



Inspiring and Anchoring Trust in Science, Research and Innovation

Combined Expert Workshops on 'Trust in Science'

2nd May 2023 (~13:00 CEST) - **3rd May 2023** (~13:30 CEST)
Soeterbeeck, Netherlands

Workshop I

'Cooperative Discourse to map the Landscape & Parameters pertaining to 'Trust in Science''

Workshop II

'Scenario- & Analyses-Planning based on historical Case-Studies'

Disclaimer

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency (REA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.



Synopsis of the combined Workshops

One year after the start of the IANUS project, the team of the 'Reconnaissance'-work package (WP2) aims to review its initial approach and result of analysing past and ongoing initiatives, mapping the network (i.e. of previous and ongoing projects with a focus on trust) and harvesting information on the state of the art for the project's conceptual framework (WP3), case studies (WP4) and co-creation (WP5) (incl. policy documents and media debates, engage with the Eurobarometer and other surveys, with a special focus on science communication (state of the art) and stakeholder consultations).

The following questions will be addressed and discussed:

- a) Who or what is the object of trust in science (micro, meso and macro levels): individual researchers (as persons or as representatives of some field or research), research organisations (can be different institutions around science, science as a system)
- b) What is involved in trust - a positive feeling towards the trustee as well as hope that the trustee will fulfil the trustor's expectations. Which expectations does trust in science involve, taking into that the trustee can be a person, an institution, science as a system or a product of science.
- c) What makes the object trustworthy? Which expectations does trust involve? Does it involve only a positive feeling about the trustee (A trusts B globally), or a three-place trust (A trusts B to C). In case of trust in science one can trust the scientist to tell the truth, or to be ethical (have researcher's integrity), or to trust that the scientist is benevolent.
- d) Which other influences (i.e. cultural, regional, historical, political, socio-economic, demographic) or biases need to be taken into account, when analysing (and possibly comparing) 'trust in science'?

Day 1 of the workshop aims to better define the reasons for and characteristics of trust and distrust in science: invited experts are asked to join one of two breakout groups (i.e. (1) Agent 'Trust', or (2) Agent 'Distrust'), in order to prepare the arguments that are likely to be used by each group in the subsequent 'cooperative discourse' workshop.¹

Day 2 of the workshop aims to apply the results of the previous day (i.e. the arguments heard and the debate held during the discourse) to plan and refine the in-depth analyses of IANUS historical Case-Studies (i.e. past cases, in which scientific topics have been discussed in public and evoked (dis)trust). The preliminary results of least one historical IANUS Case-Study (i.e. on 'Genome Editing'), will be presented, in order to provide the experts with an overview of the data available (e.g. survey data), analyses done, and parameters taken into consideration.

PLEASE NOTE: In the interest of reaching the workshop's aim, experts are discouraged from re-inventing the wheel, questioning the nature or descriptions of the groups, and philosophising about the different forms of (dis)trust and their correct English terminology.²

If a group feels that it has agree on or define certain specifics, before it can tackle the task at hand, such specifics should be documented by the group and clearly communicated before the discourse debate.

¹ The IANUS organisation team reserves the right to ask specific experts to change teams, in the case of pronounced unbalancing of the two groups.

² Definitions and perceptions of aspects pertaining to '(dis)trust in science' and any associated adjectives used in combination with the terms differ widely. IANUS has conducted its own conceptualisation work.

