

## **From Sustainability to Transformation: dynamics and diversity in reflexive governance of vulnerability, Andy Stirling**

### ***From “Broadening Out” Appraisal to “Opening Up” Commitments***

This chapter turns our attention from knowledge to action. In so doing, it will go beyond a focus just on epistemic and normative aspects, concerning *indeterminacies* in social *appreciations* concerning the natures, origins and implications of technological vulnerabilities (Jasanoff, 2005a). Consideration will shift instead to more ontological dimensions, to do with *intractabilities* associated with *enactments* of the socio-technical choices themselves – as prospective ‘furnitures of the world’ (Feenberg, 2002; Latour, 2005; Rip, 2009). This more material engagement with the challenges of vulnerability in technological culture is constituted not so much by characteristics in our ways of *knowing* and *valuing* but by encompassing (social, technical, and “natural”) ways of *being* (Leach, Scoones, & Wynne, 2005).

This focus on material intractabilities brings to the fore questions of *action* and *temporality*. After all, it is only by reference to (variously framed) human needs, intentions, interventions and practices (associated with “action”), that we may apprehend whether or not various possible states of being are experienced as “vulnerabilities” in the first place. Likewise, it is only through contemplating dynamics over time (expressed as “temporality”) that we experience the actual tractability or recalcitrance of such vulnerabilities in the face of actions to forestall or mitigate them. It is thus primarily in terms of these dual dancing parameters of action and temporality that unfolding socio-technical “progress” may be apprehended in any given instance either as “marching forward” (Smith & Marx, 1994) or “biting back” (Tenner, 1996) in relation to vulnerability – or as some contested ambiguity between the two.

In previous work I (after and among many others) have focused on the ways in which power interacts with knowledge and normativity in the *social appraisal* of socio-technical choice (Stirling, 2008a). Organizational, cultural, political, and economic forces structure our understandings of technology change, so as to further compound the vulnerabilities (Jasanoff, 2004). These dynamics come to a head with a series of intractable problems in conventional narrow methods and institutions of

“risk regulation” (Jasanoff, 1990; Wynne, 1995). As a response to these challenges, important lessons arise in particular, in the application of the precautionary principle. Among other things, these urge a “broadening out” of the “tools,” methods, and institutions through which society comes to appreciate the contending pathways that are open for socio-technical choice – as well as their respective implications (Stirling, 2008b). In this way, we can extend attention to alternative trajectories reflecting wider and deeper notions of “benefit” and “harm” (Leach, et al, 2010b). Only by more fully informing our understandings of socio-technological potentialities may we enable commitments to pathways that truly reduce technological vulnerabilities (A Stirling, 2010a).

The following discussion will engage with the implications of these issues for technology governance in a series of steps. In the next section, I will review the dominant ways of framing vulnerabilities in terms of contrasting notions of sustainability. This enables us to make explicit the central, but often concealed, role of contested understandings and normativities dealt with in the literatures mentioned above. Section 3 will then explore the dual parameters of agency and temporality introduced here, concerning more material actions and commitments. Acknowledging the importance of contending framings, this will discern systematic contrasts between temporalities of vulnerability expressed (or represented) as “shock” or “stress” and styles of action undertaken (or conceived) as “control” or “response”. These parameters are shown systematically to decompose sustainability into a series of quite distinct subordinate dynamic (ideal-typical) properties – with strong practical policy implications.

Section 4 will then discuss the implications of this more nuanced picture of vulnerability in technological culture, for the practical design of governance interventions. A diversity of strategic possibilities will be highlighted, with different interventions tending to counter contrasting aspects of vulnerability. Governance strategies will be reviewed; involving distinct kinds of infrastructure qualities, institutional practices and modes of innovation that are relevant in contrasting contexts. However, it will also become clear that a number of other governance strategies display more general applicability to different aspects of vulnerability – including especially various forms of socio-technical diversity.

Finally, in Section 5, attention will turn back to the question of framing. I will show how political and economic power can operate such as to “close down” the

appreciation of appropriate governance interventions, and restrict attention disproportionately to the “control” of “shock” to maintain “business as usual.” Marginal and critical perspectives also tend to be sidelined by presumptions that the necessary focus must always be on maintaining, rather than disrupting, incumbent socio-technical trajectories. It is by giving equal weight to governance interventions aimed at disruption and transformation – as well as sustainability – that we may best hope to address the full depth of the challenges presented by vulnerability in technological cultures.

### ***Sustainability, Normativity, and Vulnerability***

Perhaps the most prominent and longstanding articulation of notions of action and temporality in contemporary governance of vulnerability in technological cultures lies in the potent and pervasive policy concept of “Sustainability” (Adger & Jordan, 2009). Here we see the most explicit and influential expressions in high-level governance debate, of contemporary normativities around “technological progress” (Stirling, 2009). More particularly, it is under the auspices of “Sustainability” that the principle of “precaution” has become a central theme in current controversies over the *understanding* of vulnerability, as well as over *actions* to be taken in response to it (UNCED, 1992). Attention to “Sustainability,” therefore, allows us to move from essentially cognitive and evaluative predicaments – such as uncertainty, ambiguity, ignorance, indeterminacy and incommensurability – to the challenges of intentionality and agency bearing on the vulnerabilities themselves and their associated possible responses. Alongside this shift from understanding to action, Sustainability also requires attention to the temporalities of associated interventions. This requires the enacting of properties like stability, durability, resilience, robustness, transition, and transformation. These are the issues to be discussed in this chapter.

Despite the essential interlinkages, concepts of “Sustainability” have an ambiguous and multifaceted relationship with vulnerability – and in particular with the human dimensions of this (Leach, Scoones, & Stirling, 2010a). The advent of this notion in high-level governance discourse was important and distinctive, precisely in that it promised an enhanced profile, rigor and priority in policymaking for the vulnerabilities of the least powerful and most marginal people. For the Brundtland Commission, Sustainability was famously summarized as “*meeting the needs of the present, without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own*

*needs*” (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987). Although the progressive novelty of this principle is often characterized as resting on the attention to “future generations,” the emphatic requirement that the needs of the present also be met is even more immediately radical. For more than two decades, “Sustainability” has thus been the principal high-level global policy discourse enjoining the reversal of persistent appropriation, exclusion and maldistributions of privilege affecting a large proportion of the world’s population.

Another aspect of Sustainability discourses in relation to vulnerability is that the precise normative implications of what is to be ‘sustained’ remain disparate, ambiguous, and contested (Murcott, 1997). The essential thrust of this concept in formal governance rests on three broad sets of normative aims – each addressing different qualities of vulnerability. The first concerns human wellbeing – including health, education, and community as well as economic development (United Nations General Assembly, 2000). The second relates to social equity – across diverse kinds of groupings among both present and future generations (United Nations Division for Sustainable Development, 2002). The third refers to environmental integrity – in terms of various forms of ambient pollution, ecological integrity, and resource availability (Matravers, Moldan, & Billharz, 1998). Precise interpretations of the implications of the broad normative aims – as well as definitions for associated indicators, criteria and targets – are emphasized in global Sustainability discourses to be a matter for inclusive public deliberation in the settings in question (Final Declaration of the UN Conference on Environment and Development). This political-processual dimension of Sustainability is crucial, because it requires participation from – and accountability to – the most vulnerable people themselves (Dobson, 1996). Yet, despite the clarity and profile of these formal provisions, impacts of “Sustainability” policies on vulnerability continue to unfold in ways that are more modest, expedient, and even counterproductive (Meadowcroft, 1999).

One reason for these connections between Sustainability and vulnerability being sometimes counterproductive is the pressure for an instrumental usage of this kind of high-level policy rhetoric in order to justify commitments that are rather differently-motivated (Wynne, 2002). With Sustainability, there is a particular expediency in that the broad colloquial meaning of the common verb “to sustain” (in English as in other languages) refers generally to the maintaining over indefinite periods of *any* unspecified features, qualities, or functions. This provides a linguistic


license for nonspecific terminologies of sustainability in ways that are inattentive, ignorant, or actually potentially undermining of the highly specific and carefully-deliberated values of Sustainability itself (Walker & Shove, 2007). In this chapter I will therefore use the capitalized term “Sustainability” to refer to the (albeit themselves variously-defined) Brundtland triad of publicly-deliberated qualities: human wellbeing, social equity, and environmental integrity (Stirling, 2009) .

The received (specifically defined) global policy concept of Sustainability thus has a (relatively) explicit normative thrust. The quality levels to be sustained in the face of vulnerability are not fixed but aspirational and to be improved. For instance, the 1995 World Summit on Social Development defined “Sustainable Development” not in terms of the Brundtland Commission’s “meeting of needs” but as “the framework for our efforts to achieve a higher quality of life for all people” (The World Summit for Social Development, 2009, p. 1). In other words, it is an additional normative implication of Sustainability that what is being sustained is not some static level in publicly-deliberated qualities of human wellbeing, social equity, and environmental integrity. Instead, it is about a continuous progressive *trajectory of improvement*, as seen from a “future subjunctive” vantage point focused on the situations of the most vulnerable people (Robinson, 2003). It is with this fundamental clarification of the temporal aspects of this normativity that we can turn to consider some of the more detailed – and crucial but neglected – implications of Sustainability for vulnerability.

## ***Agency and Temporality in Sustainable Reduction of Vulnerability***

So far, attention in this discussion has focused on normative criteria of vulnerability implicated in Sustainability, under which progressive improvement is intended to be sustained. We have seen how both qualities and improvements may variously be framed in quite radically different ways. Indeed, this is why the specific reconciliations of ambiguities in any given context are a matter for inclusive deliberation and public accountability (O’Riordan, 2001). However, it is not only the specific normative orderings that are subject to divergent framings. The social and physical contexts themselves are often subject to such different framings too (Leach, et al., 2010a).

The implications of contrasting framings of Sustainability in socio-technical systems extend far beyond different “scales” of assessment, or “system” definitions, or “levels” or “units” of analysis (Jasanoff, 2005a). Divergent frames typically concern much more fundamental ontological commitments that underlie and crosscut all these kinds of analytical constructs (Ison, Maiteny, & Carr, 1997). Even where there is agreement over specific normative characterizations of human wellbeing, social equity, or environmental integrity, then, contrasting perspectives and engagements may each yield radically divergent consequences for the design, implementation, and interpretation of policy interventions aimed at reducing vulnerability (Schön & Rein, 1994). Divergent framings not only exist of “actors,” “technologies,” or “vulnerabilities,” but also of the ‘systems’ and “trajectories” of these assemblages (Leach, et al., 2010b). In this sense, the “context” for any given Sustainable response to vulnerability includes not only a multiplicity of “objects,” but also a diversity of observing “subjects” – and the mutually co-conditioning relations between the two (see Figure 1).



**Figure 1: Some key concepts: a “context” of divergently-framed “vulnerabilities,” “technologies,” and “actors” for a given socio-technical “trajectory.”**

It is against this background of divergent framings of vulnerability and Sustainability that we may best appreciate the imperative to “open up” contrasting implications under different perspectives and contexts (Stirling, 2008a). Although the parameters of “action” and “temporality,” with which this chapter began, represent only two dimensions among the many that constitute the diversity of possible frames, they do provide a basis for examining, through two fairly pervasive “principal components,” the effect of more diverse engagements with both vulnerability and Sustainability alike. Rather than asserting some fundamental ontological status for these two parameters of action and temporality, the aim of this chapter is to use this distinction as a *heuristic* and *analytic* apparatus for discerning – and “opening up” – further more nuanced and robust approaches to governance of socio-technical vulnerabilities in general (Leach, et al., 2010a).

In these terms, then, temporality refers to contrasting dynamics of disturbance that constitute the vulnerabilities against which Sustainability is a counter. In short, the issue is whether threats are seen as *short-term episodic shocks* or *long-term secular stresses* (Stirling, 2007b). Of course, like any heuristic contrast, this

distinction is relative, with a spectrum of possible gradations. Any precise positioning depends on the circumstances and the scales under scrutiny – as well as the subjective context of the framing perspective in question (see “context” in Figure 1). Yet, I will argue here that there is considerable value in this basic heuristic distinction between different *framings* of temporalities. Typical examples of sources of vulnerability represented as “shocks” include spikes in global commodity prices, epidemic outbreaks of zoonotic disease, and severe episodes of flooding. Examples of vulnerabilities routinely represented as “stresses” include long-run trends in global markets, demographic shifts, and changes in climate. Framing as shock or stress carries important practical implications for action.

If vulnerabilities are seen to involve short-term transitory perturbations (*shocks*) forcing unwanted disruptions in otherwise stable socio-technical trajectories associated with steadily improving qualities, then the central task (and reference point) is the *maintenance* of the trajectories in question. For instance, investment in storage for food surplus is a strategy to control resource-poor farmers’ vulnerability to drought. Likewise, the building of coastal defenses is a strategy to control coastal vulnerability to storm surge events. If, on the other hand, the same vulnerabilities are viewed as driven by enduring long-term pressures, reflecting underlying shifts in conditions (*stresses*), then the focus is on how to sustain the qualities in question under what might be fundamentally changing circumstances. Unlike a ‘shock’ framing, attention is then on adapting prior established trajectories in what may be quite profound ways. For example, if the episodic droughts to which farmers are vulnerable are instead interpreted to reflect long-run climate change, investment in new agronomic practices is likely to yield a more sustainable counter to vulnerability than would provision for storage in existing food systems. Similarly, coastal defenses that are effective against episodic storm surges will nonetheless be overwhelmed by progressive secular sea-level rise – against which a more sustainable long-term response might be managed retreat (Adams, 1997). However construed, addressing what is actually a ‘shock’ as if it were a ‘stress’ (and *vice versa*) can be a serious mistake.

Under any given normative framework, then, Sustainability measures that address vulnerabilities framed in terms of shocks will be relatively *conservative* in their implications for relevant institutions, practices, and infrastructures (Meadowcroft, 1999). This is because the aim is simply that of sustaining vulnerable




qualities through intermittent disruptions. When the temporality of disturbance is interpreted as stress, however, sustainable reductions in vulnerability can (even under the same normative framework) present much more *radical* political challenges. Instead of achieving improving quality under essentially continuous conditions, the objective is to achieve this under what are held to be fundamentally changing conditions.

An additional key dimension to governance for Sustainability (no matter how viewed) concerns the style of action envisaged. In short: is the aim to reduce vulnerability by attempting to *control* change, or by *responding* to it (Stirling, 2007b)? Once more, the complexities of intentionality, agency, causality and intractability in the real world lie along a spectrum between these dichotomous poles. And this continuum is itself typically constituted in very different ways, depending on context and perspective. Again however, the purpose here is not one of ontological taxonomy but heuristic analysis: to highlight an important distinction that is otherwise frequently elided. Alongside shock and stress, Figure 2 represents schematically the essential difference between styles of action aiming at control or response. As with the earlier contrast between shock and stress, this distinction between controlling and responsive action holds important practical implications for governance strategies aimed at Sustainable reductions in vulnerability.

