Dear Colleagues,

Allow me to begin my first address in our Newsletter by extending my warmest greetings to everybody. I welcome everyone in our team!

Let me introduce the new RC23 board for 2014-2018:

**President:** Nadia ASHEULOVA, Institute for History of Science and Technology, RAS, Russia

**Vice-President:** Alice ABREU, Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

**Secretary:** Gary BOWDEN, University of New Brunswick, Canada

**Board Members:**
- Matthias GROSS, Helmholtz Center for Environmental Research, Germany
- Jaime JIMÉNEZ, IIMAS, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México
- Miwao MATSUMOTO, University of Tokyo, Japan
- Ralph MATTHEWS, University of British Columbia, Canada
- António MONIZ, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Germany
- Leandro RAIZER, Instituto Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil
- Czarina SALOMA-ALPENDONU, Ateneo de Manila University, Philippines
- Juha TUUNAINEN, University of Helsinki, Finland

I wish to thank you for the opportunity to serve as your president for the next four years. I especially want to express gratitude to our former president Ralph MATTHEWS for their leadership and wise advice that helped our RC grow and prosper.

I am grateful to all colleagues for attending Sessions of RC 23 in Yokohama. The aim of such meetings is to have an open dialogue between our members about the challenges that are faced and discuss the opportunities for development. It is very important to share the ways STS are being organized around the world.

(continued on page 2)
The new board has been discussing plans for the future. One of our goals is to secure and develop personal and collegial contacts between sociologists of science and technology throughout the world. We prepared the new webpage of RC 23 http://rc-23.nw.ru/, that you can use as a sort of information platform for the future projects. You can find the history of RC23, archives of our meetings and newsletters, recent publication of RC23 members, current activities and so on. Special attention is paid to one of the leading sociologists of the 20th century, Robert K. MERTON. His name is closely connected with the emergence and legitimization of our academic subfield, the sociology of science. He was one of the founders of RC23 and served as its First President. We are trying to collect everything about his activity within RC 23 and the perception of his ideas within the international community. Please visit the site and advise us of any changes that will enhance its effectiveness.

We hope that the webpage and the Newsletter will promote information exchanges and facilitate collaboration among colleagues, especially collaboration that crosses national boundaries.

We are working to improve RC 23’s relation with professional associations and “sister” international associations. We are very thankful that Katarina Prpric, Chair of RN24 of ESA, Fred Steward, EASST President, and Gary Downey, 4S President, have all expressed an interest in exploring ways to strengthen the links between our organizations.

The RC23 Board has been working to develop a number of new resources for our members. We have discussed the advantages of scheduling several mid-term conferences and workshops that are located in different parts of the world. Your comments and any ideas you may have are very welcome!

Our RC will provide allocations of RC23 Sessions at the Third ISA Forum of Sociology (Vienna, Austria, 2016) and at the XIX ISA World Congress of Sociology (Toronto, Canada, 2018). We invite you to propose RC 23 sessions and participate in these events.

Finally, I hope that the next four years will be productive and exciting for our RC and that our growing membership continues to see RC23 as an important committee of the International Sociological Association.

Best regards,
Nadia Asheulova
RC23 – President’s Report, July 15, 2014
Ralph Matthews,
Professor of Sociology, The University of British Columbia, Canada

The Forum and Congress:
As many of you are aware, the activities of ISA and its Research Committees have changed over the past decade. In the previous period there was one World Congress of Sociology held every four years. In the intervening period each Research Committee (RC) was required to hold at least one regional meeting, often in association with some national or regional association.

However, beginning ten years ago, the ISA decided to hold a ‘Forum of Sociology’ in the intervening two year periods. The original intent of the Forum was to provide a less formal opportunity for each RC to provide a unique and active program with a less formal structure. However, that has not happened and ISA now operates the Forum with no significant difference in organization from that of the Congress. That is, the format is largely the same and under the supervision of the ISA centrally, with the work of organizing the program carried out by the RCs.

Given this, the primary activities of most RCs centre on organizing two major conferences — one every two years, a Forum and a Congress. The amount of work required in enabling these leave most of us who serve on the Executive of RCs little or no time to take on additional activities. With some naivety, I took on the organization of the Forum in Buenos Aires in 2012 largely on my own. I became acutely aware of the considerable work involved. It was made particularly difficult as the result of ISA contracting with Confex to provide the on-line software that was used for the first time for the Buenos Aires meeting. However, I am pleased to say that Confex has greatly improved the organization of its program software and it provided only minor challenges for us in organizing the Yokohama meetings. However, in anticipation of the amount of work that would be involved, I invited Board Member Nadia Asheulova to co-Chair the organization of the Yokohama meeting with me and was grateful when she accepted. This proved particularly fortuitous as I fell and broke my left wrist and right hand, making it difficult for me to manage some of the data entry activities for some weeks.

The number of sessions we are allowed to mount during either the Congress or the Forum is determined by our membership. RC23 is a middle-sized Research Committee (see section of ‘Membership’ below). In 2012 largely on my own. I became acutely aware of the considerable work involved. It was made particularly difficult as the result of ISA contracting with Confex to provide the on-line software that was used for the first time for the Buenos Aires meeting. However, I am pleased to say that Confex has greatly improved the organization of its program software and it provided only minor challenges for us in organizing the Yokohama meetings. However, in anticipation of the amount of work that would be involved, I invited Board Member Nadia Asheulova to co-Chair the organization of the Yokohama meeting with me and was grateful when she accepted. This proved particularly fortuitous as I fell and broke my left wrist and right hand, making it difficult for me to manage some of the data entry activities for some weeks.

The number of sessions we are allowed to mount during either the Congress or the Forum is determined by our membership. RC23 is a middle-sized Research Committee (see section of ‘Membership’ below). In 2012 largely on my own. I became acutely aware of the considerable work involved. It was made particularly difficult as the result of ISA contracting with Confex to provide the on-line software that was used for the first time for the Buenos Aires meeting. However, I am pleased to say that Confex has greatly improved the organization of its program software and it provided only minor challenges for us in organizing the Yokohama meetings. However, in anticipation of the amount of work that would be involved, I invited Board Member Nadia Asheulova to co-Chair the organization of the Yokohama meeting with me and was grateful when she accepted. This proved particularly fortuitous as I fell and broke my left wrist and right hand, making it difficult for me to manage some of the data entry activities for some weeks.

The number of sessions we are allowed to mount during either the Congress or the Forum is determined by our membership. RC23 is a middle-sized Research Committee (see section of ‘Membership’ below). In had sufficient members for us to be allocated 16 sessions in 2012 (Buenos Aires) and 14 sessions in 2014 (Yokohama). It remains at 14 sessions for the next Forum in Vienna in 2016.

This proves to be particularly difficult as there are some persons who seek to try and organize more than one session in any meeting. Others seek to have ‘invited’ or closed sessions to which the majority of our members are automatically excluded. In several instances, persons who are not even members of RC23 have sought to organize sessions. Finally, some sessions attract many proposals. For example, one session at the Yokohama meeting had 34 persons submit abstracts for approximately five presentation slots. As the number of allocated slots will not likely increase significantly in future meetings, the only alternative is to adopt another format for some of them. Thus, the session that had 34 submitted abstracts this year was turned into a Roundtable session. The result, however, was that most persons withdrew and only 13 persons allowed their abstract to be included in the program. Of these, only 10 persons actually showed up to present their papers. That is unfortunate as Roundtables provide a unique opportunity for presenters to interact directly with those who can provide expert advice as they are generally all interested in the topic. It should not be seen as a ‘second class’ opportunity to present, but one that provides opportunities to get feedback on one’s ideas that is not likely to happen when one has 15 minutes to present to a large audience. Given this, we particularly need to use roundtables in ways that are supportive of the development of new work and ideas. In concluding this section, I would like to provide the following recommended guidelines for the organization of future Congresses and Forums. I do so based on the principle that ‘Sessions’ are an important ‘resource’ and we should use them as wisely as possible for the benefit of the members as a whole.

1. Only one session per organizer.
2. Except in extraordinary circumstances, session organizers must be members of RC23 for at least the preceding two years.
3. We should have a balance between open sessions and invited sessions.

4. No more than one third of our sessions should be invited as these tend to close other members off from participating.

5. We should not allocate more than one session to a single ‘sub-theme’. The field of Sociology of Science and Technology is a broad one and we should try to be diverse in our offerings and not concentrate on one approach or one specific area of interest. If we make strong efforts to do this, we will likely attract more members and that will lead to having more sessions allocated to us in future meetings.

6. The sessions that are to be offered as Roundtables should be identified well in advance and efforts should be made to use them in ways that attract both beginning and seasoned scholars to them. Some ‘award system’ might be used to achieve this.

**Membership:**

Our membership size has become relatively static. In June 2002 at our Brisbane meeting, it was reported that we had 76 members. By 2010 and the Gothenburg Congress this had grown to 128 members. As of May 27, 2014 we had 127 members. Presumably some additional persons joined at the Yokohama Congress. However, if we can get our membership to 151 persons by the time of the Vienna Forum in 2016, we will have passed the threshold that would allow us to have 16 sessions at the Toronto Congress in 2018. I would recommend that the new Board write directly to the younger scholars who presented in our sessions, generally for the first time. They and their friends will have access to ISA student membership and the cost of the RC membership is less than the price of a coffee each year.

I would note that the size of the membership also affects the amount of operating funds that we receive from ISA as well as the amount we have available to assist members with the cost of Registration.

**Statutes:**

As some of you know, the ISA has been systematically reviewing all of the statutes of the RCs to ensure key principles and practices of the ISA are incorporated in them. Our Business Meeting in Buenos Aires was devoted primarily into developing our Statutes to be in line with the ISA requirements. Since that meeting I have formatted them in accordance with our votes at that meeting and they are now on the RC website. These will be ratified again in full with a vote in the Yokohama Business Meeting.

