WTMC SERIES

ON TEACHING & LEARNING STS

SMART

Workshop

2018(3)

WTMC | Netherlands Graduate Research School of Science, Technology and Modern Culture

WTMC Series on Teaching and Learning STS

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

Director:
Stefan Kuhlmann

Training co-ordinators:
Bernike Pasveer & Anne Beaulieu

Information on the programme:
j.a.beaulieu@rug.nl

Practical information, registration, and hotel arrangements:
Elize Schiweck, e.schiweck@utwente.nl

Last minute emergencies: +31-24-3615999 (Soeterbeeck)

Cover design:
Zahar Koretsky

Information about the series:
j.a.beaulieu@rug.nl
b.pasveer@maastrichtuniversity.nl

Available at: **https://www.wtmc.eu/graduate-program/**

ISSN: 2666-2892
DOI: https://doi.org/10.3990/4.2666-2892.2018.03

Smart

WTMC WORKSHOP

17-19 December 2018

Location: Soeterbeeck, Deursen-Dennenburg

Table of contents

Introduction to the workshop

Welcome to the workshop. It starts here. Before the actual workshop begins, read through this Reader to make sure you know what you are supposed to do in advance. You need to prepare for assignments, as well as read all the literature – best not to leave these until the last minute. It is expected that preparing for the workshop will take about one full-time week. There are not many gaps in the programme, so it is important that you do the reading before you arrive. Make notes of any questions you may have or anything you do not understand – that will remind you to raise them during the workshop. Read through the detailed programme as well so that you know in good time what you need to prepare, write and think about. Pay special attention to the activities, as these require extra preparation. Discussants have been assigned for the presentations some of you will be making. The names are listed in the Programme – do *check* to see if you need to be prepared for that. We have tried to include people as discussants who have not done that task recently, and who do not work in the same university as the presenter. Some of you may have to think hard about what you can say – it's good practice.

Each of you will get something different out of this workshop, depending on where you are in your own research and on what exactly you are studying. As a more informal part of the preparation, it will be helpful if you think about what it is you want to learn and how you would be able to achieve that. Besides that, of course you should also be prepared to be surprised, to learn something unexpected and then afterwards reflect on how that relates to your own development as a scholar.

In this workshop, we will consider how *smart* technologies function as a sphere where issues of human-machine interaction are played out. Is "smart" shifting from a human attribute to techno-drenched settings, such as smart cities, thereby signaling new forms of subjectivity where machines also sense, record and respond? Is *smart* a euphemism for new technologies of control-- as well as out-of-control (big data)-- or do smart technologies also serve as objects of participation and engagement?

STS has long engaged both empirically and conceptually with the relationships between humans/human societies and technologies. That relationship has variously been articulated as one of integration, co-production, domestication or control. The core reading selected for this workshop will help guide you through the different perspective in STS.

Threaded through this workshop are two categorically different approaches to *smart* technologies. One the one hand, we ask how they actively and often quite literally interfere with and modify (take over?) the lives we lead and the bodies we have. We will trace, quite literally, the new realities they produce and the new possibilities for creative interventions that arise as we use them. One the other hand, we will consider how *smart* technologies are caught up in systems of accumulation, circulation and control. We will ask, as always, conceptual, historical, methodological, empirical and normative questions about smart technologies posed and pose-able from STS.

Day 1 will start with introductions. From there we will move straight into this workshop's core reading of an STS 'classic' related to the theme of the workshop. After that, Darryl Cressman will talk about how STS has engaged with the divide between the social and the technical. The day will end with 3 participants' presentations.

On day 2, we will start with a session about how you manage your research data. Given the centrality of data-intensive practices in 'smart' systems, this is a fitting exercize to link the topic of the workshop and a specific type of skills you need as a researcher. Next, Fenneke Sysling will take us to tracking practices *avant la lettre*, nuancing the common notion that tracking is a practice that needs digitality for its existence. After that, Martijn de Groot will lead us through doing and reflecting on modes of self-tracking health/body-related parameters. In both presentations, the links between technology, method and theory will be put forth. The contrasting 'cases' of tracking will also enable us to discuss how epistemological elements of truth, trust, validity, objectivity with regards to data and smart technologies take on different configurations. (Think, for example, of the difference between randomized clinical trials and the N=1 approach.) The late afternoon and evening sessions will be devoted to an interview training skills session.

