

WTMC SERIES

ON TEACHING & LEARNING STS

Archiving

(online workshop)

Autumn Workshop

2023



WTMC

*Netherlands Graduate Research School
of Science, Technology and Modern Culture*

WTMC Series on Teaching and Learning STS

Publication of the Netherlands Graduate Research School
of Science, Technology and Modern Culture (WTMC)

Director:

Esther Turnhout

Training co-ordinators:

Alexandra Supper & Andreas Weber

Practical information & registration:

wtmc@utwente.nl

Cover design:

Zahar Koretsky

Information about the series:

a.supper@maastrichtuniversity.nl

a.weber@utwente.nl

Available at: <https://www.wtmc.eu/wtmc-series/>

issn: 2666-2892

DOI: 10.3990/4.2666-2892.2023.03

Contents

| | |
|------------------------------------|----|
| Directions | 4 |
| Practical Notes | 5 |
| Programme | 6 |
| Introduction to the workshop | 8 |
| Detailed overview | 10 |
| About the speakers | 15 |
| About the co-ordinators | 17 |
| List of Participants | 18 |
| PhD Presentation guidelines | 24 |
| Feedback on Presentations | 25 |

Directions

Instead of a map of how to get to Soeterbeeck, we provide a map of how to get to our chosen platform and an introduction of our guide for this journey... We will be using Zoom in connection with a shared google document. Each day has a different Zoom link. You find all links at several places in the program below. What can you expect? During most of the day we will make use of Zoom, sometimes we'll also use the shared google document to give you the chance to make collaborative notes and prepare questions for the presenters, or to simply exchange ideas and thoughts among each other.

In case you have opted to meet up with other participants near you to parts of the workshop together in satellite events, we will make sure that you have the contact details of others near you who also wish to make use of this opportunity, and leave it to you to arrange the rest. Our recommendation is that you focus these efforts for the programme of Monday and Wednesday. The reason for this is that we will want to make use of Zoom break-out rooms for some of the sessions on Tuesday: experience shows that it can be tricky to have people who are in the same physical space spread out over different break-out rooms. So please make sure that you are in a physical space where you can individually join a break-out room on Tuesday.

Before the workshop starts, we will also provide you with links to watch the pre-recorded video lectures.

Practical notes

To do before the Workshop

Allow about two weeks for preparation of this workshop. The compulsory literature consists of roughly 320 pages. At 8 pages per hour, this takes about 38 hours. We expect you to spend about 2 more hours to prepare the skills training, 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:

1. 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. There is preparation for the skills workshop that you need to do BEFORE the workshop.
2. Read all the assigned literature before the start of the workshop. 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.
3. Watch the pre-recorded lectures, which are circulated before the start of the workshop. Perhaps some of the questions you noted down based on the readings are answered by the lectures; and almost certainly, new questions will arise. Make sure to keep track of your thoughts, comments and questions, so that we can draw upon them during the workshop.
4. Check the programme to see if you are a discussant for one of the PhD presentations. Look at the instructions towards the end of this programme which contains guidelines for presenters, discussants and all others!
5. All mentioned time-slots are expressed in **Central European Time (CET)**, for conversation to your location and time zone please use websites such as: <https://www.timeanddate.com>

Attendance and cancellation

- *The workshop will be a mediated, largely synchronous event with asynchronous elements (e.g. pre-recorded lectures).* In the context of this workshop, attendance means being logged on with your camera on during synchronous events (e.g. Q&As, PhD presentations, exercises), as much as bandwidth allows. In order to prevent connection problems, we recommend to use a wired internet connection. Almost all modern routers allow for connections with a network cable. It also means participating in the asynchronous activities that we have included in the programme in order to limit screen fatigue.
- In order to receive credit for attending the workshop, *you are required to be present throughout the entire event.* Only calamities are grounds 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 Ilse Schipper-Jongman (wttmc@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 working days prior to the start of the workshop, you will receive a refund for all of the fees, minus €150 to cover the costs of administration and course materials.

In the case of cancellations received less than 10 working days before the start of the workshop, fees and any other costs that have been incurred by WTMC will not be refunded.

