issues of measurement are solved. One could question, however, whether research methods enact realities they present and could these contestations be assessed in different manner?

Being aware that the latter move will not resonate profusely among the apostles of "industrial sociology" (Kaufmann, 2004), who see their ethical and professional duties solely in a mediocre formula of "empirical investigation", our aim is to revive the question of relevance of sociological inquiry (cf. Savransky, 2016). A variety of traps into which the discipline might easily slip when trying to retrieve the denounced knowledge, in recent years is becoming a part of various discussions, spanning from normative engagements to attempts of securing sociological inquiries through demarcation (cf. Abbott, 2018; Larregue, 2018a; 2018b; Marres, 2018; Yancey, 2018). In these discussions, normativity once again becomes topical. The reason is particularly in the moral imprint the numerous concepts and data collection techniques such as surveys, leave when delineating the reality. As Abbott (2001; 2016: 237) warned, certain concepts such as domination or inequality have enabled us to discuss about the concerns that are principally considered as non-scientific such as "injustice", "in a way that sounds scientific rather than moral or political". For instance, juxtaposing income levels of people who are not otherwise related to each other or comparing current occupational achievements with the educational levels of parents, terminates every discussion on normativity, Abbott complains, by confining it to the concerns over measurement. A more pronounced problem, however, seems to be in general manner in which the *statistical holism*, often seen as an ultimate, panoptical presentation of reality, relates and arranges the entities. Sometimes, the results are seductively cogent. The public success of Bourdieu's *Distinction*, Boltanski (2014) reminds, was in that it resembled a social novel: the cathartic moment it offered to many readers was exactly in statistical profiles they could identify with, but also in encountering a mysterious reality they previously did not know much about. Yet, most of the time, surveys poorly engage with the pragmatics of everyday moral contestations in order to meet the imperative of neutrality. Results are hardly enviable: with the reality normatively bound only to several scenarios, actors' dynamics of engagement filled with the plural

forms of coupling, interacting and associating is left out. Apparent paradox of a panoptical view, thus seems to be in rather inappropriate ontological design: once devised to exterminate penultimate challenges of the social sciences such as normativity, it started being seen as something that simply epitomizes reality created for epistemological purposes.

This kind of an “externalist” epistemology, however, has reached certain limits. A broader shift in understanding the objectivity, referentiality and the life of categories that came along with the post-constructivist, speculative and material turn (cf. Beetz, 2016; Bryant, Srniček & Harman, 2011; Pellizzoni, 2015), and even with novel metaphysical moods (see: Harman, 2018), introduced a twofold twist. Along with acknowledging the gigantic agential capacities of non-human entities following the abolishment of the fictitious imaginary of inert matter and Nature found in Occidental cosmology, questions of judgments, trials and other tensions in achieving generality renewed significance exactly because of this ontological uncertainty. In the nowadays classic piece that announced a pragmatic revolution in sociology, Boltanski & Thévenot ((1991) 2006) had a simple aim: while surpassing the categorical fixity found in survey methodology, the problems of “externalist” epistemology were addressed by focusing on how actors shape social worlds by using moral judgements while concurrently employing different “referent points”. Brought up in a general disagreement with Durkheim’s formal methods and neutralizing techniques (cf. Candea, 2010; Latour, 2010; Latour *et al.* 2012), encompassing emerging trials thus indicated a flux of references and evaluative repertoires and went far beyond a pre-nominal dialectic of an individual and the society. The loosening of the determinist framework, in which agency was drawn from the pointless referencing to group membership, *post facto* reconstructed by the analyst, induced a resilient perspective on fluctuating social worlds and situated arrangements, crisscrossing the everyday (cf. Schatzki, 2010a; 2010b; Thévenot, 2001; 2002; 2007; 2014; Welch, Mandich, Keller, 2020). Still, far from inclining towards mere moral relativism, an incompatible plasticity of perspectives that was unveiled has not led to an empty reference to incommensurability of values (Boltanski & Thévenot, 2000). Instead, it denoted a *multitude of possible arrangements*, resources and ties among humans and things as well, as a perpendicular social basis.

A number of those who drew inspiration from post-Bourdieu, neopragmatic developments have generally followed this fashion of acknowledging the vital and reflective capacities of social actors to judge (particularly: Latour, 2005), employ different moral points and create social boundaries. In effect, an interest for evaluation practices increased (Krüger & Reinhart, 2017; Lamont, 2012). Yet, situating judgments involves prolonged methodological quandaries, particularly regarding whether these might be registered with abstract and mediative devices such as pre-constructed surveys, when having in mind that the starting points of pragmatist reform exactly were the methodological flaws of these techniques, along with a broader pursuit for finding novel techniques, more adequate for describing ontological complicity (cf. Law, 2004; Savransky, 2016). Ever since Pierre Bourdieu has sparked a wave of critical reassessment of surveys and particularly of polls (Bourdieu, 1973; (1979) 1984; Champagne, 2005; Wacquant,

2013), it was clear that alleged facticity would only be a poor excuse for lacking a vigilant approach in survey design. This shed a new light on the limits of survey methodology, particularly by focusing on possible deviations in responses coming from incompatible languages and cultural codes used by the researchers and the respondents respectively (Chepp & Gray, 2014; Shwarz *et al.*, 2010; Uskul *et al.*, 2010). However, most of these reflections are reserved for technical improvements rather than dealing with a more delicate question. Namely, how do surveys transmit and translate realities they assumedly present? Less technical and more ontological, this question aligns not only with methodological issues following extraction of data from complicated settings (cf. Marres, 2020), but also with broader issues concerning the human agency (*see next section*), particularly in the era of the Anthropocene (Delanty & Mota, 2017). Primarily, it seeks to retrieve the pragmatic versatility outside the tidy structuralist deductive model in which collective forms of appreciation are reduced to mechanical enacting and the culturalist stance, which are generally based upon the dully internalization of common norms, thus, to unfold how the various social bonds and attachments operate as registries for actions.

Situated within contemporary discussions on normativity in sociology, this paper aims to reassess the moral grammar of the above-mentioned critical perspectives through lenses of pragmatic sociology. In doing so, we aim to discern the complicated relation of familiarity and politics as discussed recently by Thevénot (2020), as well as by reassessing survey methodology. By deflecting from an “externalist” epistemology and stepping more closely towards the tenets of contemporary pragmatic sociology and its principal aim to recognize the plural modes of valuation, this paper develops around few major points. First, it intends to deflect from numerous problems surrounding the studies of values (cf. Heinich, 2020a; 2020b). Hence, we opt for a relational approach and further present how the theoretical model of Boltanski and Thevénot (2006) enables one to locate different orders of worth in what they term as “polities”. After positioning our methodological framework against the determinism and closer to a problem how the entities associate with each other and arrange their social bonds, we explore our key assumption that the aforementioned criticisms come as a vivid problem of achieving the befitting grammar between the familiar bonds and the civic polity, ruled by proclaimed legality, representativeness and impersonal character. We trace this problem of incorporating multiple arrangements as a problem of generality, by relating these to two layers of information acquired through the ESS data subset for Serbia (N = 2045). One involves the analysis of the household situation in terms of organization, thereby unveiling the specific worth that is given to the domestic principles such as care and protection. Another develops from a regression analysis. It further affirms the absence of “fairness” in the civil polity, with more affirmative attitude taken towards personal attachments, but the latter situation depicts a deeper ontological puzzle. Namely, question becomes how to achieve the “truce” as the familiarity is welcomed only in a narrow set of social bonds and not in civic matters, in case where exactly the assumed “horizontality” of the latter is malfunctioning. In conclusion, we discuss how these problems can be resolved, namely by “renovating” survey methodology.