On day 3, we will start with another three participants' presentations, after which Jason Pridmore will talk about Intelligent Personal Assistants - the digital home technologies and issues of privacy and surveillance. Merel Noorman will take the floor with a final lecture about how STS can contribute to conversations on social and ethical aspects of smart technologies.

As always, we have tried to connect a particular theme to a wide range of angles and topics and we are confident that you will find many opportunities to link the workshop to your own research interests.

An important remark about the readings. We often note that participants are critical of the relations between the articles they've read in preparation of a lecture, and the content of the lecture itself. Either they find this relation remains unclear, or they find the lecture overlaps too much with the readings. While we always instruct the lecturers quite intensively on this matter, participants can also actively make links, for example by writing down concrete questions derived from the readings and ask these during the workshop. It is also important to relate the different readings to each other and derive issues and questions to raise from that.

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

Anne Beaulieu and Bernike Pasveer, also on behalf of the speakers

Programme

Monday 17 December	
10.30-11	Arrival and coffee
11-12.30	1.1 Opening and introduction
12.45-14.00	Lunch
14-15.30	1.2 Core Reading: Social Shaping of Technology (E)
15.30-16	Tea
16-17.30	1.3 Darryl Cressman: Sociotechnical relations - the history of an idea (L)
18.00-19:30	Dinner
19:45-21.15	1.4 Presentations (P)
Tuesday 18 December	
9.00-9.15	What kept you awake?
9.15-10.45	2.1 Managing your research data (E)
10.45-11.15	Coffee
11.15-12.45	2.2 Fenneke Sysling: Histories of self-tracking and self-making (L) preparation
12.45-14.00	Lunch
14.00-16.30	2.3 Martijn de Groot: Quantified Self for healthy ageing and N-of-1 research design (L/M) preparation
16.30-17.45	2.4 Skill: Interview training part I (S)
18:00-19:30	Dinner
19:45:-21:15	2.5 Interview training part II (S)
Wednesday 19 December	
Before 9	Check out from Soeterbeeck
9.00-9.15	What kept you awake?
9.15-10.45	3.1 Presentations (P)
10.45-11.15	Coffee
11.15-12.45	3.3 Jason Pridmore: Negotiating the promises and fears of everyday automation (L)
12.45-14:00	Lunch
14.00-15.30	3.2 Merel Noorman: The social and ethical aspects of smart technologies from an STS perspective (L)
15:30-16.00	Farewells and group picture

P = participant presentation
L = lecture
M = method
S = skill
E = exercise

Detailed overview

1.1 Opening and introduction

As usual, we will start the workshop with a round of introductions, asking you to briefly explain who you are, where you work, and what your research is about.

Preparation:
Bring a 'smart' technology to the workshop and use it to introduce yourself and your research to the group.

1.2 Core Reading and Discussion. Mackenzie and Wajcman (Eds). 1999. The Social Shaping of Technology

The core reading exercise makes you study an STS classic related to the topic of the workshop. This time, we've chosen to put parts of MacKenzie & Wajcman's text on the agenda. This core reading connects to the theme of the workshop by introducing the main approaches to technology in STS (co-construction, critiques of technological determinism, inventions). Interestingly, the introduction predates much of the informational turn. As you read, you might keep in mind what, if anything, has changed in how we think about technology in the field since 1999 and in how we encounter it. This reading is also a nice background piece to the lectures by Cressman and Noorman, which will contrast different approaches to technology.

- MacKenzie, D. and J. Wajcman (Eds.) (1999), *The Social Shaping of Technology*. McGraw Hill Education (second ed.):
    - Introduction, pp. 3-27
    - Making People White, pp. 134-137
    - A Gendered Socio-Technical Construction, pp. 301-313

Please note that you are to read all three parts.