Programme (in CET)

| Monday, 6 November: STS and Archiving | | |
|---|-----|---|
| 11:00 – 12:00 | 1.1 | Logging in & welcome & preparing the skills session |
| 12:00 – 12:45 | | Lunch break |
| 12:45 – 14:15 | 1.2 | Skills 1: interviewing each other |
| 14:15 – 14:30 | | Coffee break |
| 14:30 – 15:30 | 1.3 | Core reading 1: in small groups |
| 15:30 – 16:00 | | Coffee break |
| 16:00 – 17:00 | 1.4 | Q&A with Geoffrey Bowker, <i>The Dream of the Perfect Archive</i> |
| | | |
| Tuesday, 7 November: Archives of Politics and Politics of Archives | | |
| 11:00 – 12:00 | 2.1 | Q&A with Charles Jeurgens, <i>Recordkeeping: in the interests of government and citizens</i> |
| 12:00 – 13:00 | | Lunch break |
| 13:00 – 14:00 | 2.2 | PhD presentations |
| 14:00 – 14:30 | | Coffee break |
| 14:30 – 15:30 | 2.3 | Skills 2: reporting back about the interviews |
| 15:30 – 16:00 | | Coffee break |
| 16:00 – 17:00 | 2.4 | Q&A with Hannah Turner, <i>Imperfect Archives and Bad Data: Museums and Mundane Bureaucracies that Matter</i> |
| | | |
| Wednesday, 8 November: Academic and Corporate Archives | | |
| 10:00 – 11:00 | 3.1 | Q&A with Jorijn van Duijn, <i>Contingent archiving: An evolutionary approach to creating corporate archives</i> |
| 11:00 – 11:30 | | Coffee break |
| 11.30 – 12:30 | 3.2 | Core reading 2: reporting back |
| 12.30 – 13.00 | | Lunch break |
| 13:45 – 14:45 | 3.3 | Q&A with Andrea Scharnhorst, <i>Open Science, FAIRness and the role of data archiving in it</i> |
| 14.45 – 15:00 | | Coffee break |
| 15:00 – 15:30 | 3.4 | Farewell & virtual group picture |

Introduction to the Workshop

Welcome to the Workshop. Together with our guest speakers, we will explore the practices and politics involved in archiving in a variety of settings: digital and analogue, scholarly and corporate, personal and institutional. The exploration starts here, well before you arrive at the online event. This programme, together with some texts, 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. The compulsory reading material amounts to (the equivalent of) roughly 320 pages, which at 8 pages per hour would take you about 38 hours to study. Also, some assignments require preparation, others require you to bring certain things. And finally, we will have a number of participant presentations. Take care to know 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.

We will work with a variety of different formats and assignments throughout the workshop. The lectures have been pre-recorded, allowing you to prepare by watching them in the lead-up to the workshop itself, and allowing us to focus our valuable time that we have together in the synchronous setting of a Zoom environment on dynamic and interactive discussions with the speakers.

In general, it is good practice to prepare one or more written questions about the reading material and about the pre-recorded lectures for each session. This helps focus your attention during the workshop, and it ensures that you have something to contribute to the discussion. 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.

Archiving & STS

In this workshop, we will address questions about the politics and practices of archiving from a variety of perspectives, involving a variety of guest speakers.

On Monday, Geoffrey Bowker helps us to set the foundation for an STS approach to the study of archives by inviting us to explore the dream of a ‘perfect archive’.

On Tuesday, we zoom in on the intersection between archiving and politics (of governments as well as public institutions such as museums), drawing on the contributions by Charles Jeurgens and Hannah Turner.

On Wednesday, and with the help of Jorijn van Duijn and Andrea Scharnhorst, we turn our attention to the role of archiving practices in corporate and academic settings.

In addition to these lectures and Q&A sessions, we will have a variety of other activities, including a skills training and a discussion of core readings, that help us explore the ways in which STS can make sense of archiving practices, whether those are the archiving practices of others or

the ones that we engage in ourselves as part of our data management efforts. The workshop will be rounded off by presentations of PhD researchers.

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

Alexandra Supper and Andreas Weber

Detailed overview

Monday 6 November: STS and Archiving

1.1 Welcome

We will kick off our workshop with a short opening session to discuss the programme of the coming days.