A style of action oriented towards *control* rests on a conviction that the drivers of the changes in question (whether shocks or stresses) are in principle (at least to some threshold extent) *tractable* to deliberate intervention. This requires a number of conditions to be fulfilled. First, there must be confidence in the quality of the understandings of the relevant causal relationships. For instance, the etiological structures underlying the relevant vulnerabilities must be seen as *determinate* and *predictable*. This resonates strongly with risk-based epistemologies, downplaying more indeterminate uncertainties, ambiguities and ignorance (Stirling, 2010). Representations of knowledge may thus typically embody conventional restrictive regulatory assumptions (Stirling and Scoones, 2009). A second condition for tractability is that drivers must not only be seen as generally *susceptible* to action, but must offer specific *moments*, *modes*, and *locii* for manageable interventions, which are identifiable and achievable with available instruments, time, and resources. Third, there must be confidence that the consequences of such interventions will (to some acceptable extent) be restricted to those that are desired and predicted – with no

significant adverse collateral effects. Any qualifications on these conditions for tractability will undermine claims (or understandings) that shocks or stresses are “subject to control” (see Figure 2).




**Figure 2: Contrasting temporalities and actions in addressing technological vulnerabilities**

Rather than aiming to control drivers of change, a “responsive” style of action aims directly to address the emergent consequences. Even under the most bullish of perspectives, this is the residual course of action where the phenomena in question are held to be intractable – perhaps because the drivers themselves are seen to be inherently indeterminate or unpredictable, or because the necessary time, resources, or loci for interventions are seen to be non-existent. Either way, responsive action may still be anticipatory. But with relevant drivers seen as intractable, action is simply more circumscribed in its ambitions to engage with underlying causes. The distinctive characteristics of responsive action lie rather in the more qualified, conditional, iterative, reflexive style – and greater humility – than is typically associated with governance interventions oriented towards control (Stirling, 2006).

This interplay between perceived temporality of change and styles of action constitutes four quite distinct dynamic properties (Stirling, 2007b: Figure 4). As with the heuristic distinction between contrasting framings of incertitude, these properties should not be understood as mutually exclusive, collectively complete or perfectly

partitioning in relation to real-world instances. Instead, they are Weberian “ideal types” that emerge from any discrimination between parameters of temporality and action. Their utility will rest on their salience to the practical governance of technological vulnerabilities. In particular, the value of the present framework lies in opening a door to more plural and differentiated understandings of the contexts for intended action. This will be discussed in the next section. For the moment, what is striking about the four ideal-typical dynamic properties that emerge, is that they correspond closely to semantic distinctions that are long established in existing dictionary definitions for widely used colloquial terms (Simpson & Weiner, 1989): “stability,” “durability,” “resilience,” and “robustness” (see Figure 3 after Stirling, 2007b; Leach et al, 2010).



**Figure 3: our necessary but individually insufficient dynamic properties of sustainability**

The value of this scheme is that it highlights a mutually-consistent set of collectively-necessary but individually-insufficient dynamic properties that are implicated in what it means to sustain anything (Stirling, 2008c). The distinctions are therefore highly relevant to the governance of Sustainability in general as well as to the contrasting aspects of technological vulnerability (that of social possibilities to the consequences of socio-technical choice and of potentially foregone socio-technical trajectories to

the effects of social closure). Taken together, these four ideal-typical dynamic properties apply to any continuous trajectories (of whatever kind) and their propensity to agency in the face of change (Dawson, Rounsevell, Kluvánková-Oravská, Chobotová, & Stirling, 2010). *Stability* is where transitory shocks are tractable to control. *Durability* is where secular stresses are tractable to control. *Resilience* is where transitory shocks are addressed by response. *Robustness* is where secular stresses are addressed by response.

As with nonspecific usage of the term “sustainability” discussed above, it follows that the normative implications of these four dynamic properties intrinsically depend on evaluations of the trajectories to which they refer. Where trajectories are defined in terms of technological or institutional configurations that are seen as problematic, then (as with the general sustaining of these trajectories themselves) specific properties of stability, durability, resilience, or robustness will, of course, also be judged to be negative. Only if the trajectory in question is regarded as good, does it follow that these associated dynamic properties will be positive. Crucially, this also means that these properties are only self-evidently positive if the focal trajectories are defined not in terms of means to ends (e.g.: technological or institutional structures), but in terms of the normative ends themselves. For present purposes, then, this applies only where trajectories are defined in terms of improvements for the most vulnerable groups in publicly-deliberated qualities of human wellbeing, social equity, and environment integrity. It is here that properties of stability, durability, resilience, and robustness can be seen to constitute collectively-necessary but individually-insufficient conditions for Sustainability in the face of vulnerability.

### ***Vulnerability and Strategic Diversity***

So far, the implications for governance of vulnerability of sustainability and resilience have been discussed in quite general terms. The heuristic framework developed here holds practical strategic significance too (Leach, et al., 2010a). Strategies aiming at stability focus on trying to control what are held to be tractable drivers of shocks to any given system. Strategies aiming at durability focus on controlling tractable drivers of stress. Strategies aiming at resilience focus on responding to intractable drivers of shock (represented as external to the trajectory). Strategies aiming at robustness focus

on responding to intractable drivers of stress. I shall elaborate these strategies by discussing a few examples.


Recall the case of spikes in costs of global commodities (like primary fuels, agricultural inputs or industrial feedstocks) mentioned earlier as “shocks” that can affect vulnerable groups like subsistence farmers or other economically marginal households. Here, control-oriented governance interventions may aim directly to achieve stability through regulating the relevant market prices, thus directly manipulating the cause of the shock as experienced by those who are vulnerable. In cases where governance entertains greater ambitions to agency, efforts at controlling for stability may take the form of trade sanctions against the responsible producers, thus forcing a lowering of the prices. Either way, such control actions contrast with response-oriented strategies aiming at resilience, which take the prices to be intractable to control and instead focus on capacities or measures that ameliorate the effects on the vulnerable groups. Resilience-oriented interventions undertaken in anticipation of global price spikes might include the fostering of *flexible* supply chains (Costello, 2004) or *redundant* alternative production capabilities or resources and capacities (Farrell, Zerriffi, & Dowlatabadi, 2004) to *substitute* for the commodities in question. The aim is to absorb the impact of global price spikes affecting particular resources, without actually controlling the market prices themselves. If it turns out that the price spikes are intermittent and of short duration, then control-oriented strategies for stability may appear most effective. However, if the disruptions are more frequent and long-lasting, then resilience-oriented strategies will likely be judged preferable. A failure to distinguish whether action is in the style of control or response may therefore obscure an important practical consideration in the governance of vulnerabilities to shock.

Another example mentioned above was the vulnerabilities of resource-poor farmers to shocks from drought. These might be addressed by investing in facilities enabling storage of earlier-accumulated surplus. However, drought might alternatively be interpreted as an incipient indication of stress. Episodic droughts might be feared to presage a shift in local climate towards a much drier regime. In this event, control strategies would aim at durability rather than stability – focusing on influencing the drivers of stress rather than shock. Short of efforts to control the causes of climate change itself, one such relatively control-style, durability-oriented

intervention might be to secure shifts in the trajectories of vulnerable farmers' livelihoods, effecting a long-term "agronomic transition" away from drought-sensitive crops and towards more drought-tolerant species or practices. Similar contrasts may be found between environmental quality measures aimed at controlling episodic pollution events and public health interventions dealing with transitory epidemic outbreaks. Either will differ strongly from regulatory measures to control long-term cumulative rises in pollution or the trends towards chronic endemic disease. In all these examples, attention focuses on control-style strategies. But – like the contrast between stability and resilience – there is a clear practical distinction between controlling strategies oriented towards stability against shock and those aiming at durability under stress.

So too is the distinction between resilience and robustness of practical importance for governance strategies. For instance, low-income riverside settlements are vulnerable to short-term shocks from storm-surge flooding. This may be addressed by control-style, stability-oriented strategies focusing on construction of engineered river defenses. Alternatively (as with global market prices and drought), such shocks might be interpreted as beyond feasible attempts at control. This suggests response-style strategies aiming at resilience: like provision of sanctuaries and retrofitting of flood-resistant features in critical infrastructure facilities like schools, hospitals, and major sources of employment. These do not seek to control the driving causes of flooding, but instead focus on *minimizing* loss of life and structural damage, maximizing continued *functionality* and *accelerating recovery* – making it easier, cheaper, and quicker to respond to flooding when it occurs. However, as in the case of drought risks to farmers from climate change, responses to flood vulnerability may also be seen in terms of long-run secular trends, rather than transitory shocks. Being equally intractable to control, this will again be a cue for response-style strategies, but this time with an entirely different character. Intractable drivers of stress require strategies for robustness: in this case taking the form of land-use and livelihood changes, involving managed retreat from the most vulnerable flood plains. Here, the implications contrast strongly with resilience strategies, which would have involved greater investment in the structures on these same flood plains from which robustness strategies require withdrawal. Again then, there emerge strong practical implications for governance action in the face of vulnerability.

Figure 4 takes this discussion a step further by highlighting in a more systematic way further circumstances where the present distinctions between stability, durability, resilience, and robustness may be crucially important to strategies for reducing vulnerabilities in technological cultures. With respect to technological infrastructures, for instance, there are potentially important distinctions to be made between the ways in which strategies for reliability may provide for stability, while strategies for flexibility may offer a better basis for resilience (Collingridge, 1980). Electricity systems provide a concrete example. Here, strategies for increased reliability may aim to stabilize the system by increased maintenance, over-engineering transmission and distribution equipment, or over-provision of generating capacity. Resilience, by contrast, may be better achieved through flexibility, by improving staff training, ensuring redundancy between facilities dependent on different fuels, or building “dual-firing” capabilities that can accommodate multiple fuels as inputs. Yet these infrastructure strategies for both reliability and flexibility may each also contrast with (and trade-off against) strategies for persistence as a means to foster durability. This may be achieved, for example, by more expensive facility siting (like underground burial) or the use of more impermeable, resistant, or non-corroding infrastructure materials. Finally, strategies for reliability, flexibility, and persistence alike may each contrast in important ways with strategies for adaptiveness. Instead of consolidating existing infrastructures in these various ways, adaptive strategies like diversification promote robustness under stress through enabling open-ended but fundamental reconfigurings of the infrastructures themselves (Jones, 1992).



**Figure 4: Contrasting strategies for stability, durability, resilience and robustness**

As before, the point here is not to assert some reified ontological differentiation between (in this case) reliable infrastructures, flexible infrastructures, persistent infrastructures, and adaptive infrastructures. Nor is it the purpose to insist that these distinctions will always be practically salient. The intention is rather to highlight the *potential* significance of these kinds of contrasting strategies for promoting divergent dynamic properties. Without a framework for at least making these distinctions, we cannot be sure that we are not simply behaving like the proverbial under-equipped carpenter armed only with a hammer, for whom every problem is a nail.

In this same heuristic spirit, Figure 6 also suggests important differences between strategies for institutional design (Ostrom, 2005). Where the aim is simply to control some specific identified form of shock or stress, strategies may aim at tightening institutional remits, concentrating capacities, or buffering complex interdependencies. Yet these very strategies for *isolated* or *autonomous* institutions may perform more poorly where the aim is to achieve sensitive responses to complex intractable disturbances that are beyond the reach of control (Jessop, 1998). Under these latter circumstances, more *open remits*, *distributed capabilities*, and *interdependent* relationships are probably more effective (Kooiman, 2003). Likewise – irrespective of whether the ambition is to control or respond – there may be



important contrasts between institutional capacities and processes that foster *vigilance* in the face of short-term transitory shocks or *foresight* in the face of long-term secular stress.

The third example illustrated in Figure 4 concerns innovation strategies. This refers to well-established contrasts between “incremental”, “directed”, “agile” and “systemic” innovation, which may resonate in interesting ways with each of the dynamic properties distinguished here. The iterative adjustments of *incremental innovation* allow controlled forms of stability, especially under successive transitory parameters of change (Freeman & Perez, 1988). *Directed innovation*, on the other hand, helps to control for durability in the face of some specific identified stress (Stirling, Geels, Scrase, Smith, & Van Zwanenberg, 2009). *Agile innovation* may be undertaken where the broad orientation of trajectories is maintained, but without seeking to control in advance all sources of possible perturbation (Oza & Abrahamsson, 2009). Finally, *systemic innovation* is more appropriate where it seems the orientation of the trajectories themselves that must be changed in the face of some secular stress, thus requiring innovation at an architectural level (Andersen & Drejer, 2008).


Unlike the relatively property-specific governance strategies discussed thus far, there are others where the available literature suggests more widely applicable potential. Examples of these kinds of more “multivalent” strategy might include enhancing equity, engaging stakeholders, promoting learning, catalyzing reflexivity, and fostering diversity. These are multivalent, because they promote a plurality of dynamic properties. *Enhanced equity* in particular is obviously both an outcome of reduced vulnerability, but also a means to reduce in the first place, a wide range of vulnerabilities. This is so, irrespective of whether greater equity is achieved through controlling or responsive interventions, or in the face of threats seen to be manifest as shock or stress (UN, 2012). Enhanced equity is therefore, in principle, similarly supportive of stability, durability, resilience and robustness. Likewise, deliberative and *participatory engagement* are argued to offer broad benefits in the governance of vulnerability, independently of the dynamics of the envisaged disturbance or the style of intended action (Lebel et al, 2006). Related qualities of *learning* and *reflexivity* all also appear in the literature as being similarly potent in relation to a range of dynamic properties (Argyris & Schön, 1978; Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1993; Voss, Bauknecht, & Kemp, 2006).

Perhaps no single strategy is more multivalent than *diversification* (Stirling, 1998; Stirling, 2007a). Here, a particularly extensive literature documents many ways in which deliberate nurturing of technological, institutional and behavioral diversity can help foster all the dynamic properties of sustainability discussed here (Page, 2007). First, socio-technical diversity permits higher degrees of fidelity and context-sensitivity to contingent cultural and bio-physical heterogeneities (Landau et al, 1996). This can help to reduce exposure of vulnerable communities to the consequences of globally-homogenized technological cultures. Second, socio-technical diversity hedges against intractable forms of uncertainty. Avoiding “all eggs in one basket” helps both ameliorate vulnerability to surprise and the associated consequences when surprise occurs (H. Brooks, 1986; Rosenberg, 1996). Third, diversity mitigates socio-technical “lock-in.” By resisting the “crowding out” of configurations favored by marginal groups, this can help to combat both kinds of vulnerabilities identified at the start of this chapter (both of and from technology). Fourth, socio-technical diversity is increasingly understood to foster innovation (Kauffman, 1995; Rosenberg, 1982). Whether the innovation is envisaged as incremental, agile, directed, or systemic – each can benefit from diversities of interacting institutions, applications, practices, and technologies (Grabher & Stark, 1997; Landau, Taylor, & Wright, 1996). Fifth, socio-technical diversity provides a way to address otherwise irreconcilable political challenges in social choice, by accommodating the plural values and interests associated with advocacy of contending technological pathways (Stirling, 1997). In these ways, consideration of diversity further illustrates how some governance strategies may be more multivalent than others in their promotion of different dynamic properties. This is of crucial potential importance for the governance of vulnerability, but is more easily missed, where the properties themselves remain undifferentiated.

## ***Power and the Framing of Vulnerabilities in Technological Cultures***

This chapter began by emphasizing the importance of explicit attention to the dynamics of framing in thinking about vulnerability and its relevance for designing governance strategies. This discussion of stability, durability, resilience, and robustness has so far proceeded exclusively by reference to properties of socio-technical vulnerabilities themselves, rather than to the contexts and perspectives under which they are viewed. It now remains to attend to the social processes through which these properties are framed (Leach, et al., 2010a).

