WTMC SERIES

ON TEACHING & LEARNING STS

CARE as concept, method, ethic

WTMC Series on Teaching and Learning STS
Publication of the Netherlands Graduate Research School
of Science, Technology and Modern Culture (WTMC)

Contents

Maps

Directions

<u>**Address**</u>

Studiecentrum Soeterbeeck / Study and Conference Centre Soeterbeeck
Elleboogstraat 2
5352 LP Deursen-Dennenburg
Phone: +31-24-36 15 999

Internet: https://www.ru.nl/soeterbeeck/

<u>**By train**</u>

Take the local train ('stoptrein' or 'sprinter', NOT the 'Intercity' or fast train) from Nijmegen or 's Hertogenbosch to Ravenstein. They leave every half hour. This takes 15 or 20 minutes, respectively. At the railway station in Ravenstein take the exit at the back of the station, and follow the small footpath ('Stationspad'); at the end of the path turn right and enter the Soeterbeeck premises through the entrance gate. This is a 10-minute walk. Dutch railway schedules can be found at www.ns.nl

<u>**By road**</u>

Motorway A50, from Arnhem to 's-Hertogenbosch: take exit Ravenstein (nr.17); at the roundabout turn left, next roundabout straight on, next roundabout turn left (de Rijt), and again left after 100 m (Elleboogstraat), enter the Soeterbeeck premises through the entrance gate.
Motorway A50, from 's-Hertogenbosch to Arnhem: take exit Ravenstein (nr.17); at T -junction, turn left, and again left at the traffic lights; first roundabout straight on, and again straight at second roundabout; next roundabout turn left at the crossing (De Rijt), and again left after 100 m (Elleboogstraat); enter the Soeterbeeck premises through the entrance gate.

Practical notes

<u>**Covid-19**</u>

We are extremely happy that Nijmegen University has decided to allow us to use the premises and the facilities of Soeterbeeck for the upcoming workshop, provided we strictly keep to the following rules:

- Stay 1.5 metres (2 arms lengths) away from other people at all times
- If you have mild or full-blown cold-like symptoms, such as a sore throat, a runny nose, sneezing, a mild cough, a fever of around 38 or higher, shortness of breath, you should stay home.
- Wash your hands frequently: when you enter the buildings, before meals and after going to the toilet.

Soeterbeeck's staff too will make sure to provide for a Covid-19 proof stay.

We have adapted the programme so that we can all travel to and from Ravenstein outside of rush hour.

<u>**To do before the Workshop**</u>

Allow about two weeks for preparation of this workshop. The compulsory literature consists of roughly 250 pages. At 8 pages per hour, this takes about 32 hours. We expect you to spend about 7 more hours to prepare the exercises, and read part of the recommended literature as you wish. This amounts to 40 hours in all, which is the standard amount of preparation time for a workshop. In preparation, proceed as follows:
- Read the detailed programme and pay special attention to the activities so that you know in advance what you need to prepare and think about.
- Read all literature before you arrive. There is no time to read during the workshop. Make notes about what you don't understand, questions you would like to ask, things you want to discuss.
- Check the programme to see if you are a discussant for one of the PhD presentations. Look at the sections "PhD presentation guidelines' and "Feedback on presentations", which contains guidelines for presenters, discussants and all others!

<u>**What to bring with you**</u>
- Your material for this workshop.
- Debit card or credit card. In the evenings, after the formal programme, there are informal drinks, which you have to pay on Friday upon check out. Cash is not accepted.
- **Earplugs:** we reside in an old convent, so corridors and doors may be noisy at night.
- Running addicts: bring your **running gear**.
- To get moving during breaks: bring footballs, badminton gear, Frisbees etc. Soeterbeeck provides a ping-pong-table, bats & balls, and (usually) some bicycles.
- **We will be doing one session outdoors.** Bring proper **footwear**, check the weather forecast and if needed, bring **rainproof clothes**.

Attendance and cancellation

- *The workshop is residential*: you are expected to check in at Soeterbeeck on Monday at lunch time, and check out on Wednesday after lunch. On Monday and Tuesday, the programme extends into the evening.
- In order to receive credit for attending the workshop, *you are required to be present throughout the entire event*. Only calamities are taken as liable to depart from this rule. If this creates problems, then please contact the coordinators beforehand and as soon as possible.
- If, for any reason, you are unable to attend the workshop, please let Elize Schiweck (e.schiweck@utwente.nl) know **as soon as you can**. We may be able to offer your place to someone on the waiting list if we know soon enough. If notice of cancellation is received more than 10 days prior to the start of the workshop, you will receive a refund for all of the fees, minus €100 to cover the costs of administration and course materials. In the case of cancellations received less than 10 days before the start of the workshop, fees and any other costs that have been incurred by WTMC will not be refunded.

