

VU Research Portal

The Powers of Expertise

Supper, Alexandra; de Hoop, Evelien

2025

DOI (link to publisher)

[10.71881/96697ce6-4957-4942-bbf5-075a42d0c4bd](https://doi.org/10.71881/96697ce6-4957-4942-bbf5-075a42d0c4bd)

document version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

document license

CC BY

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

Supper, A., & de Hoop, E. (2025). *The Powers of Expertise*. (WTMC Series on Teaching and Learning STS; Vol. 2025, No. 3). <https://doi.org/10.71881/96697ce6-4957-4942-bbf5-075a42d0c4bd>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl

WTMC SERIES

ON TEACHING & LEARNING STS

The Powers of Expertise

(online workshop)

Workshop

2025(3)



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:

Teun Zuiderent-Jerak

Training co-ordinators:

Evelien de Hoop & Alexandra Supper

Practical information & registration:

wtmc@vu.nl

Cover design:

Zahar Koretsky

Information about the series:

a.supper@maastrichtuniversity.nl

e.de.hoop@vu.nl

More information available at <https://www.wtmc.eu/wtmc-series/>

ISSN: 2666-2892

DOI: 10.71881

<https://doi.org/10.71881/96697ce6-4957-4942-bbf5-075a42d0c4bd>

Contents

Directions.....	4
Practical notes.....	5
Programme (in CET)	7
Introduction to the Workshop	8
Detailed overview	10
About the speakers	18
About the coordinators	20
List of Participants	21
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...

As the infrastructural backbone for this online workshop, we will be using Zoom in connection with a shared google document. 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.

We recommend that you join the workshop from a room that you have to yourself, with a strong internet connection, as we may at times make use of break-out sessions: 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 for most of the workshop. If you are in a location close to other WTMCers, we do of course encourage you to meet up with others for a shared lunch or after-workshop drink!

During the preparation phase, you will be undertaking a site-visit; either at Rijksmuseum Boerhaave (Lange St. Agnietenstraat 10, less than 15 minutes walk from Leiden Centraal Station), or at Rathenau Instituut (Anna van Saksenlaan 51, less than 10 minutes walk from the station Laan van NOI in Den Haag), or at a location of your own choice. We leave it to you to find your way!

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

Make sure to start preparing about two weeks before the start of this workshop at the latest. There is quite a bit to read, prepare, watch, reflect and think about before we log into our Zoom accounts for the first time! We expect you to invest about 40 hours to prepare for the workshop, in addition to our online time and the recorded lectures. 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.
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. N.B. the time to watch the lectures was not counted as part of your 40 hours preparation time, but as time you would normally spend at the workshop (you will see that our online days are short to reduce the number of hours spent behind the screen per day).
4. Check the programme to see if you are scheduled as a presenter or 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)**. In case you are in a different time zone, please use websites such as <https://www.timeanddate.com> to convert these times to your own time zone.
6. We will meet on ZOOM, using the same link for all three days that have online meetings:
[link removed]
7. During the workshop, we may want to share some notes or documents with each other outside of the very ephemeral environment of the Zoom chat. For this purpose, we have created a Google Drive, which you can find here:
[link removed]

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 inform the WTMC secretariat (wtmc@vu.nl) as soon as you can, putting the training coordinators Alexandra and Evelien in CC. 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, 3 November: Conspiracy & Controversy		
10:15 – 11:00	1.1	Welcome session
11:00 – 11:15		Brief coffee break
11:15 – 12:00	1.2	Field Visit Recapitulation
12:00 – 13:00		Lunch
13:00 – 13:45	1.3	Q&A with Jaron Harambam, <i>Conspiracy Theories as Post-Truth Expertise</i>
13:45 – 14:15		Coffee break
14:15 – 15:15	1.4	Core Reading 1: Deep Dive
15:15 – 15:45		Coffee Break
15:45 – 16:30	1.5	Q&A with Noortje Marres, <i>Three models for making expertise public in a time of emergency: reflections on the Covid years</i>
16:30 – 16:45		Reflections for your own work (in set break-out groups)
Tuesday, 4 November: Top-down and bottom-up		
11:15 – 11:30		Checking In: What Kept You Awake?
11:30 – 12:30	2.1	PhD presentations
12:30 – 13:30		Lunch break
13:30 – 14:15	2.2	Q&A Eva Kunseler, <i>Expertise in action: advancing reflexive evaluation at the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency</i>
14:15 – 14:45		Coffee break
14:45 - 15:30	2.3	Core Reading 2: Reporting Back
15:30 – 16:00		Coffee break
16:00 – 16:45	2.4	Q&A with Steven Epstein, <i>Beneath the Crisis of Expertise: Health, Politics, and the Remaking of Expertise and Authority from the Emergence of HIV/AIDS to the Aftermath of Covid-19</i>
16:45 – 17:00		Reflections for your own work (in set break-out groups)
Wednesday, 5 November: Epistemic Justice		
9:00 – 9:15		Checking In: What Kept You Awake?
9:15 – 10:45	3.1	Skills session with Sally Wyatt, <i>Citation</i>
10:45 – 11:15		Coffee break
11:15 – 12:00	3.2	Aarthi Sridhar, <i>Rules of the Game: Between autonomy and expertise in Indian Fisheries Science</i>
12:00 – 13:00		Lunch break
13:00 – 14:00	3.3	PhD presentations
14:00 – 14:15		Brief Coffee break
14:15 – 15:45	3.4	Closing discussion, farewell & virtual group picture