*(NOTE: THIS VOTE WAS HELD AND THE STATUTUES APPROVED IN THE BUSINESS MEETING IN YOKOHAMA).*

There are a small number of additional issues that have arisen that I have asked our Vice President Czarina Saloma to present for discussion and vote in our Yokohama meeting. These include: Instituting the position of ‘Past President’ as part of the Executive; Providing a separate position, either on the Board or among the membership, that is responsible for electronic communication. *(NOTE: THESE WERE ALSO CONSIDERED AND VOTED ON IN THE YOKOHAMA BUSINESS MEETING AND WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO THE REVISED STATUTES AND POSTED ON OUR WEBSITE. The actual wording of these changes will be available in the minutes of the meeting when they are made available.)*

**Communication:**

ISA Secretariat requires that we provide two formal newsletters to the membership each year. This has proven difficult over the past three years as our Secretary, whose role it was to provide these newsletters, was appointed to a senior university administrative position and did not provide newsletters on a regular basis after his first year in the role. That said, there was very little response from the membership to his calls for news items to be included in the newsletters that he did provide during that year.

In reality, the formal ISA requirement for regular newsletter does not reflect the dynamic processes of communication now available worldwide through electronic means. As President, I have communicated with the membership on numerous occasions via e-mail particularly about matters related to the Congress and Forum. I also had a special [www.RC-23.org](http://www.RC-23.org) website created and mounted on a commercial server that was easily accessible and not buried within the web hosting structure of a single university.
However, we need to have a far more active internet presence in which members can submit news of conferences, publications, and activities in their universities and region that relate directly to the Sociology of Science and Technology. This is reflected in some of the changes we have initiated in our statutes to provide new dedicated positions within the organization for these activities. It is also one of the key activities that will be undertaken under the new President and Board.

**Election Process:**

Our election procedure is set out clearly in our statutes. We must elect a President, Vice President and seven Board Members. In addition, the statutes state that the President shall selected from those elected to the Board, one member who will serve as Secretary. When that happens, the person whose total votes was in eighth position in the election to Board would also become a Board member.

ISA regulations require that RC elections be managed by two members who are not seeking election. As I was not seeking re-election, I took on the additional task of calling for nominations and serving on the election committee. I was joined on it by Luis Sanz-Menendez of Spain, a Board Member who also was not seeking re-election.

However, when nominations ceased, we had exactly enough people nominated for each position to fill the position requirements set out in our statutes. As time was short, rather than open the nomination process, Luis and I consulted the Executive and Board and we concluded that we would declare those nominated to be elected by acclamation. In an e-mail I informed the membership of this process and asked whether there were any objections. I received none. I also informed the membership that I would call for a motion at this Business Meeting to formally ratify that all the nominated candidates were elected. (NOTE: THIS MOTION WAS PUT AND SECONDED AT THE MEETING AND IT WAS APPROVED WITHOUT DISSENTING VOTE).

The names and positions of those so elected to the Executive and Board for the period 2014-2018 are given below:

**RC 23 Executive and Board 2014-2018**

**President:** Nadia Asheulova (Russia)

**Treasurer:** Also filled by the President

**Vice President:** Alice Abreu (Brazil)

**Secretary:** To be chosen by the President from those elected to the Board

**Board Members for 2014-2018**

Gary Bowden (Canada)

Mathias Gross (Germany)

Jaime Jiménez (Mexico)

Miwao Matsumoto (Japan)

António Moniz (Portugal and Germany)

Leandro Raizer (Brazil)

Czarina Saloma-Alpendonu (Philippines)

Juha Tuunahen (Finland)
SESSION REPORTS FROM THE WORLD CONGRESS

The program of RC23 Sociology of Science and Technology at the XVIII World Congress of Sociology at Yokohama was coordinated by Nadia ASHEULOVA (Institute History of Science & Technology, Russia) and Ralph MATTHEWS (The University of British Columbia, Canada). The RC organized 14 sessions, twelve of which were academic sessions, one a Young Researchers' Forum: New Research Directions in the Study of Science and Technology and Their Impacts was also organized by Ralph MATTHEWS and Czarina SALOMA-AKPEDONU, and one a Business Meeting. A number of joint sessions with others RCs, however, greatly increased the academic program of RC23 and the 20 sessions listed below show well the wide range of topics and themes discussed at the World Congress.

1. **Globalization from below: Institutional and Policy Changes in Developing Countries**
   - **Session Organizer:** Binay K. PATTNIAK

2. **Emerging Sociological and Social Psychological Perspectives on Science and Technology**
   - **Session Organizers:** Carl Martin ALLWOOD and Sven HEMLIN

3. **Higher Education As a Key Driver of Innovation and Economic Growth**
   - **Session Organizer:** Nadia ASHEULOVA

   - **Session Organizer:** Jaime JIMENEZ GUZMAN

5. **New Topics in Interaction between University and Society**
   - **Session Organizers:** Juha TUUNAINEN and Kari KANTASALMI

6. **The Future of Teaching and Research in Universities**
   - **Session Organizers:** Jaime JIMENEZ GUZMAN, A. Gary DWORIN, Gerardo DEL CERRO SANTAMARIA and Ralph MATTHEWS

7. **ICTs and Social Inequalities**
   - **Session Organizer:** Binay K. PATTNIAK

8. **Science, Technology and (New) Forms of Social Inequalities**
   - **Session Organizer:** Siddharmesh HIREMATH

9. **The Digital Divide - Contributing to an ‘unequal World’**
   - **Session Organizer:** José Manuel ROBLES

10. **Surveillance, New Media and Digital Information**
    - **Session Organizers:** Torin MONAHAN and David LYON

11. **Scientific Development, New Technologies and State: Challenges and Opportunities of Nanotechnology and Other Technological Advances**
    - **Session Organizer:** Tânia MAGNO

12. **The Sociology of Disaster and Technoscience: Public Knowledge and Sustainability Beyond Fukushima**
    - **Session Organizer:** Miwao MATSUMOTO

13. **Technological Innovation and (Un)Sustainable Consumption**
    - **Session Organizers:** Czarina SALOMA-AKPEDONU and Marlyne SAHAKIAN

14. **Assessing Technologies: Global Patterns of Trust and Distrust**
    - **Session Organizers:** Antonio BRANDAO MONIZ, Christina GOETZ, Nuno BOAVIDA and Constanze SCHERZ

15. **Right to Benefits of Scientific Progress and Its Applications**
    - **Session Organizers:** Brian GRAN and Jaime JIMENEZ GUZMAN

16. **Technological Transfer in Latin American Countries and the Caribbean: Challenges of Scientific and Technological Cooperation**
    - **Session Organizer:** Rafael PALACIOS BUSTAMANTE

17. **Toward a World of Low Carbon: Social, Economic and Environmental Impacts**
    - **Session Organizers:** Leandro RAIZER and Marcus Vinicius SPOLE

18. **Fostering Trans-Disciplinarity Amongst the Social and Natural Sciences, Engineering, Arts and Design**
    - **Session Organizers:** Benjamin TEJERINA and Cristina MIRANDA DE ALMEIDA

19. **Gendering Inclusion and Exclusion in Science and Technology**
    - **Session Organizers:** Alice ABREU and Ralph MATTHEWS

    - **Session Organizer:** Ralph MATTHEWS

We have asked all session organizers from RC23 to send us a short report of their session and published below are those that we have received. From them we can see that sessions were well attended and that the program was effectively carried out.
This session organized in collaboration with RC23 Sociology of Science and Technology and RC04 Sociology of Education addressed the topic of science-society interaction in university research and higher education by means of five presentations and some 25 other participants many of which took actively part in the discussion. The intersection of science and technology studies and sociology of higher education has long roots in sociology of knowledge, but has gained new actuality in theorizing knowledge society. As a whole, the session can be regarded as an interesting one with a potential for forthcoming joint sessions in the ISA Forum and next world congress. Another possible future outcome of the session will be a special issue to be published in Science & Technology Studies, an official journal of the European Association for the Study of Science and Technology (EASST).

The first speaker, Akiyoski Yonezawa of the Nagoya University, Japan, presented a paper entitled “University Governance and the Academic Profession in ‘Rising’ East Asia?” The paper addressed the university governance and management especially in Japan where calls for drastic reforms in the governance structures and practices have been made to enhance the universities’ chances for survival in the growing international competition in knowledge production. Comparing Japanese universities with other East Asian university systems, the author concluded that while the most of East Asian countries show strong intervention by national governments on university activities, Japan forms an exception as it has guaranteed a great deal of academic freedom and autonomy for faculties especially since World War II. Utilizing data gathered in a recent survey on the academic profession in Asia the author further concluded that although faculty committees and boards are distinctly dominant mode of university governance in Japan, the sense of personal influence by individual faculty members on university governance remained relatively low. According to him, these findings indicate that the dominance of the professoriate in university governance does not assure a sense of high participation by individual faculty members. When university governance in Japan and East Asia was compared with data coming from Western countries it appeared that the sense of participation by the faculty members was among the lowest in Japan.

The second speaker, Martine Legris Revel of the University of Lille II, France, posed the question “Are Civil Society Organizations Doing Research?” She based her topic on the notion according to which publicly-funded research has an obligation to produce outcomes that are beneficial to the wider society, a mission which has been reinforced in European countries by a growing trend towards participatory governance. In her presentation, she mapped the engagement by civil society organizations (CSOs) in research projects accomplished under the auspices of the 7th Framework Program (FP7) of the European Union. The findings based on two surveys carried out in 2012 showed that the representatives of the CSOs expected to have influence on scientific knowledge production and trajectory of the research project they were engaged with. The fact remained, however, that many of the CSOs were associated with the research at later stages of the project only. In addition to this, the division of labor between academics and CSOs was functional, that is, tasks and responsibilities were designed so that researchers and representatives of the CSOs did not have to work together during the whole duration of the project; typically the CSOs were not able to discuss the research design at the outset of the research projects. The role of the CSOs in the FP7 research projects can therefore be regarded as central but not strategic. If the funding scheme included incentives designed particularly for CSO participation (e.g., making their participation compulsory), the contribution by the CSOs to the project outcomes grew much stronger and they were more likely to contribute to the research agenda setting.

