1 <h1><i>Preface: The digitalSTS Community</i></h1>
2 <h1><i>Introduction</i></h1>
3 <h1>Introduction: Materiality</h1>
4 <h3>Laura Forlano</h3>
5 <h2>Unfolding Digital Materiality: How Engineers Struggle to Shape Tangible and Fluid Objects</h2>
6 <h3>Alexandre Camus and Dominique Vinck</h3>
7 <h2>The Life and Death of Data</h2>
8 <h3>Yanni Loukissas</h3>
9 <h2>Materiality Methodology, and Some Tricks of the Trade in the Study of Data and Specimens</h2>
10 <h3>David Ribes</h3>
11 <h2>Digital Visualizations for Thinking with the Environment</h2>
12 <h3>Nerea Calvillo</h3>
13 <h1>Introduction: Gender</h1>
14 <h3>Daniela K. Rosner</h3>
15 <h2>If “Diversity” Is the Answer, What Is the Question? Understanding Diversity Advocacy in
Voluntaristic Technology Projects</h2>
16 <h3>Christina Dunbar-Hester</h3>
17 <h2>Feminist STS and Ubiquitous Computing: Investigating the Nature of the “Nature” of Ubicomp</h2>
18 <h3>Xaroula (Charalampia) Kerasidou</h3>
19 <h2>Affect and Emotion in Digital STS</h2>
20 <h3>Luke Stark</h3>
21 <h2>The Ambiguous Boundaries of Computer Source Code and Some of Its Political Consequences</h2>
22 <h3>Stéphane Couture</h3>
23 <h1>Introduction: Global Inequalities</h1>
24 <h3>Steven J. Jackson</h3>
25 <h2>Venture Ed: Recycling Hype, Fixing Futures, and the Temporal Order of Edtech</h2>
26 <h3>Anita Say Chan</h3>
27 <h2>Dangerous Networks: Internet
Regulations as Racial Border Control
in Italy</h2>
28 <h3>Camilla A. Hawthorne</h3>
29 <h2>Social Movements and Digital
Technology: A Research Agenda</h2>
30 <h3>Carla Ilten and Paul-Brian
McInerney</h3>
31 <h2>Living in the Broken City:
Infrastructural Inequity,
Uncertainty, and the Materiality of
the Digital in Brazil</h2>
32 <h3>David Nemer and Padma
Chirumamilla</h3>
33 <h2>Sound Bites, Sentiments, and
Accents: Digitizing Communicative
Labor in the Era of Global
Outsourcing</h2>
34 <h3>Winifred R. Poster</h3>
35 <h1>Introduction: Infrastructure</h1>
36 <h3>Janet Vertesi</h3>
37 <h2>Infrastructural Competence</h2>
38 <h3>Steve Sawyer, Ingrid Erickson,
and Mohammad Hossein Jarrahi</h3>
39 <h2>Getting “There” from the
Ever-Changing “Here”: Following Digital Directions</h2>
40 <h3>Ranjit Singh, Chris Hesselbein, Jessica Price, and Michael Lynch</h3>
41 <h2>Digitized Coral Reefs</h2>
42 <h3>Elena Parmiggiani and Eric Monteiro</h3>
43 <h2>Of “Working Ontologists” and “High-Quality Human Components”: The Politics of Semantic
Infrastructures</h2>
44 <h3>Doris Allhutter</h3>
45 <h2>The Energy Walk: Infrastructuring the Imagination</h2>
46 <h3>Brit Ross Winthereik, James Maguire, and Laura Watts</h3>
47 <h1>Introduction: Software</h1>
48 <h3>Carl DiSalvo</h3>
49 <h2>From Affordances to Accomplishments: PowerPoint and Excel at NASA</h2>
50 <h3>Janet Vertesi</h3>
51 <h2>Misuser Innovations: The Role of “Misuses” and “Misusers” in Digital Communication
Technologies</h2>
52 <h3>Guillaume Latzko-Toth, Johan Söderberg, Florence Millerand, and Steve Jones</h3>
53 <h2>Knowing Algorithms</h2>
54 <h3>Nick Seaver</h3>
55 <h2>Keeping Software Present: Software as a Timely Object for STS Studies of the Digital</h2>
56 <h3>Marisa Leavitt Cohn</h3>
57 <h1>Introduction: Visualizing the Social</h1>
58 <h3>Yanni Loukissas</h3>
59 <h2>Tracing Design Ecologies: Collecting and Visualizing Ephemeral Data as a Method in Design and
Technology Studies</h2>
60 <h3>Daniel Cardoso Llach</h3>
61 <h2>Data Sprints: A Collaborative Format in Digital Controversy Mapping</h2>
62 <h3>Anders Kristian Munk, Axel Meunier, and Tommaso Venturini</h3>
63 <h2>Smart Artifacts Mediating Social Viscosity</h2>
64 <h3>Juan Salamanca</h3>
65 <h2>Actor-Network versus Network Analysis versus Digital Networks: Are We Talking About the Same
Networks?</h2>
66 <h3>Tommaso Venturini, Anders Kristian Munk, and Mathieu Jacomy</h3>

digitalSTS

A Field Guide for Science & Technology Studies

EDITED BY
Janet Vertesi & David Ribes

CO-EDITED BY
Carl DiSalvo Laura Forlano Steven J. Jackson
Yanni Loukissas Daniela K. Rosner Hanna Rose Shell

digitalSTS

A Field Guide for Science & Technology Studies

EDITED BY

Janet Vertesi & David Ribes

CO-EDITED BY

Carl DiSalvo
Yanni Loukissas

Laura Forlano
Daniela K. Rosner

Steven J. Jackson
Hanna Rose Shell

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS / PRINCETON & OXFORD

Copyright © 2019 by Princeton University Press

Requests for permission to reproduce material from this work
should be sent to permissions@press.princeton.edu

Published by Princeton University Press

41 William Street, Princeton, New Jersey 08540

6 Oxford Street, Woodstock, Oxfordshire OX20 1TR

press.princeton.edu

All Rights Reserved

LCCN 2018955221

ISBN 978-0-691-18707-5

ISBN (pbk.) 978-0-691-18708-2

British Library Cataloging-in-Publication Data is available

Editorial: Eric Crahan, Pamela Weidman, Kristin Zodrow

Production Editorial: Terri O'Prey

Production: Jacquie Poirier

Publicity: Alyssa Sanford, Julia Hall

Copyeditor: Joseph Dahm

This book has been composed in IBM Plex Serif

Printed on acid-free paper. ∞

Printed in the United States of America

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Contents

<i>Preface: The digitalSTS Community</i>	ix
Introduction	1
Introduction / Materiality	11
<i>Laura Forlano</i>	
Unfolding Digital Materiality: How Engineers Struggle to Shape Tangible and Fluid Objects	17
<i>Alexandre Camus and Dominique Vinck</i>	
The Life and Death of Data	42
<i>Yanni Loukissas</i>	
Materiality Methodology, and Some Tricks of the Trade in the Study of Data and Specimens	43
<i>David Ribes</i>	
Digital Visualizations for Thinking with the Environment	61
<i>Nerea Calvillo</i>	
Introduction / Gender	77
<i>Daniela K. Rosner</i>	
If “Diversity” Is the Answer, What Is the Question? Understanding Diversity Advocacy in Voluntaristic Technology Projects	81
<i>Christina Dunbar-Hester</i>	
Feminist STS and Ubiquitous Computing: Investigating the Nature of the “Nature” of UbiComp	99
<i>Xaroula (Charalampia) Kerasidou</i>	
Affect and Emotion in digitalSTS	117
<i>Luke Stark</i>	
The Ambiguous Boundaries of Computer Source Code and Some of Its Political Consequences	136
<i>Stéphane Couture</i>	

