

Tapuya Dossier proposal

Interaction turns in knowledge production: actors, problems and methodologies

Dra. Mariela Bianco
Mag. María Goñi Mazzitelli
Mag. Camila Zeballos
University of the Republic, Uruguay

Knowledge production in interaction among different actors –be it specific contributions, sustained collaborations or co-productions- is becoming an integral part of academic practices. This trend is reflected in a prolific literature within STS studies (Sutz et al, 2019; Vessuri, Burgos, Bocco, 2012; Bunders, et. al., 2010; Regeer, 2009; Hessels and van Lente, 2008; Nowotny, et al., 2001; Gibbons, et al., 1994; Funtowicz and Ravetz, 1993, among others) and other fields of knowledge such as feminist epistemologies (Harding, 1992). This body of literature has sought to systematize and analyze how these processes develop, who participates, what types of questions and problems are addressed, what methods are put in practice and what results emerge.

Academic interest on knowledge production in interaction inspired multiple reflections and analysis for the past decades. Several authors have focused on the asymmetrical dynamics of power and participation shaping the processes of interaction among different actors (Jasanoff, 2004; Phillips et al, 2018; Pohl et al, 2021). Processes of knowledge production in interaction are simultaneously characterized by the confluence of different scientific fields aiming at knowledge integration and social actors participation, as collaborators or co-producers of knowledge. Social actors from a varied range contribute their knowledges and experiences, the particular traits of the contexts where real life problems take place, and process orientation for transformation.

The literature has also identified signs that point to a participatory and dialogical turn (Jasanoff, 2003; Phillips et al, 2018). This movement claims the partiality, fallibility and ubiquity of knowledge (Jasanoff, 2003; Nowotny et al., 2001; Harding, 1992) in contrast to the universalist pretension of academic knowledge. Under this premise, some authors seek to identify a wide variety of contributions and perspectives that citizens and laymen bring, recognizing the relevance of their integration in the production of new knowledge. The integration of new actors enables new themes, problems and dimensions of analysis and redefines the processes of knowledge production and practices involved. Expert knowledge becomes democratic as multiple knowledge forms are recognized as legitimate and necessary. Thus, an alternative model of scientific knowledge production is being shaped, different from the conception of knowledge autonomously produced within academic communities and then transferred to society (Ingram et al, 2020; Perry et al, 2018).

Knowledge production in interaction can be recognized at three interrelated levels: i. topic framing to be addressed, ii. the knowledge construction process, and iii. the usefulness of the new knowledge produced. It should be noted that these processes do not occur linearly. In addition to the collective learning that they generate, they also present multiple challenges and tensions that must be recognized in order to deepen interaction practices. Processes of knowledge production in interaction, among

various actors, continue to be controversial and little recognized in the academic field (Vilsmaier, et al; 2017).

This dossier aims to bring authors from different regions of the world and with different scientific backgrounds to analyze the transformations in practices and methods of knowledge production shaping a new heuristic. The following questions can guide the orientation of the contributions to the dossier:

- How are practices and methods transformed throughout processes of knowledge production in interaction?
- How are the relationships among actors established? What problems do they jointly address?
- How are different types of knowledge recognized and integrated in an interactive process?
- What are the roles played by diverse societal actors in processes of knowledge production?
- What kind of skills do researchers need to develop to face interacting knowledge production processes?
- How do interaction processes foster symmetrical relationships between actors and their knowledge?
- What learning processes and conflicts characterize knowledge production in interaction?
- What type of policies and policy instruments are suitable for the promotion of knowledge production processes in interaction among multiple actors? What can we learn from policy initiatives?
- How is a new heuristic for knowledge production considered by academic evaluation practices?

Abstracts (max. 500 words) for proposed papers should be submitted by March 1, 2022 to Maria Goñi Mazzitelli (mgoni@csic.edu.uy).

Selected papers will be invited to submit full manuscripts by May 31, 2022, aiming for publication in Tapuya's Vol. 6 (2023). Manuscripts must be submitted in English.

