



EDITORIAL

Reflecting on communal responsibility in science

By Sofia Moratti & Kristine Ask

Dear reader,

As a small, independent, open-access journal, every issue is a victory. Publishing a new issue means that we have succeeded in attracting relevant research, evaluating its quality, and sharing it with the scholarly community. During times when collegiality in higher education is devalued and personal stress from the pandemics (and its aftermath) is still high, we are extra grateful to our reviewers for their valuable contribution.

Like most journals, we are noticing a growing difficulty in finding people who have the time to do peer reviews. We know that behind most decisions to decline peer review requests is not disinterest or egotism, but a scholar who is doing their best to balance too many demands on their time and energy. Our hope for the next year is that responsibility-sharing and scholarly generosity, as core values in the academic and science professions, are cherished not just by the individual – but also by the systems in which we work.

While this is not a special issue, the papers in this issue all address, in different ways, the themes of responsibility and reflection in research and innovation. Together, the three papers explore in different ways how research and knowledge is value laden, and how managing values and ethical concerns are interwoven into research practice and use of scientific knowledge.

In "When responsibility is shared: Studying the socialisation of bio- and nanotechnology through newspapers", Solbu and Sørensen look at the socialization of technoscience through newspapers as a form of public enactment of science-society relations. They call for a broader focus of RRI policy discourses (and science governance discourses generally). The focus should be extended temporally, beyond early-stage interventions in research projects; and it should include actors who participate in socialization work while not being insiders of the scientific fields, for example political parties or representatives from religious communities.

In their article "Money, time, or saving the world: Balancing valuations of 'good' interdisciplinary research", Lamberg, Ryymin and Vetoshkina look at negotiations in research planning workshops, concerning

valuations of interdisciplinary research. They find that next to statistical-economic regimes of scholarly evaluation, the valuation registries used also include a key RRI principle (sustainability) and the research's potential for solving societal problems. These valuations in turn influence the research questions that are formulated by the interdisciplinary researchers. In their paper "Ethical boundary work in Citizen Science: Themes of insufficiency", Kasperowski, Hagen and Rohden looks instead at ethical boundary work in the Citizen Science scholarly literature, and specifically at how scientists negotiate ethical positions and move beyond the paradigms of conventional research ethics to accommodate voluntary contributors to research.

Finally, Haugland's review of *Keeping Autonomous Driving Alive* by G. Both (2020) touches on "self-driving" cars as a prime example of distributed agency. The crew members' acts of care (including, for instance, the work necessary for the technology to function) maintain the appearance that the technology is self-sufficient. The car cannot be conceptualized as an autonomous "agent", with clear implications for the distribution of responsibility for its "actions".

As the recurring topic of this issue is responsibility and reflection in science, we wish to close with some thoughts on how journals like NJSTS can contribute. We want our journal to be part of the ongoing Nordic discourse on the future of STS and to lead to new insights, but the purpose of our journal is not only to review and publish research.

Next year the journal will be celebrating its 10 years since its first publication. The journal started as a hare-brained idea rather late at night during a grad student afterparty but was somehow made into reality by a group of PhD students at Interdisciplinary Studies of Culture at NTNU. The editors (many of them, young scholars) got to learn the practical working of the science community from an insider perspective, and to experience first-hand how bottom-up initiative can open opportunities in science.

The journal's editorial board has always been a place for young scholars to learn about the making of science, and to ensure that also junior researchers are shaping the field. Through our work of



discussing submitted manuscripts, planning special issues and events – we continually find ourselves having conversations about the field itself: its content, boundaries, current evolution, and futures. What is STS and how has it evolved, in dialogue with cognate scholarly fields? What are important topics for STS today? What topics do we wish STS cared more about?

We consider these conversations to be of our own contribution to systemic support for scholarly generosity where responsibility is shared, and reflection is encouraged. In the context of editorial work such musings are not merely abstract thought experiments or teaching exercises to help establish identification with the

field – they are conversations that are actually shaping the field (although modestly). In the ongoing, and highly necessary, critique of academic publishing models we should not forget that journals are far more than repositories of knowledge, publication venues and/or science communication. Journals are also communities or practice where the doing and valuation of science is thought, negotiated, and contested.

Sofia Moratti & Kristine Ask
Editors in Chief