Introduction / Global Inequalities	157
<i>Steven J. Jackson</i>	
Venture Ed: Recycling Hype, Fixing Futures, and the Temporal Order of Edtech	161
<i>Anita Say Chan</i>	
Dangerous Networks: Internet Regulations as Racial Border Control in Italy	178
<i>Camilla A. Hawthorne</i>	
Social Movements and Digital Technology: A Research Agenda	198
<i>Carla Ilten and Paul-Brian McInerney</i>	
Living in the Broken City: Infrastructural Inequity, Uncertainty, and the Materiality of the Digital in Brazil	221
<i>David Nemer and Padma Chirumamilla</i>	
Sound Bites, Sentiments, and Accents: Digitizing Communicative Labor in the Era of Global Outsourcing	240
<i>Winifred R. Poster</i>	
Introduction / Infrastructure	263
<i>Janet Vertesi</i>	
Infrastructural Competence	267
<i>Steve Sawyer, Ingrid Erickson, and Mohammad Hossein Jarrahi</i>	
Getting “There” from the Ever-Changing “Here”: Following Digital Directions	280
<i>Ranjit Singh, Chris Hesselbein, Jessica Price, and Michael Lynch</i>	
Digitized Coral Reefs	300
<i>Elena Parmiggiani and Eric Monteiro</i>	
Of “Working Ontologists” and “High-Quality Human Components”: The Politics of Semantic Infrastructures	326
<i>Doris Allhutter</i>	
The Energy Walk: Infrastructuring the Imagination	349
<i>Brit Ross Winthereik, James Maguire, and Laura Watts</i>	
Introduction / Software	365
<i>Carl DiSalvo</i>	
From Affordances to Accomplishments: PowerPoint and Excel at NASA	369
<i>Janet Vertesi</i>	

Misuser Innovations: The Role of “Misuses” and “Misusers” in Digital Communication Technologies	393
<i>Guillaume Latzko-Toth, Johan Söderberg, Florence Millerand, and Steve Jones</i>	
Knowing Algorithms	412
<i>Nick Seaver</i>	
Keeping Software Present: Software as a Timely Object for STS Studies of the Digital	423
<i>Marisa Leavitt Cohn</i>	
Introduction / Visualizing the Social	447
<i>Yanni Loukissas</i>	
Tracing Design Ecologies: Collecting and Visualizing Ephemeral Data as a Method in Design and Technology Studies	451
<i>Daniel Cardoso Llach</i>	
Data Sprints: A Collaborative Format in Digital Controversy Mapping	472
<i>Anders Kristian Munk, Axel Meunier, and Tommaso Venturini</i>	
Smart Artifacts Mediating Social Viscosity	497
<i>Juan Salamanca</i>	
Actor-Network versus Network Analysis versus Digital Networks: Are We Talking about the Same Networks?	510
<i>Tommaso Venturini, Anders Kristian Munk, and Mathieu Jacomy</i>	
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	525
<i>Contributors</i>	529
<i>Index</i>	539

Data Sprints

A Collaborative Format in Digital Controversy Mapping

Anders Kristian Munk, Axel Meunier, and Tommaso Venturini

The critic is not the one who debunks, but the one who assembles. The critic is not the one who lifts the rugs from under the feet of the naive believers, but the one who offers the participants arenas in which to gather.

—Latour (2004, 246)

We don't know what a researcher who today affirms the legitimacy or even the necessity of experiments on animals is capable of becoming in an oikos that demands that he or she think "in the presence of" the victims of his or her decision. Of importance is the fact that an eventual becoming will be the researcher's own becoming; it is in that respect that it will be an event and that what I call "cosmos" can be named.

—Stengers (2005, 997)

The notion that researchers should think through the consequences of their knowledge claims in the presence of those affected by them, here formulated by the Belgian philosopher of science Isabelle Stengers, has long struck a chord in STS, first and foremost as the underlying credo of a genre of critical engagements with modern techno-science, but increasingly with STS researchers themselves assuming roles as caretakers and facilitators of public involvement in techno-scientific projects (Law 2009; Landström et al. 2011; Jensen 2012). At stake have been questions concerning the public trust in science and technology (Wynne 2007; Felt and Fochler 2008), the role of experts and expertise in democratic processes (Nowotny et al. 2003; Callon et al. 2009), the robustness of scientific knowledge claims (this is the position taken by Stengers in her call for a democratization of the academy; Stengers 1997, 2000), and the viability of designed and engineered solutions in everyday use practices (Woolgar 1990; Hyysalo 2006; Brandt 2006; Ehn 2008; Petersen and Munk 2013). From it has emerged a plethora of collaborative formats for involving and engaging publics (Rowe and Frewer 2005), such as participatory modeling (Yearley et al. 2003), consensus conferences (Einsiedel et al. 2001), deliberative mapping (Burgess et al. 2007), living labs (Björgvinsson et al. 2012), or competency groups (Whatmore 2009).

The EMAPS project (Electronic Maps to Assist Public Science), from which the present chapter draws its example, was in many ways conceived in this broad tradition of participatory STS. It emerged in response to a call by the European Research Council to assess “the opportunities and risks in the use of the web and social media as a meaningful information tool and for developing a participatory communication between scientists and their different publics” (ERC FP7, http://cordis.europa.eu/project/rcn/101858_en.html). But where “scientists” in such participatory experiments have usually implied someone else than the STS researcher (who has tended to assume positions somewhat on the sideline of events or as a mediator between the experts proper and their publics), the division of labor was deliberately different in EMAPS. Yes, there were experts involved, notably climate scientists and various kinds of adaptation specialists, and there was a stated ambition to render the complexities and controversies of the field of climate change adaptation navigable and interrogable by a concerned public. But the real object of the participatory experiment—the thing that was being thought through in the presence of its victims, if you will—was the mapping of these controversies itself, a practice that is, by its own accounts, distinctly STS in its origins and purposes (e.g., Latour et al. 1992; Venturini 2010, 2012; Yaneva 2012; Marres 2015).

Controversy mapping was conceived by Bruno Latour, Michel Callon, and others in the late 1980s and early 1990s as a set of techniques for charting sociotechnical debates and as a pedagogical approach to teaching STS to engineering students. Although digital methods are not an obligatory part of a controversy mapping project, the ability to harvest and analyze digital traces has become part and parcel of how the method tries to achieve its ambitions (see especially Venturini 2012 or Marres 2015). EMAPS is thus a successor project to the likewise EU-funded MACOSPOL (Mapping Controversies on Science for Politics), which posited that “citizens need to be equipped with tools to explore and visualize the complexities of scientific and technical debates” and therefore sat out to “gather and disseminate such tools through the scientific investigation and the creative use of digital technologies” (www.mappingcontroversies.net/).

As we will elaborate below, the MACOSPOL project raised a number of questions about what exactly such democratic equipment could be expected to achieve and how it could be devised in order to do so. EMAPS was founded on the realization that a careful rethink of how a controversy mapping project engages with its users in specific contexts was necessary if indeed a cosmos, as Stengers puts it, was ever to be named. What kind of common world, we asked ourselves, was a controversy mapping project trying to bring about (Venturini et al. 2015)? The core idea was that such a rethink should take place in direct collaboration with the users of the maps, which in the case of controversy mapping coincides with the objects of the cartography, namely the actors in the controversy. The data sprint format, which we present in this chapter, constitutes the eventual realization of such a participatory approach to controversy mapping.

In the Belly of the Monster

Stengers’s notion that knowledge claims should be put at stake in the presence of their victims is especially pertinent in the context of a participatory approach to controversy mapping. For Stengers and others, controversies are the potent

situations that make it possible to put anything authoritatively “expert” at stake in the first place. Controversies not only energize participation but also engender a world in and about which inquiries can be fruitfully undertaken. They are thus generative in the sense that it is through them that both the researcher and the researched can acquire their identities and become aware of what they have at stake in each other’s practices. Importantly, it is also through controversies that these identities can be challenged and remade. “Controversies,” writes Michel Callon, “establishes a brutal short circuit between specialists and laypersons” and “for a time, the relative equalization of ‘rights to speak,’ [affords] the opportunity for everyone to argue on his or her own account and to question the justifications of others” (Callon et al. 2009, 33). This definition of controversy as a democratic asset resonates with the pragmatist notion that “issues spark a public into being” (Marres 2007) and the proposition by Latour that it is by following controversies that we will be able to study the social in its making (Latour 2005).