1.2 Skills training, part 1: Interviewing each other

In this skills session, we want you to practice your skills of qualitative interviewing, as well learning about each other's research in relation to some of the themes of the workshop, by interviewing each other (in pairs that take turns interviewing each other; or groups of three in which person A interviews person B, who interviews person C, who interviews person A).

Before the start of the workshop, make sure that you have read the literature below, and prepare an interview guide that you can use when interviewing your fellow WTMC participant (without yet knowing who they are or what their research is about). The interview should in any case pay attention to the following topics:

- the ways in which they manage, file and archive their research data
- whether the preparation for this workshop have made them rethink, ponder or remodel anything about how they conduct and manage any aspects of their research process
- at least one other subject that you think would help you to learn more about the other participant in relation to the themes of the workshop

The qualitative interviews itself should take about 30-45 minutes per participant.

Required Reading:

- S. J. Taylor, R. Bogdan, & DeVault, M. L. (2016). *Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods* (4th ed.). Wiley. Chapter 4, "In-Depth Interviewing", pp. 101-134.

1.3 Core Reading Session, part 1

In this first core reading session, we approach the theme of the workshop by reading parts of two important books in the field: 1] [Uncertain archives](#): Critical keywords for big data edited by Nanna Bonde Thylstrup and colleagues and 2] a short chapter from Ann Stoler's classic study [Along the Archival Grain](#). While Ann Stoler's monograph is certainly a classic in the field, the first book is only published very recently. So instead of using the core reading session to read 'only' an older classic in the field, we have this time opted for including a 'future classic' in the program. These readings can serve as inspiration for the discussions which we will have over the three workshop

days. Please make notes while reading and bring your notes and questions with you to this online session.

In this first core reading session, we will give you the opportunity to discuss the assigned texts in small groups.

Required Reading:

- Thylstrup, N.B. et al. (eds.), *Uncertain Archives. Critical Keywords for Big Data* (Boston: MIT Press, 2021), 1-29, Acknowledgments [A.W. and Introduction]
- Louisa Amore, "Ethics," in: *Uncertain Archives. Critical Keywords for Big Data*, ed. by N.B. Thylstrup (Boston: MIT Press, 2021), 203-208
- Tonia Sutherland, "Remains," in *Uncertain Archives. Critical Keywords for Big Data*, ed. by N.B. Thylstrup (Boston: MIT Press, 2021), 435-444.
- Ann Laura Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 1-16.

1.4 Q&A with Geoffrey Bowker, The Dream of the Perfect Archive

The theme of the perfect archive is doubled in the sciences. First, there is the belief that science, like the law or some religions (for example, Christianity and Judaism) have a perfect memory of the past. Second, there is the belief that nature provides us with a perfect archive, which we can learn to read. And yet both these archival sets are interestingly incomplete and flawed. I discuss the generative power of the dream; and the systemic nature of its problems.

Required Reading:

- G.C. Bowker (2019), 'The Empire of the Future', *History and Theory*, 58: 135-147.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/hith.12104>
- G.C. Bowker (2008), "Introduction," in: *Memory Practices in the Sciences* (Boston: MIT Press), pp. 1-34.

Tuesday 7 November: Archives of Politics and Politics of Archives

2.1 Q&A with Charles Jeurgens, Recordkeeping: in the interests of government and citizens

Based on the extensive child benefits scandal that has seriously affected many thousands of citizens in the Netherlands, I will discuss the role, meaning and challenges of archiving in contemporary society. Which societal values are at play? What forms of information processing are we talking about? Which legal frameworks do we have to take into account? What competencies should recordkeeping professionals have? I will pay attention to all these aspects and I will try to answer the question of what information professionals should have learned from the child benefit scandal.

Required Reading:

- Jennifer Douglas, "Origins and Beyond: The ongoing evolution of archival ideas about provenance," in: Heather MacNeil and Terry Eastwood (eds) *Currents of Archival Thinking* (Santa Barbara 2017), pp. 25-52.

- Barbara Reed, Gillian Oliver, Frank Upward and Joanne Evans, “Multiple rights in records: the role of recordkeeping informatics,” in: Caroline Brown (eds) *Archival Futures* (London 2018), pp. 99-116.