Preliminary Agenda

| Day 1 (Tuesday, 2 nd May 2023) | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 12:30 – 13:30 | Lunch Reception, Arrival & Registration | | | | | | |
| 13:30 – 14:00 | Welcome & Introduction to the combined Workshop <i>Speaker: Hub Zwart</i> | | | | | | |
| 14:00 – 15:00 | Tour-de-Table & General Discussion of broader Issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - History: Why are we still talking about trust in science after 50 years? - Impact & unique role of the pandemic: Has the pandemic changed the very nature of science in society? <i>Moderator: George Gaskell</i> | | | | | | |
| 15:00 – 15:15 | Introduction of the ‘Cooperative Discourse’ work in breakout groups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ‘What are the reasons for and the characteristics of trust / distrust in science?’ - Formulation of challenges and tasks of the Collaborative Discourse Workshop’s ‘Agent’- Breakout Groups <i>Presenter: Steffi Friedrichs</i> | | | | | | |
| 15:15 – 16:30 | Group Work in two ‘Agent’-Breakout Groups | | | | | | |
| | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Group 1: Agent ‘Trust’</th> <th>Group 2: Agent ‘Distrust’</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> Characteristics of an agent for trust in science and/or scientific systems/conduct <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trust may be both ‘valid’/‘warranted’ and/or ‘invalid’/‘unwarranted’ • Trust in (some) scientists and/or scientific systems • Trust in (some) scientific results </td> <td> Characteristics of distrust in science and/or scientific systems/conduct <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distrust may be both ‘valid’/‘warranted’ and/or ‘invalid’/‘unwarranted’ • Distrust may concern science, scientists, or scientific systems/conduct </td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Moderator: Amalia Kallergi</i></td> <td><i>Moderator: Laurens Landeweerd</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Group 1: Agent ‘Trust’ | Group 2: Agent ‘Distrust’ | Characteristics of an agent for trust in science and/or scientific systems/conduct <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trust may be both ‘valid’/‘warranted’ and/or ‘invalid’/‘unwarranted’ • Trust in (some) scientists and/or scientific systems • Trust in (some) scientific results | Characteristics of distrust in science and/or scientific systems/conduct <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distrust may be both ‘valid’/‘warranted’ and/or ‘invalid’/‘unwarranted’ • Distrust may concern science, scientists, or scientific systems/conduct | <i>Moderator: Amalia Kallergi</i> | <i>Moderator: Laurens Landeweerd</i> |
| | Group 1: Agent ‘Trust’ | Group 2: Agent ‘Distrust’ | | | | | |
| | Characteristics of an agent for trust in science and/or scientific systems/conduct <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trust may be both ‘valid’/‘warranted’ and/or ‘invalid’/‘unwarranted’ • Trust in (some) scientists and/or scientific systems • Trust in (some) scientific results | Characteristics of distrust in science and/or scientific systems/conduct <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distrust may be both ‘valid’/‘warranted’ and/or ‘invalid’/‘unwarranted’ • Distrust may concern science, scientists, or scientific systems/conduct | | | | | |
| <i>Moderator: Amalia Kallergi</i> | <i>Moderator: Laurens Landeweerd</i> | | | | | | |
| Coffee Break in Breakout Groups | | | | | | | |
| ... continues: Work in Breakout Groups | | | | | | | |

| | |
|---------------|--|
| 16:30 – 18:00 | <p>Cooperative Discourse Debate with a view to drafting policy recommendations to build bridges between Trust & Distrust in Science³</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The target of 'policy recommendations' aims to focus the format of the 'Cooperative Discourse discussions • Outcomes will support the 'IANUS Policy Recommendations to the European Commission' <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Moderator: Steffi Friedrichs</i></p> |
| 18:00 – 18:20 | <p>Close of Day 1 & Sneak-Preview of Day 2</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Speaker: Laurens Landeweerd</i></p> |
| | Dinner |

| Day 2 (Wednesday, 3 rd May 2023) | |
|---|---|
| 09:00 – 09:30 | <p>Recap of Day 1 & Welcome and Introduction to Day 2</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Speaker: Laurens Landeweerd</i></p> |
| 09:30 – 10:15 | <p>Presentation of initial Results from the IANUS Historical Case-Studies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Historical Case Studies' are presented as 'examples' of IANUS' findings in existing (dis)trust-studies of science/technology-specific topics - Study topics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Genetics / Biotech / Genome Editing ○ AI ○ Climate Change ○ Nanotechnology <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Moderator: Steffi Friedrichs</i></p> |
| 10:15 – 11:00 | <p>Discussion of common Elements from the IANUS Historical Case-Studies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What are the lessons learnt (if any)? - What are shared characteristics? - What are the main differences between the science/technology-specific cases? <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Moderator: George Gaskell</i></p> |
| 11:00 – 11:30 | Coffee Break |
| 11:30 – 12:45 | <p>... continues:</p> <p>Discussion of initial Results from the IANUS Historical Case-Studies</p> |
| 12:45 – 13:00 | <p>Close of Day 2 & of the Combined Workshop</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Next steps <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Speaker: Laurens Landeweerd</i></p> |
| 13:00 – 14:00 | Lunch & Departure |

³ Underlying definitions (Wikipedia, accessed: 28th April 2023): (a) **Policy** is a deliberate system of **guidelines** to guide decisions and achieve rational outcomes. A policy is a statement of intent and is implemented as a procedure or protocol. Policies are generally adopted by a **governance** body within an organization. Policies can assist in both *subjective* and *objective* **decision making**. (b) **Governance** is the process of making and enforcing decisions within an organization or society. It is the process of interactions through the **laws**, **social norms**, **power** (social and political) or **language as structured in communication** of an organized society^[1] over a **social system** (**family**, **social group**, **formal** or **informal organization**, a **territory under a jurisdiction** or across territories).