For the mapmaker, acknowledging the democratic role of controversies begs the question how the cartographic instruments interfere with or contribute to these already potent becomings. When controversy mapping sees its *raison d’être* as that of equipping a concerned public with navigational aids, it is thus not only designing such aids but also redesigning (or attempting to) the controversy itself and thereby its emergent publics. With a term borrowed from design research, one could say that controversy mappers engage in the “infrastructuring” (Björqvins-son et al. 2012) of controversies: The controversy and its emergent publics are not (because they cannot be) staged on the cartographer’s drawing board. Instead, what must be achieved is the collective mapping into knowledge of a “matter of concern” (Latour 2004), a thing that will persistently prevent any one position from reducing the others to mere fact or fiction.

We argue that this mapping into knowledge cannot be achieved unless the mapmakers acquire stakes in the controversy and, vice versa, unless the actors of the controversy acquire stakes in the mapping. We are, as Donna Haraway (1988) puts it, always and already “in the belly of the monster.” We base this argument on our experiences not only with EMAPS and MACOSPOL but also with teaching and facilitating controversy mapping projects in a range of contexts. These experiences have fermented our understanding that tools and equipment do not cut the mustard alone but must be acquired—by the actors, the citizens, the users, the stakeholders, depending on the situation—for specific purposes in specific contexts.

Such an acquisition is not unproblematic. Powerful data visualization instruments put at the disposal of actors in a controversy are easily appropriated to reduce the discussion in various ways. It is therefore crucially important that the position of the controversy mapper—as one who seeks to stage the arena of debate in its complexity and heterogeneity—is also put at stake and thus hardwired into the collective. The fact that we are mapping the *controversy*—rather than trying to empower any given actor-centric position—means that the controversy mapper must find ways to deploy conflicting positions while still lending an opportunity to the individual actors to acquire their own stakes in the cartography.

On top of that comes the practical challenges of facilitating a mapping project that, in order to be agile and adaptable to user input, must bring developers, designers, and domain experts into a close and concrete dialogue. And it is of course not merely a practical challenge; more than anything STS has contributed to our understanding that robust knowledge is a distributed achievement (Latour 1993; Rheinberger 1997; Nowotny et al. 2003). Given that one of the key partners on both

MACOSPOL and EMAPS had extensive experience with facilitating such collaborative processes through their winter and summer schools in digital methods (see, for example, <https://wiki.digitalmethods.net/Dmi/SummerSchool2015>), we took inspiration partly from their tried-and-tested format (Berry et al. 2015), and partly from the buzzing scene of bar camps and hackathons associated with the developer and design community (Knapp et al. 2016), in appropriating the data sprint format. Before we get to that, however, we provide an overview of the experiences gained through MACOSPOL and the early stages of EMAPS that led to the idea of the sprint.

Controversy Mapping and Public Engagement

Public engagement was not always an evident course of action in controversy mapping. Cartographies of techno-scientific debates were first pursued in STS to gain analytical purchase on a set of heterogeneous objects that were difficult to represent (Callon et al. 1983; Callon et al. 1986; Latour et al. 1992), not to make them available to public scrutiny in different ways or otherwise reconstitute their implications for the democratic process. In this respect controversy mapping is aligned with a development that has taken place in the actor-network theoretical branches of STS more broadly. From its early applications as a way of crafting situated accounts of science and technology in action, and thereby as an instrument for a critique of correspondence based theories of truth (Latour and Woolgar 1979; Latour 1987, 1993; Callon 1986), to its later merits as an intervention that multiplies and interferes with singular and essentialist ontologies (Mol 2002; Moser 2008) or assembles alternative forums for public involvement (Callon 1999; Callon et al. 2009; Latour 2004; Whatmore 2009), the agnostic prescription to let actors deploy their own worlds has served a variety of interventionist strategies (Munk and Abrahamsson 2012). And just as the more general question of whether and how actor-network theory (ANT) “means business” (Woolgar et al. 2009) has been broadly debated (see also Vikkelsø 2007; Woolgar et al. 2009; Law 2009; Jensen 2012), so the specific interventions that controversy mappers engage in have developed through a series of experiments of which the EMAPS project represents one of the more recent.

The first hint of controversy mapping engaging a public can be found in the STS classroom of the 1990s, where it was often claimed that the method blossomed as a way of teaching engineering students basic insights about science and technology in society. According to legend (which is liberally recounted by those who were there, but about which little has to our knowledge yet been published), controversy mapping became popular chiefly as a didactic approach that did not require wholesale conversions of the students to social construction of technology or ANT. This is certainly still the case in the now extensive network of universities teaching controversy mapping to students in political science, geography, engineering, architecture, media studies, design, techno-anthropology, sociology, and others (see <http://controverses.sciences-po.fr/archiveindex/> for an overview of student projects). By encouraging students to observe how techno-scientific controversies unfold in practice, complicated theoretical arguments can be pragmatically demonstrated rather than lectured from the blackboard. In a sense it was nothing more than a convenient remedy for a problem that almost any teacher with an STS curriculum has faced, but it did contain the nucleus of what later became

controversy mapping's primary commitment to public engagement: if students could be "tooled up" with STS sensibilities, then so could issue professionals and decision makers.

At the outset of the MACOSPOL project the primary point of reference for what controversy mapping was supposed to achieve was thus firmly anchored in the classroom. Controversy mapping had been developed primarily as a pedagogical intervention, and the tools and methods associated with it had never been tested outside that context. A narrative had emerged, however, about the relevance and application of controversy mapping in democratic processes. According to this narrative, which drew on pragmatist political theory, democratic publics would need to have the right representational skills in order to assemble and engage constructively with their matters of concern. Here is how Bruno Latour formulated it at the outset of MACOSPOL:

How you represent a river as an agent is a very interesting question. I do not know any river now that is not a contentious issue. In France, we even have a law to represent rivers politically. We actually have an institutional organ for river representation. But when you go to this parliament of rivers, which is the literal word they use, the representational tools from hydrography and geography are extremely disconnected with this question. So you have masses of maps in a traditional sense, which are critically informative but not necessarily what is needed to represent a river in this political river assembly, and that is precisely where all the questions of controversy mapping comes from. In the phrase "controversy mapping," the word "mapping" is not metaphorical but literal. We want to be able to help the citizens of this new parliament of things to have *the representational skills that are at the level of the issues* (Latour 2008, 134, emphasis added).

It is however one thing to acquire these representational skills at the level of the issues. In essence this has always been the driving ambition in controversy mapping, even in the very earliest attempts by STS scholars to develop computational ways of visualizing sociotechnical debates. But it is quite another to expect others—users, citizens, students, stakeholders—to do the same. It not only requires that a skill set (and its associated tools and methods) is available, but that those others understand what the skills are for, that is, understand what the issues are and why they "deserve more credit" (Marres 2007).

The MACOSPOL Experience and the Notion of Democratic Equipment

The notion of democratic equipment was pivotal in the MACOSPOL project. This is perhaps best illustrated by the development of the Lippmannian Device that took place in the context of MACOSPOL. Walter Lippmann, writing at the beginning of the 20th century, famously posited that the democratic ideal of a public capable of making competent decisions about the problems directly affecting it had become increasingly elusive (Lippmann 1927). Lippmann believed that, with the right tools at its disposal, the public could at best be expected to put its weight behind experts and representatives whom it considered capable of taking action on specific issues, in itself a momentous challenge considering that such tools were rarely available. Lippmann observed that the complexity of the public's problems was of

such a scale and magnitude that citizens would all too easily fall prey to special interests and partisan reporting when trying to orient themselves. He thus formulated a problem that others, not least his contemporary interlocutor John Dewey (1927), have since been struggling to solve: how can a democratic public manifest itself when the issues at hand are ill defined, rife with uncertainty, and thus irreducible to questions for which expert advice can be easily and unambiguously solicited?