Optional Reading:

- Giovanni Colavizza, Tobias Blanke, Charles Jeurgens, Julia Noordegraaf, “Archives and AI: An Overview of Current Debates and Future Perspectives,” in *Journal on Computing and Cultural Heritage* 15, 1, article no.: 4: pp 1–15,
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3479010> <https://dl.acm.org/doi/full/10.1145/3479010>.

2.2 PhD presentations

1. Presenter: Jelena Stankovic, Discussant: Tamalone van den Eijnden
2. Presenter: Nada Akrouh, Discussant: Anastasia Stoli

Important: See the guidelines for presenters and discussants at the end of this reader.

2.3 Skills Session, part 2: reporting back about the interviews

In this second part of our skills session, we will discuss the experiences of yesterday’s interviews and reflect on what we have learned about the process of qualitative interviewing, as well as on some of the most interesting insights about our own data management and archiving practices.

2.4 Q&A with Hannah Turner, Imperfect Archives and Bad Data: Museums and Mundane Bureaucracies that Matter

This talk will explore the idea that no system of organization management is perfect, and that the contextual and personal ways that collections are organized and controlled is a key part of understanding how to repair these systems. As knowledge organization systems like archives and museums inherit the epistemologies of colonialism and reinscribe it into daily practice, what are the ways individuals are working with and against these systems in their work? How are workers inserting a daily practice of care to the materials they steward? What is at stake when understanding how bureaucratic practice actually works? What makes the documentary record not only imperfect, but bad – a moral and ethical judgment on the warrant of historical information?

Required Reading:

- Littletree, Sandra, Miranda Belarde-Lewis, and Marisa Duarte (2020), “Centering Relationality: A Conceptual Model to Advance Indigenous Knowledge Organization Practices,” *Knowledge Organization* 47 (5): 410–26, doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-2020-5.
- Turner, Hannah (2020), Chapter 5: Object, Specimen, Data: Computerization and the Legacy of Dirty Data. In *Cataloguing Culture: Legacies of Colonialism in Museum Documentation* (Vancouver: UBC Press), pp. 157-184.

Wednesday 8 November: Academic and Corporate Archives

3.1. Q&A with Jorijn van Duijn, Contingent archiving: An evolutionary approach to creating corporate archives

Within rapidly growing companies, the creation a professional corporate archive and unlocking the historical collection for – at least – internal usage can be navigated and understood through an evolutionary approach. Dealing with an uncertain mandate to use and create an archive, having an indefinite collection, and having to comply to strict demands on confidentiality & (digital & physical) data security are just a few of the challenges. That is if the benefits of having a corporate archive are widely established in the company at all. An evolutionary approach considers the basics of variation & selection: mutation, selection and reproduction, or – used here in reference to wider bodies of literature – respectively ‘fortuna’, ‘virtu’ and ‘path’. During his contribution, Jorijn van Duijn will share his first-hand experiences in creating and using (physical & digital) corporate archives of semiconductor equipment manufacturers ASML and ASM.

Required Reading:

- Jorijn van Duijn (2019), *Fortunes of High-Tech: A History of Innovation at ASM International, 1958-2008*. PhD thesis, Maastricht University. Excerpts from Introduction and Afterword.
- Draft job description: *Archivist ASML company archive*

3.2. Core reading session, part 2

In the second part of our core reading session, we will report back in plenary about Monday’s discussions in smaller groups.

3.3 Q&A with Andrea Scharnhorst, Open Science, FAIRness and the role of data archiving in it

The Open Science paradigm sets the boundary conditions for knowledge production nowadays. Research Data have never been so much under the focus as right now. From a science-of-science point of view one could say, data are closely linked to research infrastructures. When it comes to actually looking at practices around data, the situation - as always - reveals a much more complex picture. As PhD students you might have been already exposed to requirements when it comes to the 'data' you use. Research Data Management has become a required, formalised way of doing (project-funded) research. This lecture tells the story of making data FAIR from the perspective of a research data archive. What are the science policy frameworks we work under, how do we work with scientific communities, how do we embrace new technologies?