The third paper by Nelius Boshoff of Stellenbosch University, South Africa, was entitled “Mapping the Categories and Overlapping Roles of Publics/Stakeholders in University Research in Nigeria and South Africa”. The aim of the paper was to analyze different roles of publics/stakeholders in Nigerian and South African research between 2010 and 2012 and to demonstrate that the categories overlap. In the study, publics (output stakeholders) were regarded as the receivers of a research message, that is, the target audience or intended beneficiaries of research projects, while stakeholders (input stakeholders) were people who had a direct
role in the creation, dissemination or uptake of the research results. In the first part of the presentation, the author presented a bibliometric analysis of research articles published by scholars working in the two countries and highlighted the different roles of funders and collaborators had in research. The second part of the paper, in turn, focused on the co-occurrences of publics (output stakeholders) and stakeholders (input stakeholders) at different stages of research (i.e., creation, transmission and uptake) and analyzed the different ways in which these related to other factors of research production, such as the field of research in question. When it comes to the different publics, the study concluded that different output stakeholder groups imply different audiences of research and hence different needs for and forms of research communication. It remained an open question in the presentation, however, how the analysis of different input stakeholder groups contributes to different interpretations of changing science systems, such as “the new mode of knowledge production”, “strategic research”, “post-normal science”, “triple-helix” and so on.

The fourth paper “A Globalizing University Centered in Asia: State and Society Interactions in University Restructuring” by Kong Chong Ho of the National University of Singapore examined the need for research-based universities in Singapore in the face of Singapore’s global city-type economy. As seen from triple-helix perspective, this emphasized a need for new products created in collaboration between universities and industries with the help of state funding. According to the author, particularly important were water-treatment technologies and new tropical medicines. Given the limited population size of the city state, the need for skilled and highly educated workers was also regarded as a reason for Singapore’s expanding intake for international students in its higher education system. In the presentation, the author used a survey of professors to examine their perception of research conditions in Singapore’s largest university, the National University of Singapore. Finally, the paper by Juha Tuunainen and Kari Kantasalmi, both of the University of Helsinki, summarized the discussion about the triple-helix of university-industry-government relations, developed by HenryEtzkowitz, and searched for the ways of its further development. The authors claimed that the model is theoretically ambiguous as it combines three types of sociological theory, that is, diagnosis of an era, general sociological theory and research theory. After assessing the theoretical status of the model, the authors suggested that the empirical research associated with it might benefit from a more consistent use of ideas coming from Niklas Luhmann’s systems theory, a source of inspiration that already has been used in the research associated with the triple helix. To foster this line of development, the paper drew concepts from Luhmann’s theory and specified the ways in which these might make the model more responsive to the multi-functional and internally contradictory character of the contemporary research university.

Gendering Inclusion And Exclusion In Science And Technology
Session Report by Alice Abreu (Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil)

As part of RC23 activities at the XVII World Congress of Sociology at Yokohama, Japan, in July 2014, the session Gendering Inclusion and Exclusion in Science and Technology was held on Saturday, July 19th, from 8:30 to 10:20am. Originally planned to take place in Boot 44, it was transferred to an alternative room that offered better conditions. It was well attended with about 20 persons in the room.

This session was a hybrid, since two of its five papers were originally proposed for the Symposium Gender and Science in the South: a comparative assessment of gender equality in the knowledge society”. As the other papers of the Symposium could not be present in Yokohama, the program coordinators of RC23 organized a composite session with three other papers that dealt with similar issues.

In total five papers were presented. First two country assessments of South Africa and Brazil related to gender and knowledge society were presented and discussed. Two additional papers were then presented, discussing gender and ICTs, one from Germany and one from Korea, followed by a short discussion. Finally, the last paper was presented, discussing how a feminist agenda affected the extension program of a Brazilian University.

One can see that the session brought together a wide representation of different regions of the world, since we had papers from Brazil, South Africa, Germany and Korea. It also discussed the issue of gender in a wide variety of perspectives, from the wide assessments of women participation in the knowledge society
by Brazil and South Africa, to issues related to the new information technologies. ICTs were discussed first in the study of its integration in the lives of 25 couples over a period of 5 years in Germany, showing that inequalities are tied to gender roles.

The paper on Korea, on the other hand, analyzed the remarkable increase in Korean women’s access to internet and, specifically, mobile internet technology. Women have surpassed men in the number and proportion of ‘smart’ mobile phone users. Among young generations, in particular, girls, compared to boys, tend to have access to the mobile phone earlier and use it more frequently and longer in duration of time. There are, however, concerns that the easy availability and access to the mobile technology would lead to continued gender inequality, in which women remained mere consumers, and increased vulnerability to the new problems brought by the new technology, such as digital/mobile addiction.

The last paper presented discussed an extension program of the University of Brasilia established jointly by feminist movements, the University and the Brazilian Public Minister aiming at training community leaders able to engage themselves on tackling gender based violence, as an example of the involvement of the University with the society that surrounds it.

Below, the list of papers in the order of presentation. Authors in bold were present at the session.

1. Participation of Women and Girls in the National Science, Technology and Innovation System in South Africa. BOSHOFF, Nelius (Stellenbosch University); NGILA, Dorothy (Academy of Science of South Africa (ASSAf).

2. Gender Equality in Science and Technology in Brazil: Successes and Remaining Challenges. ABREU, Alice (Federal University of Rio de Janeiro); VIEIRA, Joice Melo (UNICAMP); OLIVEIRA, Maria Coleta (UNICAMP); MARCONDES, Glauclia dos Santos (UNICAMP).

3. The Gendering of Internet-Based ICTs in Everyday Life. ROTH, Ulrike (University of Münster).

4. The New ICTs and Gender Inequality in Korea. YOON, Jeon-Ro (Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology), PARK, Hye-Kyung (Chungnam National University)

5. Towards a Democratic and Emancipatory University: Feminist Popular Extension and New Relations between University and Society in Brazil. GIMENES DIAS DA FONSECA, Lívia (Universidade de Brasília); NEPOMUCENO NARDI, Diego (Nagoya University); DE FARIA GONÇALVES COSTA, Renata Cristina (Universidade de Brasília).
Toward a World of Low Carbon: Social, Economic and Environmental Impacts
Session Report by Leandro Raizer

The thematic session Toward a World of Low Carbon: Social, Economic and Environmental Impacts promoted by RC 23, discussed the development of alternative energy and its social, economic and environmental impacts. The session was attended by researchers from Brazil, Chile, Germany and the UK.

1. Ritsuko OZAKI and Isabel SHAW (Imperial College London), presented reflections on the Provision tema-Transforming Energy and Reducing Carbon Emissions.

2. Robert Helmrich and Germany; Michael TIEMANN (Inst Vocational Education and Training) presented results of his research on the Renewable Energy Expansion and Its Effects on Vocational Education and Training and the Labour Market in Germany.

3. Patricia GRAF, (BTU Cottbus), presented his research on Eco-Innovation - the New Paradigm for Latin America?

4. Cristian PARKER (Universidad de Santiago de Chile) presented his research on Social Patterns of Energy Consumption and Lifestyles: Towards a Low Carbon Society? Study in the Chilean Society.

5. Finally, Marcus Vinicius SPOLLE (UFPEL), presented reflections on the theme The Challenges for Alternatives in the Brazilian Energy Matrix: The Sustainability of Family Farming in Biodiesel Production.
Assessing Technologies: Global Patterns of Trust and Distrust

Session Report by António Moniz
(Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Germany and Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal)

As part of RC23 activities at the XVII World Congress of Sociology at Yokohama, Japan, the session Assessing Technologies: Global Patterns of Trust and Distrust was held on Thursday, July 17, 2014: 5:30 PM-7:20 PM. Originally planned to take place in Boot 44, it was transferred to an alternative room that offered better conditions, as it happened with other sessions. It was well attended with about 20 persons in the room.

The session was organised by Antonio B. MONIZ, Christina GÖTZ and Constanze SCHERZ (all from the Karlsruhe Institute of Technology-KIT), and also by Nuno BOAVIDA (Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Cesnova/IET). Only A. Moniz and N. Boavida could attend the session. In the session abstract presented for the call for papers, it was mentioned that “in most cases, technologies are invented, implemented and applied in an unquestioned way. However, the experience of severe technical accidents, environmental catastrophes, and failed projects has led to a loss of the general confidence in the function and services of technological systems”. In fact, this was the first session of an ISA World Congress ever that was focused on technology assessment. The problem presented revealed a paradox attitude regarding technology. “On the one hand, technology has become a vital part of societal infrastructures and is very much embedded and accepted into the individual practices of our everyday life. On the other hand, public resistance arises against technological developments in general or against large technical infrastructure projects in particular”, was underlined in the call.

In total six papers were selected from a large number of proposals and five were presented. One distributed paper was also orally presented and another one provided to the participants. The session achieved to reach a variety of perspectives from different countries and regions, as well from different approaches.

The first presentation was made by Christian Büscher and Patrick Sumpf (KIT, Karlsruhe, Germany) and presented the case of the German “Energiewende”, a growing discomfort already leads to a lack of confidence in reliability and security and, partly, to doomsday scenarios of expected major breakdowns. However, as the authors underline, “the sociological problem arises in a probable shift of disappointment attribution from external references (e.g. politics) to self-reference (own decision), making smart grids primarily a problem of increased choice between decision alternatives. This future outlook might entail the paradox experience with technology”. The next presentation was made by Jodyn Platt and colleagues (University of Michigan) on “Public Trust in Health Information Sharing and Health Systems in the United States” based on a national survey. As the authors conclude, “the public’s trust of technological change that promotes information sharing in the U.S. health system is not a foregone conclusion. Understanding the nature of the public’s skepticism and uncertainty about the risks and benefits to themselves and their communities of interest can inform future development of information governance and data brokerage”.