Unwinding Axiology: Plural Orders of Worth

Albeit 30 years have passed since its first edition was published, *On Justification* still presents a particularly inspiring piece. As already mentioned, the major idea of its authors (Boltanski and Thévenot, 2006), was to engage with controversies in world-making and thus to go beyond an empty “value pluralism”, precisely by discerning how various processes of commensuration occur in everyday situations. Partially, inspiration was drawn from Latour’s (1987) exquisite examples of scientific trials that targeted these processes of commensuration, but more importantly, *how the worlds are composed*. This largely went against numerous concepts, such as norms, values, procedures, judgements, classifications, meanings, but also, beliefs, representations and dispositifs, that embodied a high modern culturalist concern on what holds the social world together, as Reckwitz (2002) noted. Namely, these concepts pushed many to adopt what Dépelteau (2015: 4) termed *co-determinism*. Exactly by avoiding “being too determinist/objectivist or voluntarist/subjectivist”, numerous solutions in contemporary sociology have only renewed old dilemmas. A recourse to reflexivity among critical realists (Archer, 2010; 2017; Vanderberghe, 2014) have set it as a unique ability to monitor life trajectories as events in the morphogenetic cycle that occur when somnolent existence, heavily dictated by the structural determination, gets disrupted. Even worse, a scenario of analytical sociology sees complex social configurations as created from a bundle of individual actions moved by desires, beliefs and opportunities (Boudon, 2012; Hedström, 2005; 2008; Manzo, 2010). Boltanski and Thévenot (2006) have abandoned surmised ontological trajectories of either individuals or society. Instead, their tedious excavation concentrated on profound articulations in political and social philosophy that have created specific principles of common collective life in various spheres – domesticity, political life, industry, etc. Delineating the six regimes found in the common world, named *politiques*, indicates how each of these distributes the beings and creates a specific order of worth in accordance with certain principles that are nonetheless metaphysical as they go beyond a situation (ibid; Boltanski & Thévenot, 2000) and offers distinct modes of justifications as a point of agreement. Yet, the question is how different worths are juxtaposed and harmonized, particularly when having in mind the uncertainty that comes with the plural modalities of being that intersect the common world.

Distinctive traits of each polity first indicate a moment of configuring habituated modes of being, but moreover, an ability to cope with mutating and uncertain realities that are experienced through existential plurality. Rather than being understood as a confined sphere or a field, the polity is quite similar to what Thévenot (2001; 2007; 2014; 2019) in his later work termed as a *regime of engagement*. Thévenot’s extensions somewhat broadened the initial focus on commensuration among the orders of worth by emphasizing cognitive and evaluative frames as distinct equipment for encountering an immediate environment. In sidestepping classical theories that have confined the practice

to terms of replication (particularly: Bourdieu, 1984; 1992) and cognitive infrastructure (cf. Lizardo & Strand, 2010), Thevénot (2007) brings back the beneficial effects of *attachments*, understood as various social bonds that bequeath each being with a certain status. Accommodating the body through habituated modes of engagement, besides providing it with tools for ordering the series of beings, still, does not lead to a confinement with one mode of being. The key lesson that might be drawn from Thevénot's extensions, similar to what other authors also displayed (Law, 2004; Latour, 2004), concerns the configuring of plural persons involved in a rather delicate interplay with other regimes of engagements. "This move", he stresses, "brings with it not so much a change in roles, social norms, or social worlds as a dramatic shift in ways of experiencing the world. This shift in turn subjects both the person and the community at large to critical tensions" (Thevénot, 2007: 410). Therefore, configuring always occurs in rather vivid settings that involve a chaotic multiplicity of associations entering each *arrangement*, meaning also that each actor is nonetheless lacerated into multiple ways of being (ibid).

Both by dwelling within a plurality of engagements and by retrieving different worths that circumscribe humans and things in different relations, the common world is characterized with a number of experiential puzzles that necessitate finding proper ways on how to at least coordinate, if not harmonize this multiplicity of normative settings. The progressive composition of the common world, which particularly covers the domestic situation or better, intersects through it, creates the different worths that are ascribed to beings. This brings forward the plural ways in which they are *distributed* in these *arrangements*: a beloved father and respected neighbor, can simultaneously be a mediocre worker with low efficiency according to the standards of the company he is working for. At the same time, it is also a question of how the worlds are being distributed and what attachments are *experientially* appreciated by the actors as operative, important and worthy. Exactly this problem of involving various principles of worth, on which the evaluation of what is good is deposited, along with the commensuration on what *attachment*, is seen as more or less worthy in a given moment. These might be taken as the key puzzles that the authors of *On Justification* found as tremendously important for a situational ontology they wanted to understand. An unease of multiple being that encompasses the common world is particularly felt in attempts to put together worths crumbling from different worlds. This operation, that becomes an epitome of this unsettling ontological situation, particularly circumscribes the domestic world.

Generally speaking, domesticity embeds the just into bonds of familiarity, though these should not be confined to a family alone because they point at engagements that generally supply a feel of ease, comfort and protection. In the case of the domestic world, chains of personal dependencies first and foremost relate to a worth ascribed to a position of a person in this concatenated world and its nuanced and delicate commensurations and ordering of beings, but also things. Much attention devoted by Boltanski & Thevénot (2006) revolves around minute

details which mark distinct operations, such as the exchange of gifts, expressions of politeness, appreciation of good manners and emotional attachments, along with the respect for tradition and inheritance in the neighborhood, altogether evolving into a relatively compact moral agenda of the domestic world (see also: Warde, Paddock & Whillans, 2020). Attachments found here also encompass non-human beings, as the valorizing of different objects is also a specificity of particular polities – like pets, which have much worth in the household but almost none or even a negative one in the civic world in cases of aberration of public hygiene for example. Later examples hint at further problems. Not only that domestic arrangements, usually situated in everyday dwelling, are trapped in a constant flux of organic fluids, memorabilia, referencing (cf. Jacobs, 2003; Jacobs, Smith, 2008; Smith, 2008). Domestic arrangements also are prone to the fractures provoked by various events, objects and networks lurking behind this scenery, rather than being an orderly configuration. Some students of everyday life, particularly Theodore Schatzki (cf. 2010a), highlight that mundane examples cannot be easily schematized as either micro or macro, such as for instance when a husband's passionate immersion into a football match all of a sudden, interrupts with an inquiry into a child's failure on a math test, and turns into an argument between the spouses. Situations unfolding within familiar engagements, present a constant attempt to harmonize various worths and to find a proper placement for beings. Nonetheless, Boltanski and Thévenot have also championed these analyses of where these grammars manage to at least circumvent these clashes, due to their general ability to supersede them (Boltanski, 2011). Still, what exactly gives rise to these tensions that lead to expressions registered at the beginning of this paper?

Quarrels occurring in the domestic world, as in others, often evolve as a loss of harmonized distribution of beings in accordance with their worth, because some of them occasionally display *deficiency*, if not becoming totally worthless. Distortions might circumscribe each world on their own. Failures of the civic world to alleviate scandalous aberration of legal procedures would, for example, call for the forming of a state committee in order to restore the principle of impersonality, as much as prolonged intercourse of professional life into the domestic world, embodied in a father's absence in household affairs, would have to be sorted with an increase in his home obligations. Each source of the tension, still, comes from this relational weaving and the truce between the worlds is not easily achieved. Namely, encounters with other regimes do not run necessarily buttery smooth because a sense of justifiable states that governs one polity, might produce a serious discord when the worth is not applicable to another, which particularly affects the domestic polity. Zones entrenched into familiarity, enveloped in loyalty, intimacy, and care given particularly in households, hardly can cope with *interests* and *respect for financial success* breed in the market polity, *efficacy* and *performance* of the industrial polity, *glory* and *recognition* found in the polity of fame or *creativity* and *fiction* ruling the polity of inspiration.