The pre-recorded lecture produced by Andrea Scharnhorst in preparation for the workshop can be watched here: https://utwente.yuja.com/v/WTMC_Scharnhorst Password: Archiving2023

Required Reading:

- Christine Borgman (2015), *Big Data, Little Data, No Data: Scholarship in the Networked World*. MIT Press, pp. 3-15.
- Gregory, K. (2021), Findable and reusable? Data discovery practices in research. Maastricht University. <https://doi.org/10.26481/dis.20210302kg>. “Introduction” & “Summary”. [*The rest of the dissertation, and in particular chapter 5 which discusses a large scale survey project, is recommended as further reading.*]
- Borgman, C, Scharnhorst, A & Golshan, MS (2019), “Digital data archives as knowledge infrastructures: Mediating data sharing and reuse,” *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 70, no. 8: 888-904, <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24172>; preprint version: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1802.02689>

3.4 Farewell & virtual group picture

We will wrap our online workshop with a farewell session and a virtual group picture.

About the speakers

Geoffrey C. Bowker is Professor at the School of Information and Computer Science, University of California at Irvine, where he directs a laboratory for Values in the Design of Information Systems and Technology. Recent positions include Professor of and Senior Scholar in Cyberscholarship at the University of Pittsburgh iSchool and Executive Director, Center for Science, Technology and Society, Santa Clara. He also acted as the anchor teacher of the WTMC summer school in 2011. Together with Leigh Star he wrote *Sorting Things Out: Classification and its Consequences*; his most recent book is *Memory Practices in the Sciences*.

Charles Jeurgens is professor of archival science at University of Amsterdam. He also advises the National Archives in the field of strategic developments and is a member of the "Adviescommissie Informatiehuishouding" at the Ministry of Justice. <https://www.uva.nl/profiel/j/e/k.j.p.f.m.jeurgens/k.j.p.f.m.jeurgens.html#>

Andrea Scharnhorst is senior research fellow at DANS. In her academic career she moved from statistical physics, to philosophy of science, scientometrics and information sciences. She has published on models of innovation and science dynamics, the Matthew effect in science, the evolution of classification systems, the use of digital research archives, visual interfaces for information navigation, and the application of linked data in the humanities. Often her work entails the transfer of concepts and methods at an interface between physics and social sciences and humanities. Dr. Scharnhorst coordinated and participated in several EU- and national funded projects. From 2013-2017 she was chair of the COST Action TD1210 "Knowescape". Most recently, she was one of the PI's of the Digging into Data project "Digging into the knowledge graph".

Hannah Turner is an Assistant Professor in the School of Information at the University of British Columbia. At the intersection of museum history, science and technology, and critical information studies, her research explores how documentation technologies in museums inherit the ideologies of settler colonialism. Her work broadly investigates how ethnographic material culture has been produced and circulated using different recording and documentation technologies through time. In particular, she is interested in how technologies can be used ethically for better practice between museums and originating communities.

Her book, *Cataloguing Culture* (UBC Press, 2020) is a history of ethnographic documentation practices and the cataloguing of material culture collections in the Smithsonian's Department of Anthropology. She has published elsewhere on the politics of digital access, participatory design, histories of access to archives, the organization of knowledge in museums, and most recently on the transmediation of contemporary Indigenous weaving. She is currently the editor of the *Journal, Museum Anthropology*.

Jorijn van Duijn is active as employee of ASM on European governmental affairs (part-time) and as freelancing consultant and Industry Historian under the name of 'Tijdeloos Advies' (Timeless Advice). Since September 2023, in the capacity of 'Senior Manager Governmental Affairs Europe',

Jorijn aligns, educates and influences government on the company & industry's intricacies, and vice-versa. As consultant and Industry Historian, I help organizations and individuals to effectuate their history. Stories and solidly reconstructed histories can help to create a corporate identity, relevant for recruitment, communication, legal, and strategic purposes. Clients are, or have been: ASML (creation of a corporate archive), ASM, PhotonDelta, BESI, the Dutch Ministry of Economic Affairs & Climate, Dutch Lithography Museum, ForwardOne, selected individuals, and various singular consultations. In 2019, Jorijn obtained his PhD with a vast dissertation called *Fortunes of High-Tech: A History of Innovation at ASM International, 1958-2008*. For this study, he relied eventually upon an expansive personal archive of company founder Arthur del Prado, which Jorijn prepared for sustainable storage afterwards.

