

TRACK 25. RHETORIC IN SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION POLICIES

The studies of science, technology and innovation have grown considerably over the last twenty years, as well as the use of this knowledge in policy circles. Transnational organizations, first of all OECD and EU have been instrumental in the formulation and distribution of new policy vocabularies. Economists of innovation, regional scientists but also scholars from STS have actively contributed to the developing of new frameworks, concepts and measurements like knowledge-base economy, learning economy, national innovation system, regional innovation system, triple helix, learning region, lifelong learning etc. Researchers have introduced these terms and frameworks - often by request of OECD or EU or by a national policy or funding organization – and they are further developed in the interface between research and in policy making. Sometimes they have been suggested by politicians and the researchers are expected to define and elaborate their definitions, meaning and implications further.

Critics have suggested that these terms and frameworks are more organizing buzzwords, attention directors, or diagnosis of era addressed to politicians, science and technology administration and large public or rhetorical resources of policy making than scientific accounts based on research results or empirical evidence. It also have been questioned whether they constitute a satisfactory foundation for policy making. The construction and use of these terms constitute, therefore, an important phenomenon that merits to be inquired critically. It is important both for the understanding the foundations of science, technology and innovation policy as well as the relationship between STI studies and policy making.

The session is devoted to the study of these ideas, their uses, the rhetoric involved and their consequences. Inspired by rhetorical approaches in science, technology and policy studies, the following kind of questions will be addressed:

- Why, when and how they emerged?
- What do they explain?
- What rationale (or rhetoric) and is offered?
- What "intentions" (explicit and implicit) do the authors have?
- How are they used in the practice of policy making.
- What kind of policy, measurement and evaluation tools have being developed to implement them?
- What consequences of the uses and implementation of these terms and frameworks have had?
- What alternative frameworks, vocabularies, and instrumentalities can the STS community and STI researchers supply for policy makers ?

Abstracts of no more that 500 words should be sent by email (following website instructions)

by 2010 March 15th.

Convenors

Benoît Godín is professor at INRS (Montreal, Canada). His main research interests concern the history of statistics and the intellectual history of innovation. (www.csiic.ca)

Reijo Miettinen is professor at the University of Helsinki. His main interests concern learning in innovation networks as well as building bridges between STS, Innovation Studies and Cultural Historical Activity Theory. (www.edu.helsinki.fi/activity/people/remiitti/)