Introduction to the Workshop

Welcome to the Workshop. Together with our guest speakers, we will be probing into the topic of expertise over the coming weeks. 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. 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, including a site visit scheduled during the preparatory phase. The lectures have been pre-recorded (you will receive links for them a week or two before the workshop), 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. We will provide ample check-in moments to share what we are taking away from the experience throughout the workshop. So let's get started!

Exploring the powers of expertise

The subject of ‘expertise’ has been a central topic for STS scholarship for decades. It is bound up with questions of trust and authority (whose expertise counts, or is even recognized as such), of participation and collaboration (what are the dynamics of interaction between holders of different types of expertise, such as professional and citizen scientists, or citizen-spokespersons and less influential citizens, etc.), and of epistemic justice (what are the underlying mechanisms and consequences of excluding, silencing or discrediting particular knowledges). In recent years, these questions have become all the more timely, going to the core of how not only the science system, but also how (democratic) societies operate.

Studying the powers of expertise can take STS researchers right into the heart of heated controversies, but it can also lead them to work with taken-for-granted assumptions that may hide under the veneer of consensus. In this workshop, we will encounter a variety of perspectives and

approaches, both conceptual and methodological, to help us understand the role and function of different forms of expertise in contemporary society.

During the preparatory phase of the workshop, you will not only read texts and watch pre-recorded lectures, but also go on a site visit to an institution that produces particular types of expertise.

On Monday, we come together for an introductory session, reflect back on the site visits, and dive deep into some key STS readings on the subject of expertise. Additionally, our first two guest speakers, Jaron Harambam and Noortje Marres, will join us to discuss their approaches for studying expertise in contexts where controversies or even conspiracy theories bloom.

On Tuesday, our guest speakers Eva Kunseler and Steven Epstein invite us to look closely at the domains of environment and health to understand how expertise is made, circulated, evaluated and contested – situated in two very differently epistemically charged (institutional) settings.

On Wednesday, we round up our exploration of expertise by considering more closely how questions of expertise are linked with epistemic justice. Sally Wyatt will join us for a skills session which interrogates how we produce expertise as STS researchers, by reflecting on our citation practices. Additionally, our final guest speaker Aarthi Sridarti will explore with us the tension between science and politics and the struggle for autonomy in Indian fisheries science.

Additionally, we look forward to hearing your ongoing reflections on how all this relates to your own PhD work (throughout the sessions, as well as in the specific time set aside at the beginning and end of each day), and also to engaging in few more in-depth discussions of specific PhD projects during the presentations sessions scheduled on Tuesday and Wednesday.

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

Evelien de Hoop and Alexandra Supper

Detailed overview

Preparatory phase: Site visits

During the preparatory phase of the workshop, each of you will pay a visit to a specific location where knowledge and expertise is produced, in a setting and context which differs from the academic institution in which you are doing your PhD. The aims of this exercise are two-fold: on the one hand, to better understand the expertise produced by this institution and the contexts in which it is produced, and on the other hand, to consider it in relation to potential career options after you complete your PhD.

Depending on your preference that you indicated when registering for the workshop, we have assigned you to one of these options:

Museum Boerhaave October 28, 14:00-16:15 (*)	Rathenau Institute October 30, 11:00-13:00 (*)	An institution of your own choice
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Anestis Amanatidis ✓ Ilse Dijkstra ✓ Cassy Juhasz ✓ Daniella Pauly Jensen ✓ Lucy van Eck ✓ Bronte Isabella ✓ Ching-Han Kuo ✓ Elena Gomel Cordeiro ✓ Celine Rooze ✓ [one additional participant] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Noel Haufs ✓ Jonathan Arenotft ✓ Jessica Coetzer ✓ Nina De Bakker ✓ Nando Katoele ✓ Inge Leurs ✓ Fenna Nijboer ✓ Renate Reitsma ✓ Paola Altomonte ✓ Ayush Shukla ✓ Jill van der Kamp ✓ Marcus Van Toor ✓ Martijn Vos ✓ Marina Bool ✓ Ena Vojvodic ✓ Hanneke de Boer ✓ Amna Pottarath ✓ [two additional participants] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Filip Rozborski ✓ Mateus Oka ✓ Shachi Mokashi ✓ Martijn van der Meer ✓ [one additional participant]

(*) Please be aware that you are responsible for organizing your own travel to the site, and in the case of Museum Boerhaave, also for paying for the entrance to the museum (but do submit the expense at your institution if that is possible).