About the coordinators:

Alexandra Supper is an assistant professor at the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Maastricht University. Her research interests include the role of sensory skills in scientific practice, the construction of scientific authority and the dynamics of (inter)disciplinary communities. She serves as (associate) editor of the journals *Science and Technology Studies* and *Journal of Sonic Studies*. Alexandra holds an MA degree in sociology from the University of Vienna (2007) and a PhD in science and technology studies, which includes WTMC training, from Maastricht University (2012).

Andreas Weber is an associate professor in the section Knowledge, Transformation & Society (KiTeS). Most of his research and teaching examine the relationship between Science, Technology and Society from a long-term historical and global perspective. Andreas has a special interest in colonial histories of science (in particular: natural history and chemistry) and sustainability. This includes research into how computational technologies are and can be used to contextualize digitized museum and archive collections, e.g. biodiversity heritage collections from former colonial areas. Andreas holds a PhD degree in History (2012) from Leiden University.

List of participants

| | First name | Surname | University/Organisation | Department | | What is the topic of your research (5 lines) |
|---|------------|--------------|-----------------------------|--|--|---|
| 1 | Maud | Oostindie | Maastricht University | Philosophy | | I ethnographically investigate communication and conflict in online public spaces, with a focus on moderation and the online-offline nexus. Conceptually, my research builds on deliberative theory and STS. |
| 2 | Margot | Kersing | Erasmus University | DPAS ESSB and HCG ESHPM | | My research is about how the use of big data in the social local domain influences the work of street-level bureaucrats, their interactions with citizens and the lives of citizens. |
| 3 | Stefan | Gaillard | Radboud University | Institute for Science in Society | | I investigate the concept of overpromising and how it occurs in nanobiology. I start with a conceptualization of overpromising, indicating how it differs from other kinds of promises, and then analyze how (over)promises are expressed by nanobiologists in different media. |
| 4 | Marije | Miedema | Rijksuniversiteit Groningen | Media and Journalism Studies & Knowledge Infrastructures | | From critical (data) center studies perspective, I aim to formulate an alternative approach to sustainable everyday engagement with personal digital archiving practices, exploring the future of our digital past. Questioning for whom do we preserve and at what (environmental) cost? |
| 5 | Sophie | van der Does | Radboud Universiteit | Institute for science in society | | I am researching inter- and transdisciplinary research |

| | | | | | | |
|---|----------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 6 | Jelena | Stankovic | Maastricht University | History | | In my research I am looking at the role of oil firms in developing solar energy during 'long age of scarcity' from roughly 1968 to 1986. Therefore, I am looking at multiple oil firms (big, medium, small) and their engagement (e.g investments) with solar PV. Addressing the outset of the oil relationship, as the dominant energy regime carrier, with renewable energy ,such as solar, offers the potential to better understand the current energy transition. |
| 7 | Lenn | Gorissen | University of Twente | Section Knowledge, Transformation & Society (KiTeS) | | My work aims to study expectations and imaginaries and explore possible transition pathways related to the new concept of 'Technology-4-Ecology-based farming' (T4E). The PhD project is part of the Synergia project that aims to develop ecological forms of arable, dairy and horticulture farming and new types of technological and socio-technical systems that challenge current forms of agriculture. |
| 8 | Tamalone | van den Eijnden | University of Twente | Behaviour Management and Society | | I develop a grounded theory of transformative change in the context of environmental degradation and biodiversity loss. The theory will be developed through reflexive engagement with material actions and practices of activist initiatives and in relation to specific visions and imaginaries of a better world; it radically question the status quo, it recognizes sustainability and research as inherently political issues. |
| 9 | Maliene | Kip | Technische Universiteit Eindhoven | INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERING & | | In this PhD project I will study how from the twentieth century onwards scientific knowledge, colonial developments and industrial modernization |