This brings us to the pervasive effects of political, economic, and institutional power. Many have shown how these various processes serve to help “close down” social commitments around technological pathways favored by incumbent interests (Stirling, 2008a). Part of this phenomenon is the way that power also operates in the institutions and practices of knowledge production and social appraisal to condition not only the concrete actualities of the choices, but even the form of our imaginations concerning the underlying potentialities themselves (Jasanoff, 2001). Figure 5 shows how an array of institutional cultures and practices exert formative pressures on our understandings of knowledge and its lack (Stirling, 2010b). It is this feature of wider institutional environments, which provides the conditions under which reductive-aggregative methods flourish (Stirling & Scoones, 2009). In effect, political, economic, and institutional power tend consistently to move appreciations of vulnerability away from the more open, humble, sensitive, and reflexive characterizations found on the right and lower sides of the diagram and move these up into the relatively closed, narrow, hubristic, and inflexible representations found in the upper left-hand quadrant. In short, Figure 5 summarises how the full breadths and depths of technological vulnerabilities tend to be closed down to risk.




**Figure 5: Institutional Pressures from Power to “Close Down” Knowledge of Vulnerabilities**

Understanding these formative effects of power in “closing down” the framings of indeterminate knowledge in appraisal of technological vulnerability, can help us to explore the possibility of similar patterns in relation to governance action . Perhaps there exist similar dynamics in the framing of the properties and strategies addressed here, concerning alternative temporalities of vulnerability and styles of strategic intervention?

Even on the basis of the discussion thus far, there seems a quite clear basis for a *prima facie* answer of “yes.” The “social ecological resilience” literature, for instance, documents – and criticizes – how existing governance interventions aimed at mitigating technological and other vulnerabilities tend consistently to highlight control-based interventions over response-style strategies (Berkes, Colding, & Folke, 2003; Folke et al., 2004; Folke, Hahn, Olsson, & Norberg, 2005; L. H. Gunderson & Holling, 2001; Holling, 1978). Yet, this same resilience literature itself tends to close down the picture of contrasting normativities and to elide structure and function, shock and stress (Smith & Stirling, 2010). In each respect, the effect of closure under dominant framings is to tend to favor incumbent interests. Presuming that the

normativities of resilience are self-evident, tends to assert hegemonic values at the expense of less visible interests of more marginal groups. Conflating structure with function tends to identify means with ends, again taking for granted a commitment to incumbent structures. Finally, by masking differences between episodic shock and enduring stress, undifferentiated notions of “resilience” highlight transitory perturbations that favor “business as usual” by incumbents, thus occluding the more potentially radical challenges of robustness under long-term secular change.

Taken together, this presents a basis for a more general and systematic hypothesis concerning the framing of dynamic properties. Figure 6 builds on longstanding insights in a wider literature (Jasanoff, 1990, 2005a; Schön, 1973; Scott, 1998) to indicate (in this case through shading) a hypothetical tendency for incumbent governance actors to direct their attention most enthusiastically in the lighter area extending from the property of stability. The argument is illustrated by the indicative example of UK government framings of vulnerabilities in energy security policy (Joint Energy Security of Supply Working Group (JESS), 2004). The smaller font in Figure 6 identifies the strategies that are cited most prominently in recent official UK energy policy. The most frequently and prominently cited strategies are aimed at securing the property of stability: where challenges are framed expediently in terms of controlling transitory disturbance to maintain the *status quo ante*. Fewer and less prominent mentions are made of resilience-oriented strategies, suggesting that the associated relinquishing of aspirations to control is intrinsically less attractive under these incumbent perspectives.



**Figure 6: Incumbent Bias towards Stability Strategies– example from UK energy security policy**

Likewise, there seems at least a *prima facie* case that strategies aiming at durability also tend in general to be relatively less favored by incumbents than those oriented towards stability. This suggests similarly unfavorable views of the associated necessity to contemplate the radically changed conditions that flow from recognition of stress. Only if the particular altered conditions in question are somehow resonant with prevailing interests will durability tend to prove appealing under dominant perspectives. Finally, it is striking from their forming the least frequent of all kinds of strategies, that UK energy security policy interventions oriented towards robustness are evidently least prominent of all in the attention of incumbent actors concerned with strategic responses to vulnerability in this major infrastructure.

What of the framings by more radical or less powerful interests?

Vulnerabilities fall disproportionately on the most marginal communities. They are a consequence both of collateral harm caused by dominant trajectories, as well as the ways in which “lock in” to these, “crowds out” the subaltern pathways favored by disadvantaged interests (Bijker, 2006; Stirling, 2010a). Accordingly, there is a double need for special effort in the governance of vulnerability to direct particular attention

to the perspectives and circumstances of the most vulnerable groups, to counter the routine emphasis afforded to incumbents. As we have seen, it is arguably the persistent exclusion or sidelining of marginal and critical perspectives on vulnerability that constitute one of the most crucially neglected aspects of the actual technological vulnerabilities themselves.


Of course, as indicated in Figure 1, there will typically exist a rich variety of possible framing perspectives on any instance of vulnerability. The views of marginal and vulnerable groups may themselves be expected to be correspondingly plural. But, amidst this diversity, the single most important consideration with respect to governance interventions focusing on any particular socio-technical trajectory may reasonably be expected to concern whether the motivating purpose is to maintain or disrupt that trajectory. Here, it is necessary to repeat the distinction between structure and function mentioned above. It may be difficult to imagine why any serious political perspective would wish deliberately to disrupt – as an end in itself – the provision of fundamental functional qualities (like the “Brundtland triad” of human wellbeing, social equity, and environmental integrity). Yet it is much less difficult to recognize situations where there are legitimate interests in disrupting particular incumbent sociotechnical trajectories (like those of global fossil fuel or military and security infrastructures) routinely claimed to be associated with addressing these functions (at least for particular populations). Despite the associated legitimization rhetorics, *structures can compromise functions*. It is when structure and function are distinguished, that the real salience of the neglected dimension of intentional disruption becomes most visible.

Here then, a key axis for analysis encompassing a diversity of framings, centers on normativity concerning the incumbent trajectory. Where the focus is on maintaining an incumbent trajectory (in whatever way) the perspective in question may be referred to broadly as (normatively) “inside” the incumbent discourse. Where the intention (with whatever reason or merit) is one of disrupting this incumbent trajectory (in order to enable some alternative pathway), the perspective in question is correspondingly (normatively) “outside” the incumbent discourse. It is in this light that we can appreciate how the pattern of emphasis in governance interventions summarized in Figure 6 applies specifically to framings of the dynamics of vulnerability conditioned by broadly “inside” perspectives. The discussion of the social ecological perspective that followed Figure 6 considered the slightly different

kind of framing evident in these somewhat more critical academic perspectives, which are distinguished by their readiness to countenance the limits to control. But, this still implies a broadly positive “inside” view of the basic features of the trajectories in question – one highlighting the potential for response rather than control.

What is different about Figure 7 is that it adds to this picture a complementary – but even more neglected – picture. It is based on the same heuristic framework used repeatedly here to articulate “temporality of vulnerability” and “style of action.” But this time, we find included in a systematic and symmetrical way, not only the dynamic properties of interest under positive (incumbent, “inside”) views of trajectories, but also the corresponding dynamic properties that are of interest under negative (subaltern, “outside”) views of these same trajectories. This allows recognition of a further suite of dynamic properties that, in several ways, represent the complements of stability, resilience, durability, and robustness discussed thus far. Instead of describing the different ways in which socio-technical trajectories may be *maintained* by control or response in the face of shock or stress, these properties describe a range of corresponding ways in which such trajectories are susceptible to reorientation through *disruption*. For reasons that will be given, I will refer to these properties as transduction, transition, transilience, and transformation.





**Figure 7: Contrasting framings of target properties in governance action against vulnerability**

Of course, this further general dimension in the possible dynamics of socio-technical trajectories is already widely recognized, not least in the social ecology literature. Folke et al. point out, for instance, that “[a] resilient social-ecological system may make use of crisis as an opportunity to transform into a more desired state” (Folke, et al., 2005, p. 441). Broad roles for transition and transformation are often pointed to elsewhere in this field (Evans, 2008; L. Gunderson, 1999; Holling, 2004; Ludwig, 2001; Olsson, Folke, & Hahn, 2004). But, especially when articulating (ecological) functions and (socio-technical structures), this kind of juxtaposition of “resilience” and “transformation” can compound the ambiguity inherent in the fundamental conflation of structure and function in this literature reviewed earlier (Smith & Stirling, 2010). If so much is lumped together under the single dynamic property of ‘resilience, it can become unclear exactly what is being maintained and what is being disrupted. This provides avoidable opportunities for legitimation strategies by powerful interests of the kinds also noted above. It is in order to address this kind of potential ambiguity – and the resulting confusions or strategic manipulations in

governance – that it may be seen as necessary and helpful to adopt the more nuanced three-dimensional representation shown in Figure 7. As with the two-dimensional grids employed thus far, the purpose is not to assert some even more elaborate ontology. The point is: only by envisaging these dynamics of framing in three interlinked dimensions of normativity, temporality, and agency is it possible properly to encapsulate the multivalent relationships between different kinds of dynamic properties and associated governance interventions.

In these terms, then, the dynamic property referred to in the foreground of Figure 7 as “*transduction*,” is one where control-style actions seek to disrupt a socio-technical trajectory into a specific new direction, by exercising control to condition a short term shock. In this sense, transduction is an antonym of stability, in that stability describes the propensity to maintain trajectories in the face of shock, while transduction relates to the role of shock in facilitating controlled disruption away from these same trajectories and towards some particular intended alternative. The term disruption itself does not fully describe this, since the focus is on the dislocation, rather than the intended controlled ends. But, widely used in fields like genetics, psychology and signal engineering, the term transduction is well suited for this purpose. It has for centuries meant “a removing from one place to another” (Simpson and Weiner, 1989). Here, the specificity of destination underscores the presumptively controlled nature of the defined process.. Either way, we see here again the dual face of vulnerability, in that pursuit of stability is driven by concerns over vulnerabilities *experienced by* a trajectory while strategies for transduction are driven by particular envisaged solutions to vulnerabilities *caused by* that same trajectory (Bijker, 2006; Stirling, 2010a)

An example of a situation in which control-style actions were aimed at disrupting an existing sociotechnical trajectory in very specific and targeted ways, can be seen in the interventions of the UK government against coal power in the 1980s. The over-riding purpose then – as key protagonists acknowledged later – was to exploit the shock of a specific instance of industrial action by miners to affect a more far-reaching transduction to the trajectory of the electricity supply industry as a whole. In particular, a key aim was to achieve a shift to a significantly different (and to the Government of the day, less vulnerable) socio-technical trajectory based more on nuclear power. This example underscores the point made above: that it is not only marginal perspectives that may favor transduction. As observed by Rahm Emanuel,

former Chief of Staff to President Obama, “you never want a serious crisis to go to waste” (Seib, 2006). In this case, the UK Government was also a very powerful political actor armed with many options for control-style strategies. But it is a reflection of the perennial predicaments of control, that even a Government should nonetheless find itself, in some important sense, “outside” the particular incumbent framing (in this case that associated with the trajectory of the coal-based electricity supply industry itself) – and wishing to see this transduced (disrupted to particular ends).

Likewise, there is a further dynamic property that is of corresponding importance to resilience under vulnerability, but which arises only where outside perspectives are taken into account. This is referred to in Figure 7 as “*transilience*” – a word has been employed recently in related literatures (Abernathy et al, 1985) and more generally for hundreds of years (Simpson & Weiner, 1989), in terms that fit quite well this suggested usage. To be precise, the dynamic property of transilience is a susceptibility of a trajectory to be disrupted by responsive actions in the face of shock. The difference with transduction, is that transilience involves responsive actions towards open-ended outcomes in the face of shock, rather than efforts to control the precise orientation of the shocks or their consequences.

For consistency, an example here may also be drawn from the energy sector. As the author knows from personal experience, the major international environmental NGO, Greenpeace, maintained its campaigning focus against the global civil nuclear industry during the 1970s and 1980s on the specific target of irradiated fuel reprocessing (and associated waste management). Greenpeace did so because these parts of the nuclear infrastructure were analyzed to be most vulnerable to actions intending to disrupt the nuclear trajectory as a whole. The more specific part of the industry constituted by nuclear power was then held to be less vulnerable to radical political action. However, the Chernobyl accident in April 1986 presented a shock to exactly this part of the industry. For the first time, there arose the opportunity for responsive actions by outside actors to effect disruption to the core trajectory of the contested industry. This particular form of vulnerability on the part of a global energy infrastructure illustrates a counterpoint to resilience, for which it is interesting that there already exists the (neglected) term “*transilience*.”

The dynamics of “transition” as defined in Figure 7 also correspond very closely to the conventional usage of this word. Indeed, there is an entire literature on

“technological transitions”, in which the term is used in senses that predominantly centre around exactly this meaning (Stirling, 2011). A transition occurs where some specific long-term stress forms a basis for control-style strategies aimed at disrupting an incumbent trajectory towards a very specific envisaged reorientation. Particular resonance can be found here in the “transition management” literature, which focuses disproportionately on control-oriented management instruments, rather than broader and more “political” governance interventions (including “response” strategies) (Genus & Coles, 2008; Shove & Walker, 2007; A. Smith & Stirling, 2007; A. Smith, et al., 2005). Arguably the best example of this in the energy sector, is the Netherlands Government’s current ‘Energie Transitie’ programme – aiming at a national transition to a low carbon infrastructure (Rotmans, Kemp, & Asselt). In this case, the stress that these control-style government actions are intending to exploit (as well as address) is the material and discursive political pressures presented by prospects of global climate change. It is crucial to the “control” dimension here, that both the stress itself and the ‘vision’ of a “low carbon” endpoint are each quite specific. Although paying attention to distributed networked and participatory processes, this “transition” program is well known for its emphasis on central coordination and managerial interventions by government agencies, rather than distributed market processes or more diffuse forms of political engagement driven by civil society (Seyfang & Smith, 2007; Smith, 2007).

“*Transformation,*” the final dynamic property defined in Figure 7, contrasts in exactly these ways with transition. While a transition implies some specific controllable endpoint, transformation is inherently more open-ended (Stirling, 2011). Transformation also contrasts with transience, as defined above, in that it implies change in the face of some enduring shift, rather than episodic shock. In this sense, then, the property of transformation may be defined as occurring where responsive interventions harness contingent stress to help catalyze radical reconfigurations, whose exact nature is not subject to control. To take a final example from the technological politics of energy systems, it may be no coincidence that this property comes to the fore when contemplating the roles of more marginal political actors than those considered thus far: social movements arising in grassroots civil society. These are not in a position, like government, even to seek to exercise control. But their circumstances also contrast with those of major international NGOs like Greenpeace in that their more diffuse and marginalized positions provide less of a basis for

responding opportunistically in timely and targeted ways to some particular contingent shock. Civil society organizations like “climate camp” and “transition towns” therefore seek more exclusively to lever change around discourse concerning long-term, large-scale secular stresses (such as “peak oil” and climate change). The potentially transformative consequences are also more distributed, diffuse, and diversely oriented than a single “transition,” opening up a more indeterminate array of possible alternative trajectories.

It is in these ways that the symmetrical representation of “outside” as well as “inside” framings in Figure 7 highlights the importance of a range of more diverse and nuanced dynamics than are conventionally made explicit in the governance of vulnerability. The context, style and orientation of governance interventions can all be seen to vary quite radically, depending on the prevailing circumstances. The conventionally undifferentiated dynamics of sustainability can – under “inside” framings – be resolved into distinct arenas for governance action in pursuit of stability, durability, resilience, and robustness (as in Figure 3). These each have counterparts under “outside” framings in transduction, transition, transilience, and transformation. These latter conditions for disruption constitute necessary but individually insufficient conditions for the neglected counterpart of sustainability: changeability. If we wish to attend fairly to the full range of implications of vulnerabilities in a technological culture – arising both from and for sociotechnical trajectories (Bijker, 2006; Stirling, 2010a) – then we need to address both changeability and sustainability when debating and designing governance interventions.