To make the most of your site visit, we ask you to prepare beforehand (see below for details on each site), and also note down some reflections for yourself afterwards, which will discuss during the online workshop (see under 1.2).

Preparation for those who will be attending the site visit at Museum Boerhaave in Leiden (Lange St. Agnietenstraat 10, walking distance from Leiden Centraal):

Inform yourself about Museum Boerhaave before the visit. Make sure to read the short interview about the current exhibition [“Unseen: Inequality in Medicine”](#) (which we also get the chance to see during the site visit) with curator and WTMC alumna Mienke te Hennepe, but also try to look around for more contextual information that helps you to make sense of the kind of institution that you will be visiting and the working environment it might provide to someone with an STS background. Try to get a sense of what sorts of expertise is produced there, for whom and with whom, and how that relates to themes of our workshop such as expertise, authority, trust, in/exclusion, etc. Please make sure to prepare at least 1-2 questions that you could ask during the site visit.

Preparation for those who will be attending the site visit at Rathenau Institute in The Hague (Anna van Saksenlaan 51, close to Laan van NOI station):

Please familiarize yourself with the work that the Rathenau Institute does. You can read about their work and access reports etc. here: <https://www.rathenau.nl/en>. Rathenau’s main ‘audience’ is the Dutch parliament. Some questions you could ponder about include: what does this audience imply for the kinds of ‘scientific’ ‘expertise’ produced by Rathenau Institute? How do notions such as trust, authority, participation and inclusion, epistemic justice etc. feature in making choices while producing knowledge, and advise, for the parliament? And what might be the role of expertises from within the parliament?

Preparation for those who will not be able to attend either of the pre-arranged site visits:

Please select a relevant site of your own choice. This could be an institution which is similar to the ones that we have arranged visits at – a medical museum in a different city, or an institution working at the science/policy interface in a different country – but it could also be a place that produces a totally different form of expertise, for and with totally different stakeholders. We do recommend that you choose a site that you are interested in not just as an abstract “case” for the study of expertise, but that also operates in a context that you consider relevant in relation to your future career options.

Also identify a person within the institution who seems like they might be a good “guide” to learn more not only about the expertise produced by the institution, but also about the experience of working in this field, and ask if they are willing to speak with you about their experiences working at this institution. We encourage you to try to meet them in person to have a conversation about their work; if that is not feasible, then perhaps you can at least have a virtual chat with them. If that also fails, then as a very last resort, you can also complete the assignment by gathering as much information as you can about this institution by studying the available online traces.

On the basis of your research, try to get a sense of what sorts of expertise is produced there, for whom and with whom, and how that relates to themes of our workshop such as expertise, authority, trust, in/exclusion, etc., and try to get a sense of what it might mean for you to work in a similar setting.

Monday, 3 November: Conspiracy & Controversy

1.1 Welcome Session

We will kick off our workshop with a short opening session to get to know each other and discuss the programme of the coming days. The Zoom link for the entire workshop is:

[link removed]

1.2 Field Visit Recapitulation

During this session, we will reconvene based on the field visit. After you have conducted your field visit, please reflect and note down for yourself:

- What were the most interesting or surprising moments of the site visit?
- How do the insights that you gathered during the sight visit resonate with the themes of our workshop on Expertise?
- How did the visit shape your perspectives about your own potential career options after your PhD?

Please bring your notes to this session!

1.3 Q&A with Jaron Harambam, Conspiracy Theories as Post-Truth Expertise

Sunscreen causes cancer. Jeffrey Epstein didn't kill himself. And corona was a hoax to put humanity into submission. These and various other conspiracy theories are generally seen as irrational, implausible and outrageous explanations of social phenomena, pitted against scientific rationality. The complex world is, after all, not reducible to simplistic and heated narratives of massive deceit. Propagators of conspiracy theories are therefore nothing more than dangerous demagogues deceiving their gullible audiences with mythical tales and pseudo-scientific quackery. While such understandings may have some truth in them, they gloss over the more important sociological questions about their societal resonance. What is the appeal of these theories, why are established epistemic authorities so heavily distrusted, and what other forms of expertise are appreciated instead? And, stretching this sociological curiosity to knowledge controversies: is the suspicion undergirding conspiracy theories maybe warranted and can it be democratically productive in light of societal knowledge/power asymmetries? We will explore these issues in my session in order to gain a richer understanding of contemporary post-truth issues.