The Lippmannian Device (<https://wiki.digitalmethods.net/Dmi/ToolGoogle-Scraper>) scrapes Google for resonance of a set of keywords across a set of web pages. The idea is to provide the user with an indication of actors' commitment to different issues. In the fracking debate, for example, who talks about native land rights? Who talks about climate change? Who talks about natural parks? Who talks about earthquakes? And who talks about water security? The tool presupposes a user who is not an expert in, but still sufficiently implicated by, a controversy to need a temporary means of orientation, a user who has a preliminary idea of what to look for but is not a native of the terrain he or she is trying to navigate.

In doing so the Lippmannian Device offers a demonstration of how MACOSPOL imagined its commitment to public engagement. Toward the end of the project a workshop was held in Venice where potential users were invited to test tools. They were primarily journalists and decision makers—the kinds of people for whom the MACOSPOL online platform (www.mappingcontroversies.net/, now offline) had been designed and intended from the start. They were asked to map a topic of their choosing. The idea was that these types of users, as part of their profession, would routinely have stakes in a changing cast of controversies and would thus self-evidently see the point of becoming controversy mappers themselves.

The reality proved more complicated. In one of the intermediary project reports from MACOSPOL, it was noted that “what we need in the first place is to have a set of tools that targets the selected public (journalists and decision makers) as possible users of the platform.” This was in many ways achieved, except that what was ignored here was the question of how exactly journalists and decision makers can be said to constitute a public. Sure enough, they are people whose job it is to act in / steer through / report on controversies, typically by trying to settle them, either by exercising editorial privileges or by acting politically. But this also implies that they are not by definition interested in opening up the controversy for exploration, especially not if they can establish criteria from which to judge up front who is right and who is wrong. They are, in other words, not necessarily inclined to become controversy mappers.

In figure 1 we see MACOSPOL researchers standing behind the users, helping them out with the tools. A frequently posed question in this situation was how the tools would compete with picking up the phone to ask a trusted expert what was important and what was not. This was how most of the users would routinely handle their encounters with controversies. The public, in this setup, was thus staged in a manner quite similar to the students learning controversy mapping—their instructors at the ready to help out where needed—but their stakes in the situation were of course completely different. In Venice we encountered users with ingrained ways of questioning the world that were not easily aligned with the tools.

It is key to understanding the MACOSPOL experience that the development and testing of tools was entirely delegated to different work packages where team members were mapping their own research topics. The experimental alpha users of the tools were thus people with a very specific, and STS informed, prior understanding

FIGURE 1: MACOSPOL final workshop in Venice. The participants are journalists and decision makers (because they are supposed to deal with controversies in their work). They sit around a table filled with computers. MACOSPOL assistants stand behind them to help the prospect mappers conduct their mappings.

of controversies and their potentials. When they conceived of the tools as “speeding up” inquiry, for instance, it was always in comparison with the extremely labor intensive work of manually and agnostically charting the arguments brought forth by actors in a controversy without a priori determining their relevance. This type of inquiry is not the standard *modus operandi* for journalists and decision makers. From this setup arose the fallacy that if the users only knew about the tools and how to *use* them, they would also *need* them. You could say that MACOSPOL was paradoxically and inadvertently enacting a version of the very same deficit model that it had been founded to challenge.

If MACOSPOL taught us something, it was that it does not suffice to simply make tools and maps available if they are to have public effects. In order for these things to be truly “public things” (DiSalvo et al. 2014), care and attention would have to be devoted to making them matters of concern to the users. MACOSPOL rather naïvely imagined that equipping the public would amount to offering tools that would allow concerned citizens to become cartographers of controversies themselves.

Early Experiments with Participation in EMAPS

When EMAPS succeeded MACOSPOL, it was thus decided to shift our engagements with the public in two important ways (at this point we had all become engaged

FIGURE 2: Early EMAPS workshop in London. Researchers from the project sit around the table along with other workshop participants. One assistant in each group asks questions, moderates the discussion, and takes notes. On the table are prefabricated maps that are shown and interpreted one after the other.

with the project, whereas two of us had worked on MACOSPOL as well). First, the idea of generic tools and equipment as a goal in itself was abandoned. Focus would instead be on maps tailored for specific issues. Second, the users invited to the workshops would now include people with more immediate stakes in one such issue, not just journalists and decision makers with a professional obligation toward it. We chose to split the work in two phases, first taking on a pilot case about aging in the United Kingdom, where the new approach would be tested, and then a case study on climate change adaptation, for which an online issue atlas would be published (www.climaps.eu). It was planned like this in order to have sufficient time for iterations, going back and forth between user workshops and drawing board, instead of the linear format adopted in MACOSPOL with a user workshop at the end.

MACOSPOL had no doubt contributed to the development of a common toolset for controversy mappers, but the feeling was that it was necessary to demonstrate what could be done with this toolset before one could realistically consider its affordances in actual use. The first workshop arranged in relation to the pilot study on aging thus saw EMAPS researchers bringing to the venue premade maps, which they would then explore together with care workers, advocacy groups, and other issue professionals of the aging debate. This was possible partly due to the domain expertise of one of the EMAPS partners, the Young Foundation, which had prior experience with social innovation in that sector and could thus provide necessary input on the preparation of maps prior to the workshop. The purpose was to observe how participants responded to maps that were, to the minds of the EMAPS researchers, the state of the art with the available toolset.

In figure 2 we see EMAPS researchers sitting down with users, listening in and taking stock of how they engage with their maps. The scene is notably different

from the MACOSPOL workshop in Venice where they assumed the role as tool instructors helping their “students” produce maps themselves. As the pilot phase progressed, however, we gradually moved from this fairly “product-centric” mode of engagement to a more “use-centric” mode (we credit our design advisor on the project, Lucy Kimbell, for this conceptualization; see also Venturini et al. 2015). In order to make better sense of the maps, it was decided that they would have to depart from research questions derived more directly from the practices of the users.

In the first instance this was attempted by simply going back and improving the maps based on user input between the first and second workshops. No additional qualitative work was undertaken outside the workshops to get a sense of what kind of questions the users might be interested in or (perhaps especially) to situate these questions in the everyday environments of the users. The users were merely asked to respond to maps and then to respond again to a set of revised maps. During the two first workshops we were able to identify one user in particular who was engaged in advocacy work, had a sick mother herself, and seemed genuinely curious about the potentials of the mapping. She agreed to let an ethnographer from the EMAPS team work closely with her to articulate research questions that made sense in her world and in the professional lives of her colleagues. These questions were then translated into digital mapping projects, the results of which were explored with a broader selection of users at an issue safari in London. It was the first time that the EMAPS team got a sense that the cartography of controversies was being meaningfully acquired by actors in a controversy.

This taught us not only that hardwiring the mapping projects into the everyday practices of the users was essential, but also that doing so required an extremely agile and adaptable collective effort on behalf of the team. For the next phase of the project, which was supposed to build an issue atlas of climate adaptation (the eventual result is available at www.climaps.eu), we would have designers from Milan, digital methods experts from Paris and Amsterdam, domain experts from Dortmund, social innovation facilitators from London, and a range of invited issue experts involved in what was essentially a distributed exercise in collective controversy mapping. The challenge was at once to find a way of managing such a distributed work process, while efficiently translating the concerns of the actors in the controversy into feasible digital methods projects. Encouraged by our experiences at the issue safari in London, we were determined to find engaged issue experts with obvious and immediate stakes in the controversy. We had learned not to expect cartography to imbue participants with an appetite for maps. Instead we would make sure, by interviewing and spending time with potential participants in advance, that they brought such an appetite with them to the project. In a sense this reversed the roles when it came to acquiring a stake in the mapping, or at least it made us realize that it was more a matter of us learning from the issue experts how maps could be useful in their domain than a matter of them learning something about controversy mapping from us. This came with some obvious risks. There was a keen sense, for example, that we could easily end up servicing the data crunching and visualization needs of issue experts who knew quite well what kind of maps would aid their agenda, that we would, as one project partner formulated it, end up “giving too much away for the process.”