Figure 7 thus also illuminates the dynamics of vulnerability in more plural, complex, nuanced, and recursive – but also precise – forms than is often acknowledged. While the present heuristic framework may offer quite concrete ways to prompt questions and test hypotheses, the main value may lie in helping to catalyze a generally more open and reflexive appreciation of the governance challenges posed by these multivalent dimensions of vulnerabilities in technological cultures.


## ***Conclusions: Towards Reflexive Governance of Technological Vulnerability***

This chapter highlighted the importance of distinguishing contrasting dynamics of vulnerability (associated with shock and stress) and styles of intervention (aiming at control or response). Exploring these key dimensions revealed a heuristic array of four contrasting dynamic properties that are individually necessary and collectively sufficient for the sustaining of anything (stability, durability, resilience, and robustness).

In short, different dynamic properties require contrasting governance strategies. There may be important trade-offs, which are neglected in conventional, less differentiated, approaches to sustainability and resilience. In particular, it emerges that marginal interests are again quite systematically sidelined because conventional approaches are preoccupied with properties under which incumbent trajectories are *maintained*. To remedy this bias, attention extended in this chapter to a corresponding series of further dynamic properties associated with the *disruption* of incumbent trajectories. By focusing on the nature and implications of these neglected properties of changeability (transduction, transilience, transition, and transformation), I argued that we can achieve a more complete appreciation both of the technological vulnerabilities themselves – and of the associated options for governance intervention. I argued that such a fuller picture is especially important, when there is a desire to counter the constraining framing effects of power and focus attention instead on the vulnerabilities of the least powerful.

Figure 8 summarizes these converging strands of argument by relating them to a series of complementary elements in the “reflexive governance” of vulnerability (Voss, et al., 2006). Featuring particular strongly here, however, is one further specific theme developed in this present chapter: the importance of epistemic, normative, and ontological diversity (Stirling, 2007a; 2011). Starting in the lower left hand side of Figure 8, we see how social appraisal can achieve more broad-based and precautionary understandings of – and learning about – vulnerabilities in a technological culture. This emerges from (and engages with) a wider array of issues, options, uncertainties, benefits scenarios, and perspectives. These in turn interact with the normative plurality conditioned by divergent contexts, perspectives, and interests

to “open up” greater transparency and accountability in wider policy discourses concerning the potentialities in technology choice.



**Figure 8: *Towards more progressive and reflexive governance of vulnerability***

Of course, in the real world, institutional commitments need to be made and decisions must be justified. This is indicated in the focus on commitments at the top of Figure 8. But here again, it is possible to mitigate globalized technological monocultures by pursuing instead a more deliberate diversity of contending technological trajectories. Part of this lies in actualizing more multivalent dynamics in these trajectories – realizing the full range of properties that have been defined in this chapter. It is here that we see the importance of more symmetrical appreciations of disruption and change, as well as stasis and sustainability. So may the ordering dynamics shaping our technological commitments help nurture more plural ontologies, returning us to the left hand side of Figure 8. It is in this way that the recursive interactions between epistemic, normative, and ontological pluralism may help to maintain more reflexive – and effective – governance of vulnerability (Stirling, 2011). Rather than depending on cognitive ideological or procedural qualities (or exhortations) of individual social actors, this institutional notion of reflexivity arises in distributed unstructured political space. By helping to reduce pressures for closure in every domain, this enhanced pluralism may also afford greater political scope for those marginal voices and interests otherwise suppressed by more structured institutions and discourse. It is in these ways that the dynamics of diversity, reflexivity, and more equitable governance



of vulnerability may be seen to be profoundly interlinked – and with important practical policy implications.

## References

- Aalders, M., & Wilthagen, T. (1997). Moving Beyond Command-and-Control: Reflexivity in the Regulation of Occupational Safety and Health and the Environment. *Law & Policy*, 19, 415-443.
- Abernathy, W. J., Clark, K. B., White, G., Kantrow, A., & Hayes, R. (1985). Innovation : Mapping the winds of creative destruction. *Research Policy*, 14, 3–22.
- Abraham, J., & Davis, C. (2007). Deficits, expectations and paradigms in British and American drug safety assessments: Prising open the black box of regulatory science. *Science Technology & Human Values*, 32(4), 399-431.
- Adams, W.M. (1997) Rationalization and conservation: ecology and the management of nature in the United Kingdom, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* NS 22:277–291
- Adamski, A., & Westrum, R. (2003). Requisite imagination. The fine art of anticipating what might go wrong. In E. Hollnagel (Ed.), *Handbook of cognitive task design* (pp. 193-220). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Adger, W. N. (2006). Vulnerability. *Global Environmental Change*(16), 268-281.
- Adger, W. N., & Jordan, A. (Eds.). (2009). *Governing sustainability*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Adren, M., Sanne, J. M., & Linell, P. (2010). Striking the Balance between Formality and Informality in Safety-Critical Communication: The Case of Train Traffic Control Calls. *Journal of Pragmatics*(42), 220-241.
- Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo sacer. Sovereign power and bare life*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Ali, S. M. A., Ramanjaneyulu, G. V., & Kuruganti, K. (2005). *Bt cotton vs. Non Pesticidal Management of cotton - findings of a study done by the Centre for Sustainable Agriculture*: Centre for sustainable agriculture.
- Allen, E. C., Manuel, J. C., Legault, C., Naughton, M. J., Pivor, C., & O'Shea, T. M. (2004). Perception of child vulnerability among mothers of former premature infants. *Pediatrics*, 113(2), 267-273.
- Alvares, C. A. (1980). *Homo faber: technology and culture in India, China, and the West from 1500 to the present day*. The Hague [etc.]: M. Nijhoff Publishers.
- Alvares, C. A. (1992). *Science, development, and violence: the revolt against modernity*. Delhi and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Alwang, J., & Siegel, P. B. (2001). *Vulnerability: a view from different disciplines*: The World Bank.
- Amin, S. (1995). *Event, metaphor, memory: Chauri Chaura, 1922-1992*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ancona, D., & Chong, C. L. (1996). Entrainment: Pace, cycle, and rhythm in organizational behavior. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 18, 251-284.
- Andersen, P. H., & Drejer, I. (2008). Systemic innovation in a distributed network: the case of Danish wind turbines, 1972-2007. *Strategic Organization*, 6(1), 13-46.

- Anderson, J. (2008). Verantwortung. In S. Gosepath, W. Hinsch & B. Rössler (Eds.), *Handbuch der politischen Philosophie und Sozialphilosophie*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Anspach, R. R. (1993). *Deciding who lives: faithful choices in the Intensive-care nursery*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Antonovsky, A. (1987). *Unraveling the mystery of health: how people manage stress and stay well* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Appadurai, A. (1984). How Moral Is South Asia's Economy? A Review Article. *Journal of Asian Studies*, 43, 481-497.
- Appadurai, A. (2004). The Capacity to Aspire: Culture and the Terms of Recognition. In V. Rao & M. Walton (Eds.), *Culture and public action* (pp. 59-84). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Appendini, K. (2001). Land and livelihood: what do we know and what are the issues? In A. Zoomers (Ed.), *land and sustainable livelihood in Latin Amerika*. Amsterdam: Royal Tropical Institute / Vervuert Verlag.
- Arcuri, A. S. (2005). *Governing the risks of ultra-hazardous activities. Challenges for contemporary legal systems*. Rotterdam: Academic Publishers.
- Argyris, C., & Schön, D. (1978). *Organizational Learning*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Arnold, D. (1984). Famine in Peasant Consciousness and Peasant Action: Madras 1876-8. In R. Guha (Ed.), *Subaltern Studies: Writings on South Asian History* (pp. 63-115.). Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Ash, J. S., Berg, M., & Coiera, E. (2004). Some unintended consequences of information technology in health care: The nature of patient care information system-related errors. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 11(2), 104-112.
- Ashton, H. A., Buxton, M. J., Day, N. E., Kim, L. G., Marteau, T. M., Scott, R. A. P., et al. (2002). The Multicentre Aneurysm Screening Study (MASS) into the effect of abdominal aortic aneurysm screening on mortality in men: a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*, 360(9345), 1531-1539.
- Aspden, P., Corrigan, J. M., Wolcott, J., & Erickson, S. M. (Eds.). (2004). *Patient Safety: Achieving a New Standard for Care*. Washington DC: National Academy Press.
- Aspden, P., Wolcott, J., Bootman, J. L., & Cronenwett, L. R. (Eds.). (2007). *Preventing Medication Errors: Quality Chasm Series*. Washington D.C: National Academy Press.
- Bagchi, D. K., Blaikie, P., Cameron, J., Chattopadhyay, M., Gyawali, N., & Seddon, D. (1998). Conceptual and methodological challenges in the study of livelihood trajectories: case studies in eastern India and western Nepal. *Journal of international development*, 10, 453-468.
- Bankoff, G. (2001). Rendering the World Unsafe: 'Vulnerability' as Western Discourse. *Disasters*, 25(1), 19-35.
- Banverket. (2000). *Tillbud vid A- och E-arbeten Gävle, 2000-04-03, Dnr B 000-1601 [Incident at A- and E-work Gävle, April 3, 2004]*. Gävle: Banverket.
- Banverket. (2002). *Arbetsolycka med dödlig utgång i Kalmar den 13 februari 2002*. Borlänge: Banverket.
- Bargian, J. P. (2006). Patient safety: lessons learned. *Pediatric radiology*, 36, 287-290.
- Baxi, U., & Dhanda, A. (1990). *Valiant Victims and Lethal Litigation: The Bhopal Case*. Delhi: Indian Law Institute.

- Baxter, B. (2004). *A theory of ecological justice*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bebbington, A. (1999). Capitals and capabilities: a framework for analysing peasant viability, rural livelihoods and poverty. *World development*, 27(12), 2021-2044.
- Beck, U. (1986). *Risikogesellschaft: auf dem Weg in eine andere Moderne*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Beck, U. (1992). *Risk society: towards a new modernity*. London (etc.): Sage.
- Beck, U. (1999). *World Risk Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Becker, M. H. (1993). A MEDICAL SOCIOLOGIST LOOKS AT HEALTH PROMOTION. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 34(1), 1-6.
- Béguin, P., Owen, C., & Wackers, G. (2009). Focusing on Human Work with-in Complex Socio-technical Systems. In C. Owen, G. Wackers & P. Béguin (Eds.), *Risky Work Environments. Reappraising human work within fallible systems*. Hampshire: Ashgate.
- Bekkers, V., & Thaens, M. (2005). Interconnected Networks and the Governance of Risk and Trust. *Information Polity*(10), 37-48.
- Bellaby, P. (2001). Evidence and Risk: the Sociology of Health Care Grappling with Knowledge and Uncertainty. In A. Edwards & G. Elwyn (Eds.), *Evidence-based Patient Choice; Inevitable or Impossible?* (pp. 78-94). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Benner, P., Tanner, C., & Chesla, C. (1996). *Expertise in nursing practice. Caring, clinical judgement, and ethics*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.
- Bennett, R., Kambhampati, U., Morse, S., & Imael, Y. (2006). Farm-Level Economic Performance of Genetically Modified Cotton in Maharashtra, India. *Review of Agricultural Economics*, 28(1), 59-71.
- Berg, M., & Timmermans, S. (2000). Orders and their others: On the constitution of universalities in medical work. *Configurations*, 8(1), 31-61.
- Berkes, F., Colding, J., & Folke, C. (2003). *Navigating social-ecological systems: building resilience for complexity and change*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bhatt, M., R. (1998). Can Vulnerability be Understood? In J. Twigg & M. Bhatt, R. (Eds.), *Understanding Vulnerability. South Asian Perspectives* (pp. 68-77). London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Bijker, W. E. (2006). The Vulnerability of Technological Culture. In H. Nowotny (Ed.), *Cultures of Technology and the Quest for Innovation* (pp. 52-69). London: Berghahn books.
- Bijker, W. E. (2007). American and Dutch Coastal Engineering: Differences in Risk Conception and Differences in Technological Culture. *Social studies of science*, 37(1), 143-151.
- Bijker, W. E. (2010). How is technology made? - That is the question! *Cambridge journal of economics*, 34(1), 63-76.
- Bijker, W. E., & Law, J. (Eds.). (1992). *Shaping Technology / Building Society*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Blount, S., Waller, M. J., & Leroy, S. (2005). Coping with temporal uncertainty: when rigid, ambitious deadlines don't make sense. In W. H. Starbuck & M. Farjoun (Eds.), *Organization at the limit. Lessons from the Columbia Disaster* (pp. 122 - 139). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Bodewitz, H. J. H. W., Buurma, H., & Vries., G. H. d. (1987). Regulatory science and the social management of trust in medicine. In W. E. Bijker, T. P. Hughes &