Required Reading:

- Harambam, J., Grusauskaite, K., & de Wildt, L. (2022). Poly-truth, or the limits of pluralism: Popular debates on conspiracy theories in a post-truth era. *Public Understanding of Science*, 31(6), 784-798.
- Harambam, J. (2023). Distrusting consensus: How a uniform corona pandemic narrative fostered suspicion and conspiracy theories. *Journal of Digital Social Research*, 5(3), 109-139.

Optional further reading:

- Harambam, J., & Aupers, S. (2015). Contesting epistemic authority: Conspiracy theories on the boundaries of science. *Public Understanding of Science*, 24(4), 466-480.

1.4 Core reading 1: Deep Dive

At every WTMC event, we set aside time for an in-depth discussion of one or two key STS texts that can provide a useful foundation for engaging with the theme of the workshop. For this workshop, we selected an uneven pair of two rather different texts: a chapter by Brian Wynne (1996), which develops a specific understanding of the nature and social role of expertise and which has since become a ‘classic’ key reference in STS; and alongside it, a much more recent article by Kelly Moore and Bruno Strasser (2022), which takes the form of an introduction to a special issue, and which helps to both situate Wynne’s text and expand the discussion towards a wider range of more recent research traditions within STS.

In preparation of the workshop, read both texts carefully and take note of anything that you find particularly important, inspiring, puzzling, unsettling, insightful or confusing. Additionally, here are a few questions to consider when preparing:

- What bodies of literature and conceptual lineages do the texts draw upon, and how do they set out to contribute to those research lines?
- How do the texts define and conceptualise the role of scientific knowledge and expertise? Against the backdrop of which other key concepts and notions are these terms defined and developed?
- How do the texts carve out the societal and political roles of scientific experts?
- What research agendas and societal agendas do the texts open up for STS scholars, and how do these resonate (or not resonate) with your own work?

Make sure that you have your notes at hand for the core reading session, to allow for a productive discussion in groups of about 5 participants. The questions above may help you to structure your discussion, but you are also free to structure your discussion differently or find your own inroads on the basis of your readings of the texts.

Required Reading:

- Wynne, B. (1996). May the Sheep Safely Graze? A Reflexive View of the Expert-Lay Knowledge Divide. In: *Risk, Environment & Modernity: Towards a New Ecology* (eds. S. Lash, B. Szerszynski & B. Wynne). Sage. Pp. 44-83
- Moore, K. & Strasser, B.J. (2022). Science & Dissent: Alternative Temporalities, Geographies, Epistemologies. In: *Engaging Science, Technology & Society* 81: 53-71.

1.5 *Q&A with Noortje Marres*, Three models for making expertise public in a time of emergency: reflections on the Covid years

In this talk I distinguish between two different models for the communication of expertise to everyday publics: pedagogical and participatory. Based on a situational analysis of the expert advice offered by Independent SAGE, a group of scientists that formed in May 2020 in the UK to provide advice on the Covid response (Marres and Valderrama Barragan, 2025), I ask if there

is a third model we should consider, which could be qualified as a material politics of making expertise public.

Required Reading:

- Marres, N., & Valderrama Barragán, M. (2025). Making expert advice public in a time of emergency: Independent SAGE and the contestation of science during the Covid pandemic in the UK. *Social Studies of Science*, 03063127241309071.
- Geiger, S., Galasso, I., Hangel, N., Lucivero, F., & Watts, G. (2024). Vulnerability and response-ability in the pandemic marketplace: developing an ethic of care for provisioning in crisis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 192(3), 441-459.

Tuesday, 5 November: Top-down and bottom-up

2.1 PhD presentations

1. *Presenter:* Hanneke de Boer, *Discussant:* Paola Altomonte
2. *Presenter:* Daniella Pauly Jensen, *Discussant:* Ching-Han Kuo

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

2.2 Q&A with Eva Kunseler, Expertise in action: advancing reflexive evaluation at the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency

Eva's contribution will illustrate her experiences with developing and professionalizing the method of reflexive evaluation at the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (in Dutch: Planbureau voor de Leefomgeving, PBL). PBL, operating at the intersection of science and policy, has historically conducted evaluations rooted in modernist evaluation that emphasize linear causality and evidence-based accountability. However, the last decade, the reflexive approach has begun to take hold within the organization, and has been professionalized over the years in collaboration with the Athena Institute of the VU University Amsterdam. The co-existence of these two evaluation logics—modernist and reflexive— explains many of the challenges that emerge in evaluation practice. Eva will illustrate how reflexive evaluation practice evolves in interaction with the organizational and political-administrative context in which evaluations are implemented. This context serves not as a passive backdrop that may constitute sources of interference, but is actively shaping and being shaped by 'learning by doing' in evaluation practice.