An encounter of the domestic polity with the civic polity is especially interesting, due to the abstract and impersonal character of the latter, that *per definitionem* has to be defended exactly against the familiar bonds. Albeit Boltanski and Thévenot associate the domestic polity to hierarchical chains of dependencies where the worth emerges from a transversal operation of making a will of many subjugated to one authority, what departs this polity particularly from the civic one is simply that the latter converges in a general will. Besides a progressive deprivatization, Boltanski & Thévenot (2006) underlined that attaining worth in civic polity occurs by “immersing” into collective beings, for example, by drawing upon legal forms and official proclamations. These operations are seen as *tests* that run in order to recall the equivalence and the version of common humanity, which in the case of civic polity revolves primarily around illuminating of possible aberrations of public institutions etc. A zeal of civic morality therefore is epitomized in almost sacrificial moments of suppressing one’s desires and undertaking rather vigilant surveillance over common issues. “In contrast to the spontaneity and warmth that ought to reign in human relations, this watchful stance is needed to unmask the all-powerful selfish interests that lurk behind fine, altruistic discourse. Such vigilance is justified by the risks incurred by the state owing to the inclination of individuals to establish direct personal bonds in pursuit of partisan interests, rather than agreeing to establish them indirectly by participating in the body politic as a whole” (ibid: 114).

Such subtended encounters and zones in which different worths overlap necessitate the reaching of a compromise that involves sometimes prolonged work of moral philosophy in defining thresholds and finding equitable solutions (such as a truce between civic and industrial world in case of workers’ rights). Otherwise, an excess of worth, its transport into another polity and ultimately, inability to reach an agreement provokes tensions and *awakens the critique* from the slumber. While the common “equivalence principles” – the ones used as grounds for the potential settling of disputes and particularly due to tests which constantly run in order to enable the smooth as possible transport of the worths, in many cases the uncertainty maintains and unfolds, as the critical assessment that unveils the murky displacement of beings and the appearance of the unworthy ones. In other words, critique emerges when the common good is “denounced as mere self-satisfaction in opposition to other principles of justification: the worthy are not producing the common good but their own happiness; their wealth is not the condition of the well-being of all – it serves only their own well-being; the work they accomplish is not useful to the common good, but is rather at the service of their vanity or their personal ambition, and so forth” (ibid: 223–4). Critical operations are still quite distant from assumptions of critical theory and its robust tendency to see these activities as the ones that should ideally target the overarching totality, rather than accentuating the attempts to achieve common humanity (Boltanski, 2011). Being more attentive

about the extensive relational entanglement among humans and things and, as a number of contemporary post-critique authors suggest, various other modalities such as preserving, conveying or understanding, possesses way more significance for the common world (cf. Felski, 2016). Menacing uncertainty is thus rather coped through genuine operations of disagreement, disappointment and appropriate characterization of the state of affairs. In later work, Boltanski (2011) has associated critical assessment with *metapragmatic registry*, indicating a reference to procedures that are aberrated, crushed or simply malfunctioning, and thus do not manage to run smooth transitions and enable truce between various sources of worth. The question then is whether the indications of “malfunctioning” of the civic world registered at the beginning of this paper are a result of the inability to secure the common humanity and reach a truce between various sources of worth? Also, can these sources of worth be discerned through survey data?

Enacting Realites: On Survey Methodology Without Determinism

The prospects of directing pragmatic sociology back to its birthplace – i.e., surveys and issues of formatting and encoding data which served as a springboard for this program, at first glance seem blurry. Statistical data sits uncomfortably with some tenets of pragmatic sociology, particularly due to the former’s pre-set, encoded attributes and predefined matrices of entities, and the pathways these might traverse. Abridged of genuine, situational interference where the contingency of drawing upon a variegated spectrum of items would disclose a point of a critical encounter of the worlds, surveys simply remain blind for these situations. While not completely denouncing them, Thevénot (2019) has discussed recently how the plural valuations incorporated in surveys pay the price of reduction associated with uniform quantification. His warnings seem to be at point. “First, they limit criticism by reifying the actors’ dynamics of engaging, which is frozen in the first stance: the yardstick fixing the letter or face value of convention/engagement. Second, they tend to reduce the plurality of modes of engaging in a plan that aims at a projected objective. Thus governing through objective1 objectives2 demand to cut actions up in limited engaged plans and still reduce these plans to measurable outputs” (ibid: 56). A recourse to negotiative moments stemming from disputes is omitted. In one particular sense, still, commensuration of worth – that is, the situational weighing of the *principle that appears as the most adequate for a given world*, occurs similarly as the application of justifiable reasoning, moments of dissatisfaction or critical stance are also registered in surveys. This focus set upon actors’ capacities to commensurate the worths also unfolds in different methodological settings and exploits distinct relational ontology, more adjusted to questions of what appears as proper ways to distribute the beings.

Speaking more specifically, this pathway first indicates how the deployed methods enact realities and retrieve the aspects that are not immediately visible. As Law (2009) has rightfully warned, a conventional understanding of methods as techniques designed to represent reality as independent from each application, usually dismisses a large amount of practical contingencies going along the methods themselves, which actually filtrate, mobilize and distribute, and thus *enact realities*. Whereas Law's argument emerges from science and technology studies that have accentuated a more vivid and delicate fabrication of facts and the performative character of knowledge practices (cf. Latour, 1987; (1984) 1993; 2005), a formula according to which the methods also shape the realities they represent that was derived from these principles (Law, 2004), opens further questions. The methodological stance scrutinized by Law empowers the rather ambiguous installation of reality, or as he puts it "a creative piece of social and political engineering" (Law, 2009: 247), lurking behind the back of respondents. Apart from the fact that surveys epitomize a romantic emergent holism through the *statistical holism* and enact liberal political philosophy along with the theory of subjectivity involving individuals as finite entities from which the data is aggregated, a greater problem seems to lie elsewhere. With a bundle of auxiliary assumptions, surveys do also ascribe, code and allocate the attributes the entities are supposed to have. Surveys therefore seek to unfold the *hinterland practices* as Law names them (*ibid.*), meaning that they translate other features of entities and pieces of reality that are not grasped directly. Still, the question is how this is done?

This brings us to our second and crucial point: sidestepping from the determinist framework and employing the idea how the *entities are associated and coupled with each other*. By opting to take a more down-to-earth approach closer to the lively settings of realities, we thus have to abandon the *general linear reality* model, convincingly scrutinized by Abbott (2001). Most of the sociology students, he warns, are almost automatically taught that entities in the game – here, the individuals, have a set of fixed features. In spite of their internal variations such as income or education levels, these features are both seen as something that ascribes the group affiliations and commands the conduct of actors. This overarching representation of the social world – seen as a unified whole, also brings forth a mere belief that there is some substantive causal process, stemming from the interaction of variables behind it, as well as the assumption that these patterns might be easily discerned. In Abbott's words (*ibid.*: 39), "such representational use assumes that the social world consists of fixed entities (the units of analysis) that have attributes (the variables). These attributes interact, in causal or actual time, to create outcomes, themselves measurable as attributes of the fixed entities." Against such models that once again drag into a distinction of individuals and the society, taking a counterintuitive course would instead unveil *how the entities are distributed and how they associate with each other*. Ultimately, this means dismissing the notion of structure. In the discussion about the long-forgotten tradition of

Gabriele Tarde, Latour (2010: 147, *original emphasis*) reminds that “the gap between overall structure and underlying components is the symptom of a *lack of information*”, which is common for disciplines such as astronomy. Sociology was unlucky to have only a Durkhemian emulation of natural sciences in its repertoire, because it has prolonged the quandaries between the “precise” and firm quantitative data against allegedly interpretative efforts in reaching humans more closely. Against our common intuition that the general linear reality brings more precise inquiries, by moving away from the components *interacting, coupling and associating* with each other, we actually lose quite common features of “building blocks” – among others, the quantitative evaluations performed by the entities which in this way create associations. “It would therefore be very odd”, Latour warns (p. 146), “for what is originally a *deficit of information* to be turned into the universal *goal* of any scientific inquiry”.