1.3 Darryl Cressman: Sociotechnical relations - the history of an idea

One of the more significant conceptual contributions that STS has made over the past 40 years is a re-thinking of the divide between the social and the technical. Unsatisfied with approaches that distinguish between these two entities, STS research presupposes a different ontology: in practice there is no distinction between the social and the technical and so one should only speak of sociotechnical relations. This insight has been translated by STS researchers into a number of different concepts, including sociotechnical ensemble, seamless web, and heterogenous engineering, to name only a few of the terms through which sociotechnical perspectives have been developed. These developments, in turn, have transformed how we think about a myriad of practices, including health care, transportation, and communication and, perhaps more radically, who and what we consider to be an agent.

In this lecture I attempt to trace the history of this idea, paying close attention to some of the theoretical and methodological insights that have developed from a sociotechnical starting point.

Readings:

Akrich, M. (1992). The De-Scription of Technical Objects. In Bijker & Law (eds.) *Shaping Technology/Buildings Society: Studies in Sociotechnical Change*. Cambridge: MIT Press, pp.205-224.

Johnson, D. G. & Verdicchio, M. (2017), Reframing AI discourse. *Minds and Machines*. pp. 575-590. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-017-9417-6

1.4 PhD presentations (Skill)

1. Femke Hoefsloot. Discussant: Hade Dorst
2. Luc van Summeren. Discussant: Kathleen Gregory
3. Laetitia Dellabianca. Discussant: David de Kam

Important: See the PhD Presentation guidelines.

2.1 Data Drama: Orientation to Data management for PhDs (Skill)

Data has become the subject of much attention in many lines of research, leading to institutional and organizational changes in dealing with data. Many universities have set up data management courses, policies and tools for example.

In this exercise, we will consider possible scenarios in which data management becomes especially salient. By working in small groups, you will explore these scenarios and how they could affect your research project and in the course of interactions, develop your own stance with regards to data management.

Activity
Students form small groups of 3-4 and each group receives a scenario and roles. In each scenario, the 'researcher' is faced with a "Data Drama". The groups have 30 minutes to discuss possible responses and courses of action to deal with the fictional situation. The group draws on the 'real' situation of the 'researcher' (for example, the actual back-ups and documentation they have, the institutional rules and resources, etc). Then, the group has 20 minutes to put together a little play of how they deal with the Drama and to decide how it ends. The final half hour is dedicated to each group putting on the play for each other. Each of the roles draws out a dimension of dealing with data.

Dramas:
1. **Crooks at Schiphol** Your laptop gets stolen from your luggage while travelling to a research visit during which you were planning on analyzing A LOT of your material, which you had uploaded to your laptop.
2. **Fire!** Your faculty burns down, and everything inside is totally lost either through flames or water damage.
3. **Data Doubts** You receive an email from an editor, in which she says she has received a "a very critical email" and she is asking questions about the data underlying your first published article in her journal. You have to respond within 24 hours.
4. **Beware Malware** A virus has completely infected your phone and computer, thereby damaging not only your operational software but also your stored files and data.
5. **Spring Clean Up** While trying to create 'just a bit of room' on your computer, you started cleaning things up… Things seem to be running faster and more smoothly. Nice. The next time you get back to work, after a long weekend, you realize you've deleted all your data files by mistake!

Roles:
-The **researcher** who is at the center of the Data Drama. Play this role as yourself, drawing on the actual situation (What are your data practices? Do you have a data management plan? Etc).
-**The post-doc** who is 5 years older and also did a PhD at the very same university where you are currently enrolled. She knows a lot about the university and doing research, and is sure that there are all kinds of experts and resources to help you out of this mess. She is working hard for you, trying to find help.
-**The office-mate** who is a really sweet person but also a worry wart. He has already figured out that this is an ABSOLUTE catastrophe for you and your project, not to mention the group and the university and he is quite keen to point out all the horrible consequences of this drama—what it's going to cost in time and money, not to mention reputation!
-**The researcher's mom** has also heard about this, and she is calling you up. While she is quite sympathetic--and knows how much your work means to you--she also tells you that this is not how she raised you! She's going on and on about the moral aspects of this whole drama, what you should have done and how this is a major shortcoming on your part.