- T. J. Pinch (Eds.), *The Social Construction of Technological Systems* (pp. 243-260). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Boenink, M. (2009). Tensions and Opportunities in Convergence: Shifting Concepts of Disease in Emerging Molecular Medicine. *NanoEthics*, 3(3), 243-255.
- Borlaug, N. (2000). *The green revolution revisited and the road ahead*.
- Borup, M., Brown, N., Konrad, K., & Van Lente, H. (2006). The sociology of expectations in science and technology. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 18(3-4), 285-298.
- Bottelberghs, P. H. (2000). Risk analysis and safety policy developments in the Netherlands. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 71(1-3), 59-84.
- Bouder, F., Slavin, D., & Löfstedt, R. (2007). *The tolerability of risk: a new framework for risk management*. London and Sterling: Earthscan.
- Bovens, M., & Zouridis, S. (2002). From Street Level to System Level Bureaucracies. How ICT is Transforming Administrative Discretion and Constitutional Control. Utrecht School of Governance.
- Bowonder, B., Kasperson, J. X., & Kasperson, R. E. (1994). Industrial Risk Management in India Since Bhopal *Learning from Disaster: Risk Management after Bhopal* (pp. 66-90). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Brinkman, J. W., Bakker, S. J. L., Gansevoort, R. T., Hillege, H. L., Kema, I. P., Gans, R. O. B., et al. (2004). Which method for quantifying urinary albumin excretion gives what outcome? A comparison of immunonephelometry with HPLC. *Kidney International*, 66, S69-S75.
- Broekhuis, M., & Veldkamp, C. (2007). The usefulness and feasibility of a reflexivity method to improve clinical handover. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*, 13(1), 109-115.
- Brooks, H. (1986). The Typology of Surprises in Technology, Institutions, and Development. In W. C. Clark & R. E. Munn (Eds.), *Sustainable Development of the Biosphere* (pp. 325-350). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brooks, N. (2003). Vulnerability, risk and adaptation: A conceptual framework. Unpublished Unpublished working paper. Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research.
- Brown, L. R. (1970). Nobel Peace Prize: developer of high-yield wheat receives award (Norman Ernest Borlaug). *Science*, 170(957), 518-519.
- Brown, N. (2003). Hope against hype - Accountability in biopasts, presents and futures. *Science Studies*, 16(2), 3-21.
- Calderwood, R., & Welch, M. (2004). Screening men for aortic aneurysm. *International Angiology*, 23(2), 185-188.
- Cannon, T. (2008a). *Reducing people's vulnerability to natural hazards. Research paper No 2008/4*.
- Cannon, T. (2008b). Vulnerability, "innocent" disasters and the imperative of cultural understanding. *Disaster Prevention and Management*, 17(3), 350-357.
- Carney, D. (1999). *Approaches to sustainable livelihoods for the rural poor*: Overseas Development Institute.
- Carpenter, S., Walker, B., Anderies, J. M., & Abel, N. (2001). From metaphor to measurement: Resilience of what to what? *Ecosystems*, 4(8), 765-781.
- Carson, D. P. (1996). The socially complex family. New dilemmas for the neonatal social worker. *Clinics in Perinatology*, 23(3), 609-620.
- Carson, R. (1962). *Silent Spring* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Caspary, W. R. (2000). *Dewey on democracy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- Castells, M. (1996). *The Rise of the Network Society* (2nd ed. Vol. 1). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Chambers, R. (1987). *Sustainable livelihoods, environment and development: putting poor people first*.
- Chambers, R., & Conway, G. R. (1991). *Sustainable rural livelihoods: practical concepts for the 21st century*. Retrieved from Retrieved 20.01.2009, from <http://www.ids.ac.uk/go/people/a-z-list-of-ids-people/chambers-robert>
- Ciborra, C. U. (Ed.). (2000). *From Control to Drift. The Dynamics of Corporate Information Infrastructures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Coeckelbergh, M., & Wackers, G. (2007). Imagination, distributed responsibility and vulnerable technological systems: the case of Snorre A. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 13(2), 235-248.
- Collingridge, D. (1980). *The Social Control of Technology*. London: Frances Pinter.
- Conradson, D. (2003). Doing organisational space: practices of voluntary welfare in the city. *Environment and Planning A*, 35(11), 1975-1992.
- Costello, K. (2004). *Increased Dependence on Natural Gas for Electric Generation: Meeting the Challenge*: National Regulatory Research Institute, Ohio State University.
- Crabb, C. (2004). Revisiting the Bhopal tragedy. *Science*, 306(5702), 1670-1671.
- CSA. (2005). *The story of Bt Cotton in Andhra Pradesh: Erratic Processes and Results*: Centre for Sustainable Agriculture.
- Cullen, W. D. (1990). *The Public Inquiry into the Piper Alpha Disaster*. London: HMSO.
- Cutter, S. L. (1993). *Living with risk: the geography of technological hazards*. London: Arnold.
- Cutter, S. L. (2006). *Hazards, vulnerability and environmental justice*. London [etc.]: Earthscan.
- Cutter, S. L., Mitchell, J. T., & Scott, M. S. (2000). Revealing the vulnerability of people and places: A case study of Georgetown County, South Carolina. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 90(4), 713-737.
- Dalrymple, D. G. (1977). Evaluating the Impact of International Research on Wheat and Rice Production in the Developing Nations. In T. M. Arndt, D. G. Dalrymple & V. W. Ruttan (Eds.), *Resource allocation and productivity in national and international agricultural research* (pp. xxviii, 617 p.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Dalrymple, D. G. (1985). The Development and Adoption of High-Yielding Varieties of Wheat and Rice in Developing Countries. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 67(5), 1067-1073.
- Daniel, L. E. (1998). Vulnerability as a key to authenticity. *Image: Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 30(2), 191-192.
- Das, V. (2006). *Life and words: violence and the descent into the ordinary*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Dawson, T., Rounsevell, M., Kluvánková-Oravská, T., Chobotová, V., & Stirling, A. (2010). Dynamic properties of complex adaptive ecosystems: implications for the sustainability of service provision. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 19(10), 2843-2853.
- de Haan, L. (2005). Exploring the frontier of livelihood research. *Development and Change*, 36(1), 27-47.

- de Haan, L. (2006). The Livelihood Approach and African Livelihoods. In P. Lindert (Ed.), *Development Matters: geographical studies on development processes and policies*. Utrecht: Utrecht University Press.
- Dekker, E., Hollnagel, E., & Woods, D. (2005). *Resilience Engineering: new directions for measuring and maintaining safety in complex organisations*. Research proposal to R ddningsverket. Lund Universitet, Link ping Universitet, The Ohio State University.
- Dekker, S. (2005). *Ten questions about human error: a new view of human factors and system safety*. London: Earlbaum Publishers.
- Dekker, S., & Hollnagel, E. (2006). *Resilience Engineering: new directions for measuring and maintaining safety in complex systems*. Lund: Lund University.
- Delborne, J. A. (2008). Transgenes and transgressions: Scientific dissent as heterogeneous practice. *Social studies of science*, 38(4), 509-541.
- Denz-Penhey, H., & Murdoch, J. C. (2008). Personal resiliency: Serious diagnosis and prognosis with unexpected quality outcomes. *Qualitative Health Research*, 18(3), 391-404.
- Dewey, J. (1948). *Reconstruction in philosophy* (Enl. ed.). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Dharampal, S. (1971). *Indian science and technology in the eighteenth century; some contemporary European accounts*. Delhi: Impex India.
- Dhareshwar, V. (2010). Politics, experience and cognitive enslavement: Gandhi's Hind Swaraj. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 45(12), 51-58.
- Dijstelbloem, H. O. (2007). *De democratie anders. Politieke vernieuwing volgens Dewey en Latour*. PhD Thesis, University of Amsterdam.
- Dobermann, A. (2004). A critical assessment of the system of rice intensification (SRI). *Agricultural Systems*, 79(3), 261-281.
- Dobson, A. (1996). Environment sustainabilities: An analysis and a typology. *Environmental Politics*, 5(3), 401 - 428.
- Douglas, M. (1992). *Risk and blame: essays in cultural theory*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Douglas, M., & Wildavsky, A. (1982). *Risk and culture: an essay on the selection of technical & environmental dangers*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dreyer, M., & Renn, O. (Eds.). (2009). *Food Safety Governance. Integrating Science, Precaution and Public Involvement*. Berlin and Heidelberg: Springer.
- Dronamraju, K. R. (1985). *The Life and Work of JBS Haldane with special reference to India*. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.
- Dworkin, R. (1999, May). Playing God. *Prospect Magazine*.
- Dyer, J. G., & McGuinness, T. M. (1996). Resilience: analysis of the concept. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*, 10(5), 276-282.
- Einarsson, S. (1999). *Vulnerability and Risk Analysis of Complex Industrial Systems. A New Approach and Discussion of Main Problem Areas*. Trondheim: The Norwegian University of Science and Technology.
- Einarsson, S., & Rausand, M. (1998). An approach to vulnerability analysis of complex industrial systems. *Risk Analysis*, 18(5), 535-546.
- Eiser, C., Eiser, J. R., Mayhew, A. G., & Gibson, A. T. (2005). Parenting the premature infant: balancing vulnerability and quality of life. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 46(11), 1169-1177.
- Ellery, J. (2007). Integrating salutogenesis into wellness in every stage of life. *Preventing Chronic Disease*, 4(3), A79.
- Engineer, A. (2003). *The Gujarat carnage*. New Delhi: Orient Longman.

- Epstein, T. S. (1973). *South India: Yesterday, today and tomorrow: Mysore villages revisited*. London: Macmillan.
- Eriksson, M., & Lindström, B. (2005). Validity of Antonovsky's sense of coherence scale: a systematic review. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 59(6), 460-466.
- European Environment Agency. (2001). *Late Lessons From Early Warnings: The Precautionary Principle 1896-2000*. Copenhagen: European Environment Agency.
- Evans, G. R. (2008). Transformation from "Carbon Valley" to a "Post-Carbon Society" in a Climate Change Hot Spot: the Coalfields of the Hunter Valley, New South Wales, Australia. *Ecology and Society*, 13(1).
- Farjoun, M. (2005). Organizational Learning and Action in the Midst of Safety Drift: Revisiting the Space Shuttle Program's Recent History. In W. H. Starbuck & M. Farjoun (Eds.), *Organization at the limit. Lessons from the Columbia Disaster* (pp. 60-80). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Farrell, A. E., Zerriffi, H., & Dowlatabadi, H. (2004). Energy infrastructure and security. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 29, 421-469.
- Farrington, J. (2004). *Recognizing and addressing risk and vulnerability constraints to pro-poor agricultural growth*: Overseas Development Institute.
- Feenberg, A. (2002). *Transforming technology: a critical theory revisited*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Feldman, S., Biggs, S., & Raina, R. (2010). A Messy Confrontation of a Crisis in Agricultural Science. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 45(4), 66-71.
- Final Declaration of the UN Conference on Environment and Development, R. d. J., 1992.
- Fischhoff, B., Lichtenstein, S., Slovic, P., Derby, S. L., & Keeney, R. L. (1981). *Acceptable Risk*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fleischer, N., Weber, A., Gruber, S., Arambula, K., Mascarenhas, M., Frasure, J., et al. (2006). Pathways to health: a framework for health-focused research and practice. *Emerging Themes in Epidemiology*, 3(1), 18.
- Folke, C. (2006). Resilience: The emergence of a perspective for social-ecological systems analyses. *Global Environmental Change-Human and Policy Dimensions*, 16(3), 253-267.
- Folke, C., Carpenter, S., Walker, B., Scheffer, M., Elmqvist, T., Gunderson, L., et al. (2004). Regime shifts, resilience, and biodiversity in ecosystem management. *Annual Review of Ecology Evolution and Systematics*, 35, 557-581.
- Folke, C., Hahn, T., Olsson, P., & Norberg, J. (2005). Adaptive governance of social-ecological systems. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 30, 441-473.
- Fombrun, C. J., & Rindova, V. P. (2000). The Road to Transparency: Reputation Management at Royal Dutch/Shell. In M. Schultz, M. J. Hatch & M. H. Larsen (Eds.), *The expressive organization* (pp. 77-96). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fortun, K. (2001). *Advocacy after Bhopal: environmentalism, disaster, new global orders*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Foster, H. D. (1993). Resilience Theory and System Evaluation. In J. A. Wise, V. D. Hopkin & P. Satger (Eds.), *Verification and Validation of Complex Systems: human factors issues* (pp. 35-60). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Fox, R. G. (1989). *Gandhian Utopia: experiments with culture*. Boston: Beacon Press.

- Foxon, T. J., Reed, M. S., & Stringer, L. C. (2008). *Governing long-term social-ecological change: What can the adaptive management and transition management approaches learn from each other?* Sustainability Research Institute, University of Leeds, SRI Paper No. 13.
- Freeman, C., & Perez, C. (1988). Structural crises of adjustment, business cycles and investment behaviour. In G. Dosi, C. Freeman, R. Nelson, G. Silverberg & L. Soete (Eds.), *Technical change and economic theory* (pp. 38-66). London and New York: Pinter Publishers.
- Friedmann, H. (1990). The Origins of Third World Food Dependence. In H. Bernstein (Ed.), *The Food question: profits versus people*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Frohock, F. M. (1986). *Special care: medical decisions at the beginning of life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Galanter, M. (1994). The Transnational Traffic in Legal Remedies. In S. Jasanoff (Ed.), *Learning from Disaster: Risk Management after Bhopal* (pp. 133-157). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Galison, P. (1997). *Image and logic: a material culture of microphysics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gallopin, G. C. (2006). Linkages between Vulnerability, Resilience, and Adaptive Capacity. *Global Environmental Change*(16), 292-303.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: selected essays*. New York,: Basic Books.
- Genus, A., & Coles, A.-M. (2008). Rethinking the multi-level perspective of technological transitions. *Research Policy*, 37(9), 1436-1445.
- Gherardi, S. (2004). Translating Knowledge While Mending Organisational Safety Culture. *Risk Management: An International Journal*, 6(2), 61-80.
- Gherardi, S., Nicolini, D., & Odella, F. (1998). What Do You Mean By Safety? Conflicting perspectives on accident causation and safety management in a construction firm. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 6, 202-213.
- Gibbons, M. (1999). Science's new social contract with society. *Nature*, 402, C81-C84.
- Gieryn, T. F. (1983). Boundary-work and the demarcation of science from non-science: strains and interests in the professional ideologies of scientists. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 781-795.
- Gill, A., & Singh, L. (2006). Farmers' Suicide and Response of Public Policy. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 41, 2762-2768.
- Gill, S. S. (2004). Punjab: Farmers' Movement: Continuity and Change. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 39, 2964-2966.
- Gillespie, B., Eva, D., & Johnston, R. (1982). Carcinogenic risk assessment in the USA and UK. The case of Aldrin/Dieldrin. In B. Barnes & D. Edge (Eds.), *Science in Context. Readings in the sociology of science* (pp. 303-335). Milton Keynes: The Open University Press.
- Gillian, P., O'Neill, S., & Danaher, P. A. (2005). *Creative Dissent and Constructive Solutions: What Contributions Does Bakhtin Make to Our Understanding of Transnational Education?* Retrieved from Also available at <http://www.aare.edu.au/05pap/dan05158.pdf>
- Glantz, M. D., & Sloboda, Z. (1999). Analysis and Reconceptualization of Resilience. In M. D. Glantz & J. L. Johnson (Eds.), *Resilience and*



- Development. Positive Life adoptions* (pp. 109-126). New York: Kluwer Academic / Pleinum Publishers.
- Glenne, B. (Ed.). (1997). *Sagaen om Saga. 25 år: 1972-1997*. Oslo: Saga Petroleum ASA.
- Glover, D. (2003). *Bt cotton: benefits for poor farmers?*
- Golan, T. (2004). *Laws of men and laws of nature: the history of scientific expert testimony in England and America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Goodman, K. J., & Cockburn, M. (2001). The role of epidemiology in understanding the health effects of *Helicobacter pylori*. *Epidemiology*, 12(2), 266-271.
- Government of Karnataka. (2002). *Farmers' Suicides in Karnataka: a Scientific Analysis*. Bangalore: Report of the expert committee for study on farmers' suicides.
- Grabher, G., & Stark, D. (1997). Organizing diversity: Evolutionary theory, network analysis and postsocialism. *Regional Studies*, 31(5), 533-544.
- Graham, J. D. (2003). *The perils of the precautionary principle: Lessons from the American and European experience*. Washington: Regulatory Forum.
- Gramsci, A. (1994). *Letters from Prison*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Green Cargo. (1996). *Tillbud vid Seglingsberg [Incident at Seglingsberg]*. Stockholm: Green Cargo.
- Greenough, P. R. (1982). *Prosperity and misery in modern Bengal: the famine of 1943-1944*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Guha, R., & Spivak, G. C. (Eds.). (1988). *Selected Subaltern studies*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Guillemin, J., & Holmstrom, L. L. (1986). *Mixed blessings: intensive care for newborns*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gunderson, L. (1999). Resilience, flexibility and adaptive management - antidotes for spurious certitude? *Conservation Ecology*, 3(1).
- Gunderson, L. H., & Holling, C. S. (2001). *Panarchy: understanding transformations in human and natural systems*. Washington: Island Press.
- Gupta, A. (1998). *Postcolonial developments: agriculture in the making of modern India*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Gupta, A. (2005). Whither the Indian Village: Culture and Agriculture in Rural India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 40, 751-758.
- Haas, J. (1977). Learning real feelings: A study of high steel ironworkers' reactions to fear and danger. *Sociology of Work and Occupations*, 5, 147-171.
- Hackett, E. J., Amsterdamska, O., Lynch, M., & Wajcman, J. (Eds.). (2008). *The handbook of science and technology studies*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Hahn, R. W., & Sunstein, C. R. (2005). The Precautionary Principle as a Basis for Decision Making. *The Economist's Voice*, 2(2).
- Hajer, M. (2003). Policy without polity? Policy analysis and the institutional void. *Policy Sciences*, 36(2), 175-195.
- Hajer, M. (2009). *Authoritative governance: policy-making in the age of mediatization*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hale, A. (2006). Method in your madness: System in your safety. Farewell lecture Technical University Delft, Delft.
- Hamel, G. (2007). *The future of management*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Hanekamp, J. C. (2006). Precaution and cholera: A response to Tickner and Gouveia-Vigeant. *Risk Analysis*, 26(4), 1013-1019.