Why not then move away from this tiresome scenario and aim at discerning how the entities – which are neither “subjects” or “individuals”, nor bearers of “function” or holders of “positions”, *associate* with each other, inhabit various worlds and distribute themselves? In pursuing other matrices of *connectivities* and *circuits* through which the judgements and attitudes registered in ESS are generated, the course of our exploration goes as follows (see *Figure 1.*). First, we will delineate how the *common world* [cmw] of principal entities involved in this research is *arranged* (ARR). By applying the relational formula, we first intend to decipher how these are related and what worth is attributed to them in particular relational settings, such as households, where they gain position and worth. Outside the possible determinism, the second point revolves around exploring the principal *attachments* (ATT), that is, various forms of values and the ways of distributing oneself and whether these are engendered by different arrangements. Here, we are examining whether or not they incline to *exclusion* departing particularly their domestic worlds from civic affairs [exc], the *intimacy* [int] of various affairs that appear important along with *human values*, as something to attune oneself [hva]. These items are particularly illustrative for delineating the principal shapes of familiarity, the bonds and positions situated in the domestic world and how an inevitable overlapping with different worlds and the worths they provide is settled. As such, an analysis of both ARR and ATT will help us to understand how the existing orders of *worths* (WRT) are assessed in this survey and what helps creating the critical stance and indication of “malfunctioning” of certain orders, respectively, whether critical assessment of justice and fairness covering the possibility to be *included* [inc] follows or not the equivalence principles, whether the individual *competences* [com] are respected and whether some individual traits are respected as such in job-related affairs and considered as *efficient* [eff].

Figure 1. Selected items for the analysis of arrangements, attachments and worths.

ARR	ATT	WRT
<p>[cmw] F1 No of household members F2-F4 Relationships among household members F3 Age group F17a Activity</p>	<p>[exc] A4 Would you say that most people can be trusted, or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people? A5 Do you think that most people would try to take advantage of you if they got the chance, or would they try to be fair? A6 Most of the time people try to be helpful or that they are mostly looking out for themselves?</p>	<p>[inc] G1 political system ensures that everyone has a fair chance G2 government takes into account the interests of all citizens G3 decisions in politics are transparent G4 fair chance of achieving the level of education G5 fair chance of getting the job G26 fairness – income and wealth are equally G27 fairness – hardworking people earn more than others G28 fairness – care of those who are poor and in need G29 fairness – families with high social status enjoy privileges</p>
	<p>[int] C2 How often do you meet socially with friends, relatives or work colleagues? C3 How many people, if any, are there with whom you can discuss intimate and personal matters? C4 Compared to other people of your age, how often would you say you take part in social activities?</p>	<p>[com] G13a gross pay is unfairly low, fair, or unfairly high G14a net pay is unfairly low, fair, or unfairly high G20 differences in wealth unfairly small, fair, or unfairly large</p>
	<p>[hva] E important to him to live in secure surroundings G people should do what they're told and follow rules I important to be humble and modest P important always to behave properly R important to be loyal to his friend T follow the customs handed down by his religion or his family</p>	<p>[eff] G21 job – person's knowledge and skills G22 job – person's on-the-job experience G23 job – person knows someone in the organization</p>
<p><i>Arrangements cover various worths gained in different worlds</i></p>	<p><i>Attachments to various beings and the ways of distributing oneself</i></p>	<p><i>Assessment of worths stemming from different worlds</i></p>

Embedding the Arrangements: An Outline of the Common World

Against a typical determinist strategy epitomized in constructing of statistical models that delineate how the group attributes induce a general linear reality and dictate the conduct of actors, our starting point considers how the actors are distributed in terms of worth gained in specific relational settings and how they associate with each other by employing various qualitative evaluations. Eventually, this will help us to discern whether the relatively *stabilized* common world, embodied specifically in ways how they are relationally situated in their familiar, domestic arrangements, engenders different moral expressions and assessments of orders of worth (ATT). Although the available data, unfortunately, did not provided with much details on how the entities, in accordance with the worth ascribed to them, are distributed in everyday life and how the various aspects of familiarity, such as care and affection operate, by narrowing down the focus to several features found in their [cmw], we have been principally interested in positionality of respondents that is embedded in familiar arrangements. In doing so, we have intended to *cluster* the data that would combine together some of the principal social bonds unfolding within this regime of domesticity. Some commonly taken traits, like the various aspects of income or level of qualifications, even though maintaining the inequalities arranged elsewhere – for example in industrial and market worlds in terms of competences that create a prolonged effect as income assets do, did not statistically proved significant for the relations that comprise the domesticity. Conversely, the chains of personal dependencies unfolding through the composition of household, but also the position the one takes in kinship structures in terms of seniority, position of authority or various forms of dependence, accompanied with the work status, proved to provide principal means for discerning several possible formats of the [cmw]. After being recoded and adjusted, a combination of these information on worth gained in a concatenated world of domesticity, helped distinguishing seven possible clusters of (ARR), as the relational compounds involving various household situations (see *Figure 2*).⁴

4 Besides age and a number of household members, other items included in constructing of clusters included following information. First, the activity was set in following order: 1) employment, 2) housework, 3) education, 4) unemployment and 5) retirement. Domestic position summed up several variables describing kin and non-kin relations in the household as follows: 1) solitary life, covering single-person household; 2) seniority, implying that the person has certain authority according to the model of familiar world, like in cases of being eldest person in the household; 3) co-dependence, describing various horizontal and vertical bonds (such as couples with children) and 4) dependence, describing subjugation in terms of domestic authority and economic dependence, such as children. Number of household members was also recoded into three-scale variable, with 1) being single-person household, 2) two-person household and 3) household with three and more members.

Figure 2. The results of Two-step cluster analysis, presenting seven key arrangements.

ARR	Size in % (no of cases)	Activity (mean 1–5)	Age	Domestic position (mean 1–4)	HH type (1–3)	No. of HH members
[cl1]	17.5% (350)	4,87	70,6	1	1	1
[cl2]	11.2% (223)	4,68	61,2	2,96	3	3,98
[cl3]	15.6% (312)	4,82	67,7	2,91	2	2
[cl4]	14.6% (292)	1,57	48,6	3,13	2	2
[cl5]	9.2% (184)	1,41	46,5	1	1	1
[cl6]	24.7% (494)	1,13	43,1	3,06	3	3,91
[cl7]	7.2% (145)	3,3	22,4	3,71	3	3,97

Namely, a Two-step cluster analysis, which has reached a value of 0.6 (on a scale spanning from -1.0 up to 1.0) for a Silhouette measure of cohesion and separation, helped profiling these, generally stabilized statuses acquired in familiar circle that were ordered hierarchically after post-hoc analyzes. First among these [cl1] encompassed the single-person households with predominantly elder people living in them. Following two clusters also had the retired, elderly persons as the key respondents. Difference is that the first among the two clusters gathers elders living in extended households, mostly with spouses, children and quite often, grandchildren [cl2], whereas the second one aggregates those living in a co-dependent two-person household, mostly with their spouses and to a lesser extent, children [cl3]. Against these, following cluster mostly encompasses the middle-aged persons living in a cohabitation and to a lesser extent, as single-parents, who are either economically-active or devoted to housework [cl4]. A cluster after this one differs only as being a single-person household [cl5]. Next cluster also involves an economically-active people of similar age as in previous two, but who live in extended households with partners and children and to a lesser degree, their parents(-in law) or other relatives [cl6]. Finally, last among these clusters also encompasses an extended, usually multigenerational households, but from a point of relatively young persons, who are either educating or are unemployed, which overall sets them into particular kind of dependence in kin relations [cl7].