2.2 Fenneke Sysling: Histories of self-tracking and self-making

This session revolves around histories of technology, self-tracking and self-making. The rapidly growing popular interest in self-tracking or 'self-quantification' has been hailed by journalists and sociologists as a revolutionary development. Historians know better: there are all sorts of measuring tools and ideals for self-improvement that go back as early as the nineteenth century if not further.
In this session, we will look how people in the past have recorded data about their own bodies and habits and discuss how new technologies, when applied to individual bodies and selves, have introduced new notions of autonomy, responsibility, citizenship and the possibility of self-improvement. How did new practices of measurement change the way people thought about their lives, their bodies and their relationship to authorities? What kind of personhood did these techniques propagate? How did numbers become an incentive to self-improvement? These are some of the questions we will address.

We will also pay attention to some of the concepts that may help us to understand historical and present-day self-tracking, such as Foucault's 'care of the self' and the 'outsourced self' and I hope that we can discuss the ways in which the historical examples help us think about present-day discussions about surveillance, the values embedded in technologies or the reductionism of numbers.

Preparation:
Try to find out as much as you can about ONE of these two early self-trackers: Santorio Santorio (Sanctorius Sanctorius) or Benjamin Franklin. Who were these guys? What did they measure and why? How successful were they? To what extent are their self-tracking practices comparable to ours today?

Readings:

T. Sharon (2017). Self-Tracking for Health and the Quantified Self: Re-Articulating Autonomy, Solidarity, and Authenticity in an Age of Personalized Healthcare', *Philosophy & Technology* 2017, 30(1), 93–121.

Crawford, K., J. Lingel & T. Karppi (2015). Our metrics, ourselves: A hundred years of selftracking from the weight scale to the wrist wearable device, *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 2015, 18(4-5), 479 –496.

2.3 Martijn de Groot Quantified Self for healthy ageing and N-of-1 research design (method)

Quantified Self is a world-wide community of people who use self-tracking to answer personal questions. Many of these are health-focused. Due to technological developments, it has become increasingly easy and cheap to measure aspects of your health and lifestyle. But what can you actually measure, and how? And how are these measurements meaningful? These questions will be explored in the lecture.

Prepare: 'Self-generated health data'

- *Actively and deliberately practice self-tracking for two weeks.*
- Continuous daily tracking of an aspect of your health (physical activity, food, sleep, heart rate (variability), mood, stress level or any other health variable)
- You can use a device (smartphone app, wearable, if available) or pen & paper, as long as you also have to actively record the data (not only passive sensing with wearables) So for example, write down your daily activity (active minutes) instead of step counting with an activity tracker.
- You can perform a quasi-experiment if you like: one week simply measuring (baseline) and one week intervention (where you try to change the behaviour)
- Keep it simple and doable: pursuing the daily tracking should not be so onerous that you give up after two days because it takes so much time

Bring your 'data' with you to the workshop.

Readings

Almalki, M., K. Gray, and F. J. Martin-Sanchez (2017). Refining the Concepts of Self-Quantification Needed for Health Self-Management. A Thematic Literature Review." *Methods of Information in Medicine* 56 (1): 46–54. https://doi.org/10.3414/ME15-02-0007

Choe et al. (2014). Understanding Quantified-Selfers' Practices in Collecting and Exploring Personal Data. CHI '14 *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*: 1143:1152 http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2556288.2557372

De Groot, M. (2018). Quantified Self: Discovery through everyday science. In Engelen, L. (ed), *Augmented Healthcare*, Lucien Engelen Holding, 317-320.

De Groot, M. et.al. (2015). Quantified Self in de huisartsenpraktijk. *Bijblijven* 31 (8): 642–54. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12414-015-0077-2.

Lupton, D. (2016). Introduction, *The Quantified Self*. 1 edition. Cambridge: Polity, 1-7.