Required Reading:

- Kunseler, E. (2016). Revealing a paradox in scientific advice to governments: the struggle between modernist and reflexive logics within the PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications* 2, 16029. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palcomms.2016.29>
- Kunseler, E. (2017). Chapter 4 An introduction to the PBL Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency, in: *Government expert organisations in-between logics* (PhD Dissertation, VU Amsterdam).

2.3 Core Reading Session, part 2: Reporting Back

We will this session begin by briefly returning to the small groups in which you discussed the readings yesterday, so that you can take a few minutes to take stock of your most important take-aways from yesterday's session and to see if there are any particular points that you would still like to bring in on the basis of the discussions we've had during the workshop in the meantime. We will then share those take-aways during a plenary discussion.

2.4 *Q&A with Steven Epstein, Beneath the Crisis of Expertise: Health, Politics, and the Remaking of Expertise and Authority from the Emergence of HIV/AIDS to the Aftermath of Covid-19*
Please note that there will be no pre-recorded lecture associated with this live Q&A session. Instead, we ask you to read and prepare questions on the basis of the abstract, along with three short articles (co-) authored by Steven Epstein that give you a sense of his previous work that the current book project builds upon. During the live session, we will move directly to the Q&A!

I am currently at work on a short, synthetic book that will present my take on the contemporary “crisis of expertise,” with a focus on the United States. It has, of course, become common to speak of expertise as being in crisis, and to link growing distrust of experts with declining confidence in authorities of all sorts. To better understand and evaluate these perceptions of crisis, I draw attention to two underlying shifts in the politics of knowledge in the United States in recent decades that have transformed what it means to be an expert and who can plausibly serve as one: first, the diversification and proliferation of cultural authority, marked by a growing competition to provide answers and make pronouncements on how life should be lived; and second, the simultaneous rise to prominence of hybrid forms of “lay expertise” that include knowledge-empowered social movements.

To ground my analysis, I focus on the domain of health, where these transformations are especially evident. To bookend my analysis, I trace developments from the early years of the HIV/AIDS epidemic to the aftermath of Covid-19, proposing that in the crucible of pandemics the fault lines of expertise become particularly visible. (While I originally thought I would stop with Covid, it now seems impossible to imagine not discussing current Trumpian developments in the United States.)

Throughout, I seek to highlight recent scholarship that contributes to the rethinking of expertise. My aim is to provide a somewhat more hopeful account of the crisis of expertise, one that recognizes the risks of populist dismissal of experts (and elite manipulation of anti-expertism) but also emphasizes the potential virtues of democratic challenges to traditional expertise in the service of epistemic justice.

Required Reading:

- Epstein, S. (2011). Misguided boundary work in studies of expertise: time to return to the evidence. *Critical Policy Studies*, 5(3), 323–328.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19460171.2011.606306>
- Epstein, S., 'The Meaning and Significance of Lay Expertise', in Gil Eyal, and Thomas Medvetz (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Expertise and Democratic Politics* (2023; online edn,

Oxford Academic, 20 Apr. 2023),
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190848927.013.4>.

- Epstein, S., & Timmermans, S. (2021). From Medicine to Health: The Proliferation and Diversification of Cultural Authority. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 62(3), 240-254.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/00221465211010468>

Wednesday, 6 November: Epistemic Justice

3.1 Skills Session with Sally Wyatt, Citation

Citation remains a cornerstone of scholarly and scientific work. It is how we acknowledge those on whose shoulders we stand, and with whom we are in conversation. Citation analysis provides insight into scholarly networks and the circulation of ideas. References provide an important service to our readers. However, like many academic practices, citation is neither neutral nor universal. There are important differences between disciplines and language groups, and how and what we cite changes over time. There is also a great deal of evidence suggesting that the conscious and unconscious biases and discrimination that marks so much of our world also shapes who gets cited. Such bias serves to render the contributions of marginalised groups less visible. There is now more attention to questions of citational and epistemic justice.

Prior to the workshop, participants are asked to reflect on point one, and then do one or both of points two and three.

1. How were you trained to cite when doing your bachelor and master degrees? Which system/s did you use? What were you told about citation? How were you socialised in this important scholarly practice?
2. If you already have a publication related to your PhD, have a close look at the references. Who have you referred to, and why? How have you referred to them – direct quotation, in parentheses or footnote, or one of many in parentheses or footnote? Can you discern any patterns (not going to give hints here – curious to see what people come up with)? What guidelines did the journal or publisher provide? Were there any constraints, for example due to word limits, that influenced your references?
3. If you do not yet have a publication, that's fine. Pick a text that is important for your project. As with point two, look carefully at the references. What do you observe? Are there any gaps? If so, why do you think the original author didn't mention them.

After a short introduction by Sally, we will reflect on the points above in small groups and in a plenary session.