The third presentation was made by Young Hee Lee (The Catholic University of Korea, South Korea) on “Technology and Citizens: Case of Citizens’ Jury on National Pandemic Response System in South Korea”. His approach was oriented towards an important technology assessment method based on a case study. As he has concluded, compared to consensus conference, the citizens’ jury used in his study was different. First of all, the participants are randomly selected. Besides that, the modalities of opinion collection and presentation illustrate the differences and non-alignment between the participating citizens. The author concluded that such characteristics of citizens’ jury present highly positive implications in realizing genuine democracy in South Korea. The next presentation was referring also an Asian case. It was on “Research on public attitude towards social impact assessment of Chang E Lunar Probe Program” and presented by Bowen Hou (co-authoring with Haijie Yin, both from Harbin Institute of Technology Department of Humanity and Social Sciences Sociology, China). Their study chose the Chinese Chang E Lunar Probe Program and conducted a survey by using questionnaires about public’s attitude towards the social impacts of this space experience. The results suggest that public’s attitude towards high-tech and non-direct-interest engineering’s social impact consists of military impact factor, political and economic impact factor, psycho-social impact factor and educational impact factor. The final presentation was made by Christoph Dukat (co-authored with Simon Caton, both from the Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Germany). It was a paper that discussed some of the references that were made by the session organizers. They mentioned that is
common an un-reflected public attitude at least towards social media technology. As they mention “to put it shortly people’s naive confidence in technology is disturbed by short moments of reflection caused by the thematization of technology related problems respectively risks”. After this presentation there was also time for a presentation based on a distributed paper from Silvia Akter (East West University, Dhaka, Bangladesh) on “Privacy and Security Issues of Mobile Phone: Perceptions of University Students”. The author concluded that a strong pro-user regulatory board is expected by the respondents. She also referred that the “study finds that the security concerns will be more significant in the coming days than before”. The discussion that followed these presentations was very intensive and contributed to build the idea that more debate on such topic is needed. The contribution of sociology to the technology assessment field is highly relevant, and the session could prove that high quality presentations from all over the world mean that such debate should not only be based on Europe or US. It is also relevant in other regions of the world. The next ISA international events (Forum and World Congress) can contribute to pursue the research outcomes exchanges on technology assessment, or conceptual discussions, or even methodological ones.

Below, the list of papers in the order of presentation. Authors in bold were present at the session.

1. Patterns of Trust and Distrust in Energy System Transformation (Oral Presentation) Christian BÜSCHER, KIT, Germany; Patrick SUMPFF, KIT, Germany
2. Public Trust in Health Information Sharing and Health Systems in the United States: A National Survey (Oral Presentation) Jodyn PLATT, University of Michigan, USA; Daniel THIEL, University of Michigan School of Public Health, USA; Tevah PLATT, University of Michigan School of Public Health, USA; Nicole FISHER, University of Michigan School of Public Health, USA; Sharon KARDIA, University of Michigan School of Public Health, USA
3. Technology and Citizens: Case of Citizens’ Jury on National Pandemic Response System in South Korea (Oral Presentation) Young Hee LEE, The Catholic University of Korea, South Korea
4. Research on Public Attitude Towards Social Impact Assessment of Chang E Lunar Probe Program (Oral Presentation) Haijie YIN, Harbin Institute of Technology, China; Bowen HOU, Harbin Institute of Technology, China
5. Trust and the Reflection on Social Media Related Risks (Oral Presentation) Christoph DUKAT, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Germany; Simon CATON, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Germany
6. Policy Actions for Securing Computers (Distributed Paper) Arnd WEBER, KIT, Germany
7. Privacy and Security Issues Of Mobile Phone: Perceptions Of University Students (Distributed Paper) Silvia AKTER, East West University, Bangladesh

The Future of Public Research Universities: Confronting the Demands of Increasing Economic Self-Sufficiency

Session Report by Jaime Jiménez-Guzmán
(Institute of Applied Mathematics and Systems, National Autonomous University of Mexico)

The session developed with a wide participation of the attendants. Only one speaker could not attend because of her physician recommendation.

Hugo HORTA (Portugal): Bringing Science and Academia to the Population: Activities to Raise Questions and Make People Think in Vulnerable Urban Contexts.

Hugo dissertated on the university’s role in a context of academic capitalism, institutional competition and the quantification of activities/results, associated to a tendency of decreasing resources and public funding. All these facts put at risk the integrity of the university as a social institution. He asserted that a new mission has recently been assigned to the university expressed as “service to the community”, which may be interpreted as “opening” the university to society. This service mission not only benefits the univer-
sity by orienting it to fulfill its social mandate, but also contributes to the benefit of vulnerable populations in urban areas. He illustrates his assertion with the description of two interventions of academics in Lisbon, Portugal, aimed at approaching the university to vulnerable populations to at least raise awareness about risky phenomena and sensitive situations.

**Henry Lee Allen (USA): The Future of Teaching and Research in Universities: Global Transformations.**

Henry talked about the global transformations that are taking place all over the world concerning the new relationship between university and society. He asserted that profound transformations due to the arrival of powerful ICTs have reshaped academic labor via MOOCs, distance learning, assessment, and for-profit higher education. Taking the USA as an example, Henry explains how the professoriate is dominated by contingent labor rather than full-time employment, outside a core of prestigious research universities. Changes within universities are not devoid from academic capitalism or commercialization, spreading a bias distorting humanistic and scientific learning away from basic research or theoretical questions. He asserts that in the same way climatologists monitor climate change, sociologists must continuously investigate ‘academic climate change’ on a global scale.

**Nikita Gоловко (Russia): The Entrepreneurial University: Institutional, Political and Social Factors.**

Nikita asserts that the mission of the public research university is to advance excellence in research, scholarship and creative activities. He referred to the new role universities are forced to take as entrepreneurs, and the factors implied institutionally, politically, and socially. Nikita elaborates the idea of building an explanatory model of the research sector of the university, involving the abovementioned factors, to guarantee true entrepreneurial activity of the university, based on technology transfer. He finally illustrates the link between entrepreneurial activity and the research sectors with some results from a broad study of the universities in Western Siberia.

**Yongmei Xie (China): Field Fusion — the Experience of Engineering Education in New China’s Early Stage.**

Yongmei addresses the general problem of the low engineering ability of students in China, taking as an example the situation in the Harbin Institute of Technology Welding. He refers to the “New China’s higher education”, managed by the government, as responsible for this situation. The motto “education serves for politics and combines with production” called for by the government has been the orientation followed by the China’s professional studies in general, and by the engineering studies in particular. This motto has been recently changed to the interactive mode of “society-engineering-research-teaching” which better responds to China’s current social and technological needs, and fits to the global understanding of the role science and engineering play in society.

The general discussion addressed to the universities’ global problem of responding to the ever increasing pressure of increasing sources of support, in conjunction with the demand of producing science aimed at its application, responding to the market needs. This impulse is impinging upon the universities’ vocation of advancing knowledge by its own sake, and producing science in areas apparently not connected with applications like the humanities. The general conviction was to adapt universities to the new situation, however preserving its original vocation of producer of new knowledge, irrespective of its potential application.
Girijadevi VISHALAKSHI (India): IGNOU-Paradigm Shift for Higher Education in India.
Girijadevi started by positioning India in the global context of higher education. She referred that India is number one in number of institutions, and number three in terms of enrollment. However, the Gross Enrollment Ratio (GER) is low (16.23%) as compared with the world average (27.06). She then described the qualities of IGNOU (Indira Gandhi National Open University) that makes it a singular institution in India. Among its features they stand out in: 1) Offer high-quality, innovative and need-based programmes. 2) Reach out to the disadvantaged by offering programmes at affordable costs. 3) Adopts a variety of media and latest technology. Finally the speaker asserted that IGNOU, by the use of innovative technologies and methodologies, ensures convergence of existing systems for large-scale human resource development.

Dave POST (USA): Ranking Regimes, “World Class” Universities, and the Impoverishment of Intellectual Life.
Dave dissertated on the world-wide pressure felt by scholars to publish in journals that are highly ranked according to their “impact factor”, with the added fact that in non-English speaking countries scholars are pushed to publish in English-language journals. This goes in detriment of the intellectual life at the national level. He then discusses the funding mechanisms and research assessment for higher education. Dave finally reviews factors involved in this movement: “1) the rationalization of expertise as a feature of Weberian bureaucratic authority; 2) the politics of higher education regulation and control, as manifest in the new managerialism and associated research assessment exercises; 3) the pricing and finance of commercial scholarly publishing, which takes advantage of the preceding developments by charging high prices to maximize profits; 4) decisions by editors and their journals to play by the new rules even when they are personally opposed to them”. He drew on national case studies from Japan, Taiwan, Argentina, Singapore, the UK, and South Africa.

Olivier CHANTRAINE (France): Discourse Distortion in University Communication.
Olivier asserts that, due to the non-resistible construction of a unique global higher education and research systems, a language distortion -double bind- is taking place in the academic - administrative context. He points out slogan-keywords like “autonomy”, “new public management”, “excellence”, “modernity” are contradictory with the reality they label. The new forms of organization, management, and evaluation imposed by the State supervision constrain the academic authorities to abide by. This social discourse along with the neo-capitalistic reframing of the University, leads to the extinction of the University language.

Susan TALBURT (USA): Chilean Universities, Crisis Ordinariness, and Respatializing Knowledge.
Susan centered her presentation in the “internationalization and research development in Chilean universities as a spatial reorientation of faculty work, knowledge, and subjectivity.” She asserts that universities are also subject to neoliberalization which in turn intensifies competition in a free market, simultaneously declining the welfare state. Hence international excellence of faculty research productivity is measured with external parameters like indexed publications, and research citations. Current Chilean university policy responds to World Bank and OECD directives of increasing research productivity and university rankings. Susan infers “themes” from interviews of twenty faculty of two prestigious Chilean universities in the following terms: (1) Faculty describes becoming self-managers, securing grants, publishing in ISI journals, and participating in international networks, thus creating new privileges and hierarchies; (2) As
faculty “becomes productive,” some describe losses like abandonment of local projects of social change, and diminishing space to participate in national debates, because of research regulation through funding agencies and journal standards; (3) These constraints produce alternative knowledge projects, such as using grant funds to create digital platforms for public exchange or indexing long-existing Chilean journals to legitimize “expressions that expand our social imaginary”. She concludes that “crisis ordinariness” creates new spaces, subjectivities, and knowledge.