- Hannerz, U. (1992). *Cultural complexity. Studies in the social organization of meaning*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hänninen, H. I., & Laurila, J. S. (2008). Risk Regulation in the Baltic Sea Ferry Traffic The Successive Failures of Bow Visor Technology. *Science Technology & Human Values*, 33(6), 683-706.
- Hardiman, D. (1996). Usury, dearth and famine in western India. *Past & Present*(152), 113-156.
- Harrison, P. (2000). Making sense: embodiment and the sensibilities of the everyday. *Environment and Planning D-Society & Space*, 18(4), 497-517.
- Harvey, F., & Chrisman, N. (1998). Boundary objects and the social construction of GIS technology. *Environment and Planning A*, 30(9), 1683-1694.
- Haverland, M. (1999). *National Autonomy, European Integration and the Politics of Packaging Waste*. Amsterdam: Thela Thesis.
- Health Council of the Netherlands. (2003). *Contours of the Basic Health Care Benefit Package*. The Hague, 02E.
- Health Council of the Netherlands. (2005). *Neonatal Screening*. The Hague. 2005/11.
- Healy, S. (2006). Risk as Embodied *Circumstance* - Some Organisational Observations. *Risk Management*, 8(2), 77-91.
- Helmreich, R., & Schaefer, H. G. (1994). Team performance in the operating room. In M. S. Bogner (Ed.), *Human error in medicine*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Heredia, R. C. (1999). Interpreting Gandhi's Hind Swaraj. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 34(24), 1497-1502.
- Herring, R. (2005). Miracle Seeds, Suicide Seeds and the Poor: GMOs, NGOs, Farmers and the State. In R. Ray & K. M.F (Eds.), *Social Movements in India: Poverty, Power, and Politics* (pp. 203-232). New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Hess, D. J. (2007). *Alternative pathways in science and industry: activism, innovation, and the environment in an era of globalization*. Cambridge, MA (etc.): The MIT Press.
- Hess, G. R. (1967). *Sam Higginbottom of Allahabad*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.
- Hesse, A. (Ed.). (1988). *Un/settled multiculturalisms: diasporas, entanglements, "transruptions"*. London: Zed.
- Hilgartner, S. (1992). The Diet-cancer debate. In D. Nelkin (Ed.), *Controversy: politics of technical decisions*. (3rd ed., pp. 115-129). London: Sage Publications.
- Hilhorst, D., & Bankoff, G. (2004). Introduction: Mapping Vulnerability. In G. Bankoff, G. Frerks & D. Hilhorst (Eds.), *Mapping Vulnerability* (pp. 1-9). London: Earthscan.
- Hogan, D. J., & Marandola, E. (2005). Towards an interdisciplinary conceptualisation of vulnerability. *Population Space and Place*, 11(6), 455-471.
- Holling, C. S. (1973). Resilience and stability of ecological systems. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 4, 1-23.
- Holling, C. S. (1978). *Adaptive environmental assessment and management*. Chichester and New York: International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis and Wiley.
- Holling, C. S. (1986). The Resilience of Terrestrial Ecosystems: Local Surprise and Global Change. In W. C. Clark & R. E. Munn (Eds.), *Sustainable*

- Development of the Biosphere* (pp. 292-317). London and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holling, C. S. (1996). Engineering Resilience versus Ecological Resilience. In P. Shulze (Ed.), *Engineering Within Ecological Constraints* (pp. 31-44). Washington DC: National Academy Press.
- Holling, C. S. (2004). From complex regions to complex worlds. *Ecology and Society*, 9(1).
- Hollnagel, E. (2004). *Barriers and Accident Prevention*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Hollnagel, E., Woods, D., & Leveson, N. (Eds.). (2006). *Resilience Engineering: Concepts and Precepts*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Hollnagel, H., & Malterud, K. (2000). From risk factors to health resources in medical practice. *Med Health Care Philos*, 3(3), 257-264.
- Hommels, A. (2005). *Unbuilding Cities. Obduracy in Urban Sociotechnical Change*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hommels, A., & Cleophas, E. (2008). *In case of break-down: transnational collaboration and the vulnerability of emergency communication infrastructures. Paper presented at the EUROCRIT workshop Transnational infrastructures: coping with scarcity and vulnerability*.
- Honoré, T. (1999). *Responsibility and fault*. Oxford and Portland: Hart Publishing.
- Hood, C., Rothstein, H., & Baldwin, R. (2001). *The government of risk: understanding risk regulation regimes*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hopkins, A. (2001). Was Three Mile Island a 'Normal Accident'? *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 9(2), 65-72.
- Hopkins, A. (2005). *Safety, Culture and Risk: the Organisational Causes of Disasters*. Sydney: CCH Australia Ltd.
- Horibe, F. (2008). *Creating the Innovation Culture: Leveraging Visionaries, Dissenters and Other Useful Troublemakers*. New York: Wiley.
- Horlick-Jones, T. (2005). Informal logics of risk: contingency and modes of practical reasoning. *Journal of Risk Research*, 8(3), 253-272.
- Howard, A. (1940). *An agricultural testament*. London: Oxford university press.
- Hughes, T. P. (1998). *Rescuing Prometheus*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Humphrey, C., & Hugh-Jones, S. (Eds.). (1992). *Barter, exchange, and value: an anthropological approach*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Iacuone, D. (2005). 'Real Men Are Tough Guys': Hegemonic Masculinity and Safety in the Construction Industry. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 13, 247-266.
- Iedema, R. (Ed.). (2007). *Discourses of hospital communication: tracing complexities in contemporary health care organizations*. Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- Iedema, R., Jorm, C., Braithwaite, J., Travaglia, J., & Lum, M. (2006). A root cause analysis of clinical error: Confronting the disjunction between formal rules and situated clinical activity. *Social Science & Medicine*, 63(5), 1201-1212.
- Iedema, R., Merrick, E. T., Kerridge, R., Herkes, R., Lee, B., Anscombe, M., et al. (2009). Handover - Enabling Learning in Communication for Safety (HELiCS): a report on achievements at two hospital sites. *Medical Journal of Australia*, 190(11), S133-S136.
- Ihde, D. (1993). *Philosophy of technology: an introduction* (1st ed.). New York: Paragon House.

- Institute for Healthcare Improvement. (2003). *The breakthrough series: IHI's collaborative model for achieving breakthrough improvement*. Boston: Institute for Healthcare Improvement.
- International Risk Governance Council. (2005). *Risk Governance. Towards an Integrative Approach*. Geneva: IRGC.
- Ison, R. L., Maiteny, P. T., & Carr, S. (1997). Systems methodologies for sustainable natural resources research and development. *Agricultural Systems*, 55(2), 257-272.
- Iyer, K. G., & Manick, M. S. (2000). *Indebtedness, impoverishment and suicides in rural Punjab*. Delhi: Indian Publishers Distributors.
- Jackson, P. (1991). The Cultural Politics of Masculinity: Towards a Social Geography. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 16(2), 199-213.
- Jacksteit, M., & Kaufmann, A. (1999). *The Common Ground Network for Life and Choice Manual*. Washington: Search for Common Ground (SCG).
- Jaeger, C., Renn, O., Rosa, E. A., & Webler, T. (1998). Decision Analysis and Rational Action. In S. Rayner & E. L. Malone (Eds.), *Human Choice and Climate Change, Volume 3: Tools For Policy Analysis* (pp. 141-215). Columbus, Ohio: Battelle Press.
- James, C. (2007). *Global Status of Commercialized Biotech/GM crops: Brief 37*. Ithaca, NY: ISAAA.
- Jasanoff, S. (1986). *Risk Management and Political Culture*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Jasanoff, S. (1990). *The fifth branch: science advisers as policymakers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Jasanoff, S. (1993). Bridging the two cultures of risk analysis. *Risk analysis: an international journal*, 13(2), 123-130.
- Jasanoff, S. (1994a). Introduction: Learning from Disaster. In S. Jasanoff (Ed.), *Learning from Disaster. Risk Management After Bhopal* (pp. 1-21). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Jasanoff, S. (1995). *Science at the bar: law, science, and technology in America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Jasanoff, S. (2001). 'Image and imagination: the formation of global environmental consciousness', in Clark A. Miller and Paul N. Edwards (eds), *Changing the Atmosphere: Expert Knowledge and Environmental Governance*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 309-37
- Jasanoff, S. (2004). *States of knowledge: the co-production of science and social order*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Jasanoff, S. (2005a). *Designs on nature: science and democracy in Europe and the United States*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Jasanoff, S. (2005b). Restoring Reason: Causal Narratives and Political Culture. In B. Hutter & M. Power (Eds.), *Organizational Encounters with Risk* (pp. 209-232). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jasanoff, S. (2007). Technologies of humility. *Nature*, 450(7166), 33.
- Jasanoff, S. (Ed.). (1994b). *Learning from Disaster: Risk Management after Bhopal*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Jessop, B. (1998). The rise of governance and the risks of failure: the case of economic development. *International Social Science Journal*, 50(1), 29-45.

- Johnson, B. B., & Covello, V. T. (Eds.). (1987). *The social and cultural construction of risk: essays on risk selection and perception*. Dordrecht: Dordrecht Reidel Publishing Company.
- Johnson, J. L., & Wiechelt, S. A. (2004). Introduction to the Special Issue on Resilience. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 39, 657-670.
- Johnson, J. V. (1989). Collective control: strategies for survival in the workplace. *International Journal of Health Services*, 19(3), 469-480.
- Johnson, S. (2001). *Emergence. The connected lives of ants, brains, cities, and software*. New York: Scribner.
- Joint Energy Security of Supply Working Group (JESS). (2004). UK Department of Trade and Industry, Fourth Report. London, May.
- Jones, M. (1992). *Adaptive learning environments: foundations and frontiers*. Berlin and New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Kaldor, M. (1981). *The baroque arsenal*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Kalelkar, A. (1988). *Investigation of Large-Magnitude Incidents: Bhopal as a Case Study*. Cambridge, MA: Arthur D. Little, Inc.
- Kasperson, J. X., & Kasperson, R. E. (2001). *A workshop summary*.
- Kauffman, S. A. (1995). *At home in the universe: the search for laws of self-organization and complexity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kerr, M. P. (2002). A qualitative study of shift handover practice and function from a socio-technical perspective. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 37(2), 125-134.
- Keulartz, J., Schermer, M., Korhals, M., & Swierstra, T. (2004). Ethics in technological culture: A programmatic proposal for a pragmatist approach. *Science Technology & Human Values*, 29(1), 3-29.
- Klaver, I., Keulartz, J., van den Belt, H., & Gremmen, B. (2002). Born to be wild: A pluralistic ethics concerning introduced large herbivores in the Netherlands. *Environmental Ethics*, 24(1), 3-21.
- Klein, R. J. T., Nicholls, R. J., & Thomalla, F. T. (2003). Resilience to Natural Hazards: How Useful is this Concept? *Environmental Hazards*, 5, 35-46.
- Klein, R. J. T., Smit, M. J., Goosen, H., & Hulsbergen, C. H. (1998). Resilience and vulnerability: Coastal dynamics or Dutch dikes? *Geographical Journal*, 164, 259-268.
- Klinke, A., Dreyer, M., Renn, O., Stirling, A., & Van Zwanenberg, P. (2006). Precautionary risk regulation in European governance. *Journal of Risk Research*, 9(4), 373-392.
- Klinke, A., & Renn, O. (2002). A new approach to risk evaluation and management: risk-based, precaution-based, and discourse-based strategies. *Risk Analysis*, 22(6), 1071-1094.
- Knill, C., & Lenschow, A. (1998). Coping with Europe: the impact of British and German administrations on the implementation of EU environmental policy. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 5(4), 595-614.
- Kohn, L. T., Corrigan, J., & Donaldson, M. S. (2000). *To err is human: building a safer health system*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Kooiman, J. (2003). *Governing as governance*. London and Thousand Oaks: SAGE.
- Krimsky, S., & Golding, D. (1992). *Social theories of risk*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger.
- Kunneman, H. (2010). Viable alternatives for commercialized science: the case of humanistics. In H. Radder (Ed.), *The commodification of scientific research*. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh University Press.
- La Porte, T. R. (Ed.). (1991). *Social responses to large technical systems (Vol. 58)*. Dordrecht / Boston / London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- La Porte, T. R., & Consolini, P. M. (1991). Working in Practice but not in Theory: Theoretical Challenges of 'High-Reliability Organizations'. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 1(1), 19-48.
- Lakoff, A., & Collier, S. J. (Eds.). (2008). *Biosecurity Interventions: Global Health and Security in Question*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Landau, R., Taylor, T., & Wright, G. (Eds.). (1996). *The mosaic of economic growth*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Lantos, J. D., & Meadow, W. (2006). *Neonatal bioethics: the moral challenges of medical innovation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Lapierre, D., & Moro, J. (2002). *Five Past Midnight: The Epic Story of the World's Deadliest Industrial Disaster*. New York: Warner.
- Lash, S. (2000). Risk culture. In B. Adam, U. Beck & J. v. Loon (Eds.), *The risk society and beyond: critical issues for social theory* (pp. 47-62). London/Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Latini, G., De Felice, C., Presta, G., Rosati, E., & Vacca, P. (2003). Minimal handling and bronchopulmonary dysplasia in extremely low-birth-weight infants. *European Journal of Pediatrics*, 162(4), 227-229.
- Latour, B. (1987). *Science in action: how to follow scientists and engineers through society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Latour, B. (1990). Drawing Things Together. In M. Lynch & S. Woolgar (Eds.), *Representation in Scientific Practice* (pp. 19-68). Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Latour, B. (1999). *Pandora's hope: essays on the reality of science studies*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the social: an introduction to actor-network-theory*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Law, J. (1987). On the Social Explanation of Technical Change: The Case of Portuguese Maritime Expansion. *Technology & Culture*, 28, 227-252.
- Law, J. (2000). *Ladbroke Grove, Or How to Think about Failing Systems*. Unpublished manuscript, Centre for Science Studies, Lancaster University.
- Leach, M. (Ed.). (2008). *Re-framing resilience: a Symposium Report (Vol. 13): STEPS working*
- Leach, M., Mearns, R., & Scoones, I. (1999). Environmental entitlements: Dynamics and institutions in community-based natural resource management. *World development*, 27(2), 225-247.
- Leach, M., Scoones, I., & Stirling, A. (2010a). *Dynamic Sustainabilities: Technology, Environment, Social Justice*. London: Earthscan.
- Leach, M., Scoones, I., & Stirling, A. (2010b). Governing epidemics in an age of complexity: Narratives, politics and pathways to sustainability. *Global Environmental Change*, 20(3), 369-377.
- Leach, M., Scoones, I., & Wynne, B. (Eds.). (2005). *Science and Citizens: Globalization and the Challenge of Engagement*. London: Zed.
- Lebel, L., Anderies J. M., Campbell B., Folke C., Hatfield-Dodds S., Hughes T. P. and Wilson J. (2006). Governance and the capacity to manage resilience in regional social-ecological systems. *Ecology and Society* 11(1): 19.
- Lee, K. N. (1993). *Compass and gyroscope. Integrating science and politics for the environment*. Washington: Island Press.
- Lessick, M., Woodring, B., Naber, S., & Halstead, L. (1992). Vulnerability: a Conceptual Model Applied to Perinatal and Neonatal Nursing. *The Journal of Perinatal and Neonatal Nursing*, 6, 1-14.