| | | | | | | |
|----|-------|--------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | INNOVATION SCIENCES | | contributed to the development of transnational production chains of edible oils, fats and protein. These connected the Netherlands food and agriculture with the rest of the world. This historical study analyses the developments and provides perspectives for contemporary initiatives in protein and food transitions. |
| 10 | Nada | Akrouh | Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam | Health Care Governance | | In my PhD I research novel ways for analyzing patient narratives, for which different methods (citizen science, computational methods and qualitative methods) are being integrated. I also look at the epistemic value we acquire from the extracted experiential knowledge and the interdisciplinary work that is needed to analyze these patient narratives. |
| 11 | Jill | van der Kamp | Radboud University | Institute for Science in Society | | While early screening via home-based digital testing is considered promising for prevention, detection and treatment of chronic diseases, it is not self-evident that citizens are able and willing to use these tests. In the transdisciplinary project Check@Home, I investigate with participatory mixed methods the needs, concerns and real-life experiences among citizens, regarding digital home-based screening and follow-up. |
| 12 | Masha | Denisova | Maastricht University | Health, Ethics and Society | | My research explores the co-production process between private healthcare organisations and evidence-based medicine in Russia. Drawing from the informality studies and STS, I study how private healthcare spaces enable new |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---------|-------------|------------------------------|------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | knowledge practices; and how these spaces are secured in the challenging environment of Russian healthcare. |
| 13 | Nina | de Bakker | Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam | Athena Institute | | Ethnography on how neighbourhood initiatives and active citizens in Amsterdam Southeast aim to reduce health inequalities. As many neighbourhood initiatives and active citizens focus on sustainable food transitions, this is a big part of my project. |
| 14 | Gianna | Marsman | Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam | Athena Institute | | This research explores how structurally embedding reflexivity practices in the institutions of the healthcare system and in the habits of its individuals, can contribute to the long-term adaptability (sustainability) of that system. |
| 15 | Windson | Lin | University of Groningen | History | | My PhD project examines the global circulation of the medical phenomenon "neurasthenia" between China and the United States. Through the case study, the project intends to provide a historical, theoretical and critical study of translation/ transformation between different knowledge systems. |
| 16 | Tessel | Wijne | Utrecht University | Copernicus | | The role of academia in the transition towards animal-free safety assessment of chemicals, with a specific focus on regulatory acceptance of new models and the views on risk. |
| 17 | Wise | Van Engelen | University of Twente | BMS Kites | | My research looks at foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) in northern Botswana through a multispecies lens. It studies how this disease has been framed, manipulated and managed by different actors; how current biosecurity measures impact human-animal |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--------|---------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | relations, and how recent efforts at (transboundary) conservation are leading to policy reform, shifting disease geographies, and a restructuring of disease ecologies. |
| 18 | Natasa | Stoli | Maastricht University | Department of Health, Ethics and Society | | How to ensure meaningful public participation in governing matters of collective concern? With the growth of distrust and alienation between citizens and established political institutions, it is urgent to improve democracy by finding new ways of involving citizens in decisions that shape their lives. This project makes a counterintuitive turn to look for new modes of public participation in informal practices creatively employed by citizens to contest governance arrangements, especially in settings where they are discouraged from doing so. |
| 19 | Joost | Kuijper | University of Twente | BMS section KiTeS | | Smart specialization in regions |
| 20 | Nina | Schwarzbach | Groningen | Behavioral and Social Sciences | | science-to-practice gap in psychotherapy |
| 21 | Maite | Van den Borre | Utrecht University | History and Art History | | The Netherlands holds the worst sustainability track record in Europe, stemming from its historical role in shaping global production chains through scientific knowledge, colonialism, and industrialization over two centuries. These processes commodified natural resources, altering Western perceptions of the environment and adversely impacting the global ecosystem and indigenous communities. The STONEM project investigates this commodification alongside |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | <p>the development of global supply chains, focusing on the actors responsible for constructing transnational socioeconomic systems. This PhD research will specifically analyze the implications of these processes in relation to ores and metals, shedding light on their far-reaching consequences.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|

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.
- Have your presentation ready on your computer. As soon it is your turn, we will give you the opportunity to share your screen.
- 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: we will give the word to the discussant
- 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 add your comments to the shared googledoc. Your feedback will be collected and sent to the presenter in a separate word file.
- 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 in the shared googledoc. 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 will be shared in a joint google document. We will distribute the link when we meet. Write your comments during or immediately after the presentation. Don't forget to add your name. This gives the presenter the opportunity to get in touch with you, if there are follow-up questions.

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

