

media and its consequences (Blanchette 2011; Dourish and Mazmanian 2011; Hayles 2004; Rosner et al. 2012). Building on these questions, I ask what space- and place-making practices are at stake in social and mobile computing, as materially and territorially locatable. In particular, I consider how emerging media generate or reconfigure geographic scales of everyday communication. Drawing on ethnographic fieldwork in Berlin, I discuss the relationship between mobile devices, cultural mobilities, and public spaces, and the production of online publics through language practices. Mobile phones have occupied notable roles in recent protest movements, yet phone-mobilized crowds are characterized in class-specific ways (e.g., Rafael 2003). In Berlin devices such as smartphones and laptops accommodated the mobilities of dominant, middle-class subjects, while potentially disabling minoritarian users. Social and digital media also facilitated diverse publics online, as users moved between—and created—publics at different geographic scales, through practices like code switching. In these instances, STS can help locate clouds and crowds as neither global nor placeless, but as implicated in multiple and uneven ways of making and organizing everyday space.

Science and the Commodification of the Crowd. *Olivier Glassey, University of Lausanne, Switzerland*

From emotion epidemics (MacKay, 1841) to digital mass collaboration (Shirky, 2009) the notion of crowd has a long history with the commentators of social phenomenon and was instrumental to the early shaping of social sciences with Le Bon Tarde and Simmel among many others (Borch, 2010). The development of the so-called “social” web brought the crowd back to the agenda, highlighting its trajectory from being mainly perceived as a cause of social regression to become some sort of generic enabler (Howe, 2009). This renewed interest for the crowd comes along with a major paradoxical ontological shift as this notion both gained a new digital materiality and, simultaneously, becomes less visible with its numerous, blurred and open-ended definitions. Moreover the templates and the tools designed for these distributed digital collectives configure (and sometimes hide) new power, financial and work relationships (Irani, 2013) which still need to be explored. The proposed contribution will focus on scientific projects that are integrating crowd based dynamics (crowdsourcing, crowdfunding, crowd pooling of data, etc.. .) Considering several large scientific projects in the field of genetics, social sciences and digital humanities we analyze how the “crowd” is defined and translated within research projects arrangement. Our aim is to discuss the epistemic issues linked with this processed materiality of crowd within science and to explore the imbedded representations of the social in those crowd-enabled dynamics.

135. Integrating Neuroscience and Neuroscholarship: Adapting and Updating Transdisciplinary Research Paradigms in STS

10:30 to 12:00 pm

Town and Country: Sheffield

Chair:

Melissa M. Littlefield, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

Participants:

Becoming Neuroscholars: Disciplinary Double Consciousness in Emergent Neuroscholarship. *Melissa M. Littlefield, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign*

Given the academy’s recent obsession with ‘neuro’ as a disciplinary and linguistic prefix, this paper interrogates what it means to become neuroscholars. “Neuroscholarship” is a nascent term that could be applied to a wide selection of academic work: collaborative partnerships and research teams that include both neuroscientists and scholars from the humanities and social sciences; science and technology studies (STS) scholars examining the phenomena of neuroscientific research from the perspectives of Public Understanding of Science (PUS), policy, and ethnography; ethicists posing questions about practice, neuro-realism, and neuro-essentialism; humanities scholars

examining the discursive and rhetorical shifts in language and knowledge production; and a plethora of scholars from disparate disciplines devising experiments and stepping into laboratory work of their own. Over the past five years, our research group (made up of scholars from the social sciences, neurosciences, and humanities) designed and executed a fMRI experiment that was intended to challenge current lie detection paradigms by posing a new question: is truth-telling a viable baseline for human cognition against which deception can be measured? Or, is truth itself a more complex variable, particularly if it is told in a socially-stressful situation. Focusing on the disciplinary double-consciousness experienced during this transdisciplinary fMRI experiment, the paper seeks to define neuroscholarship as a phenomenon and asks what intellectual and political possibilities are enabled by neuroscholarship.

Can Neuroscience and Creativity Co-Exist in the Same Room?

Phuonguyen Chu, NeuroLinx Research Institute; Ann Lam, NeuroLinx Research Institute; Elan Liss Ohayon, NeuroLinx Research Institute

A neuroscientist, a zombie, an artist and a duck enter a room. The neuroscientist and zombie look around and yell “brains!” The artist and duck look back in horror and cry “quack!” Neuroscientists have been increasingly interested in the topic of creativity. The central questions of this paper are, “What can neuroscience research reveal about creativity and are we seeking to connect two domains that cannot -- or should not -- be connected? We begin by reviewing how creativity has been studied in psychology, social sciences and neuroscience. We inquire whether methods used in neuroscience research reveal more than social and behavioral studies or do the approaches exacerbate existing problems? Specific case studies are considered as well as interacting factors, including: culture, social conditions, gender, and spoken language. We argue that there are deep methodological and conceptual problems with the very attempt to define “creativity”. We further argue that although the express intentions are to cultivate and employ creativity, the effects can result in the very essence of creativity being lost. Current neuroscience remains largely reductionist and fundamentally destructive in nature. These tendencies are opposite to -- and threaten -- the creative process. We also question the nature of the room neuroscience and creativity are increasingly being forced to share. Why are we seeing this increase interest in creativity? What interests do these studies serve? Conversely, we highlight new constructive and synthesizing approaches and suggest that these may be best achieved by leaving “creativity” undefined.

The Signature Identities of Experimental Neuroscience. *David Brian Hay, King's College London*

This paper explores the research perspective of neuroscience by documenting the brain cell (neuron) drawings of undergraduates, trainee scientists and leading neuroscience researchers in a single research-intensive university. Qualitative analysis, drawing-sorting exercises and hierarchical cluster analysis are used to answer two related questions: Are there categorical differences in drawings of participants; and if differences exist, can they be objectively recognised as measures of research experience? The analysis strongly suggests that: 1) a willingness/ability to hybridise extant brain cell knowledge with imaginative conjecture grounded by experience of experimental plausibility gives rise to drawings which are recognised as being “expert signatures” by all classes of participants; 2) the drawings of PhD students and postdoctoral researchers’ are influenced by a more mechanical observation style where faithfulness to actual observation-work is prioritised; and 3) while a subset of undergraduates recognise the images of “experts”, their own drawings are invariably textbook reproductions. Nevertheless, teaching interventions designed to engender research perspective free-up undergraduates’ creative drawing potential so that sometimes their post-intervention drawings are indistinguishable from those of Principal Investigators. We explore the teaching implications of our data, emphasising the distinctive role of the