As being embedded into distinct arrangements, each of these profiles at least hint at a positionality built around the “accumulated” worths, gained by attaining appreciation in different worlds. But these relational webs operating through the [cmw] also are organized through “loops” of connectivities, where specific attachments (ATT) are shaped by the actors themselves (see Figure 3.). Affective and moral weight of certain social bonds thus largely accompanies arrangements, as the respective profiles attune to different scope, frequency and, to say, depth of these bonds. Thus, it might be no wonder that, the most indicative aspects of familiarity covering specific bonds where intimacy, such as discussing sexual experiences or family matters, reach statistically significant differences between the clusters. When the three items are taken as a composite scale [int], a fair degree of correlation ($r = 0.218$) indicates that the intensity, scope and the frequency of personal bonds, thus expands from clusters covering

predominantly elders who, contrary to the middle-aged respondents living in extended households, reduce their engagement or even diminish it, when it exceeds the household alone. Amount of trust, bequeathed to others particularly in terms of intimate affairs and confidentiality, certainly runs along with certain states of the human body, the timing of life and other institutional framings that, in plural ways, assemble persons. Still, the scope of these *networked attachments*, as being engendered by different relational settings identified for each of the clusters, open a question whether these modalities of bonds appear as a firm moral agenda where a higher amount of trust ascribed to familiarity, implies incompatibility with some other sources of worth?

Figure 3. Reliability analysis for selected scales.

Reliability Analysis	ATT			WRT			WRTcomp
	[exc]	[int]	[hva]	[inc]	[com]	[eff]	
Cronbach-s Alpha	0.756	0.612	0.667	0.560	0.531	0.571	0.735
Inter-item correlation (mean)	0.508	0.341	0.256	0.508	0.832	0.292	0.279
No of items	3	3	6	9	3	3	8
N	1954	2024	1920	1646	1634	1939	1427

While the items exploring intimacy were roughly situated within the coordinates of the domestic world, other two blocks of items encompassed by [exc] and [hva] might be considered as providing an axiological continuum between the civic and the domestic polity. Items composing the exclusion [exc] generally counterpoise rather irreconcilable principles that are established either by confidently aligning to impersonal ties in the civic polity, or adopting a more suspicious attitude towards the former and associating the trust to a higher degree of personal attachments. What might be found here does not favor the civic imperatives to a full extent, both when looked as a continuous scale, and when analyzing each item separately. Thus, even though the clusters and profiles identified above proved to have statistically significant differences among themselves, a relatively weak amount of correlation, together with a standard deviation for all of the three items reaching the value of 2.32 as well as a mean of 3.56 on a 11-degree scale, overall makes overlapping of worths and achieving a “truce” as possible but with a lot of hesitation. Weighing on different sources of trust thus particularly distinguishes the elders from the clusters [cl1] and [cl3], who are more prone to adopt the vigilant attitude inclining towards the horizontal bonds (“you can’t be too careful”). Again, there is a conspicuous distrust, with almost half of cases affirming that people would take advantage of you if the circumstances would allow that. Also, a half thinks that people are looking out for themselves rather than altruistically helping others. Similar vigilance and more favorable attitude towards personal attachments, despite variegated relational settings contained in clusters, applies also to human values [hva]. When considered as a continuous scale, the [hva] also induces statistically significant differences among the clusters, with the slight but not completely negligible correlation ($r = 0.185$) implying that the profiles emerging from the clusters [cl1], [cl2] and [cl3] are more susceptible to narrow down the circle of

loyalty, affirm authority and the imperatives of familiar conduct. By generally being considered as worthy, these items testify that a composite acceptance of such traits engages with the trust that is oriented towards an almost primordial placement within a hierarchy that, *inter alia*, manages to harmoniously balance personal duties and given obligations. It is no wonder why in more than three quarters of the cases there is an appreciative attitude towards feeling secure in immediate surroundings, but also, humbleness, modesty and other related worths that assume inclining towards personal subjugation and a suspension of any kind of deed, along with continuous and lasting aspects of tradition – handed down by a religion or a family.

Sustenance of these motives in the common world therefore accentuates a rather subtle footing in the familiarity. While not having clear-cut forms, engendered by profiles from different arrangements, attachments at least display a higher degree of affinities towards more personal, immediate and customary forms of life. Appeals for more “personal” and “humane” judgments, particularly encompassed by the [hva], thus are getting more pronounced with aging. These two also appear as highly contingent ($C = 0.804$). An inclination of profiles emerging from the clusters such as [cl1], [cl2] and [cl3] towards almost self-sufficient domestic worth, with lot of hesitations due to danger to evoke some sort of psychological theory or functional explanation, might be associated with a *deficiency* coming from a loss of worth in other worlds that accompanies ageing – particularly in the industrial world where imperatives of efficiency have primacy or the rivalry found in the market world. Still, what is appealing here is the cognitive formatting that sets almost an insurmountable barrier to impersonal and somewhat “detached” relations implied by the civic formula, as a general format of qualitative evaluation. Whereas, relations between the polities does not simply fit into binary matrices because different moral formulas do coexist as we have already underlined, the attachments predominantly configured in terms of familiarity impose further questions. Primarily, might they be taken as a source of criticism of the institutional “malfunctioning” in Serbia? If so, does this criticism see familiarity as welcoming in public affairs, or it rather sticks to clearly defined zones of morals with general affinities towards the safety and warmth in the domestic realm and against the deficiency of public officials?

Surveilling the Common Good: A Loss of Equivalence in the Civic Polity

Embeddedness into plural settings, as being said, commonly involves commensuration among different sources of worth along with quite practical issues of how to arrange different settings for beings in the common world by evoking generalizable principles. A loss of equivalence, especially in the cases of recalling more justice or fairness (WRT), involves a stage preceding a possible truce, but also different “hinterland practices” that these appeals somehow unveil and put forward. Critical judgements, still, do not clearly resonate with some purely “factual” or “fictional” grounding, because these are both experiential

in the sense of capability of being affected (cf. Latour, 2004) and metaphysical, involving a generalizable equivalence contained in the principles that are mobilized in justification. Everyday affairs are quite variegated and display the worlds in making: government officials can be accused of favoring a foreign investor because they forgot the “national interest”, while a skillful oppositional politician might use an argument from a domestic world and indicate the long-term impact that this foreign direct investment will have on the “future of our children”. At the same time, critically oriented sociologists would emphasize the low wages of the labourers and the dismissal of workers’ rights (for similar analyzes, see: Thevénot, 2002). Survey data certainly appear rather reduced in this regard, but realities they also evoke might shed the light on certain discords created when worlds encounter each other. After particularly seeing the share that domestic judgements have in the composition of the common world, the principal question is whether the familiar attachments might be “transported” elsewhere, or if exactly this operation in case of the civic world, surveilled against any familiar relations, would approve as inappropriate for running a test? The question thus is whether a search for an equitable solution would require adopting a more pliable strategy in order to simultaneously keep the zone of familiarity intact while forbidding the application of similar principles in common, civic affairs?

