

Dear colleagues,

Please consider submitting an abstract as part of the special topic panel I am convening for the upcoming STS-hub.de 2023, under the heading “Contested Conduct shaping Sciences and Societies: Epistemic and Moral Accountability in the Worlds of S&T Research”

I am happy to receive and review abstracts (of about 500w + short authors BIO)

latest by October 31st, 2022 to my personal address: melina.antonakaki.eu

(Feel free to use same address for communications in regards to any issues that might emerge in the meantime or to address questions specifically about the panel organization)

Notification of acceptance will be sent before the 7th of November.

The STS-Hub.de does not charge any participation fees, and this panel does not compensate monetarily for participation. For more details, please see: [Frequently asked questions STS-hub 2023 - HedgeDoc \(gwdg.de\)](https://www.gwdg.de/sts-hub/2023/)

I look forward to continuing the discussions with some of you, as I am also very much looking forward to meeting new colleagues of all academic career stages. MA thesis level papers, professional and/or personal experience reflections, and project presentations are as much welcome as fully fledged scientific papers, to the extent that they engage any of the panels’ questions, STS literature and/or the theme of ‘circulations’.

Cordially,

Melina Antonakaki

Doctoral Candidate, STS Department TUM

Contested Conduct shaping Sciences and Societies: Epistemic and Moral Accountability in the Worlds of S&T Research

Convenor: Antonakaki, Melpomeni [short bio below]

In recent years, longstanding questions about proper scientific conduct have gained a new currency, as scientists, policymakers, affected publics and even new categories of aspiring gatekeepers, i.e., ‘epistemic activists’ of the metascience movement, professionals in misconduct detection or ‘science watchdogs’, debate the nature of appropriate scientific practice in a wide variety of fields and forums. Controversy often surrounds the so-called “reproducibility crisis” as well as highly visible cases of data fabrication, plagiarism or the overall careless mishandling of research. Debate on public research governance pertaining to its (data and beyond) accessibility, as well as the re-allocation of ownership and control in knowledge production and circulation, have also been sharply criticized, often arising in concert with questions about financial conflicts of interest or cases of ‘whitewashing’ criminal money and reputations through extremely opaque practices for cultivating research donorship. Debates about gender disparity in citation practices, gender and racial bias in hiring and promoting decisions, and sexual harassment are raising issues that include questions in regards to epistemic consequences as well as matters of fairness and justice.

Although scholarship, policy analysis, and public discussions tend to treat these disparate issues as belonging to different domains, the concept of the panel is premised on the idea

that in the present moment, they all share sufficient similarities to justify treating them as members of a common category: debate about the epistemic and moral accountability of specific academic and public research practices.

Whether the practice being criticized pertains to data access, financial arrangements, reproducibility problems, or gender justice, prominent voices are challenging academic and research institutions, raising epistemic concerns, demanding accountability, and, in some cases, promoting imaginaries of far-reaching reform.

Beginning from the premise that the boundaries of acceptable scientific practice are historically situated and continually revised, this panel invites contributions that engage (but need not be limited to) the following questions:

- *How do challenges to established research (or its management) practices take shape? How do critics and new technopolitical movements emerge?*
- *How do the boundaries shift and change in regards to what is held as acceptable practice in specific frontier fields of research? To what extent are new knowledge-making techniques implicated in stimulating contemporary debate about appropriate practice?*
- *How do changes in contemporary societies relate to new challenges to extant definitions of acceptable scientific practices? What roles do participatory (media and beyond) cultures occupy in de- and restabilizing of gatekeeping systems and how do they modulate perceptions and orientations about the trustworthiness of contemporary S&T expertise(s)?*
- *To what extent does the intensification of demands for accountability portend the emergence of new “social contracts” for science? This final question, necessarily a speculative one, raises both empirical and normative issues: What kinds of visions of the future of technoscience, its institutions and its sponsors currently circulate amongst us?*

BIO: I'm a doctoral candidate at the STS department, School for Social Sciences and Technology (TUM). Background in history and philosophy of science and (at another life) molecular oncology practitioner. My doctorate comprises extensive empirical research into how visions and applications of regenerative biomedicine/stem-cell research obtain social credibility in different political cultures, by analytically investing in episodes of credibility damage and the practical management of their aftermath. Current writings pertain to the 'material politics of scientific misconduct investigation', and how the relationship between research laboratory and public order is reconfigured via the invited or enforced public participation in scientific activities.