3.2 Q&A with Aarthi Sridhar, Rules of the Game: Between autonomy and expertise in Indian Fisheries Science

A troubled relation exists between the realms and practices of 'science' and 'politics' across the world in the 21st century, and presents itself as a struggle for autonomy within diverse domains of expertise, including state-funded scientific fields such as fisheries science.

How can we historically and sociologically understand struggles for autonomy by actors within Indian fisheries science? The talk draws from the speaker's doctoral thesis that interrogates the unexamined claim to modernity seen in contemporary struggles for autonomy within scientific organisations. The empirical focus is on fisheries science and the historical shaping of a national fisheries science organisation in India, the Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute (CMFRI). The talk will lay out the shaping of this field and struggles within its experts, using Pierre Bourdieu's field theory to sociologies science, and put this in play with postcolonial science studies. The talk will present vignettes from across a hundred years, straddling the 18th and 19th centuries, looking at various dimensions of actors and organisations. This is a talk that discusses contestations of expertise to trace the wider social forces that influence the relationship between experts and society over the idea and practice of autonomy.

Required Reading:

- Sridhar, A. (2019). The Scientific Worker and the Field: Seeing Value in Fisheries Science. *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. 54(37).
- Subramanian, A. (2015). Making Merit: The Indian Institutes of Technology and the Social Life of Caste *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 57(2):291–322.

3.3 PhD presentations

1. *Presenter:* Amna Pottarath, *Discussant:* Renate Reitsma
2. *Presenter:* Mateus Oka, *Discussant:* Jonathan Arenotft

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

3.4 Closing discussion, farewell & virtual group picture

We will wrap our online workshop with some final reflections on the workshop and on what you take away from this experience for your PhD trajectory. This final session also includes the final evaluation, a virtual group picture and some farewells.

About the speakers

Steven Epstein is Professor of Sociology and John C. Shaffer Professor in the Humanities at Northwestern University. His research and teaching examine the contested production of expert and especially biomedical knowledge, with an emphasis on the interplay of social movements, experts, and health institutions, and with a focus on the politics of sexuality, gender, and race. His award-winning books include *Impure Science: AIDS, Activism, and the Politics of Knowledge* (1996), *Inclusion: The Politics of Difference in Medical Research* (2007), and *The Quest for Sexual Health: How an Elusive Ideal Has Transformed Science, Politics, and Everyday Life* (2022). His past service to the STS community includes editorial board memberships on multiple journals, council member for the Society for Social Studies of Science (4S), and chair of the Section on Science, Knowledge, and Technology of the American Sociological Association.

Jaron Harambam (PhD) is Assistant Professor of Media, Truth Politics and Digitalization at the Sociology Department of the University of Amsterdam. His research deals with public disputes over truth in a digitalized public sphere. More specifically, he studies conspiracy theories, news and platform politics, and AI (content moderation, search/recommender systems). Central to his research is the participation of multiple stakeholders to design our (future) digital worlds along democratic and public values. His monograph "Contemporary Conspiracy Culture: Truth and Knowledge in an Era of Epistemic Instability" (2020) is out at Routledge.

Dr. Eva Kunseler is a [Fellow at the Athena Institute](#). She holds an academic interest in the institutionalisation of reflexive ways of working in knowledge-policy arenas. She is also a senior researcher at the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency (PBL) where she coordinates a research programme and projects on reflexive evaluation and policy learning. Her current research project centers on transformative change in (climate) policy networks.

Eva holds a PhD in Environmental Policy Analysis and a MSc. in Environmental Health Sciences. Her PhD research developed insight into reflexive ways of working in science-based government advice. Her [dissertation](#) identifies that policy researchers find themselves in-between logics: they are inclined to adopt reflexive ways of working in response to wicked problems, but are bounded by the limits imposed by modernist structures, norms and ways of working in government institutions. Eva identified how epistemic alignment between co-existing logics takes shape in research practice.

Eva has previously worked on environmental risk assessment at PBL, at Finnish National Institute of Health, Welfare and the Environment (THL) and at the World Health Organisation (WHO) Environmental Health Centre. She also developed and coordinated a training programme for Dutch public knowledge organisations.

Noortje Marres is a Professor in Science, Technology and Society in the Centre for Interdisciplinary Methodologies at the University of Warwick. She is also a Visiting Professor in the Centre for the Media of Cooperation at the University of Siegen and External Faculty at the Institute for Advanced Studies at the University of Amsterdam. Noortje studied sociology and philosophy at the University of Amsterdam and the Ecole des Mines (Paris). She has published

two monographs *Material Participation* (2012) and *Digital Sociology* (2017) and has led various research projects investigating public engagement with science and innovation in technological societies, in areas such as sustainable living and automated mobility. Noortje is currently completing a third book which examines technology trials beyond the laboratory - of automated vehicles, facial recognition and Covid tests - as critical interfaces between science, engineering, nature and society.