- Lévi-Strauss, C. (1966). *The savage mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Levine, C. (2004). The concept of vulnerability in disaster research. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 17*(5), 395-402.
- Lie, E. (2005). *Oljerikdommer og internasjonal ekspansjon. Hydro 1977 - 2005. Bind 3 av Hydros Historie 1905 - 2005*. Oslo: Pax Forlag.
- Little, A. D. (2002). *Root Cause Analysis of Red Zone Working*. London: Railway Safety and Standards Board.
- Lofstedt, R., & Frewer, L. (Eds.). (1998). *The earthscan reader in Risk and modern society*. London: Earthscan.
- Ludwig, D. (2001). Crisis and transformation. *Conservation Ecology, 5*(1).
- Luhmann, N. (1993). *Risk: a sociological theory*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Lukasik, S. J. (2003). Vulnerabilities and Failures of Complex Systems. *International Journal of Engineering Education, 19*(1), 206-212.
- Lundestad, C., & Hommels, A. (2007). Software vulnerability due to practical drift. *Ethics and Information Technology, 9*(2), 89-100.
- Lupton, D. (1999). *Risk and sociocultural theory: new directions and perspectives*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: a report on knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Macpherson, C. B. (1977). *The life and times of liberal democracy*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Majone, G. (2002). What price safety? The precautionary principle and its policy implications. *Journal of Common Market Studies, 40*(1), 89-109.
- Malaysia, F. o. t. E. (1985). *The Bhopal tragedy - one year after*. Penang: Appen.
- Malone, R. E. (2000). Dimensions of vulnerability in emergency nurses' narratives. *Advances in Nursing Science, 23*(1), 1-11.
- Manias, E., & Street, A. (2000). The handover: uncovering the hidden practices of nurses. *Intensive and Critical Care Nursing, 16*(6), 373-383.
- Manyena, S. B. (2006). The Concept of Resilience Revisited. *Disasters, 30*, 433-450.
- Marchant, G. E., & Mossman, K. L. (2004). *Arbitrary and capricious: the precautionary principle in the European Union courts*. Washington: AEI Press.
- Martin, B. (1996). Technological Vulnerability. *Technology in Society, 12*(4), 511-523.
- Mathison, S. (1988). Why triangulate? *Educational Researcher, 17*, 13-17.
- Matravers, R., Moldan, B., & Billharz, S. (1998). *Sustainability Indicators: A Report on the Project on Indicators of Sustainable Development*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- McGoey, L. (2009). Pharmaceutical Controversies and the Performative Value of Uncertainty. *Science as Culture, 18*(2), 151-164.
- Meadowcroft, J. (1999). The politics of sustainable development: Emergent arenas and challenges for political science. *International Political Science Review, 20*(2), 219-237.
- Mearns, K., Flin, R., Gordon, R., & Fleming, M. (1998). Measuring safety climate on offshore installations. *Work and Stress, 12*(3), 238-254.
- Mensink, A. (2007). *Infectieziekten en veiligheid. Toekomstige uitdagingen voor maatschappij en beleid*. Bilthoven: RIVM.
- Mesman, J. (2008). *Uncertainty in medical innovation: experienced pioneers in neonatal care*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Mesman, J. (2009). The geography of patient safety: a topical analysis of sterility. *Social Science & Medicine*, 69(12), 1705-1712.
- Mesman, J. (Forthcoming). Resources of Strength: an Exnovation of Hidden Competence to Preserve Patient Safety. In J. Waring, R. Finn & E. Rowley (Eds.), *A Socio-cultural Perspective on Patient Safety*: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.
- Milieu- en Natuurplanbureau. (2003). *Nuchter omgaan met risico's*. Bilthoven: MNP.
- Milieu- en Natuurplanbureau and Rijksinstituut voor Volksgezondheid en Milieu. (2004). *Risico's in bedijkte termen. Een thematische evaluatie van het Nederlandse veiligheidsbeleid tegen overstromen*. Bilthoven: RIVM.
- Miller, H. I., & Conko, G. (2001). The perils of precaution - Why regulators' "precautionary principle" is doing more harm than good. *Policy Review*(107), 25-39.
- Mishra, S. (2006). *Suicides of Farmers in Maharashtra (Submitted to the Government of Maharashtra)*. Mumbai: Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research.
- Mohanakumar, S. (2006). Analysis of Farmers' Suicides in Kerala. *Economic and Political Weekly*(41), 1553-1558.
- Mohanty, B. B. (2005). 'We are like the living dead': Farmer suicides in Maharashtra, western India. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 32(2), 243-276.
- Mohanty, B. B., & Shroff, S. (2004). Farmers' Suicides in Maharashtra. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 39, 5591-5598.
- Monsanto. (2007). *Monsanto Pledge Report 2007: Growth for a better world*. Retrieved 13.12.2009, from [http://www.monsanto.com/responsibility/our\\_pledge.asp](http://www.monsanto.com/responsibility/our_pledge.asp).
- Mourik, R. (2004). *Did water kill the cows? The distribution and democratisation of risk, responsibility and liability in a Dutch agricultural controversy on water pollution and cattle sickness*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Maastricht University, Maastricht.
- Mumford, L. (1961). *The city in history: its origins, its transformations, and its prospects* ([1st ed.]). New York: Harcourt.
- Murcott, S. (1997). *Sustainable Development: A Meta-Review of Definitions, Principles, Criteria Indicators, Conceptual Frameworks and Information Systems*. Retrieved from Summary available at: <http://www.sustainableliving.org/appen-b.htm>
- Murray, A. T., & Grubestic, T. H. (2007). Overview of Reliability and Vulnerability in Critical Infrastructures. In A. T. Murray & T. H. Grubestic (Eds.), *Critical Infrastructure. Reliability and Vulnerability* (pp. 1-8). Berlin: Springer.
- Nandy, A. (1980). *Alternative sciences: creativity and authenticity in two Indian scientists*. New Delhi: Allied.
- Nandy, A. (1983). *The intimate enemy: loss and recovery of self under colonialism*. Delhi: Oxford.
- Nandy, A. (Ed.). (1988). *Science, hegemony and violence: a requiem for modernity*. Tokyo and New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Nehru, J. (1946). *The discovery of India* (2nd ed.). Calcutta: Signet Press.
- Nelkin, D. (1989). Communicating technological risk: the social construction of risk perception. *Annual review of public health*, 10, 95-113.
- Nelson, R. E., & Baker, T. (2005). Creating Something from Nothing: Resource Construction through Entrepreneurial Bricolage. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50, 329-366.



- Neyer, J., & Zürn, M. (2001). *Compliance in Comparative Perspective. The EU and Other International Institutions*.
- Nordmann, A. (2007). If and then: A critique of speculative nanoethics. *NanoEthics*, 1(1), 31-46.
- Nore, P. (2003). *Norsk Hydro's Takeover of Saga Petroleum in 1999. A case study*. Oslo: UiO/SV, Makt- og demokratiudredningens rapportserie, rapport 73.
- Norges offentlige utredninger. (2000). *Et sårbart samfunn. Utfordringer for sikkerhets- og beredskapsarbeidet i samfunnet*. Norges offentlige utredninger 2000: 24. Oslo: Statens forvaltningstjeneste Informasjonsforvaltning.
- Norton, B. G. (1999). Pragmatism, adaptive management, and sustainability. *Environmental Values*, 8(4), 451-466.
- O'Riordan, T. (Ed.). (2001). *Globalism, Localism and Identity: Fresh Perspectives on the Transition to Sustainability*. London: Earthscan.
- Olsson, P., Folke, C., & Hahn, T. (2004). Social-ecological transformation for ecosystem management: the development of adaptive co-management of a wetland landscape in southern Sweden. *Ecology and Society*, 9(4).
- Oosterveer, P. J. M. (2005). *Global Food Governance*. PhD dissertation. Wageningen University and Researchcentrum, Wageningen.
- Ostrom, E. (2005). *Understanding institutional diversity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Otway, H. J., & Peltu, M. (1985). *Regulating industrial risks: science, hazards, and public protection*. London/Boston: Butterworths.
- Owen, C., Wackers, G., & Béguin, P. (Eds.). (2009). *Risky Work Environments. Reappraising human work within fallible systems*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Oza, N., & Abrahamsson, P. (Eds.). (2009). *Building Blocks of Agile Innovation*: BookSurge Publishing.
- Paap, K. (1999). "Voluntarily put themselves in harms' way": The "Bait and Switch" of Safety Training in the Construction Industry. *The Sociology of Job Training: Research in the Sociology of Work*, 12, 197-227.
- Page, S. E. (2007). *The difference: how the power of diversity creates better groups, firms, schools, and societies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Pain, M. T., & Pain, M. A. (2005). Essay - Risk taking in sport. *Lancet*, 366, S33-S34.
- Palmboom, G., & Willems, D. (2010). Risk detection in individual health care: any limits? *Bioethics*, 24(8), 431-438.
- Parekh, B. (1989). *Colonialism, Tradition and Reform: An analysis of Gandhi's Political Discourse*. New Delhi: Sage.
- Patterson, J. T. (1987). *The dread disease: cancer and modern American culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Perin, C. (2005). *Shouldering risks: the culture of control in the nuclear power industry*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Perkins, J. H. (1997). *Geopolitics and the green revolution: wheat, genes, and the cold war*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Perrow, C. (1999 (1984)). *Normal accidents: living with high-risk technologies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Perrow, C. (2007). *The Next Catastrophe. Reducing our Vulnerabilities to Natural, Industrial and Terrorist Disasters*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Peters, P. (2006). *Time, Innovation and Mobilities. Travel in Technological Cultures*. London: Routledge.
- Peterson, M. (2006). The precautionary principle is incoherent. *Risk Analysis*, 26(3), 595-601.

- Peterson, R., & Wingqvist, B. (1982). *Olycksfallsrisker vid banarbeten - en arbetsmiljöstudie [Accident risks in railway track work - an occupational health and safety study]*. Göteborg: SJ Företagshälsovård Göteborg.
- Pidgeon, N. (1997). The Limits to Safety? Culture, Politics, Learning and Man-Made Disasters. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*(5), 1-14.
- Pidgeon, N., & O'Leary, M. (2000). Man-made disasters: why technology and organizations (sometimes) fail. *Safety Science*, 34(1-3), 15-30.
- Polgreen, L., & Kumar, H. (June 7, 2010). 8 Former Executives Guilty in '84 Bhopal Chemical Leak. *New York Times*, p. A8.
- Porter, S., & Wettig, J. (1999). Policy issues on the control of major accident hazards and the new Seveso II directive. *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 65(1-2), 1-14.
- Porter, T. M. (1995). *Trust in numbers: the pursuit of objectivity in science and public life*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Power, M. (2007). *Organized uncertainty: designing a world of risk management*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Putnam, H. (1995). *Pragmatism: an open question*. Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Qaim, M., & Zilberman, D. (2003). Yield effects of genetically modified crops in developing countries. *Science*, 299(5608), 900-902.
- Qayum, M. A., & Sakkhari, K. (2003). *Did Bt Cotton Save Farmers in Warangal? A season long impact study of Bt Cotton - Kharif 2002 in Warangal District of Andhra Pradesh: APCIDD, DDS*.
- Quartz, J. (2011). *Constructing Agrarian Alternatives. How a Creative Dissent Project Engages with the Vulnerable Livelihood Conditions of Marginal Farmers in South India*. Maastricht University, Maastricht.
- Raithu Sahaya Committee. (1998). *Farmers' Suicides in Andhra Pradesh: Report of the Peoples Tribunal*. Hyderabad.
- Ramanjaneyulu, G. V. (2002). *The second Green Revolution: sustaining agriculture and agriculture based livelihoods*: Centre for Sustainable Agriculture.
- Ramanjaneyulu, G. V., & Kurugnanti, K. (2006). Bt cotton in India: sustainable pest management? *Economic and Political Weekly*, 41(7), 561-562.
- Randell, R. (2003). Medicine and aviation: a review of the comparison. *Methods of Information in Medicine*, 42(4), 433-436.
- Randhawa, M. S. (1980). *A history of agriculture in India*. New Delhi: Indian Council of Agricultural Research.
- Ranjan, N., Sarangi, S., Holleran, S., Ramakrishnan, R., & Varma, D. R. (2003). Methyl Isocyanate Exposure and Growth Patterns of Adolescents in Bhopal. *Research Letter, JAMA*, 290(14), 422-423.
- Rao, P. N., & Suri, K. C. (2006). Dimensions of Agrarian Distress in Andhra Pradesh. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 41, 1546-1552.
- Rao, V. M., & Gopalappa, D. V. (2004). Agricultural Growth and Farmers' Distress: Tentative Perspectives from Karnataka. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 39, 5591-5597.
- Reason, J. (1993). The Identification of Latent Organizational Failures in Complex Systems. In J. A. Wise, V. D. Hopkin & P. Satger (Eds.), *Verification and Validation of Complex Systems: human factors issues* (pp. 223-237). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Reason, J. (1995). A Systems-Approach to Organizational Error. *Ergonomics*, 38(8), 1708-1721.