Programme

Monday: Matters of Care			Remarks
12.30-13.30		Lunch & Introductions	
13.30-15.00	1.2	Core Reading: Puig de la Bellacasa	
15.00-15.30		Break	
15.30-17.00	1.3	Israel Rodríguez Giralt: Disasters as a matter of (un)care	
17.00-17.30		WTMC: Upcoming activites	
17.30-18:45		Dinner	
18:45-20.00	1.4	PhD Presentations	
Tuesday: Knowledge and Practices of Care			
9.00-9.15		What kept you awake?	
9.15-10.45	2.1	Iris Wallenburg: Caring for Numbers and Regions	
10.45-11.15		Break	
11.15-13.00	2.2	Review part I	
13.00-14.00		Lunch	
14.00-15.30	2.3	Esha Shah: Science as care: the history of the gene	
15.30-16.00		Break	
16.00-17.30	2.4	Review part II	**Preparation needed Three print-outs are to be brought to the workshop**
17.30-19:00		Dinner	
19.00-20.00	2.5	Goodbye Session: reflecting with Bernike on future fieldwork	
Wednesday: Care in the anthropocene			
9.00-9.15		What kept you awake?	
9.15-10.00	3.1	Christian Ernsten: River love (part 1)	Bring rainwear (just in case) and walking shoes
10.00-10.15		Transition to part 2	
10.15-12.45	3.2	Christian Ernsten: River love (part 2)	
12.45-14:00		Lunch + Round off	

Introduction to the Workshop

Welcome to the Workshop. Together with a number of guest lecturers, we will explore relatively new modes of thinking and doing with care as they have been developed also within the field of STS. The exploration starts here, well before you arrive at our beautiful convent Soeterbeeck. This reader, together with some texts that you will have to collect yourself, provides the luggage for your journey. Travel well prepared!

It is advisable that you first carefully study the whole programme, before embarking on the actual reading. This should help you get a sense of the themes and how they connect, and how specific texts fit in those themes. Also, some assignments require preparation, others require you to bring certain things. And finally, we will have a number of participant presentations. Be sure to check whether you are scheduled as a discussant for one of them.

For each of you, the ideas and concepts discussed during the workshop will have different kinds of relevance. This depends on your research topic and method, the phase you are currently in, and your personal interest. The workshop is not a "one size fits nobody" event, and getting the most out of it does require some work. Make sure that you have in mind what you would like to learn, and how that can be achieved. In general, it is good practice to prepare one or more written questions about the reading material for each session. This helps focus your attention during lectures, and it ensures that you have something to contribute to the discussion, especially if you are not that eager by nature to join discussions. Of course, going with the flow and welcoming things the way they happen to come to you, is also an important mode of learning.

So here we go.

While STS has a long tradition of studying 'care' as an object of research, of talking *about* care, recent approaches challenge these conventional readings and uses of 'care'. For example, Joan Tronto proposes to "explore its significance as an ethical and political obligation for thinking in the more than human worlds of technoscience and natureculture" in her endorsement for *Matters of Care*. For while STS has profoundly questioned the categories of human/non-human, nature/culture, it has so far largely failed or refused to take this questioning and its consequences onto itself: while our objects of study have become hybrid and messy, STS still seems to assume "that our own research is not directly related to these more than human worlds it is situated in" (Jerak-Zuiderent, 2018, p. 56).

In this workshop, we will engage with care as proposed by the ground-breaking writing of Haraway, Puig de la Bellacasa, Tsing, Nading and others. This work aimed to explore the possibilities of care in and with our multispecied and diverse world. Here, care is about the responsibilities of STS researchers to attend to the (often invisible) labour that gets us through the day, to articulate the work it takes to live in this world as well as possible - and to do research as well as possible. Care is also about an ethic that contrasts with engagement with matters of fact or matters of concern. Can care further help us explore how human-machine associations (machine-learning, care-robots, tracking devices) tend to train us to leave unquestioned the human care-work? Can attention to care help clarify the risks we run, if care is rendered useless or largely transformed into data for others? In addition, the workshop will address how to re-engage with affect: is care an alternative to critical distance between ourselves and those we study? Engaging with care is thus not only about *revealing invisible care-work* beyond situations we are used to associate with care, but also about *generating care* by pausing over these engagements. It is also about exploring the epistemic potential of "the affective, ethical and hands-on agencies of practical and material consequence" (Puig de la Bellacasa, 2017, p. 4). We will look at what it means to move from thinking and writing *about* care, to (critically) thinking and doing *with* care.