**Maria DUSHINA, Anatoly ABLAZHEY (Russia):** *Research University in Modern Russia: From Science to Innovation.*

Maria and Anatoly gave a panorama of science in Russia with emphasis in the changes taking place recently. Russia joined the current trend of “modernization” by giving a business orientation to scientific endeavor. As a consequence some universities received the status of National Research Universities. Research universities became entrepreneurial, characterized by the managerial model adopted, similar to the business model. This business-orientation turned into “unstable conditions of work for scientists, limitation of permanent contracts, and public perception of scientists as ordinary workers”. Maria and Anatoly gave some results of an ongoing survey research directed to young St. Petersburg leading scientists. The results so far show that “in spite of the high scientific productivity, there is a weak role of business in the financing of science, “bureaucratization”, uncertainty for the permanence of the laboratory at the end of the project, and continuing “brain drain””. This leads to the conclusion that, spite of the efforts to convert universities into “businesses” some prefers its role as research universities, not entrepreneurial.

The joint session was exhausting and fruitful in insights on the problematique at hand. All presenters coincide in the fact that the “modern” view of research universities will very likely jeopardize its future as centers of knowledge generation regardless of its potential application. Although interesting and sound analysis were presented, there were not workable alternatives discussed.

**Technological Transfer in Latin American Countries and the Caribbean: Challenges of Scientific and Technological Cooperation**

*Session Report by Jaime Jiménez-Guzmán (Institute of Applied Mathematics and Systems, National Autonomous University of Mexico)*

Unfortunately in this session there was only one presentation out of five programmed.

**Daniel VILLAVICENCIO (Mexico):** *La Cooperación Científica entre universidades de México y Francia: qué prácticas estrategias y alcances podemos identificar.*

Daniel not only referred to the Mexico — France scientific cooperation university agreements, but to the whole range of agreements and ways of supporting cooperation between Mexican scholars and foreign scientific institutions. Due to the good number of Latin American colleagues attending, a wide discussion about academic cooperation and interchange of that part of the globe and the rest of the world took place.

I have the impression that if we wish to organize sessions in a language other than English, it is necessary to keep a closer look at the way they are put together, and make sure, as much as possible, they will take place as the ordinary sessions in English are carried out.
Technological Innovation and (Un)Sustainable Consumption
Session Report by Czarina Saloma-Akpedonu

This panel featured studies on the consumption of technologies and the paradox that such consumption creates. Binay Pattnaik (Institute for Social and Economic Change, India) offered a comprehensive overview of the conceptual shift from “appropriate technologies” to “sustainable technologies.” Four other studies provided conceptual and empirical contributions to understanding the nature and dynamics of the consumption of technological innovations. Using the case of digital objects such as music, video games, and films, Lance Stewart (Toronto, Canada) brought in cultural materiality into the analysis of the consumption of copyright. Marlyne Sahakian (University of Lausanne, Switzerland) applied the practice theory approach to the analysis of aircondition consumption in a mega-city in the Philippines. Czarina Saloma-Akpedonu (Ateneo de Manila University, Philippines) examined the agency of domestic/household technologies in structuring food consumption practices of Filipino middle-class condominium residents. Giriyappa Kollannavar (Central Leather Institute, India) analyzed the role of women empowerment strategies in the revival of the Indian household footwear industry which has long suffered from the lack of technological innovations.

Higher Education as a Key Driver of Innovation and Economic Growth
Session Report by Nadia ASHEULOVA, IHST of RAS, Russia

Nowadays higher education is posited as one of the primary drivers of the nation’s economic competitiveness. At the session we discussed the role of universities in producing a high-skilled workforce, attracting the best minds from other countries, and fostering creative activity and innovation. This session brought out six deliberations focusing on key role of higher education on economic development differently in various countries. In total six papers were selected for the session, but not all were presented. One of the important features of the session was the presence of researchers from different regions and countries: India, Germany, USA, Spain, Russia. The session started with a presentation by Uwe WILKESMANN from TU Dortmund University (Germany). His topic suggested the discussion about the form of organizational governance. He raised the following question in this context: does it support freedom of teaching and increase their perception of relevance? He presented the empirical evidence from two types of higher education institutions and this theme attracts interest among all participants.

Duru ARUN KUMAR (Delhi University, India), Rachit JAIN and Raunaq SAWHNEY (Netaji Subhas Institute of Technology, Delhi University, India) gave their presentation on “Changing Trends in Academic Practices in Higher Education — Reasons and Remedies”. Adam GAMORAN, William T. (Grant Foundation, USA), while presenting lessons learnt from American educational system, outlined the implications of rising of privatization in tertiary education for teaching and research in universities. Sambit MALLICK from Indian Institute of Technology Guwahati (India) presented his paper on contested proprietary technology. He focused on the searching of a non-proprietary technology in agriculture in India. Ramón FERNÁNDEZ-DÍAZ and Artemio BAIGORRI (University of Extremadura, Spain) highlighted “El Impacto Del Plan Bolonia En La Estructura De Usos Del Tiempo Del Profesorado Universitario”.

You can find the abstracts of participants at the webpage of ISA Congress (Session 3576) [https://isaconf.confex.com/isaconf/wc2014/webprogram/Session3576.html](https://isaconf.confex.com/isaconf/wc2014/webprogram/Session3576.html)

It was enable us to share our experience, to listen to and express certain critical remarks, find the ways of developing further these topics.

Our work was productive and it generated new incentives for the participants in their future work.
Report on registration grants for XVIII ISA World Congress of Sociology
by Nadia ASHEULOVA, Co-Program Coordinator of RC23

According to the rules, Research Committee 23 Sociology of Science and Technology (RC23) was responsible for allocating only registration grant(s) to persons selected by Board of RC23.

There were two types of registration grants:
1. for Program Coordinators;
2. for active participants in the RC23.

Only Individual ISA members in good standing (i.e. who have paid the individual membership fee at least two years before the month of the ISA conference) were eligible for registration grants.

RC 23 has received one registration grant (with the full registration fee) for the Program Coordinator from category B Country (Russia): Nadia Asheulova.

As to registration for active participants in the RC23, RC 23 Board has received 8 applications from India (5), Russia (2), German (1). But not all the colleagues could be eligible for a registration grant according to the main criteria: members who have paid the individual membership fee at least two years before the month of the ISA conference. Moreover, according the rules of ISA's selection process RC23 had opportunity to cover grants for 930 Euro.

The decision of RC 23 Board was the following: the registration grants for active participants have received:

Name:
1. Sambit Mallick, India
2. Giriappa Kollannavar, India
3. Manushi KU(PhD student), India
4. Rafael Palacios Bustamante, Germany
5. Czarina Saloma-Akpedonu, Philippines

This information was posted at the webpage of ISA:
http://www.isa-sociology.org/congress2014/guidelines-for-grant-application-submission.htm
Call for Sessions

We invite you to propose RC 23 sessions for the THIRD ISA FORUM OF SOCIOLOGY in English, French or Spanish. The right to propose sessions is restricted to members of RC 23 ‘Sociology of Science and Technology’. If you are not a member and wish to propose a session, please join RC 23 through the ISA website. Members of other ISA Research Committees who wish to propose a joint session may contact any RC23 member to propose the session jointly.

Session proposals must be submitted on-line via the Confex platform at the ISA website between the dates of 2 February, 2015 and 15 March, 2015 24:00 GMT

RC 23 has been awarded a total of 14 Sessions, including one for our business meeting. A small proportion of these sessions may be jointly organized with other ISA Research Committees.

Session proposals should relate either to the theme and subthemes of the Forum as these apply to the topic of science and technology and/or to the main themes and topics framing the regular activities of RC 23 such as:

- Social Studies of Science;
- Science & Technology Studies;
- History of SST;
- Research Policy;
- Science, Technology, Innovations and Society;
- Public Understanding of Science;
- Globalisation of Science and Technology;
- International Cooperation and Mobility of Scientists;
- Future of Universities and Academies: New Public Management;
- Communications in Science and Technology;
- Gender and Science and Technology;
- Social Positions and Social Roles of Scientists;
- Research Funding and the Dynamics of Science;
- Research Career Development;
- Inequalities through Science and Technology.

Moreover, we encourage RC23 members to propose not only ‘regular’ open paper session topics (for which abstracts are then submitted), but also to propose other session formats, as described below:

**Regular Sessions.** Comprising four 15-20 minute presentations (or at most five 15 minute presentations) and 10-20 minutes of collective discussion.

**Roundtable Session.** In order to accommodate more papers, a regular session time-slot may be used for a maximum of 5 concurrent running *round table* presentations in one room (maximum of 5-6 presenters
at each table). Five tables will be set up at the same time and in the same room. Each table will accommodate 10 persons including the presenters (suggested number of 5 presenters).

**Joint Session.** Joint Sessions are sessions organized jointly by two or more RCs, or an RC and a Working Group or Thematic Group of ISA, on a theme of overlapping interest. Please note that Joint Sessions must be included in the regular session allocation of one of the participating units. Joint sessions cannot constitute more than 50% of all sessions organized by a RC/WG/TG. RC 23 Members are invited to suggest topics on which to collaborate with other RCs/WGs/TGs.

**RC 23 will also organize a Young Researchers’ Forum.** The Session is directed specifically to those more junior scholars. This includes Ph.D. students, post-doctoral fellows, and those in the first five years post Ph.D. and at the beginning of their careers in this field. The primary aim of the session is to give those new to the field of the Sociology of Science and Technology an opportunity to present their research proposals, preliminary research findings, and new ideas to an audience with experience in the field and an interest in their work. If you are interested in participating in the organization of this session please write to the program coordinators.

The Program Committee will review all proposals, and may suggest some modifications or combinations of proposals.

**The Final list of Sessions will be appear on the ISA webpage on or before 7 April, 2015**

Please note that individuals may not organize more than two sessions in the program.

More information on the Forum, including news and deadlines, can be found at the following website, which is regularly updated: [http://www.isa-sociology.org/forum-2016/](http://www.isa-sociology.org/forum-2016/)


**Other Important Dates:**

**Abstracts submission:** 3 June — 30 September, 2015 24:00 GMT
Participants must submit abstracts on-line via Confex platform. Abstracts must be submitted in English, French or Spanish. Only abstracts submitted on-line will be considered in the selection process.

