

PART 1

Choose a piece of your own writing. It can be unpublished, still in progress, or published a long time ago. It doesn't matter. Respond to a few or all of the following prompts designed to reflect on your own citational habits:

Why am I writing this piece? Who do I want to read it and what do I want to convey to someone who is looking at my bibliography?

I am writing this piece to bring something from the real world to the academic world and hopefully back to the real world. I worked for Slow Food for three months and reflected on my experiences during that time and realized it might have some valuable insights. I hope that those reflections of what people do and think can help us understand food practices and thus our approach to changing them. To be honest, I am not sure who needs to read this, as when I publish it I can barely believe it will end up at the tables of policy makers within a small municipality, although that is what I would like to happen. Right now my bibliography is not yet worthy to be looked at, as I am still in progress and have not dived deep enough into the literature (ready to get inspired in this workshop!). What I wish for – but which I cannot make true – is to have a list that includes more women, more non-European philosophers and more 'other forms' of knowledge, whatever that may be. Right now, almost all references are from authors that published in the journal of Valuation and my supervisor. Although the journal is public to all – yeey – I have to admit that it is not very good to have only one source of my literature. Working on it!

Where am I planning to publish this? In what form and with what kind of licensing? Why? Who do I want to cite this work and why?

Since I'm new in the academic world – as in, I did a masters, but never thought I would do a PhD – I have not thought thoroughly about where to publish whatever I am writing. Of course I would love to publish something that is then open access, but I have not looked into it.

*Whose voices did I point to for "theory"? Whose **voices** were **foregrounded** in the piece? Which **institutions** are the scholars I cite situated in **intellectually** and **geographically**? In what **forms**/genres were the works that I cited? Did I cite anything **outside of the journal article format**? What are the **national, racial, gender (and other) intersectional identities** of the intellectuals I have cited? Why/How/Where (in the work) have I made clear how their contributions have been generative for my own arguments?*

Most of my theoretical framework comes from a journal dedicated to valuation practices. The articles that I have focused on have been written by

white males from Europe, one specifically from Sweden. Other authors in that journal that I have referred to are all white and from Europe (Great Britain, France and the Netherlands). I have also mentioned Latour a few times. I can continue, but it becomes clear that most of my references are from authors based/from Europe. They are foremost STS scholars, and are quite known. Most of the references are scientific articles, predominantly qualitative research. I don't think I made very clear the why/how/where of their contributions, and I am also not sure how to do so.

Do my citations include relevant material by Black, Indigenous, People of Color, especially those working outside of EuroAmerican academic settings? Do I include other frequently uncited or historically marginalized scholars?

Nope. I wish I did. Even the articles that I read about Indigenous Peoples and inspired me were written by European scholars. I just don't know how to find it, where to find it. Also, I wonder whether my supervisors would approve. One of them mentioned once that Indigenous wisdom is idealized sometimes and the other one mentioned that such approaches wouldn't work in marginalized communities in the country where I live. This made me very self-conscious about whether I know enough to make my claims that it is important to include their views, and that we should have them actually at the forefront. After critiquing the positivist stream of science, how dare we now look down on other forms of research? More importantly, how can we go past that attitude and include them and see them as valid and legitimate? Why do I feel I need to (but cannot) justify why I'm using other forms of science/views?

Were the works cited published Open Access? If not, are there other ways to access the work (e.g. a pre-print hosted on a non-commercial platform?) If yes, cite the pre-print, non-commercial version. NOTE: ResearchGate and Academia.edu are for-profit commercial ventures funded by Venture Capitalists. Most of them, yes! I think some chapters and Latour that I referenced are not, but most of my conceptual framework is based on articles that are open access.

Where were the articles I am citing published? Is this a journal outside of the "big five" corporate publishers (Elsevier, Springer, Wiley-Blackwell, Taylor & Francis and Sage)?

Yes, their website is this: <https://valuationstudies.liu.se/> Somehow I find it quite typical that this is made possible in Sweden. I studied there and I feel like – probably because they are well developed – they focus a lot on public access in society. If that is also the reason why this journal is also open, I don't know. I think however that it is a privilege to start an open access

journal, which reinforces the lack of citations of less known, marginalized scholars.

Am I citing works published in university presses or scholarly society journals based in/from the regions I am working in?

I have a few references from authors from my country, but still written in English and in scientific journals that are not based here.

Am I citing "grey literature", blogs, zines, etc.?

Yes, sometimes. Just to make a statement about what's happening in the world, or where I got some of my ideas.

PART 2

1. *Braiding Sweetgrass: Indigenous Wisdom, Scientific Knowledge and the Teachings of Plants* by Robin Wall Kimmerer

It's not a scientific paper, nor a book that would be categorized as scientific. However, the author is a professor and draws upon her own experiences as an Indigenous researcher. It has opened my eyes to another way of looking at the world, which indirectly or actually directly changes my approach to science. In every chapter the author explains certain values, certain practices, certain phenomenon by describing plants and trees and our relationship with them. They made me realize how different Indigenous Peoples experience the world, how they are more connected to nature, might even be closer to the truth of how the world works, and how colonizers in the past and in the present have diminished this form of knowledge. It has made me conscious of my future contributions to scientific knowledge, and how it might worsen it. It brought questions to the fore about how we as PhD candidates can worsen or lighten colonization with our work, even when we are not working with Indigenous or marginalized groups. Just the fact that we are publishing articles or creating knowledge might in itself be a way of colonization. How to go against that?

2. Walby, S. (1989) *Theorising Patriarchy*.

It's been a while since I read this, but I feel I want to recommend it anyways. It can probably be categorized as critical theory, but instead of one base in the base-superstructure theory, the authors theorizes patriarchy as six partially-interdependent bases. Within STS, feminist theory is quite a big thing, but I got introduced to the topic in the field of Sustainability Science. This article opened my eyes to a different society, and helped me recognize patterns I hadn't before. Although

my research does not primarily focus on feminist studies, this article introduced me to the fact that patriarchy and gender inequality can be found in daily practices and should thus always be recognized and included in research.