On Monday, right after the introductions, we will set the stage with the workshop's Core Reading, Puig de la Bellacasa's Matters of Care in Technoscience, an important proposition to consider matters of care as a central approach, drawing on the field of STS and feminist epistemology. We will then more from the conceptual work around care to the articulation of the concepts in concrete cases with Israel Rodríguez Giralt's lecture. The evening session will be devoted to presentations of your work.

On Tuesday, Iris Wallenburg will reflect on care as both an object and an aspect of research in her work on healthcare, followed by another session of PhD presentations. The afternoon will start off with Esha Shah's lecture in which we will consider knowledge as care, and after that you will work on your review skills. After dinner, we will have a session led by Bernike Pasveer, to mark the ending of her work as WTMC coordinator.

On Wednesday, Christian Ernsten will give a short lecture and then take us outdoors for a walk & talk on caring for rivers. After lunch, you will re-engage with your reviews in the final session of the workshop, and your first thoughts about what the workshop has brought you. We end, as always, with our small ritual of farewells and the group photo.

We hope you will enjoy preparing for this workshop and look forward to meeting you (again) in a few weeks!

Bernike Pasveer and Anne Beaulieu

Corona Coda

At the point where the workshop was all set up, anti-pandemic measures were implemented in the Netherlands and in many countries around the world, affecting both the local organisation as well as guest speakers and participants from abroad. While an online workshop was one of the options, consultation with the WTMC PhDs indicated that a physically co-present workshop would be the preferable option. The coordinators elaborated a number of scenarios and in consultation with the direct and board, opted for postponing the workshop to June. In order to run such a workshop with the current public health recommendations, the number of participants had to be scaled down from the original 30 (we had a full house plus waiting list!). The PhDs registered in WTMC were therefore given priority, since this workshop is part of their formal training. Further adjustments to the timing were made, so as to avoid travel during rush hour and adaptation of the introduction exercise, to provide an opportunity to link to the changed conditions of the recent months.

Shortly before the start of the workshop, Israel Rodríguez-Giralt was invited to join a team working on anti-pandemic measures, specifically, to design a new infrastructure for contact tracing and contribute as a social scientist to the group of people designing it. Israel felt that it was his civic and academic duty to contribute his expertise, even though it would mean not participating in the Care workshop as planned. This led to two changes in the programme: a Q&A session with Maria Puig de la Bellacasa, and the plan to hold a webinar with Israel Rodríguez-Giralt later in the year, once his intensive project is completed—which we are very much looking forward to.

For most participants, this was the first physically co-present academic activity since the lockdown. Given that there were quite a few participants who were new to the programme (7 out of 16), we feel we took the right decision to postpone the workshop, since WTMC is as much an intellectual endeavour as an important mode of community- and network-making. Some participants noted that the sphere was gentler and the discussions less heated than in previous event – but some also missed the 'heat' of more confrontational conversations. We were left wondering whether this might have to

do with the increased carefulness in our interactions, due to the theme of the workshop or to the experience of the lockdown.

Monday

1.1 Introductions

The workshop will start with a lunch during which you introduce yourself and/or your research. We would like you to do this by sharing the answer to the following questions: What has the corona crisis taught you about your project? In other words, what have you learned or discovered about your research and how you approach it?

1.2 Core Reading

Maria Puig de la Bellacasa (2011), Matters of care in technoscience: assembling neglected things. *Social Studies of Science 41(1),* 85-106.

Recommended additional reading:
Bruno Latour (2004), Why has the critique run out of steam? From matters of fact to matters of concern. *Critical Inquiry,* 225-248.

We will discuss Puig de la Bellacasa in groups of 2 and then in a short plenary setting. Make notes of any questions you want to raise and of relations you see between this text and the issues raised in the other reading. We encourage you enormously to start discussing and questioning these texts in advance of the workshop with your group, through email or otherwise. Email-addresses of all participants can be found on one of the final pages of this programme.

The group composition will be as follows:

group 1	group 2	group 3	group 4
Nienke	Chiara	Irene	Joyce
Lotje	Denise	Mario	Mike

group 5	group 6	group 7	group 8	group 9
Jacqueline	Niko	Carla	Hanna	Jing
Ivan	Dani	Dirk	Selen	Sarah Rose

1.3 Israel Rodríguez Giralt: Disasters as a matter of (un)care

NOTE: this session was replaced with a Q&A session with Maria Puig de la Bellacasa, which enabled us to deepen our exploration of the

Drawing on empirical evidence, and the conceptual work done by STS and techno-feminist approaches, in this lecture, I aim to interrogate the more naturalistic, securitised and accelerated approaches to disasters. To do so, I will mainly rely on the idea of care, exploring through specific case studies, how this complex and ambiguous notion, and practice, opens up new and interesting

possibilities for thinking and relating with disasters as matters of (un)care. In particular, I will show that care can work as an epistemic, as well as an ethico-political pillar, to make visible, and think with, undervalued and minimized voices, geographies, temporalities, and intersections in disaster situations. How does care contribute to question what counts as a disaster, when, how and for whom a disaster happens? This talk will contribute to engaging with disasters as much slower and more complex processes, which constantly refer to issues of inequality and neglect of sociotechnical, or socio-natural, assemblages and/or infrastructures.