2.4 Interview training (part I) (skill)

During the workshop, we will split in groups of three (or if necessary: four) to carry out and reflect upon an interview about your own experiences of 'becoming smart' as developed in preparation of and during De Groot's contribution (2.3), and perhaps also developed earlier on as a 'connected' person.
Each group will consist of an interviewer, an interviewee, and an (or two) observer. In this first part, you will prepare the interview itself. *First* take some time to discuss the focus of the interview together, and to decide upon the kind of interview you will do: structured, semi-structured, or open. *Next*, divide the roles within the group. Each member then takes some

individual time to prepare her/his part. Thus, the interviewer will need to prepare their questions (depending on the kind of interview) and decide upon a form of recording (manual, tape, both), while the interviewee is to think about what role they wish to play (open, reluctant, knowledgeable, experienced, etc.). The observer(s) will need to research the kinds of reflections they will want to generate and how they will go about doing that. In case of a group of four, they also need to divide tasks between them. The observer is to video (at least part of) the interview to be used when providing feedback.
End the session by **carrying out the actual interview** - it should last no longer than 20 minutes.

Reading:
http://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents/assessment/assessing-community-needs-andresources/conduct-interviews/main

http://managementhelp.org/businessresearch/interviews.htm

These sites will provide you with concrete suggestions on how to formulate questions or structure interviews (and therefore also on how to assess interviews done by others).

2.5 Interview training (part II) (skill)

This part begins with the groups watching the interview (perhaps not the entire 20 minutes), and then reflecting on all roles. Make sure everyone's reflections and experiences are taken into account. Use the **Interview feedback checklist.**

There are some very important rules to take into account:

- *Provide each participant with the opportunity to talk about the interview from his/her perspective*
- *Provide both motivational (recognizing what the interviewer did well) and constructive (suggestions for improvement) feedback*
- *Make your feedback specific: use examples to illustrate your point*
- *Be constructive. If you're being critical, provide alternatives*
- *Keep the focus on the roles; don't make this personal*
- *Be attentive to body language*

3.1 PhD Presentations (skill)

1. Jamie Steele. Discussant: Zahar Koretsky
2. Wouter van Rossem. Discussant: Sabrina Huizinga
3. Aafke Fraaije. Discussant: Jochem Zuijderwijk

Important: See the PhD Presentation guidelines.

3.2 Jason Pridmore: Negotiating the promises and fears of everyday automation: Perceptions and experiences of voice activated 'Intelligent Personal Assistants'

The emergence of smart speakers with voice activated 'Intelligent Personal Assistants' (IPAs) represent a continued push for the technological automation of routine practices within the home environment. The current presence and drive of both Amazon and Google (and to a lesser extent that of Apple) in pursuing this market demonstrates an intensifying focus on the domestic sphere as a place of crucial technology engagement and of data production. While the goal may be the 'platformization' of the home, current and future use of these devices is dependent both on the differing intentions and services provided by these platforms and the ongoing choices and negotiations of users – from early adoption to more normalised and routine IPA use. This talk will describe how users (may) negotiate the dataveillance affordances and privacy concerns of these IPA platforms, indicating some of the stakes and implications in the everyday use of these devices as they both configure users in particular ways and are configured by their ongoing use. It concludes by noting the need for a nuanced approach to combating and limiting the potential harms of these home devices while there remains some interpretive flexibility in their current deployment and use.

Readings:

L. A. Mäkinen (2016). Surveillance On/Off: Examining Home Surveillance Systems From The User's Perspective. *Surveillance & Society* 14(1): 59-77. https://ojs.library.queensu.ca/index.php/surveillance-and-society/article/view/onoff/on-off

I.Lopatovska, K. Rink & I. Knight (2018). Talk to me: exploring user interactions with the Amazon Alexa. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science, 1-14.*
http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0961000618759414

3.3 Merel Noorman: The social and ethical aspects of smart technologies from an STS perspective

In recent years, debates about the social and ethical aspects of the digitization and datafication of society have picked up steam, as smart technologies have become an increasingly pervasive element of our work, cities, homes, environments and bodies. Concerns raised about these technologies include decreasing privacy, discrimination, exclusion, increased surveillance, and the outsourcing of power and control to private-sector providers. In this session, I will look at several current social and ethical issues related to smart technologies and reflect on how STS can contribute to the debates on these issues. The focus will be on discussions of Smart Cities.