**Abstracts selection:** 4 October — 24 November, 2015 24:00 GMT
Session Organizer must complete selection of abstracts and provide a final presentation designation (oral, distributed, poster, round table).

**Notification letters:** 30 November, 2015 24:00 GMT
Session Organizer must send notification letters to:
1. Authors and co-authors of accepted abstracts
2. Submitters whose abstract was rejected in this session but has been transferred to Program Coordinator for review and possible consideration in another session
3. Authors of rejected abstracts.
At present, both scientific communications and popular texts dealing with the topic of subjectivity and the mind are frequently accompanied by images of the human brain. In addition to the fundamental role visual representations play in the very process of research and in the communication between scientists, within the last decades such images have emerged as an essential tool for the dissemination of scientific results to a lay public. In particular, with the emergence of a new generation of imaging technologies (principally, functional magnetic resonance imaging [fMRI], positron emission tomography [PET] and single-photon emission computed tomography [SPECT]) this tendency has intensified, resulting in a real boom of images of the brain. Currently, such technologies of visualization allow researchers to study the brain in action. As a consequence, such images of cerebral functioning are used to address the study of an ever wider variety of cognitive, affective and behavioral states and processes and even personality traits, contributing thus to the “cerebralization” of discourses on the human subject. In this sense, these technological images of the brain constitute the foundation for the present proliferation of fields of study that investigate the human subject through the brain, which range from the more traditional branches such as neurobiology or neurolinguistics to new areas of specialties such as neuroengineering, neuroinformatics, neuroeconomy, neuromarketing, neuropolitics, neuropsychopharmacology, neuroanthropology, neuroethology, neuropyschoanalysis, neurotheology, etc. At the same time, such multiplication of scientific perspectives has developed in parallel with the emergence of the voracious consumption of “neuro-knowledge”, as evidenced by the boom of cultural products of scientific diffusion (magazines, books, talks, workshops, television programs, etc.) dedicated to the topic of the human brain.

The availability of such imaging technologies of the brain therefore poses a variety of questions: How is the meaning of brain images constructed socially? What role do these images play in the social production of “facts” and “truths” regarding the individual, his/her identity, abilities and afflictions? How do these “facts” and “truths” circulate in different social spheres? More specifically, what role do images have in the circulation of expert knowledge (scientific or professional)? And how are such images re-appropriated by other social spaces? How do they take part in other types of lay practices and discourses? What impact do they have on the present transformation of fields of study, specialties, disciplines and circuits of dissemination dedicated to the study of the human subject? What role do the images play in the social legitimation of such fields of inquiry within scientific or professional circles and among the lay public? Among other considerations, given in particular the competitive pressure among disciplines to modernize, what impact does the availability of technological images of the brain have on fields dedicated to the human subject that do not—or cannot—draw upon the artillery of such novel imaging technologies?

Hence, for the present thematic dossier we extend our call for papers to articles that study the societal role of brain images and their contribution to the circulation of “psy knowledge,”—that is, discursive and practical knowledge related to subjectivity and the mind—within disciplines such as psychoanalysis, psychiatry, psychology, the different specialties of neuroscience, and beyond. We invite researchers to submit unpublished original texts that problematize the diffusion, circulation of brain images in either professional, scientific circles or among the lay public from a socio-historical, socio-anthropological, communicational or social studies of science perspective.

About the journal:
CulturasPsi/PsyCultures is a free-access electronic journal catalogued in Latindex with a system of double-blind peer review. It focuses on the discussion and debate on topics related to the circulation of “psy knowledge” and associated practices. In an ample sense, by “psy knowledge” we mean not only the development of scientific disciplines related to the study of subjectivity and the mind (such as psychoanalysis, psychiatry,
psychology, neurosciences, etc.) but also extending to all forms of dissemination, circulation and reception of such discourses and practices, within scientific and professional circles and beyond. In particular, the journal places special emphasis on questions related to the transnational circulation of “psy knowledge”.

**Reception deadlines:**
The deadline for the electronic submission of manuscripts is March 15, 2015 for articles to be considered for the September 2015 issue of the dossier and September 15, 2015 for its March 2016 issue, respectively.

**Review process:**
Texts preselected by the editors will be evaluated through a system of double-blind peer review.

**Manuscripts:**
The journal receives electronic submissions of unpublished manuscripts on original research in English, Spanish, Portuguese and French. To upload manuscripts, please proceed to http://ppct.caicyt.gov.ar/index.php/culturaspis/about/submissions. Articles accepted for publication will appear in their original language.

**Submission guidelines and style:**
The electronically submitted manuscript (max. 12,000 words) must be accompanied by an abstract in English, an abstract in the source language of the article (for manuscripts in Spanish, Portuguese or French), as well as five keywords. For detailed submission guidelines and specifications on bibliographic style, please visit the journal’s webpage.

**Contact address:**
editor@culturaspis.org

---

**The ESRC Genomics Network — Genetics and Society Book Series**

**Deadline: June 01 2015**

The ESRC Genomics Network - Genetics and Society Book Series provides an outlet for outstanding scholarship in the multiple fields of genetics and genomics social sciences research. Published with Routledge since 2006, the research monographs, handbooks, textbooks, and edited collections offer authoritative, cutting edge perspectives on issues covering the ethical, legal, social, economic or political aspects of:

- tissue engineering, enhancement, and cloning
- genetic modification of foodstuffs and other organisms,
- neuroscience and neuroethics
- genetic screening and testing
- stem cell research and reproductive technologies
- psycho-social aspects of medical genetics and gene therapy
- the social and ethical issues surrounding biomedical innovation
- public engagement and political discourse
- representations of genetics across the media and cultural spheres
- regulatory policy and governance of biomedical research and its human applications
- the sociology and anthropology of bio-science and bio-technology
- bioethics
- the economics of new biomedical technologies and their place in the ‘knowledge economy’
Proposals for new titles within the scope of these topic areas are encouraged from individuals and groups. Please see the book proposal submission guidelines and application form.

Further information, requests and queries contact:
Helen Greenslade, Editorial Manager Cesagen Cardiff University 6 Museum Place Cardiff CF10 3BG
e-mail: greensladeh@cardiff.ac.uk Tel: 02920-875389 Fax: 02920-870024

UPCOMING CONFERENCES

19th Biennial Meeting Society for Philosophy and Technology

July 2-6, 2015
Theme: Technology and Innovation
Location: International Academic Exchange Center of Northeastern University, Shenyang, China
Conference website: http://spt2015.neu.edu.cn/

We warmly invite participants to the 19th SPT Biennial Meeting, which will be hosted jointly by the Research Center for Philosophy of Science and Technology, Northeastern University, and the Chinese Society for Dialectics of Nature/Philosophy of Nature, Science and Technology, in Shenyang, China. It is hoped that participants will share their views of recent developments in relevant research fields concerned with technology. The theme for this meeting is “Technology and Innovation”. It responds to some remarkable and interesting outcomes in the philosophy of technology research. Innovation has been a big theme in public discussions, and more and more scholars are investigating the relationship between innovation and science, technology, etc., and thinking about the co-production of science, technology, engineering and innovation from the perspective of philosophy. It is thus particularly worthy of discussion as a central theme in the SPT biennial meeting.

The 19th meeting provides a forum to explore responses across the broad range of disciplinary perspectives found within science, technology, engineering and innovation studies. Papers are encouraged exploring diverse aspects of the theme from ontology, epistemology, methodology, axiology, and praxis. The usual themes on philosophy of technology such as Biology, Information, Nano, Cognition, Sustainability, etc. are also warmly welcomed.

Contributions are sought in the following tracks:
• Science, Technology, Engineering and Innovation
• Phenomenology of Innovation (Character and Dynamics)
• Innovation, Safety, and Risk
• Responsible Innovation
• Technology, Innovation, Culture and Globalization
• Technology, Innovation and Design
• Technology, Innovation and Economics (Markets)
• Technology, Innovation and Education
• Technology, Innovation, Ethics, Politics, and Policy
• Technology, Innovation and Epistemology (Local and Global Knowledge)
• Technology, Innovation and Marxism
• Technology, Innovation and Space Exploration
• Technological, Institutional, and Social Innovation
  Technology, Sustainability and the Environment
  Technology, Culture and Globalization
Important Dates

- March 15, 2015: Deadline of Abstract Submission;
- March 30, 2015: Acceptance notification;
- Before April 1, 2015: Early Registration;
- April 1-May 1, 2015: Regular registration;
- After May 1, 2015: Late registration open
- June 15, 2015: Final program posted

The International Committee for the History of Technology

42nd Symposium in Tel Aviv, Israel
History of High-Technologies and Their Socio-Cultural Contexts
16–21 August 2015

The 42nd ICOHTEC Symposium will be held together with IEEE Histelcon in Tel Aviv from 16 to 21 August 2015. The main theme of the meeting will be History of High-Technologies and Their Socio-Cultural Contexts. The aim is to analyse the social, cultural, political, economic, scientific as well as military impact of high-technologies, ranging from recent and contemporary developments in computer technology through to innovations that were state-of-the-art in their own time, such as the telegraph, radar, and the jet engine. The conference will explore this complex process from national as well as international perspectives. It will trace both developers and users of high-technologies and their appropriation strategies. It addresses scholars from various backgrounds such as historians, sociologists, practicing engineers, and scientists.

The symposium covers all periods and areas of the globe. We invite submissions of new, original and unpublished work that offers fresh perspectives for the history of technology as well as exploring sources and methods.