Readings:

- Tironi, M., & Rodríguez-Giralt, I. (2017). Healing, knowing, enduring: Care and politics in damaged worlds. *The Sociological Review*, *65*(2_suppl), 89–109. https://doi.org/10.1177/0081176917712874
- Knowles, S. G. (2014). Learning from Disaster? The History of Technology and the Future of Disaster Research. *Technology and Culture*, *55*, 773–784.

Optional reading (recommended, but not required)

- Klinenberg, E. M. (1999). Denaturalizing disaster: A social autopsy of the 1995 Chicago heat wave. *Theory and Society*, (28), 239–295. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006995507723
- Alexievich, S. (2006). *Voices from Chernobyl: The Oral History of a Nuclear Disaster.* London: Picador. [Particularly the Prologue: "A solitary human voice"].
- "When the Levees Broke: A Requiem in Four Parts", a documentary by Spike Lee (available on youtube).

1.4 PhD Presentations

Please be sure to consult the instructions to presenters and the instructions on feedback in this programme.
1. Presenter: Dirk van de Leemput   *Discussant:* Nienke van Pijkeren
2. Presenter: Niko Wojtynia   *Discussant:* Mike Grijseels

Tuesday

2.1 Iris Wallenburg: Caring for Numbers and Regions – Unsettling HealthCare Practices

Care is central to health care: patients are being taking care of by physicians, nurses and allied professionals and, more indirectly, financial controllers, cleaners and inspectors (amongst others). The theoretical notion of care however transcends the empirical boundaries of care-giving, sensing its affective force (Duff 2010) and charged sensibility characterized by worry, attentiveness, and thoughtfulness (Ivanova et al. 2019; Puig de la Bellacasa 2011). Care and caring address many things and issues and often go unnoticed as they occur within mundane practices, usually provided by those who play 'only' a marginal role (e.g. technical lab workers, data scientists, cleaners) but who are significant for success – whether this be a satisfied patient, a high position on the hospital ranking or a safe clinical environment where subordinates dear to 'speak up' to those in charge. STS scholars seek to highlight these hidden socio-technical practices of care in order to envision their world producing effects (Friese 2013; Puig de la Bellacasa 2011).

In this talk, I will follow this tradition and aim to explore the care that goes into healthcare practices to enhance its multitude of outcomes. I build on two ongoing research projects. The first project is about 'Caring for numbers' in which we envision how (often highly criticised) practices of measuring care – think about the use of performance indicators to account for quality of care – encompass various and collaborative practices of measuring and *caring with* quantitative data to enhance clinical and organizational outcomes (Wallenburg et al. 2019).

The second project takes on a somewhat different perspective, and is about the regionalization of elderly care in the Netherlands. In this project, we *act with* healthcare providers and policy makers in rural areas that face increasing staff shortage and a growing elderly population, in order to develop alternative practices of elderly care. Through caring for the elderly in those regions, we demonstrate, also the geographical region itself is taken care of as its identity and liveability are strengthened (see also Ivanova et al. 2016). Through discussing these themes, we also turn our critical gaze upon our own research practices: what role do we as researchers play in caring for our respondents, their work and how do or don't we account for that?

Readings:
Friese, C. (2013), 'Realizing potential in translational medicine: the uncanny emergence of care as science', *Current Anthropology,* 54 (S7), S129-S38.
Ivanova, D., Wallenburg, I., and Bal, R. (2020), 'Place-by-proxy: care infrastructures in a foundling room', *The Sociological Review 68(1),* 144–160.

2.2 Review Part I
Reviewing articles is one of the services we can give to our scholarly communities. It is a good way to help authors develop their arguments, to keep in touch with the latest publications in your field, and to help you think about why a paper does or doesn't work-- one of the most useful writing skills. Good reviews contribute to good writing, and this demonstrates that all writing is about having a productive interplay between individual and collaborative work. There is no such thing as a 'single-authored paper', as acknowledgements of articles always display.