Readings:

Kitchin, R. (2014). The real-time city? Big data and smart urbanism. GeoJournal, 79, 1–14. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/S10708-013-9516-8

Zuboff, S. (2015). Big other: Surveillance capitalism and the prospects of an information civilization. *Journal of Information Technology*, 30, 75–89. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/jit.2015

About the speakers

Darryl Cressman is an assistant professor in the Philosophy Department at Maastricht University. He is the author of *Building Musical Culture in Nineteenth-Century Amsterdam: The Concertgebouw*(University of Amsterdam Press, 2016) as well as articles and book chapters on the philosophy of technology, STS, and media theory.

Fenneke Sysling is a postdoctoral researcher at the University of Utrecht, funded by an NWO Veni grant. She specializes in the history of science, technology, race and colonialism. Her current project looks at histories of self-tracking from the mid 19th century onwards and explores the role of quantification in conceptualizing new identity categories and as an incentive to self-improvement.

Martijn de Groot has a degree in medical biology (MSc) and is qualified in pedagogy (MEd) as well as holding a PhD in medical sciences. He is co-founder and was programme leader of the Quantified Self Institute (QSI) at the Hanze University of Applied Sciences from 2012 tot 2017. Martijn is currently working as innovation coach and lecturer at the Hanze. He is also active as speaker, consultant and researcher in the area of Quantified Self, Digital Health & Personalized Science.

Jason Pridmore is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Media and Communication at Erasmus Universit Rotterdam. His resaerch interests are focused primarily on practices of digial identification, the use of new/social media and consumer data as surveillance practices, and digital (cyber) security issues. He has written extensively on marketing practices and information exchange and participates in research focused on privacy, data ethics, (cyber)security, mobile devices, policing practices, citizenship, branding, and quantified self movements. Jason currently participates in an advisory capacity for a range of European Union Research projects and Dutch funded projects on new technologies, privacy, and security issues. He is co-editor of *Digitising Identities: Doing Identity in a Networked World* (Routledge, 2016).

Merel Noorman is a philosopher of technology and currently assistant professor of AI, Robotics and STS at Tilburg Institute for Law, Technology and Society. She studied artificial intelligence and science & technology studies at the University of Amsterdam and Edinburgh University and received her PhD from Maastricht University. Since then, she has been part of various research projects in the U.S. and the Netherlands looking at the ethical and social aspects of complex and intelligent computer technologies. Currently, she is particularly interested in the distribution of responsibility around Artificial Intelligent technologies. She also teaches Data Science Ethics and the philosophy of AI to data science and knowledge engineering students.

About the coordinators

Anne Beaulieu is associate professor of Science and Technology Studies at Campus Fryslan and the Faculty of Science and Engineering, University of Groningen. At Campus Fryslan, she works on creating knowledge infrastructures for sustainability and is responsible for the major Responsible Planet in the programme Global Responsibility and Leadership. She also writes and teaches about the societal aspects of energy and Big Data at the Johan Bernouilli Institute of Mathematics and Computer Science. She is the co-founder of the Groningen Energy Summer School for PhDs and acted as one of its scientific directors for 6 years. She is a member of the Board of Studium Generale Groningen and of the NIAS-Lorentz Advisory Board.

Bernike Pasveer is an assistant professor at the department of STS of the Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences (FASoS) at Maastricht University. She has worked on medical (imaging) technologies; on how (medical) technologies are constitutive of the human body's 'natural' achievements such as childbirth, reproduction, sports, and - her current research - dying; on how such 'natural' achievements and arrangements are culturally situated; and on how they might 'travel' to and from other places notably the so-called global South. She is currently working on an edited volume (with I. Moser & O. Synnes) called *Ways of Home-Making* (Palgrave-McMillan). She has a PhD in STS from the University of Amsterdam. She is a member of the NIAS-Lorentz Advisory Board, and programme director of the debating centre Sphinx in Maastricht.