The solution came from our project partners at the Digital Methods Initiative in Amsterdam who had the following program lined up for their 2013 Winter School in digital methods:

The 2013 Digital Methods Winter School is devoted to emerging alternatives to big data. The Barcamp, Hackathon, Hack Day, Edit-a-thon, Data Sprint, Code Fest, Open Data Day, Hack the Government, and other workshop formats are sometimes thought of as “quick and dirty.” The work is exploratory, only the first step, outputting indicators at most, before the serious research begins. However, these new formats also may be viewed as alternative infrastructures as well as approaches to big data in the sense of not only the equipment and logistics involved (hit and run) but also the research set-up and protocols, which may be referred to as “short-form method.”

The 2013 Digital Methods Winter School is dedicated to the outcomes and critiques of short-form method, and is also reflexive in that it includes a data sprint, where we focus on one aspect of the debate about short- vs. long-form method: data capture. To begin, at the Winter School the results of a data sprint from a week earlier (on counter-Jihadists, see www.hopenothate.org.uk/counter-jihad/map/) will be presented, including a specific short-form method for issue mapping (www.densitydesign.org/2012/10/visualizing-right-wing-populism-in-europe/). One outcome of the Winter School would be a comparison of short-form methods for their capacity to fit the various workshop formats (barcamp, sprint, etc.), with the question of what may be achieved in shorter (and shorter) time frames. We also will explore a variety of objects of study for sprints, including data donations, where one offers particular data sets for abbreviated analysis.

Drawing inspiration from the developer community and its tradition of hackathons (hack marathons), we decided to organize four consecutive *data sprints* (we credit Liliana Bunegru and Erik Borra at the Digital Methods Initiative for this term; see also Berry et al. 2015) where we would invite issue experts, designers, developers, and social scientists to work together for five consecutive days on a preselected theme. Over the course of a year (January–September 2014) we thus organized sprints in Paris (around the international negotiations on adaptation), Amsterdam (around the question of vulnerability assessments and indices), Oxford (around the question of financial compensation), and Milan (focusing mainly on the design of the platform for the issue atlas). Below we go through the process of organizing and executing one such sprint in order provide a feel for its gait and composition.

The Paris Sprint in Pictures

On the morning of the first day of the sprint, the invited issue experts present and discuss controversies in the international negotiations around climate change adaptation. The issue experts include (1) Farhana Yamin, associate fellow at the Royal Institute of International Affairs (London) with extensive experience as an environmental lawyer and policy expert on climate change, also a lead author for the IPCC who has served as senior adviser to the European Commission and the EU Commissioner for climate change (2) Richard Klein, senior research fellow at the Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI), lead IPCC author, and senior policy adviser to a range of governments and international organizations on the subject of climate adaptation; (3) Kees van der Geest, expert on loss and damage and researcher at the United Nations University in Bonn; (4) Alix Mazounie, policy expert

on adaptation from the French branch of the NGO Climate Action Network; (5) Nicolas Bériot, secretary general of the French National Observatory for the Effects of Global Warming (ONERC) and head of climate adaptation policy at the French Ministry for the Environment; and (6) Francois Gemenne, a specialist in environmental geopolitics at the Institute for Sustainable and International Development (IDDRI) in Paris who was tasked with mediating the discussion among the experts.

While the issue experts present and discuss, the EMAPS team consisting of 25 to 30 designers, developers, and social scientists take notes in a shared Google Doc (projected on the screen on the wall; see figures 3 and 4). This is the beginning of a process to translate the concerns of the issue experts into workable digital methods projects. The team knows in advance which datasets have been collected and immediately begin discussing whether and how they might be useful to the projects taking form.

During lunch break the collective notes of the team are condensed into six project briefs that are pitched on a so-called *issue auction* (see figure 5). The team has already been divided into five working groups that can now bid on the project they want to work on. One project is deliberately left orphaned and will not be taken forward. In order to condense the collective notes as respectfully as possible, we prioritized to have meaningful and coherent project briefs even though it meant the number of briefs would be higher than the number of groups that were able to take them on.

During the afternoon of the first day of the sprint each of the working groups gather to decide how they are going to operationalize their brief. The issue experts circulate between the groups to offer their commentary and help clarify the questions they have raised in their presentations. The photo of the white board that appears as figure 6 is from a group working on the question, “who are the experts of adaptation?” It was a question raised by several issue experts who asserted that, in the international negotiations, much depends on who has privileged access to which rooms and negotiating tables. No good dataset had been prepared in advance for a question like this. Together with the issue experts, the group had to devise a mapping strategy that would scrape the participants lists year by year for all the COPs (the Conference of Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, i.e., the international climate summits) and then search the meeting notes for a range of committees and subcommittees to see who had been granted the rights to speak in which forums over the course of the negotiations.

As work progresses toward the milestone presentations on the third day of the sprint, intermediary visualizations are built to explore the potentials of the mappings with the issue experts. Figure 7 displays an online interface developed for that same project on the experts of adaptation (you can explore it here: <http://ladem.fr/misc/sprint2014/trajectories.php>). Compared to the chaotic whiteboard of the first day, we now have a workable prototype that allows both issue experts and other sprint participants to get tactile with the datasets and explore their potentials and limitations. One of the motivations for this particular subproject was to have a hands-on tool that would allow a participant in a COP to quickly survey another participant’s track record and standing in different expert groups, forums, and subsidiary boards. Another quite different motivation was to be able to gauge, on an aggregate level, how expert groups, forums, and subsidiary boards share and exchange experts. The mock-up has thus been designed in a way that enables

FIGURE 3: Issue experts pitch projects on the first day of the sprint.

FIGURE 4: Collective note taking in a shared document on the first day of the sprint.

The material is protected by copyright and its reproduction is restricted by law, except that you may download each available chapter and copy, redistribute the material in any medium or format for personal use, educational, and non-commercial purposes only, provided that you give appropriate credit to Princeton University Press.

FIGURE 5: Proposed projects are auctioned off on the afternoon of the first day of the sprint.

FIGURE 6: Draft for a protocol that tracks mentions of actors in meeting minutes from climate change negotiations.

FIGURE 7: Intermediary visualization that makes it possible for sprint participants to explore different filterings of a dataset that tracks mentions of actors in meeting minutes from climate change negotiations.

us to filter COP participants in different ways. We can for example choose to explore the trajectory of an individual participant, of all participants, of those who have been active in side events, or of those who have never been active in side events.

On the afternoon of the third day the issue experts are invited back to the conference room, but this time it is the working groups delivering the presentations of their intermediary results. It is around this point in the sprint that issue experts begin to acquire a more concrete stake in the mapping. Contrary to the presentations and discussions on the first day, when the rest of the participants attempted to get their heads around the different problems and positions of the international negotiations on climate change adaptation, the issue experts now have to get their heads around what can and cannot be done with digital methods. It has become clear that the options are not endless and that the process of crafting workable maps requires specific ways of thinking that are not always in line with what the issue experts are used to. In the project being presented in figure 8 the issue experts have been asked to help tag a dataset on adaptation funding based on the main thematic areas of intervention. According to one of them, this has been an eye-opening experience that has helped bring some of her more lofty expectations for the instant potential of data visualization healthily down to earth. It has proven much more complicated than first thought to find a logical and consistent way to tag interventions thematically. During the first three days, then, it is not only the resident controversy mappers who have become more issue-savvy; it is just as importantly the issue experts who have become more attuned to the challenges of digital controversy mapping.