A good review can work miracles – it can really be a 'careful' contribution. It can start a discussion, help an author clarify what an audience will understand, or will fail to grasp. A good review points out important contributions on the topic already in the literature. It helps clarify connections between various parts of the argument (such as between empirical and theoretical sections), and it can suggest reordering a text to avoid confusion. A review can point out which parts could be developed that are very strong, which parts are better left out because they may be interesting but do not fit into the dataset or argument, or how claims could be modified to make them fit the material. To make these points come across, all reviews should contain positive feedback. There is considerable variation in reviewing styles between fields and individuals. Some reviewers even refuse to make a formal recommendation, but only comment on how submissions might be improved. Despite such positive notes, reviews are almost invariably hard to read the first time, and yet the most serious reviews contain the most precious treasures for every author.

Such treasures are at times quite well hidden though. Despite the often truly helpful intentions of reviewers, there are many ways to phrase criticism, and they are not all equally supportive. As Rosalind Gill recently noted, there even seems to be a growing aggression in anonymous peer reviewing, which makes her wonder when it became "acceptable to write of a colleague's work, "this is self-indulgent crap"" (2010, 239).

One of the underlying reasons for harsh language in reviews may be the double blind reviewing procedure which seems to make reviewers forget there is actually a colleague attached to this submission. An alternative reason that has been suggested is that (in the US context?) PhD students do substantial bits of reviewing while they are being trained by reading the best texts and tearing those apart. Another problem is that PhD supervisors do not always do the basic quality control that would be needed before letting their students be savaged by anonymous peer review, or that authors do not have their submissions checked for clarity and correctness of writing. A further problem may be that reviewers increasingly seem to forget that it actually is possible to say that a submission is good and can be accepted for publication! Whatever the reasons may be; this activity aims to help you learn to write a truly helpful review.

Gill, Rosalind (2010). Breaking the silence: the hidden injuries of the neoliberal university. Secrecy and Silence in the Research Process. In Róisín Ryan-Flood and Rosalind Gill, Feminist Reflections. London, Routledge: 228-244.

Preparation:

1. Write a critical review of one of the articles you read for this workshop – you are free to pick any of the assigned readings. Imagine the article to be a draft sent in to a journal (rather than a published piece of work). The review does not need to deal with all kinds of detailed and specific comments about typos etc. It should really focus on the major points that might improve the article. Your review should not be longer than one page. For good examples of such short reviews, you may take a look at http://somatosphere.net/category/books/
2. Bring three print-outs of your review to the workshop. Also, send your review to your peers (fellow group members) **no later than Monday June 1st,** and make sure you read their reviews in advance of the workshop. Also send a copy to the co-ordinators. Email-addresses can be found on the last page of this programme.

During the session, you will work in groups of 3 (see below) to critically discuss each other's reviews. Use the points in italics in the text cited above to structure your discussion. Pay particular attention to the (hidden) treasures, and to how the review, when reviewed, might really become a

'gift' to the author of the paper. Don't worry: this 'gift' may also be that you wish to protect the article from being published – there is no need to be positive only. Take 1 hour to do this. Then swap your reviews, so each of you becomes the author/editor of another person's review. Use the last 30 minutes to think of your newly adopted review, and how you might want to edit it in light of what has been said during the discussion.

The group composition will be as follows:

group 1	group 2	group 3	group 4	group 5	group 6
Dani	Jacqueline	Joyce	Mario	Dirk	Carla
Nienke	Chiara	Irene	Lotje	Ivan	Jing
Sarah Rose	Selen	Denise	Hanna	Niko	Mike

2.3 Esha Shah: Science as care: the history of the gene

One late night in 1926, Herman J Muller, one of the pioneering geneticist, was found shouting out of the window of his office to a colleague working in the office directly below. Muller was overjoyed and excited that he was able to produce mutations in the genetic structure of *Drosophila* (fruit flies) by the application of X-ray. After this news was published in the journal *Science*, Muller became an instant celebrity in the United States. It was a heroic achievement because humans had for the first time wilfully manipulated genetic material and controlling mutations was projected as controlling whole of (human) evolution. By 1929, this initial excitement had turned into a major disappointment, even a nightmare. It became clear that the artificially induced X-ray mutations were not only mostly lethal to the organism but they almost never produced desired traits. Almost after a century, this incident in many different ways finds resonance with the current claims being made on the way genetic editing and modification can cure significant parts of human diseases and also enhance human life span and capacities.

In this lecture, I will refer to several such "moments" in the century-long history of genetic science discussed in my recently published book *Who is the Scientist-Subject? Affective History of the Gene (London: Routledge, 2018)*. I will show how the scientific knowledge on the structure and function of "particulate gene" has been shaped by, what I call, the immortality ideologies. Based on the case study of genetic science, I aim to argue that science is fundamentally existential because it aim to create human immortality – to take humanity to new heights of temporal and spatial expansion, to "perfect humanity's future", even to imagine future possibilities in entirely different way. My claim is that the awareness of finiteness of human life makes care as the basic state of humanity, and the care translates into building the culture of permanence, science being the most powerful form of this culture of permanence.