ANNEX A1: More Information about the IANUS Project

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Project Acronym | IANUS |
| Project Title | Inspiring and Anchoring Trust in Science, Research and Innovation |
| Grant no | 101058158 |
| Type of action | Research and Innovation Action (RIA) |
| Start date | 01/06/2022 |
| Duration in months | 36 months |

Project Summary

The IANUS project strengthens warranted trust in science by fostering participation in research as a co-creative and inclusive process, sensitive to societal values, concerns and needs. Trust must be inspired by transparency and trustworthiness of knowledge production, and anchored by actively involving and serving society, as part of the modus operandi of science. Our core objectives: (a) Enable citizens and stakeholders to distinguish valid from unfounded trust; (b) Enable them to deal with the uncertainties and epistemic pluralism inherent in scientific knowledge; (c) Enable researchers to foster trust through radical methodological change, making research inclusive, transparent and responsive to societal needs and concerns, lowering barriers between research and society; (d) Enable researchers to conduct relevant, engaged and value-driven research while foregoing partiality, ideological biases and conflicts of interests. The acronym IANUS refers to the deity Janus of gateways (ianus in Latin), looking both at the inside and at the outside of the knowledge production process. Trust in science is never a given. Robust trust is well-placed, reciprocal and informed. Building on insights and results from other projects funded under Framework Programmes, IANUS will (a) map the landscape of projects and discourses relevant for trust in science; (b) develop its conceptual framework; (c) conduct participatory research into conditions of trust in science; (d) initiate concrete actions for strengthening trust through co-creation and engagement; (e) provide policy recommendation to key stakeholders in science and society (e.g. funding bodies, universities, research teams, educators, media); (f) create platforms for interaction and engagement between scientists and societal stakeholders to foster trust. The complexity and urgency of societal challenges has rapidly intensified, and trust in science determined our ability to address these challenges effectively.

ANNEX A2: Information about the Workshop Location

Conference Centre Soeterbeeck

Seek not to understand that you may believe, but believe that you may understand.

- Saint Augustine

The above quote from saint Augustine does not uncontroversially relate to the topic of our meeting - trust in science. Still, the church father also wrote: "The world is a book and those who do not travel read only one page". It was Augustine's philosophy that formed the guiding rule for the community of women that lived and worked at the Soeterbeeck convent.

Conference center Soeterbeeck is a former convent of the Augustinian order of Windesheim. Their community originally established a convent at the river Dommel in Nuenen around 1450, but by January 1732 the Augustinian sisters were forced to leave their old accommodation due to floodings of the Dommel. They bought a small manor house owned by the 'van den Broeck' barristers den Bogaert in Deursen, near Ravenstein. The estate and its buildings were expanded and renovated several times over the centuries.



The oldest wing of the current complex dates from 1733. The neo-Gothic chapel was added in 1906 and underwent a major modernization in the 1960s. Authentic parts of the interior, such as the choir stalls and the organ, were preserved. The convent was gifted to Radboud University Nijmegen in the late 1990s to provide the university a place removed from all the hustle and bustle of everyday academic life. The complex recently it underwent a complete renovation. It is located on the edge of the fortified town of Ravenstein, less

than half an hour from Nijmegen. The center is easily accessible by public transport (train) and by car.

By train

A train to Ravenstein departs twice an hour from both 's-Hertogenbosch (if coming from Schiphol) and Nijmegen (if coming from the East). For the exact departure and arrival times of the train at Ravenstein station, you can consult the NS travel planner:

<https://www.ns.nl/en/journeyplanner/#/>

Conference Center Soeterbeeck is about a 10-minute walk from Ravenstein station and can be reached via the Stationspad, which is located at the back of the station.



By car

Ravenstein is located on the A50 Arnhem - Den Bosch, about twenty kilometers south of Nijmegen. On the A50, both from the direction of Den Bosch and from the direction of Arnhem, take the Ravenstein exit (exit 17). From Den Bosch, turn left at the bottom of the exit and then left again towards Ravenstein. You will now drive under the A50 motorway and go straight on at the roundabout.

From Arnhem you drive three quarters around the roundabout at the bottom of the exit. Go straight on at the next roundabout.

When you have passed under the railway viaduct, you will see Soeterbeeck on your left. At the next roundabout, take the third exit (De Rijt) and then take the first left again (Elleboogstraat). You will now enter the Soeterbeeck car park through the entrance gate.

Address:

Elleboogstraat 2
5352 LP Deursen-Dennenburg

Telephone:

++31(0)24 - 36 15 999