During the milestone presentations on the third day the issue experts listen in and respond. They are being asked to imagine how the presented mock-ups may or

FIGURE 8: Preliminary results of data projects presented on the third day of the sprint.

may not be (made) useful for them in their own practice (see figure 9). This is also an opportunity for the working groups to deliver feedback on each other's work. The session sets the pace for the remaining days of the sprint. The job is now to finalize a set of mappings that will conceivably be of use to the issue experts and their professional communities. This involves a number of tough choices. The first three days have thrown up a range of opportunities, but the time constraints of the sprint are now acutely felt, and the need to deliver a product that will conceivably travel with the issue experts by the end of the week becomes the imperative that guides our decisions. There is excitement about the projects, but there is also a considerable amount of frustration as the EMAPS team, largely academics and accustomed to keeping questions open, has to compromise and temporarily close down avenues of exploration.

As the sprint progresses, the working groups spontaneously abandon their designated rooms and decide to gather permanently in the lunch area (see figure 10). Besides eliminating the need to break for food, this offers several other advantages. Developers have been distributed between the groups, but their specific skills are often needed in other groups; datasets that are being harvested or cleaned by one group turn out to be useful for another; results of one mapping project turn out to be interesting for the questions posed in another. This may seem like a trivial point about layout, but we found that sprints became less efficient and engaging the more subgroups were physically contained and the work organized in siloes.

On the last day of the sprint the finalized visualizations from each project are presented to the team and the issue experts (see figure 11). It provides a sense of

FIGURE 9: Issue experts provide feedback on preliminary results on the third day of the sprint.

FIGURE 10: Sprint participants work in groups to implement ideas from issue experts on the fourth day of the sprint.

FIGURE 11: Visualization showing the career of an actor in the climate change negotiations presented on the last day of the sprint.

closure to the sprint, and a tangible target to work toward. A race toward a finish line, if you will. In figure 11 we see a further development of the interface for the subproject on “who are the experts on adaptation?” It has been designed with the scenario in mind where a negotiator on the COP floor needs to acquire a quick track record on another COP participant. It is of crucial importance that not only the finished maps and visualizations but also, to the extent possible, the datasets, the tools, and the code used are made publicly available along with a protocol that explains the projects. As Berry et al. note, “Data sprints are based on reproducibility: the work done needs to be documented and shared online in order to foster similar work and further developments” (Berry et al. 2015, 2). The results of the Paris sprint were published on the EMAPS blog (www.emapsproject.com/blog/archives/2348), and a reworked version of the results is available in the final issue atlas of the project (www.climaps.eu).

What’s in a Sprint?

Data sprints in controversy mapping are extended research collectives that assemble over several days to collaboratively explore and visualize a set of pertinent questions. They comprise the necessary competencies to (1) pose these questions, (2) consider their relevance and implications for the controversy, (3) operationalize them into feasible digital methods projects, (4) procure and prepare the necessary datasets, (5) write and adapt the necessary code, (6) design and make sense of the relevant data visualizations, and (7) elicit feedback and commentary through consecutive versions of these visualizations. In practice this means that the following roles should be considered necessary to the functioning of the collective:

The Issue Experts/Alpha Users

Regardless of the subject matter of the sprint, the first order of business is always to formulate research questions. This is done with the help of people who have something at stake in the topic of the sprint (because they are affected by it, produce knowledge about it, intervene politically in it, or—highly likely—a combination of the above). They are at once the issue experts, who are able to deploy their matters of concern for the rest of the sprint participants, and the alpha users, who

will be able to provide feedback and commentary on the evolving maps from the point of view of someone who might conceivably make use of them in their practice. The selection of these issue experts/alpha users does not presume to be representative (as is, for example, the case in citizen conferences) but is driven by the research collective's need to acquire stakes in the controversy. As Whatmore and Landström put it in the context of their competency groups, actors are called for who are "sufficiently affected by what is at stake to want to participate in collectively mapping it into knowledge and, thereby, in its social ordering" (2011, 583).

The Developers

Sprints are supposed to be agile. They must be able to adapt not only to the issues experts/alpha users bring to the table but also to what the research collective as a whole makes of these contributions. The one asset that more than anything ensures this agility (or hampers it if neglected) is developers. Successful sprints are fundamentally anathema to the idea that development needs can be fully anticipated much less serviced in advance. If this is possible, it almost certainly means that the labor-intensive and resource-demanding process of sprinting will have been unnecessary. The job of the developers is to adapt tools and scripts for particular analysis needs, harvest new datasets, and help the designers build applications for exploring the datasets with the issue experts when necessary.

The Project Managers

Research questions must be asked in such a way that they are amenable to the available digital methods and yet still pertinent to the issues they concern and the issue experts that asked them. This requires a translational competence. Project managers must be sufficiently knowledgeable of the controversy to understand the questions posed by the issue experts and sufficiently adept with digital methods to see the potentials and constraints flagged by the designers and the developers. This is especially critical in operationalizing the research questions where the project managers become, in a sense, the stewards of the alpha users (who often cannot be there the whole time). It is also crucial in the interpretation and exploration of the maps where the project managers can help the issue experts understand what can and cannot be claimed with digital traces.

The Designers

A sprint process relies on visualizations through several of its key stages. They are especially essential for facilitating the ongoing exploration of the datasets and the proposed analysis of them with the issue experts (which mostly happens through quick prototypes and mock-ups along the way). To the extent that the research collective is making its results public by the end of the week and is risking failure for its maps in the everyday practices of the issue experts, the design mind-set and competence are absolutely key. It is often the designers who have their eyes best trained on the final product and are able to force the pace of the sprint toward the end.

The Sprint Organizers

Besides making the necessary practical arrangements for the sprint to take place (booking rooms and accommodation, organizing food, distributing programs and practical info, etc.), the organizers play a key role in the preparatory phase leading up to the sprint. The most obvious occasion for this is the decision on the overall sprint theme. Although sprints should be agile enough to accommodate evolving research questions, thematic framing is necessary for a number of reasons. In order to invite issue experts, it is necessary not only for the organizers to know who they are looking for but also for those invited to know why they should come. Good issue experts are likely to be dedicated people with busy agendas. It falls to the sprint organizers to provide them with an incentive by giving them a sense of what their stakes in the sprint could be. Thematic framing is also necessary for preselecting datasets. Again, although sprints should be agile enough to accommodate the harvest of new datasets, if so required by the operationalized research questions, the organizers should do what they can to anticipate relevant datasets. In effect this means that important processes of scoping and foreshadowing precede the successful sprint.

In practice these roles can be filled by the same people who have crossover competences. It is our experience that the possibility to have developers with design competencies, or vice versa, can be highly beneficial to the sprint. It is in itself an important learning outcome of a sprint that participants become more attuned to each other's practices. A good example of this is provided by issue experts who in several cases have used their experiences with the sprint to formulate and launch digital methods projects of their own.

You will notice that there is no such role of "the controversy mapper." Sprints are in many ways the embodiment of what Noortje Marres calls "distributed methods." They require all the competencies in the room and draw on every available extraneous source (whether code or data) and make every attempt to contribute back to the open source/data community. To our minds, the sprint participants, if successful, are all controversy mappers in the making; they are complicit in mapping into knowledge what thus becomes a collective matter of concern.

Below we go through the different phases of the sprint in a more stylized manner.

Posing Research Questions

During the EMAPS sprints we experimented with several ways of posing research questions. Common to all of them was the fact that the invited issue experts were given time on the first day of the sprint to deploy the controversy from their respective points of view. Typically this took place as 30- to 40-minute keynotes on a preagreed theme. During the sprint in Paris these presentations were the first opportunity the other participants had to acquaint themselves with the perspectives of the issue experts. During the second sprint in Amsterdam this was changed so that issue experts were now asked to prepare written project briefs in collaboration with EMAPS researchers that could be circulated in advance. This meant that research questions were more developed at the outset of the sprint in Amsterdam, in the sense that they were more attuned to the needs and wants of a digital methods project (we elaborate in the "Operationalizing Research Questions" section). It

also meant that research questions were more hardwired to the interests of specific issue experts, in the sense that initial project briefs were developed without the interventions of other issue experts (we elaborate in the “Considering the Relevance and Implications of Research Questions” section). In preparation for the sprint in Paris there had indeed been extensive consultations with issue experts about the possible forms a research question could take in a controversy mapping project, but these were mainly aimed at getting the academically trained issue experts to present their perspective on the controversy—i.e., present themselves as stakeholders—instead of what they considered to be the balanced overview of the controversy suited for a research project context.