Bibliographic references

Bunders, J. (2010). How can transdisciplinary research contribute to knowledge democracy? En R. i. (Ed.), Knowledge Democracy. Consequences for Science, Politics and Media. Heidelberg: Springer

Funtowicz, S., & Jerome, R. (1993). Science for the Post-Normal Age. Perspectives on Ecological Integrity , 146-161.

Gibbons, M., Limoges, C. N., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P., & Trow, M. (1994). The new production of knowledge: the dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies. Londres: SAGE.

Goñi Mazzitelli, M.; Zeballos, C.; Bianco Bozzo, M. (2021). Construyendo agendas situadas de conocimiento: experiencias desde la Universidad de la República en Uruguay. *Revista del IICE. Dossier Libre acceso al conocimiento y publicaciones científicas en el campo educativo*. Universidad de Buenos Aires (forthcoming).

Harding, S. (1992). Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology: What is 'Strong Objectivity?' . En L. Alcoff, & E. Potter, *Feminist Epistemologies*. New York: Routledge.

Hessels, L. K. & van Lente, H. (2008). Re-thinking new knowledge production: A literature review and a research agenda. *Research Policy*, (37) 740-760.

Hirsch Hadorn, G.; Hoffmann-Riem, H. & Biber-Klemm, S. (2008). *Handbook of Transdisciplinary Research*. Springer Science

Ingram J, Gaskell P, Mills J y Dwyer J. (2020). How do we enact co-innovation with stakeholders in agricultural research projects? Managing the complex interplay between contextual and facilitation processes. *Journal of Rural Studies* 78: 65–77.

Jasanoff, S. (2004). Science and citizenship: a new synergy. *Public Policy*, 31 (2).

Jasanoff, S. (2003). In a constitutional moment: Science and social order at the millennium. En B. Joerges, & H. Nowotny, *Social studies of science and technology: Looking back, ahead, yearbook of the sociology of the sciences*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 155–180.

Nowotny, H. (2001). *Re-thinking science. Knowledge and the public in an age of uncertainty*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Perry, B.G. , Patel, Z., Noren Bretzer, Y., Polk, M. (2018). Organising for Co-production: Local Interaction Platforms for Urban Sustainability. *Politics and Governance* 6 (1): 189–198.

Phillips, L. et al (2018) De-romanticising dialogue in collaborative health care research: a critical, reflexive approach to tensions in an action research project's initial phase. *Qualitative Research in Medicine & Healthcare*; 2:7178

Pohl, C et al (2021) Conceptualising transdisciplinary integration as a multidimensional interactive process. *Environmental Science and Policy* 118: 18–26.

Pohl, C. (2007). From science to policy through transdisciplinary research. *Environmental Science and Policy*, (11) 46-53.

Regeer, B. (2009). Making the invisible visible. Analysing the development of strategies and changes in knowledge production to deal with persistent problems in sustainable development. Oisterwijk: Boxpress.

Regeer, B., & Bunders, J. (2009). A transdisciplinary approach: to complex societal issues. Amsterdam: VU University - Athena Institute.

Sutz, J.; Tomassini, C.; Zeballos, C.; Goñi Mazzitelli, M.; Rodales, M. (2019). "Ten years of research and innovation for social inclusion in the Uruguayan public university: policy lessons learned" en *Atlas of social innovation. Ecosystem and infrastructures for social innovation*. 2nd Volume: A World of New Practices Publisher: Sozialforschungsstelle, TU Dortmund University: Dortmund. Ed. Howaldt, Jürgen; Kaletka, Christoph; Schröder, Antonius; Zirngiebl, Marthe. ISSN/ISBN: 978-3-96238-157-8.

Vessuri, H.; Burgos, A.; Bocco, G. (2012). "Vinculación ciencia-sociedad: la participación del investigador" en *Apropiación social del conocimiento y aprendizaje: una mirada crítica desde diferentes ámbitos*. Martínez Martínez A., R. de Gortari Rabiela, H. Vessuri, A. Vega Corona. Edition: Plaza y Valdés

Vilsmaier, U.; Brandner, V.; y Engbers, M. (2017). Research In-between: The Constitutive Role of Cultural Differences in Transdisciplinarity. *Transdisciplinary Journal of Engineering & Science*. Vol. 8, pp. 169-179, 2017.