ESA Research Network 24 — Science and Technology

The European Sociological Association (ESA) has chosen Prague as the city to host the 12th ESA conference

25–28 August, 2015. The main theme this year is ‘Differences, Inequalities and Sociological Imagination’

RN coordinator: Katarina Prpić, independent researcher, Zagreb, Croatia katarina@idi.hr
Conference webpage and Abstract submission platform: [www.esa12thconference.eu](http://www.esa12thconference.eu)

Inequalities in and through science and technology as challenges for sociological research

Increasing social inequalities, exacerbated by neoliberal policies and international economic crisis, have been an issue of science and technology studies (STS) even prior to the crisis. Instead of normative claims about the socially beneficial or harmful role of science and technology, a more complex sociological perspective has been promoted. This perspective, postulating that S&T impacts are closely interrelated to social context and circumstances has the potential to be more productive in studying the relationship between technoscientific development and social inequalities. The global economy, with its increasing role of S&T, seems to increase inequalities within contemporary societies, as well as between them. Therefore, it has become
crucial and urgent to not only understand how science and technology influence the increase in and different forms of inequality, but also how these factors can help to mitigate inequality, primarily through S&T policies. A tension has been recognized between the dominant concept of the knowledge economy paradigm (focused on science-based industries and profitable knowledge) and broader social objectives already built into the EU’s Lisbon Agenda. Such conflicting economic and social approaches have been reflected in recent ERA (European Research Area) policy. For example, the aim of achieving European competitiveness in S&T which stresses research excellence is accompanied by some re-distributive goals of the ERA, such as networking and collaboration, gender equality and greater European research cohesion at both regional and local levels. The meritocratic recruitment of researchers, professional competition and mobility all support achieving excellence, but can also undermine some social objectives like gender equity or more equal national and regional techno-scientific development.

Conflicting economic and social paradigms and objectives of understanding, as well as dealing with inequalities in and through science and technology, require the mobilization of the attention and imagination of sociologists and other social scientists.

Thus, the Sociology of Science and Technology Network (SSTNET) invites papers to its sessions on S&T inequalities and differences, their structural, representational and distributional forms, (re)production, their reflections on S&T policy, human resources, science governance and accountability mechanisms, as well as the socio-economic impacts of established and emerging technologies.

Society for the Social Study of Science (4S)

Denver, Colorado, 11-15 November
Conference website: http://www.4sonline.org/meeting

Important Dates

• Wednesday, Feb. 4, 2015: Submission opens
• Sunday, March 29, 2015: Deadline for submissions of individual papers, session proposals and movies/videos.
• Sunday, May 24, 2015: Acceptance notification.
• May 25 — August 9, 2015: Early registration.
• September 1, 2015: All presenters must register to be included in the program. For papers with more than one author, one presenter must register to be included in the final program.
• September 13: Program posted
ISBN 9780674599222

Soaring income inequality and unemployment, expanding populations of the displaced and imprisoned, accelerating destruction of land and water bodies: today’s socioeconomic and environmental dislocations cannot be fully understood in the usual terms of poverty and injustice, according to Saskia Sassen. They are more accurately understood as a type of expulsion—from professional livelihood, from living space, even from the very biosphere that makes life possible.

This hard-headed critique updates our understanding of economics for the twenty-first century, exposing a system with devastating consequences even for those who think they are not vulnerable. From finance to mining, the complex types of knowledge and technology we have come to admire are used too often in ways that produce elementary brutalities. These have evolved into predatory formations—assemblages of knowledge, interests, and outcomes that go beyond a firm’s or an individual’s or a government’s project.

Sassen draws surprising connections to illuminate the systemic logic of these expulsions. The sophisticated knowledge that created today’s financial “instruments” is paralleled by the engineering expertise that enables exploitation of the environment, and by the legal expertise that allows the world’s have-nations to acquire vast stretches of territory from the have-nots. Expulsions lays bare the extent to which the sheer complexity of the global economy makes it hard to trace lines of responsibility for the displacements, evictions, and eradications it produces—and equally hard for those who benefit from the system to feel responsible for its depredations.

Link: http://www.hup.harvard.edu/catalog.php?isbn=9780674599222

Saskia Sassen is Robert S. Lynd Professor of Sociology and co-chair of the Committee on Global Thought at Columbia University.

ISBN 9780230217614

Media, Environment and the Network Society provides a timely and far-reaching analysis of the shifting role of the media in covering some of the most important global environmental challenges we face today. Anderson examines the influential theory of ‘network society’ and discusses its significance for understanding the nature of contemporary environmental activism and the media politics of the environment. She argues that the success of an environmental campaign cannot be judged by media visibility alone. Among the key questions the book seeks to address are: What factors trigger particular environmental stories to make their way into the headlines while others are ignored? How do issue attention cycles operate? And how do some actors seek to keep issues off the agenda?
The chapters focus specifically on climate change, the Deepwater Horizon oil disaster and emerging technologies such as synthetic biology and nanotechnology.


Alison G. Anderson is Professor of Sociology and Director of the Centre for Culture, Community and Society at the University of Plymouth, UK. She is Editor of Environmental Communication. Her previous books include Media, Culture and the Environment (1997) and Nanotechnology, Risk and Communication (2009) with Alan Petersen, Clare Wilkinson and Stuart Allan.


Science is the cornerstone of development. As the connection between scientific advancement and development becomes firmer, efforts are directed towards strengthening the scientific system. This is increasingly relevant and indispensable for countries on the path of scientific progress. Collaboration has been accepted as a key factor in scientific advancement, and the effects of collaboration are often manifested in the productivity of scientists. This book explores how science in South Africa has grown due to collaboration over the course of its colonial, apartheid and democratic regimes. It provides a comprehensive analysis of the role of collaboration in science and its relation to communication, networks and the productivity of scientists. In giving a detailed account of the concept of scientific collaboration, the South African model presented in this book has great significance not only for other African countries but also for developing nations generally. Transforming Science in South Africa: Development, Collaboration and Productivity will be of interest to anyone who wants to know how science works nationally and internationally in the contemporary world. Includes a foreword by Arthur Stinchcombe.

R. Sooryamoorthy is Professor of Sociology at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa.


Renewable Energy normally refers to usable energy sources that are an alternative to fuel sources, but without the negatively evaluated consequences of the replaced fuels. Although energy issues have a long tradition in sociology and other social sciences, it may now be high time to conceptualize these in sociological terms as the lynchpin in our understanding of the way societies are set to develop in the 21st century.

This concise book focuses on sociological attempts at better framing contemporary theories of energy transformations and to deliver an accessible overview on the relationships between different types of renewable energy sources and their practical usages in modern societies. A strong focus is laid upon new forms of envi-
ronmental governance and unavoidable knowledge gaps triggered by attempts to transform contemporary energy systems to renewable ones.

Critical topics include the challenge of transition from centralized to decentralized system structures, the integration of renewable energies into existing energy structures or the replacement of these, coping strategies to unforeseen risks and conflict issues, and socio-cultural reservations to new technologies connected to renewable energies.

Link: http://www.sponpress.com/books/details/9780415858618/

Matthias Gross is professor of Environmental Sociology at Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research — UFZ, Leipzig, and, by joint appointment, the University of Jena, Germany. His recent research focusses on the evolution of alternative energy systems, the centrality of ignorance in engineering, and experimental practices in society. His most recent monograph is Ignorance and Surprise: Science, Society, and Ecological Design (2010, MIT Press).

Rüdiger Mautz is senior research scientist at the Sociological Research Institute of Göttingen (SOFI), Germany. His recent research concentrates on energy system transitions and the social dynamics of renewable energies. His most recent book (together with A. Byazio and W. Rosenbaum) is Auf dem Weg zur Energiewende: Die Stromproduktion aus erneuerbaren Energien in Deutschland (2008, Universitätsverlag Göttingen).

ISBN 978-3-319-08628-6

- Examines the position of women in science within national and international labor markets
- Surveys female participation in the fields of chemical sciences, computer science, mathematics and statistics
- Features contributions and case vignettes from a diverse spectrum of scholars, analysts and practitioners from around the world

Many countries have implemented policies to increase the number and quality of scientific researchers as a means to foster innovation and spur economic development and progress. To that end, grounded in a view of women as a rich, yet underutilized knowledge and labor resource, a great deal of recent attention has focused on encouraging women to pursue education and careers in science — even in countries with longstanding dominant patriarchal regimes. Yet, overall, science remains an area in which girls and women are persistently disadvantaged. This book addresses that situation. It bridges the gap between individual- and societal-level perspectives on women in science in a search for systematic solutions to the challenge of building an inclusive and productive scientific workforce capable of creating the innovation needed for economic growth and societal wellbeing.

This book examines both the role of gender as an organizing principle of social life and the relative position of women scientists within national and international labor markets. Weaving together and engaging research on globalization, the social organization of science, and gendered societal relations as key social forces, this book addresses critical issues affecting women’s contributions and participation in science. Also, while considering women’s representation in science as a whole, examinations of women in the chemical sciences, computing, mathematics, and statistics are offered as examples to provide insights into how differing disciplinary cultures, functional tasks, and socio-historical conditions can affect the advancement of women in science relative to important variations in educational and occupational realities.
Edited by three social scientists recognized for their expertise in science and technology policy, education, workforce participation, and stratification, this book includes contributions from an intellectually diverse group of international scholars and analysts, and features compelling cases and initiatives from around the world, with implications for research, industry practice, education, and policy development.

Link: http://www.springer.com/business+%26+management/technology+management/book/978-3-319-08628-6

Willie Pearson, Jr., is Professor of Sociology in the School of History, Technology, and Society at Georgia Institute of Technology. Lisa M. Frehill is a Senior Analyst at Energetics Technology Center (ETC) providing subject matter expertise to the U.S. Department of Defense Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics Development Office. Connie L. McNeely is Professor of Public Policy and Co-Director of the Center for Science and Technology Policy at George Mason University.

ISBN 978-5 4469-0250-7

The rationale for preparing a scientific meeting and subsequent book on academic careers rests not only on the cognitive and policy relevance of this research theme but also on its neglect and underrepresentation in STS (science and technology studies).

The twofold meaning (of its title) denotes the two aims of the book. The first one is to present some relevant findings on searching for a scientific career, which has an additional connotation of a personal activity in career development. The second goal was to simultaneously present some interesting approaches and methods for researching scientific careers. In a word, both the social phenomenon and the modes of its study are the subjects of this book.

All the book chapters are empirical but theoretically well-informed and well-founded research. The qualitative studies are based on interviews, and one of them also applied participatory observation. The quantitative studies mostly use questionnaire surveys or national databases, sometimes combining them with bibliometric analyses. There are also combinations of both quantitative and qualitative methods, which have become a desirable methodological option for research into more complex social phenomena. Such methodological variety indicates that career studies might have promising reconciliatory potential, to encourage bridging the gap between the two traditional streams of STS, the hiatus between qualitative and quantitative methodologies, and their alleged critical or positivistic theoretical correlates.