PhD Presentation guidelines

For presenters

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

For discussants

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

All others

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

Interview feedback checklist

Opening sentences/interactions:
Interviewer greeted partner and introduced him/herself (Name, Agency Affiliation, and Role)
Interviewer asked interviewee for his/her name and preference for address
Interviewer stated purpose clearly and accurately
Interviewer encouraged interviewee to offer feedback about anything the interviewer might say that could cause discomfort or offense
Interviewer thanked interviewee for their response to the comfort question

Questioning:
Order of the questions made sense
Open-ended or closed question
Were the questions relevant to the interview?
Was there a clear logic to the order of the questions?
Did the interviewer manage to make the interviewee talk?
Did the interviewer manage to make an end to irrelevant exposes?

Summarizing:
Interviewer summarized interview accurately
Interviewer asked for feedback, (i.e., "Is that an accurate summary of what you told me?")

Closing:
Interviewer thanked interviewee for sharing information

Purpose Check:
Was the purpose of the interview accomplished? If not, why not?

Focused Listening:
List the verbal and nonverbal (body language) that indicated that the interviewer was attentive to the communication of the interviewee.

Containment:
Did the interviewer introduce his/her own experiences or extraneous comments into the interview? If so, how did that work out? If not, might it have been appropriate at some point?

Displaying Understanding of Interviewees' Feelings:
What did the interviewer say that conveyed an understanding of the partner's feelings? How might that have been different?

Motivational Feedback:
What did the interviewer do or say (not already mentioned) that helped make the interview effective?

Constructive Feedback:
What did interviewer do or say (not already mentioned) that made the interview ineffective?
What could be done differently to avoid that obstacle?

Readings

(In chronological order, as they will be discussed in the workshop)

MacKenzie, D., & J. Wajcman (Eds.) (1999), *The Social Shaping of Technology.* McGraw Hill Education (second ed.):

- Introduction, pp. 3-27
- Making People White, pp. 134-137
- A Gendered Socio-Technical Construction, pp. 301-313

Akrich, M. (1992). The De-Scription of Technical Objects. In Bijker & Law (Eds.) *Shaping Technology/Buildings Society: Studies in Sociotechnical Change.* Cambridge: MIT Press, pp.205-224.

Johnson, D. G. & M. Verdicchio (2017), Reframing AI discourse. *Minds and Machines.* pp. 575-590. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-017-9417-6

Sharon, T. (2017), Self-Tracking for Health and the Quantified Self: Re-Articulating Autonomy, Solidarity, and Authenticity in an Age of Personalized Healthcare. *Philosophy & Technology*, 30(1), 93–121.

K. Crawford, J. Lingel & T. Karppi (2015), Our metrics, ourselves: A hundred years of selftracking from the weight scale to the wrist wearable device. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 18, 479 –496.

Almalki, M., Gray, K. & Martin-Sanchez, F.J. (2017), Refining the Concepts of Self-Quantification Needed for Health Self-Management. A Thematic Literature Review. *Methods of Information in Medicine* 56 (1): 46–54. https://doi.org/10.3414/ME15-02-0007

Choe et al. (2014). Understanding Quantified-Selfers' Practices in Collecting and Exploring Personal Data. CHI '14 *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*: 1143: 1152 http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2556288.2557372

De Groot, M. (2018). Quantified Self: Discovery through everyday science. In Engelen, L. (ed), *Augmented Healthcare.* Lucien Engelen Holding, 317-320.

De Groot, M, et.al. (2015). Quantified Self in de huisartsenpraktijk. *Bijblijven* 31 (8): 642–54. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12414-015-0077-2.

Lupton, D. (2016). Introduction, *The Quantified Self.* 1 edition. Cambridge: Polity, 1-7.

L. A. Mäkinen (2016). Surveillance On/Off: Examining Home Surveillance Systems From The User's Perspective. *Surveillance & Society* 14(1): 59-77. https://ojs.library.queensu.ca/index.php/surveillance-and-society/article/view/onoff/on-off

I.Lopatovska, K. Rink & I. Knight (2018). Talk to me: exploring user interactions with the Amazon Alexa. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science,* 1-14. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0961000618759414

Kitchin, R. (2014). The real-time city? Big data and smart urbanism. *GeoJournal,* 79, 1–14. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/S10708-013-9516-8

Zuboff, S. (2015). Big other: Surveillance capitalism and the prospects of an information civilization. *Journal of Information Technology*, 30, 75–89. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/jit.2015