Aarthi Sridhar is a founder trustee at Dakshin. She holds a doctoral degree from the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences of the University of Amsterdam. She heads Dakshin's Communities and Resource Governance Programme, supports integrated interventions under Dakshin's SeaChange initiatives and leads the Communications Team. Trained in the social sciences, her academic interests centre on historical and contemporary socio-legal studies, Science and Technology Studies, and sociological approaches to knowledge and expertise. Her empirical focal areas are coastal and marine environments, resource politics, maritime infrastructures and practices of environmental norms and justice. She enjoys collaborative projects and has worked with diverse disciplinary teams to write essays, make documentary films, educational websites, field manuals and other learning material on the subject of marine environments and people.

Sally Wyatt is Professor of Digital Cultures with the Maastricht University Science, Technology and Society Studies research programme. She was the training coordinator for WTMC between 2005-10, first with Els Rommes and later with Willem Halfman. Between 2011-2017, she was its academic director. More information at <https://sallywyatt.nl>

About the coordinators

Evelien de Hoop is an assistant professor at the Athena Institute, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. Her research interests span across a variety of themes including but not limited to practices and politics of agriculture, landscape change, (digital) knowledge politics, health and healthcare, etc.. Evelien holds an MPhil degree in Geography and the Environment from Oxford University, and did her PhD at the Technology, Innovation and Society group at Eindhoven University of Technology. Her transdisciplinary research and education are rooted in STS, critical geography, post- and decolonial studies and (connected) history. She also coordinates the CLUE+ interfaculty research institute's Inclusive Landscape Transformations programme.

Alexandra Supper is an assistant professor at the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Maastricht University. Her research interests include the role of role of sensory skills in scientific practice, the construction of scientific authority, the dynamics of (inter)disciplinary communities, as well as the role of sound technologies in popular music. 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).

List of Participants

Name	What is the topic of your research? (90 words max)
Amna Pottarath	I am a PhD candidate for the Disapeer Project(The reconfiguration of peers in editorial review) at Radboud University. My research will mainly include looking into the impact of transformative developments in academic publishing and mapping the diverse roles and identities of multiple stakeholders involved at various stages in the peer review and editorial processes.
Anestis Amanatidis	I am researching how public participation in scientific knowledge production - 'invited' or 'uninvited' alike - test the constituency of scientists and how such tests result in new epistemic practices. In other words, I look at how science tests society. Empirically, I (will) focus on environmental and agricultural knowledge production.
Ayush Shukla	As part of the MSCA consortium MELOAMANES, my PhD project focuses on building capacity for response-based research and innovation in the R&D of novel cancer therapies."
Bronte Isabella	My PhD project, titled 'The value appraisal of high-value art', explores how the value of art is constructed and legitimised by focusing on the professional practice of art appraisal in The Netherlands.
Cassy Juhasz	Practices of Responsible Innovation; Interdisciplinary and Inclusivity in Innovation; Ethics of Technology Development
Celine Rooze	Resilience of healthcare systems during crises and disasters
Ching-Han Kuo	As one of the researchers in the DISAPEER project, I focus on exploiting quantitative methods of text mining and social network analysis to explore transformative developments in scholarly peer review mechanisms.
Daniella Pauly Jensen	Diversity and bias in AI systems for media
Elena Gomel Cordeiro	I am researching how risk analysis processes under EU food regulation can extend their focus on food safety to include sustainability and nutritional goals, while accounting also for social preferences and ethical concerns. This is highly relevant for the transition towards a circular economy in food systems, which will require a balance between different policy objectives that can hopefully be informed by risk analysis. Key concerns are how scientific evidence can be complemented by different knowledge sources, how uncertain risks are dealt with and the separation between assessment and management.
Ena Vojvodic	My research explores the role of science in energy projects, focusing on Groningen gas extraction. Following the shutdown of the Groningen gas field, my research investigates how trust in science was damaged and what is needed to restore it.
Fenna Nijboer	This PhD explores the assetization of healthcare—the transformation of care infrastructures into financial assets for profit. Moving beyond debates on privatization, it examines how investors and financial actors reshape healthcare systems through future-oriented narratives and valuation techniques. By tracing the infrastructures, logics, and instruments introduced by financial actors, the project asks how assetization reconfigures the meaning and practices of care. Drawing on critical theory, feminist studies, STS, economic sociology, and care ethics, it interrogates the societal and unequal implications of investor-driven healthcare.