Numerous items in the ESS envelop the traits of the civic worlds and particularly the Round 9 has included a series of these explorations attuned to the political philosophy of justice and its institutional workings. Each of the items summarized into three scales with relatively high inter-item correlations (see *Figure 3.* above) indicated a relatively high and widespread critical assessment, pointing at the deficiency of collective bodies or public agencies or a situation where collective interests do not manage to supersede the individual ones. First among these scales thus directly encompasses the inclusive capacities [inc] of collective bodies. Their detachment is marked commonly: in two thirds of the cases for each item separately, the collective bodies are judged as a failure, providing only self-satisfaction to a few and thus going against the dignity these should provide, because the ensuring of fair chances to participate in politics, taking into account the interests of citizens, transparency of politics are quite negatively assessed. Several other items further bring this “transport” of worths into the civic yard, which is particularly the case when assumed universality suspends the workings of familiarity in the realm where efficiency should rule [eff]. Thus, a person’s knowledge and skills and on-the-job experience are also considered as signals of a handicap, in 55.0% and 50.6% cases respectively, because both critically point at an overvaluation of familiarity where it should be rather foreign. The person with privileges is thus particularly denounced: knowing someone in the organization is also seen as a possible aberration of the common good, with 80.8% exposing this judgement. Maybe the most vivid examples touch upon the fairness of competitive outcomes expressed through the assessment of different issues in the distribution of income and wealth [com]. Here we might find the highest degrees of scrutiny encompassing both the net

and gross pay, as the values on a scale ranging from -4 marking “low, extremely unfair”, over value 0 marking “fair” are selected in two thirds of the cases.

These critical judgements clearly point at the deficiencies of the civic world, but the question is whether the different relational settings (ARR) help emerging distinct experiential formats that lead to criticism, or these sources of critique draw from higher common principles and resonate with metaphysical formulas? Suspending discords brought with the rivalries and unjust outcomes of economic transactions [com], along with the poor performance of collective bodies to run indifferently [inc] and enabling the fair incorporation of certain personal competences [eff] only partially relates to features organizing the common world. Notwithstanding that statistically significant differences accompany each of profiles from the clusters when assessing these institutional workings, there are pronounced inter-group variations and none of these appear as a stable format. Only in rare cases the judgements follow relatively clear lines – for instance, when critical assessment of whether the chances for achieving the wanted educational level were fair drops among higher educational profiles ($r = -0.323$). Otherwise, it seems that metapragmatic registry transmitted through the ESS in the Serbian case basically comes down to a complexity of establishing the common world, particularly the domestic one. Similar to Thevénot's (2020) recent ethnographic journey in Russia where he explored a lack of proximity of political institutions when seen from a perspective of personal attachments, metapragmatic registry supporting these hinterland practices and attachments located in the common world, also is deployed, or at least, it coincides with marking discords in other worlds.

The regression analysis that we have performed nonetheless offered beneficial access to attachments which appear to be the crucial source our main criticisms. Albeit different sources of criticism are coexistent, overlapping in one case showed that the higher degree of worth given to familiar bonds – especially when recalling more “humane” and “personal” worths [hva] coincides with distrust and appeals that point at injustice and inadequate corrective features. To support this claim, we have first designed four composite scales of which three – already mentioned in the previous section, summarize the items that measure the relations of worth. What might be considered as a contribution to a common good and what might be seen as a deficiency, in cases of exclusion [exc], intimacy [int] and personality features [hva], thus illustrates this move from domestic towards civic polity and *vice versa*, where their overlapping and a point of reconciliation seemed impossible, at least according to the results of our analysis. Thus, inclining towards more horizontal means of integration implied in the civic polity goes against arbitrary familiarity, as much as being affected with bonds provided in the domestic world opens a critical attack to the other side. All of the composite scales proved reliability analysis and solid degrees of inter-item correlations, as shown in *Figure 4*. below. Fourth among these encompassed issues of justice and fairness, with 4 items that displayed the highest degree of mutual correlation.

Figure 4. Reliability analysis for composite scales and a regression model.

Reliability Analysis	ATT			WRT			WRTcomp
	[exc]	[int]	[hva]	[inc]	[com]	[eff]	
Cronbach-s Alpha	0.756	0.612	0.667	0.560	0.531	0.571	0.735
Inter-item correlation (mean)	0.508	0.341	0.256	0.508	0.832	0.292	0.279
Regression Model	PREDICTORS ↓			DEPENDENT ↓			
Standardized Beta Coefficient	-.088	.259	.009				
R	.265			ANOVA Sum of squares	57.273		
R Square	0.70			Mean Square	19.091		
Adjusted R Square	.069			Sig.	.000		

This codependence is further examined by using the selected items from exclusion [hva], intimacy [int] and personality features [hva] as predictors for WRTcomp. The latter scale summarizes overall nine items previously used for the scales describing (WRT) as the ones with highest degree of mutual correlation.⁵ These findings once again indicate that the cognitive formats of familiar attachments particularly go hand in hand with the judgements indicating various discords due to denouncing of common good. Namely, a regression model indicated a value of 0.70 for the coefficient of determination and specifically pointed at the personality features, with a standardized beta coefficient reaching 0.259. In these cases, inclining towards loyalty, tradition and personal traits also enforced viewing the injustice in aspects where the intervention of public bodies should be seen rather than subjugating to the same rules applied in the domestic world. This finding appears once again interesting both as a question about what configures this criticism as well as how these critical judgements are transmitted through configurations such as surveys, which will together be our final points of interest.

In Place of Conclusion: Surveys and World-Configuring

The apparent ambiguity of these findings first comes down to a plurality of modes of engagement which produces such variegated landscapes of judgements. On the one hand, attachments anchored in personality features [hva] depict

5 Selected items are: [inc]G1 Political system in country ensures everyone fair chance to participate in politics; [inc]G2 Government in country takes into account the interests of all citizens; [inc]G3 Decisions in country politics are transparent; [inc]G5 Everyone in country fair chance get job they seek; [com]G13a Would you say your gross pay is unfairly low, fair, or unfairly high; [com]G14a Your net [pay/pensions/social benefits] is unfairly low, fair, or unfairly high; [eff]G21 Influence decision to recruit in country: person's knowledge and skills and [eff]G22 Influence decision to recruit in country: person's on-the-job experience. Unfortunately, there was no other option but to recode these items into 3-degree scales. The reason was that items in [inc] were measured with 5-degree scale, items in [com] with a 9-degree scale, but those items in [eff] were measured with a 4-degree scale, which caused severe problems for the authors. Even though we are aware that this might affect the findings, the entire scale was checked through reliability analysis and computed.

a systematic crafting of immediate environments, more localizable and to a certain extent, idiosyncratic equipment that “glues” to situated and more sensible settings. On the other hand, exactly these attachments that arrange a familiar realm are at the same time taken as rather inappropriate to simply be extended into realms where they are not welcomed. May this situation then be read as a methodological defect and a schizophrenic scission leading to “dissonant” representation, or should another, more feasible pathway be taken, one that is closer to reality? Seemingly binary, these findings might easily drag into a series of dualisms and replicate the opposition between the poorly incorporated or self-interested individuals and “society” from which they are detached because they have pre-reflexively adopted the alodoxic “beliefs” and allegedly are belated in following of values that are put ahead by the “legitimate culture” (Bourdieu, 2000). There are numerous examples similar to this one. But such ontological matrices easily slip into applying various ethical standards that demarcate certain blocks of worth as an epiphenomenon of a generalized societal image, which in effect denounces them as less reflective, subjugated to tradition, false beliefs or all other subtle accusations. Even worse is that they retrieve the substantialist thinking – especially by echoing the ancient conception of human nature assuming this maladaptation, thus once again restoring the alleged problem of order and atrophic model of subjectivity (cf. Abbott, 2016).