Considering the Relevance and Implications of Research Questions

The main point of asking the issue experts to pose their questions on the first day of the sprint is to ensure that the digital methods projects, on which the sprint participants will be working for the rest of the week, are informed by, and acquire stakes in, what the actors of the controversy consider to be important matters of concern. There is an auxiliary point, which is to give the sprint participants, who cannot be expected to have prior experience with the controversy, an opportunity to get acquainted with the issues they will be working with, but both require that time is prioritized to take the problems raised by the issue experts properly into account. This can be done through conventional Q&A sessions or panel discussions following the presentations by the issue experts, but it can also, and often-times more fruitfully, take place as informal consultations between project groups and issue experts as part of the running feedback and commentary on data visualizations (see under “Eliciting Feedback and Commentary” below). It is a matter of sprint participants—designers and developers for instance—coming to grips with the scope of the questions. But it is also, quite importantly, a matter of issue experts questioning each other’s positions. Effectively this means that no one issue expert is issued a monopoly on the mapping projects.

Operationalizing Research Questions into Feasible Digital Methods Projects

In a sense, this process begins already before the sprint where the organizer tries to gauge, in very broad terms, what type of projects the sprint might be liable to end up with. We found that an excellent way of doing this initial vetting was to ask issue experts to suggest interesting datasets in advance. This provided a chance to get back to the issue expert and explain why the dataset had the wrong structure for certain types of hypothetical projects, for example, and thus getting them attuned to what a digital methods project can and cannot achieve. The actual operationalization, however, happens in the work groups led by one or more project leaders.

Procuring and Preparing Datasets

As mentioned, it is of course desirable to have datasets available in advance, but also incompatible with the agility of the sprint to fully anticipate what kind of data

will be needed. During the Paris sprint we thus invited a data provider from the NGO Climate Funds Update as an auxiliary issue expert. We also had developers putting a significant effort into procuring new datasets as a consequence of the questions raised by the issue experts. It often happened that datasets were indeed available, but had been parsed in a way that was not amenable to the projects undertaken.

Writing and Adapting Code

In stark contrast to the work done in MACOSPOL, where focus was on stand-alone tools that would be operable by a user, the sprints can potentially build customized scripts to do the kind of analysis that is required by the research questions raised by the issue experts. These projects are only as agile as the coders who are there. This does not mean, however, that old tools cannot be fruitfully adapted during the sprints, and indeed several useful developments of the controversy mapping tool-set came out of the sprints.

Designing and Making Sense of Maps

The driving factor of a sprint is its tangible outcomes. In the course of five days the research collective produces a series of data visualizations that the issue experts can bring with them, that will be made openly available, and that, in the case of EMAPS, the sprint participants know they will be making public together on a website (www.climaps.eu). It is therefore obvious why data design and data narration need to be part of any data sprint in some measure. In EMAPS, however, we also took the opportunity to dedicate an entire sprint (namely the last one, in Milan) to designing the final web platform. This involved selecting and redesigning maps, publishing and organizing datasets and code, narrating stories across projects, and generally thinking through what it takes to make controversy maps public.

Eliciting Feedback and Commentary

It has almost become a cliché in controversy mapping circles that the main value is not in the map but in the mapping. Although sprints work from very concrete expectations of finished maps, it is important to remember that the main learning potential—for all parties—lies in the process of making maps together. Sprints are not reducible to five days of hard labor with a clear agenda and a fixed production deadline. They deliberately incorporate opportunities to alternate between doing things together and stopping momentarily to think through whatever is being done. This is mainly possible during the three plenary sessions on the first, third, and fifth days, but the fact that the work is colocated means that an informal conversation between, for instance, issue experts, social scientists, and developers takes place in the corridors. This should not be missed but in fact encouraged through ongoing opportunities to have casual interactions, such as eating together or being able to take breaks in nice surroundings.

Toward Controversy Mapping as Coproduction of Knowledge

Having gone through the aspects of the sprint as a participatory format in controversy mapping, we can now repose the question of what a researcher who affirms the necessity of social cartography will become in the presence of his or her victims.

Michel Callon (1999) has argued that involvement of laypeople in science and technology comes in roughly three varieties: the public education model (PEM), premised on the idea of a knowledge deficit and a fundamental opposition between lay and expert knowledge; the public debate model (PDM), which acknowledges the stakes of specific situated publics in the production of scientific knowledge, and thus accepts a need to keep knowledge claims provisional until commentary from those affected by their consequences can be obtained; and the coproduction of knowledge model (CKM), in which a public is entrusted with the competence to participate on an equal footing in all aspects of the scientific process and the lay-expert divide is thus no longer maintained.

One of the great qualities of Callon's framework is its implication that the most upstream public engagement exercise in the PDM register remains incommensurable with true coproduction of knowledge if it confines lay competence to situated and local knowledge domains. If experts remain privileged as the final arbiters of what gets to count as objective and universal, so the argument goes, the much-cited ambition to restore public trust in science and technology is unlikely to be more than an empty gesture. Here Callon resonates with a sentiment in much recent STS scholarship. The acute risk that a public involvement initiative will be perceived as a mere legitimization exercise, no matter how early or often the stakeholders are consulted, is now frequently noted and agreed upon, so much so that an author like Brian Wynne (2007) deems any attempt to engender trust in science through public engagement intrinsically futile.

For others, and arguably also for Callon, the futility is less intrinsic, or at least the means of engendering public trust are potentially available if CKM is taken seriously. The reasons given are quite pragmatic: If it is the case that scientists build trust in their own knowledge claims through a series of translations (and this is how ANT accounts for it), then something similar ought to be true for publics. Without a firsthand appreciation of the reductive choices that go into stabilizing a knowledge claim, trust cannot be expected to emerge out of the blue. One recent STS project that has taken this premise to its fullest and most radical consequence is the Pickering Flood Research Group, set up in North Yorkshire in 2008. Central to the success of this "competency group," as it dubbed itself, was the notion of apprenticeship and the maxims to be "doing things together" and "making things public" (Whatmore and Landström 2011).

To our minds, the development of the cartography of controversies through projects like MACOSPOL and EMAPS describes a movement from a quite classic PEM approach, where the public is construed as being in a navigational deficit that can be fixed by "tooling up" the citizens, to a PDM model in the early phases of EMAPS, where maps are produced in the cartographer's workshop and then solicited for commentary with the users (stakeholders in the aging debate), to the sprints as a version of CKM that allows the mapmakers to acquire stakes in the controversy and the actors of the controversy to acquire stakes in the mapping. In the end all participants became competent sprinters, sufficiently savvy about each other's domains to be mapping things together.

In this mode of engagement it becomes possible to simultaneously make controversy mapping relevant for its users and manage a necessarily distributed cartographic machinery, and also allows the research collective to render the controversy as a controversy, to deploy it in its complexity without reducing it to a single point of view.

In conclusion, however, it should be noted that *allowing* the controversy to manifest itself is not the same thing as *ensuring* that it happens. The data sprint is an occasion, characterized by specific social, temporal, and material affordances, through which it becomes possible for the controversy mapper to acquire a stake in the controversy and allow the actors of the controversy to acquire a stake in the mapmaking. But data sprinting alone will not force that to take place. It seems that one of the more serious barriers is the blackboxing of both digital methods and professional practices of issue experts that normally characterize attempts to read premade maps or use tools without a pretext. Data sprints are potential occasions precisely because they force such black boxes to be temporarily opened and scrutinized. Therein lies a *potential* for engagement, one that must be actively pursued by the organizers.