Readings:
Bauman, Z. (1992). *Mortality, Immortality and Other Life Strategies*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
        Chapter 1: Living with Death, pp. 12 – 50.
Borges, J. L. (1998). The Immortals (A. Hurley, Trans.). In *Collected Fictions Jorge Luis Borges*.
        New York: Penguin Books.

2.4 Review part II

Take the first half hour to individually edit the review you adopted at the end of session 2.1, and focus in particular on 'revealing' the treasure of the review. Then, join your small group again, and discuss the most important revision(s) you made to the review, and in what way this/these may contribute to an improved version of the article.

We will end the session with a short plenary on whether and how these three days of 'thinking with care' have changed your mind about your research, or about other things. Has a specific lecture, discussion and/or reading sparked new interests or insights?

2.5 Goodbye Session

This will be Bernike's last official event as WTMC coordinator. We will mark her contributions and departure during this session.

Wednesday

3.1 and 3.2 Christian Ernsten: River love

My contribution consists of two parts. In part one I respond to a question I was asked during a recent meeting of the Dutch Cultural Heritage Agency, namely: What is the future of river research and conservation? I will take everyday narratives of care with regard to the river Meuse as a point of departure to think through the nature of the river in the Anthropocene, and its associated crises. Following historian Dipesh Chakrabarty's proposition that the crisis of the Anthropocene is essentially a crisis of knowledge, I will invite you to consider different ways of producing knowledge about the river --loving the river would be one of these ways. During part two, I will take you on a river walk, an ethnographic exploration of the Meuse, near Ravenstein. During this journey you will explore notions such as broken or captured natures of the Meuse and river love as strategies of care and conservation.

Readings :
Sandoval, C. (2000) *Methodology of the Oppressed.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 134-153.
Tsing, A. L. (2015) *The Mushroom at the End of the World. On the possibility of Life in Capitalist Ruins.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. vii-xii and 1-25.

3.3 Lunch & round off

We will end the workshop with discussing, over lunch, on whether and how these days of 'thinking with care' have changed your mind about your research, or about other things. Has a specific lecture, discussion and/or reading sparked new interests or insights?

Lecturers

Israel Rodríguez Giralt is Senior Research Fellow at the Internet Interdisciplinary Institute at Universitat Oberta de Catalunya, Spain, where he coordinates the CareNet Research Group (Care and Preparedness in the Network Society). His field of research is the so-called STS (Science and Technology Studies). His work revolves around the forms of social experimentation and political mobilization of citizens, concerned and affected groups in environmental crisis, disasters and public technoscientific controversies.

Iris Wallenburg is associate professor of Valuation in Healthcare and a former nurse, as well as a former WTMC-student. She is based at the Erasmus University Rotterdam. Using STS -insights, her work particularly focusses on the valuation of professional work in the healthcare domain, moving in and between the policy field and clinical/care work floor practices. Her main interest lies in the sociology of numbers and quantitative practices. She is currently involved in two national action-oriented projects, one on the regionalization of elderly care in the Netherlands, and one on valuing and crafting nursing work. The notions of care, numbers and place are central to her work.

Christian Ernsten is Assistant Professor in Cultural History in the Department of History of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at Maastricht University. He is affiliated with the Maastricht Centre for Arts and Culture, Conservation, and Heritage (MACCH). His research is situated at the intersection of the fields of heritage studies, urban studies and postcolonial studies. He specializes in the study of the heritage practices involved conservation and design of urban and natural landscapes, both locally *and* globally. Currently, he explores the interrelations between rivers' cultural and natural heritage in the Maastricht and Cape Town regions, applying, amongst others, transdisciplinary research methodologies, such as embedded ethnographic research, walking as a form of embodied research, and photographic recordings.

Esha Shah is Assistant Professor with the Environmental Science Groups at Wageningen University. All her past and current research is focused on anthropology, history and philosophy of science and technology with special reference to traditional and modern water control technologies in India, GMOs, Green revolution, farmers' suicides. More recently, she is developing her research interests on 'affective histories' of the modes of development, normativity, rationality, and knowledge practices, including the way human subjectivity shape objectivity in science and engineering. She is currently working on the following research projects: 1) the way ideals and practices of manliness and masculinity shaped the colonial history of dam engineering, 2) the way 'imagineering' mega-hydraulic infrastructure such as large dams and the colossal National River Interlinking Project in India are concretely manifested in creating distinct political identities and subjectivities.