The absence of fairness in the civic polity with a higher degree of worth given to the domestic one, depicts a deeper ontological puzzle about achieving the “truce” between the two general principles. Albeit the available data prove to be poor for discerning more thoroughly the household situation and how the different worths, progressively inscribed into the distribution of everyday life are organized, these moral artifacts allow bringing forward more intricate disagreements. They also denounce certain orders of worth no matter what other attachments look like. Certainly, a part of these indicatively unveil the problem of incorporating multiple arrangements in cases where familiarity is welcomed only in one set of relations. Otherwise, the majority of these judgements might be seen as an expansion of generality that specifically targets the collective bodies – the ones that are seen as mediators are delegated to allow the smooth transport of values. Yet, against recalling some mystical forces contained in “contextual features”, “institutional heritage” or “semi-periphery” that rules over human heads as it reintroduces the omnipotent existence of general linear reality, attention should instead be given to the delicate work of arrangements and how this relationality is entailed. Ultimately, this brings forward the question of how to create a feasible strategy for the understanding of plural engagements, variegated worlds and different worths, particularly with the help of tools such as surveys.

One of the most buried “secrets”, particularly within the social sciences, still seems to be that methods emulate realities and that the major issue revolves solely around technical enhancements. Yet, this transplanting of an externalist epistemology accomplices with disengaging from any thorough ontological assessment, even though a variety of delicate questions were mentioned in the introduction, ranging from the normativity, encountering with troubles of

human agency and the encountering of knowledge practices with numerous disapprovals, seem to create enormous gaps. Novel ontological directions seem to enforce stepping out from a comfort zone where a tranquil presentation of “public mood”, “attitudes” or vacuous references to “context-dependence” reside, because these appear as severely insufficient to withhold the variegated treatments of evaluations that surveys push forward. Having in mind that recreation of certain realities through surveys should be kept at all costs, it is also necessary to potentially expand the scope of inquiry in order to encompass various pragmatic registries through which the worths are distributed. Various authors in studying processes of evaluating scientific work (Dromi & Stabler, 2019), resettling of ecological tensions (Blok, 2013; Blok & Meilvang, 2015; Centemeri, 2015) or studying of variations in conducting dispute in digital environment (Davies, 2021) have exactly located consummation of fluctuating references used in judgements in various social bonds, also seeing these as registries for actions. Precisely the colliding generality, trials and commensurations which encompass how the worlds are composed, should bring to light different forms of attachments and engage into discerning how the various arrangements are settled. This is why there is a need for more data, attuned to heterogeneous means through which the beings are distributed and settled.

Therefore, it is redundant to be pessimistic or to take quantitative methodology as being severely affected by these problems so that it loses its “use value”. Quite the contrary, the data and evaluations acquired through surveys also indicate how the contrasted evaluations exhaust specific moral grammars. There is thus a good reason to move further from a conventional model. The latter understands a dichotomous situation and an alleged tension between a recursive guidance of norms that supposedly represent an ontologically “higher” order of society and personal values. Heterogeneity, on the other hand, as such has to be treated carefully. Because the scholarship on surveys usually avoids to question the compound of such a delicate process, realities that have been cut-off actually create the well-known and unpleasant situation, often experienced by many researchers in the social sciences: that is, the systematic inability to fill the gaps between the insufficient elements of datasets. Such a situation in effect becomes a prime cause for despairing moments coming after an untenable and ontologically hazardous requirement for “detecting regularities” is not fulfilled. Quite the contrary, scientific endeavor deserves more precision rather than embedding into some general formats: it is exactly why this alleged “lack of regularities” and other pitfalls of emergentism are not at all problematic, because the heterogeneity presents a regular situation which only requires more data on how the multiplicity of links between the entities in complex settings are established. Some masterful analyses that concurrently evolved through valuable methodological guidelines (see particularly: Desmond, 2014; 2016), have precisely showed how various webbed and precarious sets of transactions that situate the actors into more fluid and relational settings (cf. Crossley, 2015; Dépelteau, 2015; 2018; Emirbayer, 1997). As such, these potentially might direct further formatting of methods outside of purely cathartic moments fostered by alleged, but barren superiority of the panoptical view, towards overlapping

of worths and engaging with more delicate questions on how this kind of an equipped humanity might be further assessed in terms of interlaced, co-dependent bonds operating in common worlds.

Acknowledgments

We kindly thank Nataša Simić, Jorn Koelemaj, Vladimir Mentus, Jovana Zafirović and both reviewers for useful comments that helped improving this paper.