Filip Rozborski	My PhD research explores how imagination and future orientation shape discourses and pathways of sociotechnical transitions. It aims to understand how imaginaries emerge, stabilize, and constrain future narratives and actions. Empirically, I focus on German hydrogen discourses and energy transitions. The research analyzes the emergence and stability of hydrogen imaginaries and their role in shaping sociotechnical change.
Hanneke de Boer	I study the historically developed socio-cultural attitudes towards the menopause and how these attitudes shape women's experience of the perimenopause in the present. My project is an interdisciplinary project, connecting the fields of history and public health.
Ilse Dijkstra	I study the making, use and effects of labels and categories used in health inequality research. Currently, I am studying how labels developed in the fields of psychology and sociology traveled to health inequality research, and how they are used to shape health inequality research and interventions.
Inge Leurs	The institutionalisation and power dynamics of transdisciplinary education
Jessica Coetzer	The impact of digitalisation of the healthcare system on digital health equity in The Netherlands.
Jill van der Kamp	Public participation in the development of digital home-based screening with a focus on the inclusion of people in vulnerable life situations.
Jonathan Arenotft	Science and technology are marked by uneven geographies and power relations, especially in fields like medicine and plant biotechnology. Yet distant and often marginalized communities still have limited influence over their development and governance. My PhD research focuses on democratizing innovation by enabling the representation of smallholder farmers from the Global South in crop genome editing. I aim to draw lessons for improving their inclusion in seed systems and to contribute to STS scholarship on the democratic governance of science and technology in a global yet post-colonial context.
Lucy van Eck	This project examines how consultants shape Dutch healthcare through epistemic practices and performances of expertise. Despite their growing influence, the everyday knowledge work of consultants remains largely invisible. Using an ethnographic approach, it investigates how consultancy knowledge is translated. The analysis highlights how consultants co-produce imaginaries of “good care” and reconfigure relations between knowledge, power, and care.
Marcus Van Toor	My PhD-project aims to study under which conditions (e.g. social, political, epistemological) scientific research takes place that substantiates government policy. With this question, the PhD-project aims to study three interconnected problems. First, some scientific facts seem to have a hard time entering policies, for example regulating chemical substances. Second, the way in which politicians and policymakers use science to depoliticize decisions can threaten democratic legitimacy. Thirdly, criticizing the use of science in policies by deconstructing notions like 'absolute truth' can result in relativism.
Marina Bool	Developing a sustainable knowledge infrastructure in the Dutch Regenerative Agricultural Knowledge Innovation System
Martijn van der Meer	History of Public Health. Specifically of weighing babies, vaccination, and developmental testing.
Martijn Vos	In my PhD I use agonistic and deliberative political theory as a lens to investigate Public Engagement with Science and Technology (PEST). More specifically I analyse, design and evaluate public engagement efforts that emerged in response to conflict and polarisation on knowledge-intensive issues.

Mateus Oka	My research lies at the intersection of the anthropology of science and multispecies studies. Specifically, I investigate the history of a primatological study conducted with capuchin monkeys (<i>Sapajus libidinosus</i>) in southern Piauí, focusing on the role of the local rural community in collaborating with the scientists, particularly the "mateiros" ("woodsman", in literal translation). The importance of these agents in the development of scientific knowledge is a topic that deserves further exploration in anthropology and the history of science.
Nando Katoele	To secure timely access to good-quality care, policymakers are calling for a more efficient organisation of healthcare services. Meanwhile, in the workplace, healthcare professionals are confronted with more vulnerable patients and complex caseloads. Combined with workforce shortages, this often prompts healthcare professionals to make decisions about who to provide care to, transfer to other providers, or strategically ignore. This project scrutinises these coordination acts in everyday healthcare practice and the moral dilemmas inherent to them.
Nina De Bakker	A neighbourhood ethnography on knowledge valuation & sustainable (food) transitions to explore in what way community initiatives can reduce health inequities. Based in Amsterdam Southeast.
Noel Haufs	I research the technomoral mediation between farmers, ecologies and data and ask: How do farmers use various soil-sensing technologies ranging from fully automated camera-sensor systems to co-production between farmers and technology to using your senses to understand the soil's condition? Therefore, I facilitate autoethnographic assignments with farmers. I tackle the interrelated questions of what it means to be a 'good' farmer and a 'good' ethnographer and I think about the multimodal political and ethical inputs and outputs of sensorial agri-tech.
Paola Altomonte	I research on the history of women who were both scientists and activists in the 1960s and 1970s.
Renate Reitsma	Deep sea mining is one of the most controversial technologies in the Blue Economy. Scientific knowledge has authority in the development of regulations and policy. I study researchers who collaborate with industrial actors to gain more knowledge about the deep sea. STS literature on ignorance studies, discard studies and undone science points to tensions and challenges that science industry collaborations entail. I focus on how scientists navigate and reflect on these collaborations. (How) do these collaborations in and exclude actors and non-scientific knowledges?
Shachi Mokashi	My doctoral research focuses on various people's efforts and proposals to monitor, remediate, and repair environmental pollution.
And four additional participants who preferred to remain anonymous	

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 sign 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
- 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

Regardless of what aspects you decide to focus on in your feedback, make sure to keep the tone of your feedback constructive and supportive!