About the coordinators

Anne Beaulieu is associate professor of Science and Technology Studies at Campus Fryslan, and director of the Data Research Centre, University of Groningen. At Campus Fryslan, she leads the research group Knowledge Infrastructures for Sustainability. She coordinates the minor Data Wise: Data Science in Society (together with Gert Stulp) and the major Responsible Planet at University College Fryslan. Beaulieu's work focuses on diversity and complexity in knowledge infrastructures. Her contributions provide insights into how data is created, synthesized and transformed into evidence, and how databases, platforms and data flows shape what we know and who has access to this knowledge. Since September 2018, she is co-coordinator of the PhD training network of the Netherlands Graduate Research School of Science, Technology and Modern Culture (WTMC). She is also a member of the board of Studium Generale Groningen and of Studium Generale Leeuwarden, and of the NIAS-Lorentz Advisory Board.

Bernike Pasveer is assistant professor at the department of Society Studies of the Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences (FASoS) at Maastricht University. She holds a PhD in STS from the University of Amsterdam. She has worked on medical (imaging) technologies; on how (medical) technologies are constitutive of the human body's "natural" achievements such as childbirth, reproduction, and sports. With Ingunn Moser and Oddgeir Synnes she published an edited volume entitled *Ways of Home Making. On Home and Care at the End of Life (*Palgrave, 2020). Her current research is on food, refuge, and belonging. She is member of the NIAS Scientific Committee, the NIAS-Lorentz Advisory Board, director of debating centre Sphinx in Maastricht, and an amateur singer.

Participants

No.	First name	Surname	University/Organisation	What is the topic of your research (5 lines)?
1	Nienke	van Pijkeren	Erasmus University Rotterdam	In this PhD trajectory, I study how the future of healthcare in (mainly non-metropolitan) rural regions is taking place. I do ethnographic research with (health) professionals working in nursing homes, home care organizations or hospitals and I hope to contribute to the growing field of human geography and care.
2	Lotje	Siffels	Radboud University	My PhD is part of the 'Digital Good'-project, which investigates the 'Googlization of health'. Consumer tech companies are increasingly getting involved in the health domain. This project aims to investigate the different conceptions of the common good that are at stake in these new partnerships and to provide a normative framework for these new collaborations.
3	Denise	Petzold	Maastricht University	I investigate how the heritage of classical music is maintained or conserved in an array of musical practices taking place outside the concert hall. With the help of STS and Museum Studies, I first want to understand how musical works are made obdurate through and within these practices. Subsequently, I ask how these works can be 'opened up' in order for musical institutions to address the tension between the current drive for innovation in the classical music landscape and the conservation of its artistic heritage. My project is positioned in the Maastricht Centre for the Innovation of Classical Music (MCICM).
4	Mario	Pinzón-Camargo	University of Twente	I am exploring the role performed by Institutional Entrepreneurs in inclusive innovation initiatives in local communities in Colombia to contribute to the understanding the relevance of these initiatives in initiating processes of path-transformative development. This analysis will be done through the study, on the one hand, of Institutional Entrepreneurs' actions implemented in projects supported by the National government, and, on the other, of their interplays with other actors such as National policymakers, Science, Technology and Innovation experts, local authorities and communities, among others, in such projects.
5	Irene	Niet	TU Eindhoven	Governance of AI in the energytransition
6	Joyce	Hoek	University of Groningen	Before a new medicine can be used by people, it needs to be assessed by a regulatory authority that needs to combine scientific evidence of its efficacy and safety with social and ethical judgment. I will be studying this decision-making process by looking at the context in which these decisions get made and the aspects that influence the outcome, specifically focusing on the role of statistical evidence.
7	Mike	Grijseels	Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam	In my research with the working title "scripting for inclusion" I explore the possibilities technology can provide towards improving inclusion of people with disabilities. For now I focus on the labour market and how technology can help people find- or keep a job or keep a job but also how the introduction of technology can "make" disability.
8	Jacqueline (Jackie)	Ashkin	Universiteit Leiden	My research examines the relationship between evaluation practice and knowledge production in marine science. What do we value in contemporary studies of the ocean, and what lines of inquiry does this make (im)possible? Part of the ERC project FluidKnowledge.
9	Ivan	Veul	Radboud University	In my PhD project I inquire into the indeterminate situation surrounding Big Tech (Google, Amazon, Facebook, Apple and Microsoft). During my project, I will use several technology assessment/design techniques to problematize the situation and come to an alternative way of organizing Big Tech that better aligns with the public's values.
10	Sarah Rose	Bieszczad	Leiden University	My research, as part of the larger Fluid Knowledge project, focuses on evaluation and knowledge production practices in European Marine Science.
11	Selen	Eren	University of Gronigen	My PhD project aims to first understand how scientific knowledge is produced through the combination of various new and old techniques of data gathering and data analysis, such as ground surveys and big data analysis, and secondly to contribute to knowledge production processes (or knowledge infrastructures) by making them more reliable and sustainable.
12	Chiara	Carboni	Erasmus University Rotterdam	My research focuses on the implications of new technologies for professional roles in health care. Through ethnographic case studies, I will investigate the interplay between the development of technological innovations (what expectations about health care professions and care provision are embedded in their design?) and how health care professionals navigate the implementation of these innovations in clinical settings.
13	Hanna	Stalenhoef	Erasmus University	As part of the REGIOZ project at Erasmus University, I look at the way elderly care is organized in geographic regions. In particular I am interested in the movement of care to new spaces.