References

- Abbott, A. 2001. *Time Matters: On Theory and Method*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Abbott, A. 2016. *Processual Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Abbott, A. 2018. Varieties of Normative Inquiry – Moral Alternatives to Politicization in Sociology. *The American Sociologist*, Volume 49: 158–180.
- Archer, M. 2010. Morphogenesis versus structuration-on combining structure. *The British Journal of Sociology* 61 (s1): 225–252.
- Archer, M. 2017. Introduction: Has a Morphogenic Society Arrived? *Morphogenesis and Human Flourishing*, Archer, M. (eds.). Heidelberg: Springer.
- Beetz, J. 2016. *Materiality and Subject in Marxism, (Post-)Structuralism, and Material Semiotics*. London: Palgrave-McMillan.
- Blok, A. 2013. Pragmatic sociology as political ecology: On the many worths of nature(s). *European Journal of Social Theory* 16(4): 492–510.
- Blok, A. & Meilvang, M.L. 2015. Picturing Urban Green Attachments: Civic Activists Moving between Familiar and Public Engagements in the City. *Sociology*, 49 (1): 19–37.
- Boltanski, L. & Thévenot, L. 2000. The reality of moral expectations: A sociology of situated judgement. *Philosophical Explorations*, 3 (3): 208–231.
- Boltanski, L. & Thévenot, L. 2006. *On Justification. The Economies of Worth*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Boltanski, L. 2011. *On Critique. A Sociology of Emancipation*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Boltanski, L. 2014. *Mysteries and Conspiracies: Detective Stories, Spy Novels and the Making of Modern Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Boudon, R. 2012. “Analytical sociology” and the explanation of beliefs. *European Journal of Social Sciences*. 50 (2): 7–34.
- Bourdieu, P. 1973. L'opinion publique n'existe pas. *Les temps modernes*, 318, janvier 1973: 1292–1309.
- Bourdieu, P. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Bourdieu, P. 2000. *Pascalian Meditations*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bryant, L., Srnicek, N. and Graham H. 2011. Towards a Speculative Philosophy. In: *The Speculative Turn: Continental Materialism and Realism*. Bryant, L., Srnicek, N. and Graham H. (eds.). Melbourne: Re.Press:1–18.
- Candea, M. 2010. Introduction: Revisiting Tarde's House, in: *Tarde's idea of quantification*. Candea, M. (ed.): 1–23. London & New York: Routledge.
- Centemeri, L. 2015 Reframing problems of incommensurability in environmental conflicts through pragmatic sociology. From value pluralism to the plurality of modes of engagement with the environment. *Environmental Values*, 24(3): 299–320.
- Champagne, P. 2005. Making the People Speak: On the Social Uses of and Reactions to Opinion Polls, in: *Pierre Bourdieu and Democratic Politics: The Mystery of Ministry*, Wacquant, L. (ed.), London: Wiley.
- Chepp, V., Gray, C. 2014. Foundations and New Directions. In: Miller, K., Wilson, S., Chepp, V. Padilla, J.. *Cognitive Interviewing Methodology*. London: Wiley.
- Crossley, N. 2015. Relational sociology and culture: a preliminary framework, *International Review of Sociology*, 25:1, 65–85.
- Davies W. 2021. Anti-equivalence: Pragmatics of post-liberal dispute. *European Journal of Social Theory*. 24(1):44–64.
- Delanty, G. & Mota, A. 2017. Governing the Anthropocene: Agency, Governance, Knowledge. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 20(1): 9–38.
- Dépelteau, F. 2015. Relational sociology, pragmatism, transactions and social fields. *International Review of Sociology*, 25:1, 45–64.
- Dépelteau, F. 2018. Relational Thinking in Sociology: Relevance, Concurrence and Dissonance. in: *The Palgrave Handbook of Relational Sociology*. Dépelteau, F. (ed.), Palgrave-MacMillan, London.
- Desmond, M. 2014. Relational Ethnography. *Theory and Society* 2014 (43): 547–579.
- Desmond, M. 2016. *Evicted: Poverty and Profit in the American City*. New York: Crown.
- Dromi, S.M., Stabler, S.D. 2019. Good on paper: sociological critique, pragmatism, and secularization theory. *Theoretical Sociology*, Volume 48: 325–350
- Emirbayer, M. 1997. Manifesto for a Relational Sociology. *American Journal of Sociology* 103 (2): 281–317.
- Felski, R. 2016. Introduction. *New Literary History*, 47(2–3), 215–229.
- Harman, G. 2018. *Speculative Realism: An Introduction*. London: Wiley.
- Hedström, P. 2005. *Dissecting the Social: On the Principles of Analytical Sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hedström, P. 2008. Studying mechanisms to strengthen causal inferences in quantitative research, in: Box-Steffensmeier, J., Brady, H., Collier, D. (ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology* (319–338). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Heinich N. 2020a. A Pragmatic Redefinition of Value(s): Toward a General Model of Valuation. *Theory, Culture & Society*. 37(5):75–94.
- Heinich N. 2020b. Ten Proposals on Values. *Cultural Sociology*. 14(3):213–232.
- Jacobs, J., Smith, S. 2008. Living Room– Rematerialising Home. *Environment and Planning A* 40 (3): 515–519.
- Jacobs, J. 2003. Editorial– Home rules. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 28 (3): 259–263.
- Kaufmann, J-C. 2004. *L'entretien compréhensif*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Krüger, AK., Reinhart M. 2017. Theories of Valuation – Building Blocks for Conceptualizing Valuation between Practice and Structure. *Historical Social Research* 42(1):263–85.
- Lamont, M. 2012. Toward a Comparative Sociology of Valuation and Evaluation. *Annual Review of Sociology* 38 (1):201–221.
- Larregue, J. 2018a. Against Sociology à la Gorgias: Evidence Is the Measure of all Scientific Arguments. *The American Sociologist*, 49: 344–347.
- Larregue, J. 2018b. Conservative Apostles of Objectivity and the Myth of a “Liberal Bias” in Science. *The American Sociologist*, 49: 312–327.
- Latour, B. 1987. *Science in action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers Through Society*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Latour, B. 1993. *The pasteurization of France*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Latour, B. 2004. How to talk about the body? The normative dimension of science studies. *Body and Society* 10 (2/3): 205–229.
- Latour, B. 2005. *Reassembling the Social. An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Latour, B. 2010. Tarde’s idea of quantification, in: *Tarde’s idea of quantification*. Candeia, M. (ed.): 145–162. London & New York: Routledge.
- Latour, B., Jensen, P., Venturini, T., Grauwin, S., Boullier, D. 2012. ‘The whole is always smaller than its parts’ – a digital test of Gabriel Tarde’s monads. *British Journal of Sociology* 63 (4): 590–615.
- Law, J. 2004. *After Method. Mess in Social Science Research*. London: Routledge.
- Law, J. 2009. Seeing like a survey. *Cultural Sociology* 3: 239–256.
- Lizardo, O. & Strand, M. 2010. Skills, Toolkits, Contexts and Institutions: Clarifying the Relationship between Different Approaches to Cognition in Cultural Sociology. *Poetics* 38(2):205–28.
- Manzo, G. 2010. Analytical Sociology and its Critics. *European Journal of Sociology/Archives Européennes de Sociologie*. LI, 1: 129–170.
- Marres, N. 2018. Why we can’t have our facts back, *Engaging Science, Technology and Society*, 4 (2018): 423–443.
- Marres N. 2020. For a situational analytics: An interpretative methodology for the study of situations in computational settings. *Big Data & Society*. July 2020. doi:10.1177/2053951720949571
- Pellizzoni, L. 2015. *Ontological Politics in a Disposable World: The New Mastery of Nature*. London: Routledge.

- Reckwitz, A 2002. The status of the 'material' in theories of culture: From 'social structure' to 'artefacts'. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 32: 195–217.
- Savransky, M. 2016. *The Adventure of Relevance: An Ethics of Social Inquiry*. Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schatzki, T. 2010a *The Timespace of Human Activity: On Performance, Society and History as Indeterminate Teleological Events*. Plymouth: Lexington Books.
- Schatzki, T. 2010b Materiality and Social Life. *Nature and Culture*, 5 (2): 123–149.
- Schwarz, N., Oyserman, D., Peytcheva, E. 2010. Cognition, Communication, and Culture: Implications for the Survey Response Process. In: Harkness, Janet A. et. al. (eds.). *Survey Methods in Multinational, Multiregional and Multicultural Contexts*. London. Wiley.
- Smith, S. 2008. Owner-Occupation– At Home with a Hybrid of Money and Materials. *Environment and Planning A* 40 (3) 3: 520–535.
- Thévenot, L. 2001. Pragmatic regimes governing the engagement with the world, in: *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*, Schatzki, Theodore, Knorr-Cetina, Karin, von Savigny, Eike (ed.) 64–83. London and New York: Routledge.
- Thévenot, L. 2002. Which Road to Follow? The Moral Complexity of an "Equipped" Humanity,. in: *Complexities: Social Studies of Knowledge Practices*. Mol, A., Law, J. (ed.). Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Thévenot, L. 2007. The plurality of cognitive formats and engagements: Moving between the familiar and the public. *European Journal of Social Theory* 10(3): 409–423.
- Thévenot, L. 2014. Voicing concern and difference: From public spaces to common-places. *European Journal of Cultural and Political Sociology* 1(1): 7–34.
- Thévenot, L. 2019. Measure for Measure: Politics of Quantifying Individuals to Govern Them. *Historical Social Research / Historische Sozialforschung*, 44(2 (168)), 44–76.
- Thévenot, L. 2020. How Does Politics Take Closeness into Account? Returns from Russia. *International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society*, Volume 33, 221–250
- Uskul, A. K., Oyserman, D., Schwarz, N. 2010. Cultural Emphasis on Honor, Modesty, or Self-Enhancement: Implications for the Survey-Response Process, in: Harkness, Janet A. et al. (eds.). *Survey Methods in Multinational, Multiregional and Multicultural Contexts*. London:Wiley.
- Vandenbergh, F. 2014. *What's Critical about Critical Realism: Essays in Reconstructive Social Theory*. London: Routledge.
- Wacquant, L. 2013. Bourdieu 1993: A Case Study in Scientific Consecration. *Sociology*. 47 (1): 15–29.
- Warde A, Paddock J, Whillans J. 2020. Domestic Hospitality: As a Practice and an Alternative Economic Arrangement. *Cultural Sociology*. 2020;14(4):379–398.
- Welch D, Mandich G, Keller M. 2020. Futures in Practice: Regimes of Engagement and Teleoaffectivity. *Cultural Sociology*. 2020;14(4):438–457.
- Yancey, G. 2018. Yes academic Bias is a problem and we need to address it: A response to Larregue. *The American Sociologist*. 49: 1–8.