Katarina Prpić, previously a tenured senior scientist at the Institute for Social Research in Zagreb. Currently, she is chairing the ESA network Science and Technology (SSTNET). Inge van der Weijden, a PhD in organization sciences, works as a researcher at the Centre for Science and Technology Studies of Leiden University. Nadia Asheulova is Academic Secretary at the Institute for the History of Science and Technology (IHST), St Petersburg Branch, Russian Academy of Sciences and also the assistant editor of the journal Sociologyof Science and Technology.
Articles and book chapters


Abstract: This paper analyses how energy consumption and energy efficiency evolved in the Spanish ceramic tile industry in the 20th century and explores the emerging possibilities in the 21st century. In the last century, the tile industry undertook three radical transitions by switching from traditional biomass fuels to liquid hydrocarbon fuels (fuel oil and gas oil), and subsequently to gas fuels, mainly involving natural gas. Although it is difficult to obtain the information that enable the real energy efficiency in manufacturing plants to be reliably evaluated, the available data indicate that a high degree of efficiency has been achieved with current manufacturing technologies. Consequently, significant developments in this sense are not expected, even though efforts are still being made to reduce energy consumption in the production process. However, environmental regulations and impacts, and the emerging new energy sources based on agricultural biomass could open up new avenues for energy supply in the Spanish ceramic tile cluster.

Link: [http://boletines.secv.es/upload/2014070792201.201453111.pdf](http://boletines.secv.es/upload/2014070792201.201453111.pdf)


Abstract: This paper analyses how environmental issues have affected and are continuing to affect the evolution of European manufacturing industries based on the example of the Spanish Ceramic Tile Industry (SCTI). The Ceramic Tile Industry (CTI) in Europe became very competitive and innovative in the early 1990s, with the Italian and the Spanish sectors, which are cluster-based, becoming world leaders. However, since 2008, this leadership position is being eroded. We provide an in-depth analysis of the SCTI focusing on the influence of new European environmental regulations. The CTI has a major impact on the environment and has been the focus of environmental regulations. We also consider the innovation system and socioeconomic effects of the industry. In order to analyse the relationship between the environmental issues and innovation the empirical part of the paper builds on research on SCTI, including the industry value chain, and the innovation system and how it functions. We take account of the views of industry experts on the SCTI innovation system, its environmental impact and the constraints on the sector.

Current research at the local level suggests that the environmental impacts of the industry are outweighed by its huge contribution to socioeconomic wellbeing. The transition from national environmental legal frameworks towards EU-wide regulation has had a clear effect on both the strategic goals and the management of the industry and the new regulation combined with a more complex international economic scenario is jeopardizing European manufacturing industries. This applies especially to traditional industries. The case study demonstrates that the capacity of the SCTI to adapt to new scenarios will be vital for its future survival and success.


Abstract: In this article we apply the functions of innovation systems framework to assess its appropriateness to characterise the innovation activity of the tile industry in Castellón. This framework is based on idea that a well functioning innovation system requires that a number of key activities take place. If this occurs innovative output is higher. Our analysis provides a deeper understanding of the role of innovation as a strategic option in a mature industry in the context of globalisation. By applying this new theoretical approach to study innovation and highlighting the functions that the system requires, we shown the constraints, inertias, challenges and opportunities that the innovation system of the tile industry in Castellón faces. The results also show that the functional approach allows higher flexibility in order to recognise and analyse the opportunities and constraints that a given innovation system presents.

Link: http://boletines.secv.es/upload/20130704104006.201352151.pdf


Abstract: In this article we provide a timely account of how sustainable technologies become entangled with cultural practices and thus co-evolve, influencing energy consumption. In doing so, we critique the approach current UK policy takes towards energy renewal and carbon reduction. We investigate the effectiveness of the social housing sector’s efforts to implement environmental policy initiatives that use a technology-driven approach. By looking at how social housing residents consume energy as part of domestic practices, we identify tensions between strategies to influence energy consumption by a housing association, and the ways residents incorporate sustainable technologies into everyday practices. Our findings reveal how sustainable technologies become enrolled in established practices: residents creatively develop novel routine strategies to accommodate new technologies to their daily routines. We contend that policy efforts to engender ‘behaviour change’ through a technology-driven approach have limitations. This approach ignores how practices become entangled, affecting energy consumption.

Link: http://soc.sagepub.com/content/48/3/590.full.pdf+html
DOI: 10.1177/0038038513500101


Abstract: Much of the debate on sustainability is predicated on the belief that environmental demands lead to the production of sustainable technologies that induce environmental benefits. This fails to account for the influential ways technologies are used in practice, and the interactions between users and technologies that shape their environmental effects. This article uses the example of how cars and their drivers together accomplish the practice of driving through their interactions with each other, and explores the implications this has for generating environmental outcomes. We draw on a body of literature that argues how together, users and technologies participate in carrying out practices that actively shape outcomes, and we show how and why this applies to sustainability. The article presents the case of the Toyota Prius, analyzing Toyota’s intent in designing a sustainable car and contrasting it with the perspectives of thirty-eight of its drivers. We find that the possibility for fuel and carbon reduction is coproduced and is a result of complex interactions between technology, drivers, and driving practice.

Link: http://sth.sagepub.com/content/38/4/518.full.pdf+html
DOI: 10.1177/0162243912441029

Abstract: Companies encourage consumers to purchase environmentally sustainable products. The nexus between making and buying sustainable products, however, does not by itself generate sustainable outcomes. Sustainability results from users developing new practices around products and technologies, which we call ‘negotiated consumption’. By extending the existing understanding of organizational practices through combining perspectives from social studies of science and technology, and consumption studies, we identify the nature of the negotiated consumption of sustainability. We argue that the effectiveness of environmental strategy, which meets demand for sustainable outcomes, can be only understood through the appreciation of how organizations, and their products and customers, are implicated in, and co-produce, the processes and practices that deliver sustainability.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2012.10.004


Abstract: Large numbers of individuals, many of them senior citizens, live in social isolation. This typically leads to loneliness, depression, and vulnerability, and subsequently to other negative health consequences. We report on research focused on understanding the communication needs of people in environments associated with social isolation and loneliness, and how technology facilitates social connection. Our work consists of successive iterations of field studies and technology prototype design, deployment, and analysis. Particular attention is paid to seniors in retirement communities and in long-term care settings (nursing homes). We present design implications for technology to enable seniors’ social connections, the «InTouch» prototype that satisfies most of the implications, and a report on one older adult’s experience of InTouch.

Link: http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=2661375


Abstract: This paper explores how Latent Class Models (LCM) can be applied in social research, when the basic assumptions of regression models cannot be validated. We examine the usefulness of this method with data collected from a study on the relationship between bridging social capital and the Internet. Social capital is defined here as the resources that are potentially available in one’s social ties. Bridging is a dimension of social capital, usually related to weak ties (acquaintances), and a source of instrumental resources such as information. The study surveyed a stratified random sample of 417 inhabitants of Lisbon, Portugal. We used LCM to create the variable bridging social capital, but also to estimate the relationship between bridging social capital and Internet usage when we encountered convergence problems with the logistic regression analysis. We conclude by showing a positive relationship between bridging and Internet usage, and by discussing the potential of LCM for social science research.

Link: http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0049089X14001987

Abstract: The social effects of Internet use have been a major concern for social scientists and society alike. How the Internet affects social capital has been a hot topic in sociology and other social sciences: Is the Internet reinforcing and complementing social capital? Or is it isolating people and diminishing their social capital? Social capital is here defined as the resources that are embedded in one's social ties. This article reviews the literature on the subject, looking at three perspectives: one that suggests no relationship between the Internet and social capital, a second that suggests a negative relationship between the Internet and social capital, and a third that suggests a positive relationship between the Internet and social capital. I conclude by showing that despite the prominent dystopian view of the Internet in the public and in some academic discourse (and the moral panic associated with it), research supports a positive relationship between Internet use and social capital. In addition, I discuss new trends and directions for future research.


Abstract: Most developed countries are in the midst of two significant societal trends: the first is an aging population; the second is the uptake of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) by large segments of society. But research shows a strong association between age and the so-called digital divide: older adults are less likely to use ICT when compared to other age groups. If we consider the social affordances of the Internet and the online migration of several public and private services, the lack of access or of digital literacy might be increasing age-related inequality. Consequently, we studied adoption, usage, and non-usage of ICT (mobile phones, computers, and the Internet) by Portuguese older adults. For that, we surveyed a random stratified sample of 500 individuals over 64 years of age living in Lisbon. Of this sample, 77% owned a mobile phone, 13% used computers, and 10% used the Internet. The main reasons for non-usage were functional and attitudinal, rather than physical or associated with age. But usage of mobile phones and computers was predicted by age and education, whereas the usage of the Internet was only predicted by education. We followed up the survey with 10 qualitative interviews, using a mixed methods strategy. The qualitative data showed a general positive perception of ICT as well as the importance of family and intergenerational relationships for technology adoption and use.

Link: [http://www.socresonline.org.uk/18/2/6.html](http://www.socresonline.org.uk/18/2/6.html)
Abstract: Given the existing divide related to Internet skills and types of Internet use, it is safe to assume that a large proportion of the population uses the Internet for health purposes in a partially productive fashion. We suggest that in addition to user characteristics, another factor that inhibits productive Internet use, and thus contributes to the existing gap, is related to the ways in which the technology is configured. The goal of this study was to explore the processes that webmasters and content managers use for constructing and producing, or selecting content, for health websites. Interviews conducted with 23 website builders and managers of websites that represent public and non-public health organizations revealed that they do not plan or conduct activities for content needs elicitation, either in the design stage or on an ongoing basis. Rather, these professionals rely on a “self-embodiment” standard, whereby their and their cohorts’ expectations determine the quality and functionality of the websites’ structure and content. Hence, target groups beyond their social sphere are disregarded, and instead of new opportunities, new cleavages are created. We recommended that government, public and non-public stakeholders work to establish construction standards, to ensure that health websites meet the needs of varied end-user populations.
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