14	Dirk	Van de Leemput	Maastricht University, Fasos	I study the precarious socio-material networks of time-based media artworks, as well as how museums and other actors care for these socio-material artworks. The project aims to develop better understanding of technoscientific "obsolescence", while at the same time giving museums more insight into how they could care for the technologies they need. My project is a cooperation between Maastricht University and Tate
15	Dani	Shanley	Maastricht University	I explore the pre-history of technology assessment and the appropriate technology movement as ways of understanding the changing relationship between technology and society since the 1970s.
16	Carla	Greubel	Utrecht University	My research is situated at the intersection of STS and Ageing Studies. Drawing on ethnographic fieldwork, participant observation in stakeholder co-creation workshops, and additional interviews, it analyses material discursive practices of valuing the 'good later life' as they are enacted by elderly citizens and stakeholders within the European Smart Living Environments Large Scale Pilot (LSP) project GATEKEEPER.
17	Niko	Wojtynia	Utrecht University	I'm working on a project that aims to develop transition / transformation pathways towards a regenerative agricultural system in the Netherlands. A different appreciation of and care for the environment are crucial to this.
18	Jing	Wang	Radboud University	Journal quality in China

PhD Presentation guidelines

For presenters

- Send the title & summary of your presentation to the discussant assigned to you at least 1 week before the workshop.
- A projector and PC are available. Copy your presentation onto the PC in advance. You may want to use your own laptop, which usually works fine, but mind that it poses an extra risk of technical issues. Also, if you have video material, make sure you have it downloaded locally. There is internet, but relying on YouTube etc. is risky.
- The duration of your presentation should be **15 minutes**. Then there is another 15 minutes for the discussant and plenary discussion. We keep time very strictly.
- Try to make a sophisticated choice on what you want to present. One typical pitfall is wanting to give an overview of your whole PhD project, which leads to an unfocused and overloaded presentation. Rather select an interesting aspect of your research and discuss it in-depth.

For discussants

- Make sure you receive the title & summary of the presentation at least 1 week before the workshop. Contact the presenter if needed.
- After the presentation: join the presenter in the front of the room
- Present your comments in **5 minutes** max.
- Mind that being a discussant is not about pointing out all the flaws in the presenter's argument, but about setting the stage for a constructive discussion. Offering critique is good, but also try to bring out what the potentials of the argument are for improvement, and to identify some questions for the speaker or the group as a whole.
- You may want to get in touch with the presenter to prepare some comments. Feedback should address the quality of the presentation itself (slides, clarity, focus) as well as its content.

All others

- Listen carefully and attentively to the presentation.
- Please fill in a **feedback form** for each presentation. They can be found at the end of the reader. They will be collected and given to the presenter. We will bring spare copies for people who don't print out the reader.
- Join the discussion after the discussant has given their feedback.
- Chances are that there is not enough time to discuss all questions from the audience. Please write them down on the feedback form. Even without discussion, your questions might be very valuable for the presenter!

Feedback on Presentations

This is to help you give feedback to your fellow participants, some of whom will be presenting their research during this event. Feedback forms will be available at Soeterbeeck. Use a separate sheet for each presentation, put your name and that of the presenter at the top of a piece of paper. That way, if something isn't clear, the presenter knows whom to ask. Write your comments during or immediately after the presentation and give them to the presenter during the next break.

Points to consider when preparing feedback (you don't need to cover everything):

- Attractiveness of title and opening
- Usefulness of summary provided in the reader
- Clarity and significance of problem definition, research questions and aims (refinement of, addition to, clarification or rejection of an existing thesis)
- Use of theory and/or historiography (concepts, interpretations, etc.)
- Embeddedness in fields relevant to WTMC
- Clarity of structure
- Presentation of the method(s) employed
- Validity and reliability of the method(s) employed
- Accessibility of the research data to the audience
- Use of (intriguing and relevant) details and examples
- Clarity of argument
- Relation to the nature and level of expertise of audience
- Use of PowerPoint and other audio-visual resources
- Contact with audience and audibility of speech
- Clarity and significance of conclusions
- Response to questions and comments
- Time management