Works Cited

- Berry, D. M., E. Borra, A. Helmond, J. C. Plantin, and J. Walker Rettberg. 2015. "The Data Sprint Approach: Exploring the field of Digital Humanities through Amazon's Application Programming Interface." *Digital Humanities Quarterly* 9 (3). <http://digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/9/3/000222/000222.html>.
- Björgvinsson, E., P. Ehn, and P. A. Hillgren. 2012. "Design Things and Design Thinking: Contemporary Participatory Design Challenges." *Design Issues* 28 (3): 101–16.
- Brandt, E. 2006. "Designing Exploratory Design Games: A Framework for Participation in Participatory Design?" In *Proceedings of the Ninth Conference on Participatory Design: Expanding Boundaries in Design*, vol. 1, 57–66. New York: ACM.
- Burgess, J., A. Stirling, J. Clark, G. Davies, M. Eames, S. Staley, and S. Williamson. 2007. "Deliberative Mapping: A Novel Analytic-Deliberative Methodology to Support Contested Science-Policy Decisions." *Public Understanding of Science* 16 (3): 299–322.
- Callon, M. 1986. "The Sociology of an Actor-Network: The Case of the Electric Vehicle." In *Mapping the Dynamics of Science and Technology*, edited by Michel Callon, John Law, and Arie Rip, 19–34. London: Macmillan.
- . 1998. "An Essay on Framing and Overflowing: Economic Externalities Revisited by Sociology." *Sociological Review* 46 (S1): 244–69.
- . 1999. "The Role of Lay People in the Production and Dissemination of Scientific Knowledge." *Science, Technology and Society* 4 (1): 81–94.
- Callon, M., J. P. Courtial, W. A. Turner, and S. Bauin. 1983. "From Translations to Problematic Networks: An Introduction to Co-word Analysis." *Social Science Information* 22 (2): 191–235.
- Callon, M., P. Lascoumes, and Y. Barthe. 2009. *Acting in an Uncertain World: An Essay on Technical Democracy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Callon, M., J. Law, and A. Rip, eds. 1986. *Mapping the Dynamics of Science and Technology*. London: Macmillan.
- Dewey, J. 1927. *The Public and Its Problems [an Essay in Political Inquiry]* by John Dewey. New York: Holt.
- DiSalvo, C., J. Lukens, T. Lodato, T. Jenkins, and T. Kim. 2014. "Making Public Things: How HCI Design Can Express Matters of Concern." In *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 2397–2406. New York: ACM.
- Ehn, P. 2008. "Participation in Design Things." In *Proceedings of the Tenth Anniversary Conference on Participatory Design 2008*, 92–101. Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Einsiedel, E. F., E. Jelsøe, and T. Breck. 2001. "Publics at the Technology Table: The Consensus Conference in Denmark, Canada, and Australia." *Public Understanding of Science* 10 (1): 83–98.

- Felt, U., and M. Fochler. 2008. "The Bottom-Up Meanings of the Concept of Public Participation in Science and Technology." *Science and Public Policy* 35 (7): 489–99.
- Haraway, D. 1988. "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective." *Feminist Studies* 14 (3): 575–99.
- Horst, M., and A. Irwin. 2010. "Nations at Ease with Radical Knowledge on Consensus, Consensusing and False Consensusness." *Social Studies of Science* 40 (1): 105–26.
- Hyysalo, S. 2006. "Representations of Use and Practice-Bound Imaginaries in Automating the Safety of the Elderly." *Social Studies of Science* 36 (4): 599–626.
- Jensen, T. E. 2012. "Intervention by Invitation." *Science Studies* 25 (1): 13–36.
- Knapp, J., J. Zeratsky, B. Kowitz. 2016. *Sprint: How to Solve Big Problems and Test New Ideas in Just Five Days*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Landström, C., S. J. Whatmore, S. N. Lane, N. A. Odoni, N. Ward, and S. Bradley. 2011. "Coproducing Flood Risk Knowledge: Redistributing Expertise in Critical 'Participatory Modelling.'" *Environment and Planning A* 43 (7): 1617–33.
- Latour, B. 1987. *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- . 1993. *The Pasteurization of France*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- . 2004. "Why Has Critique Run Out of Steam? From Matters of Fact to Matters of Concern." *Critical inquiry* 30 (2): 225–48.
- . 2005. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2008. "The Space of Controversies: Interview with Bruno Latour." *New Geographies* 0:122–35.
- Latour, B., P. Mauguin, and G. Teil. 1992. "A Note on Socio-technical Graphs." *Social Studies of Science* 22 (1): 33–57.
- Latour, B., and S. Woolgar. 1979. *Laboratory Life: The Social Construction of Scientific Facts*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Law, J. 2009. "The Greer-Bush Test: On Politics in STS." Draft paper, December 23.
- Lippmann, W. 1927. *The Phantom Public*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Marres, N. 2007. "The Issues Deserve More Credit Pragmatist Contributions to the Study of Public Involvement in Controversy." *Social Studies of Science* 37 (5): 759–80.
- . 2015. "Why Map Issues? On Controversy Analysis as a Digital Method." *Science, Technology, & Human Values* 40 (5): 655–86.
- Mol, A. 2002. *The Body Multiple: Ontology in Medical Practice*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Moser, I. 2008. "Making Alzheimer's Disease Matter: Enacting, Interfering and Doing Politics of Nature." *Geoforum* 39 (1): 98–110.
- Munk, A. K., and S. Abrahamsson. 2012. "Empiricist Interventions." *Science Studies* 25 (1): 5270.
- Nowotny, H., P. Scott, and M. Gibbons. 2003. "Introduction: Mode 2 Revisited: The New Production of Knowledge." *Minerva* 41 (3): 179–94.
- Petersen, M. K., and A. Munk. 2013. "I Vælten: Kulturanalysens Nye Hverdag." *Kulturstudier* 4 (1): 102–17.
- Rheinberger, H. J. 1997. *Toward a History of Epistemic Things: Synthesizing Proteins in the Test Tube*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Rowe, G., and L. J. Frewer. 2005. "A Typology of Public Engagement Mechanisms." *Science, Technology, & Human Values* 30 (2): 251–90.
- Stengers, I. 1997. *Power and Invention: Situating Science*. Vol. 10. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- . 2000. *The Invention of Modern Science*. Vol. 19. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- . 2005. "The Cosmopolitical Proposal." In *Making Things Public: Atmospheres of Democracy*, edited by Bruno Latour and Peter Weibel, 994–1003. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Venturini, T. 2010. "Diving in Magma: How to Explore Controversies with Actor-Network Theory." *Public Understanding of Science* 19 (3): 258–73.
- . 2012. "Building on Faults: How to Represent Controversies with Digital Methods." *Public Understanding of Science* 21 (7): 796–812.
- Venturini, T., D. Ricci, M. Mauri, L. Kimbell, and A. Meunier. 2015. "Designing Controversies and Their Publics." *Design Issues* 31 (3): 74–87.
- Vikkelsø, S. 2007. "Description as Intervention: Engagement and Resistance in Actor-Network Analyses." *Science as Culture* 16 (3): 297–309.

- Whatmore, S. J. 2009. "Mapping Knowledge Controversies: Science, Democracy and the Redistribution of Expertise." *Progress in Human Geography* 33:587–98.
- Whatmore, S. J., and C. Landström. 2011. "Flood Apprentices: An Exercise in Making Things Public." *Economy and Society* 40 (4): 582–610.
- Woolgar, S. 1990. "Configuring the User: The Case of Usability Trials." *Sociological Review* 38 (S1): 58–99.
- Woolgar, S., C. Coopmans, and D. Neyland. 2009. "Does STS Mean Business?" *Organization* 16 (1): 5–30.
- Wynne, B. 2007. "Public Participation in Science and Technology: Performing and Obscuring a Political-Conceptual Category Mistake." *East Asian Science, Technology and Society* 1 (1): 99–110.
- Yaneva, A. 2012. *Mapping Controversies in Architecture*. Oxford: Ashgate.
- Yearley, S., S. Cinderby, J. Forrester, P. Bailey, and P. Rosen. 2003. "Participatory Modelling and the Local Governance of the Politics of UK Air Pollution: A Three-City Case Study." *Environmental Values* 12 (2): 247–62.