- Reason, J. (2000). Human Error. Models and Management. *BMJ*, 320, 768-770.
- Reason, J. T., Carthey, J., & de Leval, M. R. (2001). Diagnosing "vulnerable system syndrome": an essential prerequisite to effective risk management. *Quality in Health Care*, 10 Suppl 2, ii21-25.
- Reivich, K., & Shatté, A. (2002). *The resilience factor: 7 essential skills for overcoming life's inevitable obstacles* (1st ed.). New York: Broadway Books.
- Renn, O. (2005). *White paper on Risk Governance. Towards an integrative approach*. Geneva: International Risk Governance Council.
- Renn, O. (2006). *Risk Governance: Towards an integrative approach*. Geneva: IRGC White Paper No 1, International Risk Governance Council (IRGC).
- Renn, O. (2008). *Risk governance: coping with uncertainty in a complex world*. London and Sterling: Earthscan.
- Renn, O., & Walker, K. D. (Eds.). (2008). *Global risk governance : concept and practice using the IRGC framework*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Richardson, G. E. (2002). The metatheory of resilience and resiliency. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 58(3), 307-321.
- Rijpma, J. A. (2003). From Deadlock to Dead End: The Normal Accidents - High Reliability Debate Revisited. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 11(1), 37-45.
- Rip, A. (1991). The Danger Culture of Industrial Society. In R. E. Kasperson & P. J. M. Stallen (Eds.), *Communicating Risks to the Public* (pp. 345-365). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Rip, A. (2009). Technology as prospective ontology. *Synthese*, 168(3), 405-422.
- Robbins, L. (1932). *An Essay on the Nature and Significance of Economic Science*. London: Macmillan.
- Roberts, K. H. (Ed.). (1993). *New challenges to understanding organizations*. New York and Toronto: Macmillan.
- Robinson, J. (2003). Future subjunctive: backcasting as social learning. *Futures*, 35(8), 839-856.
- Roche, D. J. (2008). *Creative dissent: a politician's struggle for peace*. Toronto: Novalis.
- Rochlin, G. I. (1994). Broken Plowshare: System Failure and the Nuclear Power Industry. In J. Summerton (Ed.), *Changing large technical systems* (pp. xi, 348 p.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Rogers, A. C. (1997). Vulnerability, health and health care. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 26(1), 65-72.
- Rosenberg, N. (1982). *Inside the black box: technology and economics*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosenberg, N. (1996). Uncertainty and Technological Change. In R. Landau, T. Taylor & G. Wright (Eds.), *The mosaic of economic growth*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Rosness, R. (1992). *Vulnerability in complex systems. Directions for research*.
- Rotmans, J., Kemp, R., & Asselt, M. v. (2001). More evolution than revolution: Transition management in public policy. *Foresight*, 3(1), 1-17.
- Rowley, E., & Waring, J. (Eds.). (2011). *Socio-Cultural Perspectives of Patient Safety*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.
- Ruttan, V. W. (1988). Models of agricultural development. In K. K. Eicher & J. M. Staatz (Eds.), *International Agricultural Development* (3rd ed.). Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

- Ryff, C. D., & Singer, B. (1998). The contours of positive human health. *Psychological Inquiry*, 9(1), 1-28.
- Ryggvik, H. (1997a). De tre bukkene Saga, Norsk Hydro og Statoil. Fra nasjonal beskyttelse til internasjonal ekspansjon. In O. E. Olsen & F. Sejersted (Eds.), *Oljevirkosomheten som teknologiutviklingsprosjekt* (pp. 198-247). Oslo: Ad Notam Gyldendal.
- Ryggvik, H. (1997b). Norsk oljepolitikk mellom det internasjonale og det nasjonale. In O. E. Olsen & F. Sejersted (Eds.), *Oljevirkosomheten som teknologiutviklingsprosjekt*. (pp. 26-78). Oslo: Ad Notam Gyldendal.
- Sabatier, P., & Jenkins-Smith, H. (Eds.). (1993). *Policy Change and Learning: An Advocacy Coalition Approach*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Sagan, S. D. (1993). *The Limits of Safety. Organizations, Accidents and Nuclear Weapons*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Sainath, P. (2004a, August). How the better half dies. *The Hindu*. Retrieved from <http://www.indiatogether.org/2004/aug/psa-womenfarm.htm>
- Sainath, P. (2004b, August). How the better half dies II. *The Hindu*. Retrieved from <http://www.indiatogether.org/2004/aug/psa-womenfarm2.htm>
- Sainath, P. (2004c, June). Sinking borewells, rising debt. *The Hindu*. Retrieved from <http://www.indiatogether.org/2004/jun/psa-sinkbore.htm>
- Salvi, O., Jovanovic, A., Bolvin, C., Depuis, C., Vaquero, C., Balos, D., et al. (2008). *F-Seveso. Study of the Effectiveness of the Seveso II Directive*: European Virtual Institute for Integrated Risk Management (EU-VRi).
- Sanne, J. M. (1999). *Creating Safety in Air Traffic Control*. Lund: Arkiv.
- Sanne, J. M. (2007). *Organizing as Bricolage: Making do with given resources in railway maintenance*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Technology and Social Change, Linköping University.
- Sanne, J. M. (2008a). Framing Risks in a Safety-Critical Hazardous Job: Risk-Taking as Responsibility in Railway Maintenance. *Journal of Risk Research*, 11(5), 645-658.
- Sanne, J. M. (2008b). Incident reporting or story-telling? Competing schemes in a safety-critical and hazardous work setting. *Safety Science*, 46, 1205-1222.
- Sanne, J. M. (2009). Making Matters Speak: Trouble-shooting in Railway Maintenance. In M. Buscher, D. Goodwin & J. Mesman (Eds.), *Ethnographies of Diagnostic Work: Dimensions of Transformative Practice*. London: Palgrave.
- Sarewitz, D., Pielke, R., & Meykhah, M. (2003). Vulnerability and Risk: Some Thoughts from a Political and Policy Perspective. *Risk Analysis*, 23(4), 805-810.
- Sarma, E. A. S. (2004). Is Rural Economy Breaking Down? *Economic and Political Weekly*, 39, 3087-3089.
- Savage, T. A., & Conrad, B. (1992). Vulnerability as a consequence of the neonatal nurse-infant relationship. *Journal of Perinatal & Neonatal Nursing*, 6(3), 64-75.
- Schermer, M. (2009). The mind and the machine. On the conceptual and moral implications of brain-machine interaction. *NanoEhtics*, 3(3), 217-230.
- Schermer, M., & Keulartz, J. (2002). How pragmatic is bioethics? The case of In Vitro Fertilization. In J. Keulartz, M. Korthals, M. Schermer & T. Swierstra (Eds.), *Pragmatist ethics for a technological culture* (pp. 41-68). Dordrecht [etc.]: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- Schermer, M., & Keulartz, J. (2003). Pragmatism as a research program - A reply to Arras. *Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics*, 24(1), 19-29.
- Schiefloe, P. M., & Mauseth Vikland, K. (2005). Årsaksanalyse etter Snorre A hendelsen 28.11.2004. Stavanger: Statoil.
- Schmidt, S. K., & Werle, R. (1998). *Coordinating Technology. Studies in the International Standardization of Telecommunications*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Schön, D. A. (1973). *Beyond the stable state*. New York: Norton.
- Schön, D. A. (1979). Generative metaphor: A perspective on problem-setting in social policy. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought* (pp. 254-284). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schön, D. A., & Rein, M. (1994). *Frame reflection: toward the resolution of intractable policy controversies*. New York: BasicBooks.
- Schulman, P., Roe, E., Eeten, M. v., & Bruijne, M. d. (2004). High Reliability and the Management of Critical Infrastructures. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 12(1).
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1942). *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Scoones, I. (1998). *Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: a framework for analysis*.
- Scoones, I. (2006). *Science, Agriculture and the Politics of Policy: The Case of Biotechnology in India*. New Delhi: Orient Longman.
- Scott, J. C. (1998). *Seeing like a state: how certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Sen, A. (1981). *Poverty and famines: an essay on entitlement and deprivation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Seib, G (2008) In Crisis, Opportunity for Obama, *Wall Street Journal*, Friday 21<sup>st</sup> November. Available (11/12) at: <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122721278056345271.html>
- Seshadri, C. V., & Balaji, V. (1988). Equity is Good Science. *Proceedings of Indian National Science Academy*, 54(1), 1-11.
- Seshia, S., & Scoones, I. (2003). *Tracing policy connections: the politics of knowledge in the Green Revolution and biotechnology eras in India*: Institute for Development Studies.
- Seyfang, G., & Smith, A. (2007). Grassroots innovations for sustainable development: Towards a new research and policy agenda. *Environmental Politics*, 16(4), 584-603.
- Shah, E. (2003). *Social Designs: Tank Irrigation Technology and Agrarian Transformation in Karnataka, South India*. Hyderabad: Orient Longman.
- Shah, E. (2005). Local and Global Elites Join Hands: Development and Diffusion of Bt Cotton Technology in Gujarat. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 40, 4629-4639.
- Shah, E. (2008). What Makes Crop Biotechnology Find its Roots? The Technological Culture of Bt Cotton in Gujarat. *European Journal of Development Research*, 20(3), 432-447.
- Shaini, K. S. (2006). Bhopal activist dies with broken dreams.
- Shambu Prasad, C. (1999). Suicide Deaths and Quality of Indian Cotton: Perspectives from History of Technology and Khadi Movement. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 34, 12-21.
- Shambu Prasad, C. (2001). Towards an Understanding of Gandhian Science. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 36(39), 3721-3732.

- Shambu Prasad, C. (2005). Science and Technology in Civil Society: The Innovation Trajectory of Spirulina Algal Technology. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 4363-4372.
- Shambu Prasad, C. (2006). *SRI in India: Innovation history and institutional challenges*. Patancheru: WWF-International-ICRISAT dialogue project and Xavier Institute of Management, Bhubaneswar.
- Shambu Prasad, C. (2008). Knowledge, Democracy and Science Policy: The Missing Dialogue in Globalised India. *Journal of Governance and Public Policy (ICFAI Press)*, 3(2-3), 87-102.
- Shambu Prasad, C. (2009). *Conversations on Knowledge and Democracy: Fables from SRI*.
- Shambu Prasad, C. (2009). Encounters, dialogues and learning alliances: The System of Rice Intensification in India. In I. Scoones & J. Thompson (Eds.), *Farmers First Revisited: Innovation for Agricultural Research and Development*. London: Earthscan.
- Shambu Prasad, C., Basu, P., & Hall, A. (2005). *Assessing System of Rice Intensification as a Process: Evidence from India*.
- Sharma, D. (2005a). Bhagwati, globalization and hunger. *Dissident Voice*.
- Sharma, D. (2005b). No pesticides, no Bt cotton, no pests. *India Together*.
- Sheehy, J. E., Peng, S., Dobermann, A., Mitchell, P. L., Ferrer, A., Yang, J. C., et al. (2004). Fantastic yields in the system of rice intensification: fact or fallacy? *Field Crops Research*, 88(1), 1-8.
- Shetty, P. K. (2004). Socio-ecological implications of pesticide use in India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 39(49).
- Shiva, V. (1988). *Staying alive: women, ecology, and development*. London: Zed Books.
- Shklar, J. N. (1990). *The faces of injustice*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Shorrocks, S., Young, M., & Faulkner, J. (2005). Who moved my (Swiss) cheese? *Aircraft and Aerospace*, January/February, 31-33.
- Shove, E., & Walker, G. (2007). CAUTION! Transitions ahead: politics, practice, and sustainable transition management. *Environment and Planning A*, 39(4), 763-770.
- Shweder, R. A. (2001). Culture: contemporary views. In S. N. J. & B. P. B. (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of the social and behavioral sciences* (Vol. 5, pp. 3151-3158). Oxford (etc.): Elsevier Science Ltd.
- Signaleringscommissie Kanker van KWF Kankerbestrijding. (2004). *Vroege opsporing van dikkedarmkanker. Minder sterfte door bevolkingsonderzoek: [Dutch Cancer Society. "Early tracing of colorectal cancer. Less mortality because of population screening"]* KWF Kankerbestrijding.
- Simpson, J., & Weiner, E. (Eds.). (1989) (Second ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sims, B. (2007). 'The Day After the Hurricane'. Infrastructure, Order, and the New Orleans Police Department's Response to Hurricane Katrina. *Social studies of science*, 37(1), 111-118.
- Sinclair, T. R., & Cassman, K. G. (2004). Agronomic UFOs. *Field Crops Research*, 88(1), 9-10.
- Singh, R. B. (2000). Environmental consequences of agricultural development: a case study from the Green Revolution state of Haryana, India. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 82(1), 97-103.

- Singh, S. (2004). Crisis and Diversification in Punjab Agriculture: Role of State and Agri-Business. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 34, 5583-5590.
- Sinha, I. (2007). *Animal's people*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Skolbekken, J. A. (1995). THE RISK EPIDEMIC IN MEDICAL JOURNALS. *Social Science & Medicine*, 40(3), 291-305.
- Slovic, P. (1998). Perception of risk. In R. Lofstedt & L. Frewer (Eds.), *The earthscan reader in Risk and modern society* (pp. pp. 31-43). London: Earthscan.
- Slovic, P. (Ed.). (2000). *The perception of risk*. London; Sterling, VA: Earthscan Publications.
- Smetacek, R. (March 17, 2005). Monsanto clarifies in GM crops. *The Hindu*. Retrieved from <http://www.hindu.com/2005/03/17/stories/2005031701790900.htm>
- Smith, A. (2007). Translating sustainabilities between green niches and socio-technical regimes. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 19(4), 427-450.
- Smith, A., & Stirling, A. (2007). Moving Outside or Inside? Objectification and Reflexivity in the Governance of Socio-Technical Systems. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, 9(3), 351-373.
- Smith, A., & Stirling, A. (2008). *Social-Ecological Resilience and Socio-Technical Transitions: Critical Issues for Sustainability Governance*.
- Smith, A., & Stirling, A. (2010). The Politics of Social-ecological Resilience and Sustainable Socio-technical Transitions. *Ecology and Society*, 15(1).
- Smith, A., Stirling, A., & Berkhout, F. (2005). The governance of sustainable socio-technical transitions. *Research Policy*, 34(10), 1491-1510.
- Smith, M. R., & Marx, L. (Eds.). (1994). *Does technology drive history? The dilemma of technological determinism*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Snook, S. A. (2000). *Friendly Fire. The Accidental Shootdown of U.S. Black Hawks over Northern Iraq*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Soneryd, L. (2007). Deliberations on the unknown the unsensed and the unsayable? Public protests and the development of third-generation mobile phones in Sweden. *Science Technology & Human Values*, 32(3), 287-314.
- Soussan, J., & Blaiki, P. (2001). Understanding Livelihood Processes and Dynamics, Livelihood-Policy Relationships in South Asia.
- Soyinka, W. (1999). *The burden of memory, the muse of forgiveness*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Spiers, J. (2000). New perspectives on vulnerability using emic and etic approaches. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 31(3), 715-721.
- Sridhar, V. (2006). Why Do Farmers Commit Suicide? The Case of Andhra Pradesh. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 41, 1559-1565.
- Star, S. L. (1991). Power, Technology and the Phenomenology of Conventions: On Being Allergic to Onions. In J. Law (Ed.), *A Sociology of Monsters. Essays on Power, Technology and Domination* (pp. 26-57). London/New York: Routledge.
- Star, S. L., & Griesemer, J. R. (1989). INSTITUTIONAL ECOLOGY, TRANSLATIONS AND BOUNDARY OBJECTS - AMATEURS AND PROFESSIONALS IN BERKELEYS-MUSEUM-OF-VERTEBRATE-ZOOLOGY, 1907-1939. *Social studies of science*, 19(3), 387-420.
- Starbuck, W. H., & Farjoun, M. (Eds.). (2005). *Organziation at the limit. Lessons from the Columbia Disaster*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Starbuck, W. H., & Milliken, F. J. (1988). Challenger: Fine-tuning the odds until something breaks. *Journal of Management Studies*, 25(4), 319-340.
- Steele, J. (2004). *Risks and legal theory*. Oxford and Portland: Hart.
- Steffen, V. (1997). Life stories and shared experience. *Social Science & Medicine*, 45(1), 99-111.
- Stirling, A. (1997) Multicriteria Mapping: mitigating the problems of environmental valuation?, chapter in J. Foster (ed), *Valuing Nature: economics, ethics and environment*, Routledge, London
- Stirling, A. (1998). On the Economics and Analysis of Diversity. SPRU Electronic Working Paper 28. University of Sussex.
- Stirling, A. (2006). Uncertainty, Precaution And Sustainability: towards more reflective governance of technology. In J.-P. Voss, D. Bauknecht & R. Kemp (Eds.), *Sustainability and Reflexive Governance* (pp. 225-272). London: Edward Elgar.
- Stirling, A. (2007a). A general framework for analysing diversity in science, technology and society. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, 4(15), 707-719.
- Stirling, A. (2007b). Framing Complexity and Resilience: towards more reflexive socio-ecologies of sustainability, keynote paper to conference of the European Society for Ecological Economics on 'Integrating Natural and Social Sciences for Sustainability', Leipzig, 8 June 2007.
- Stirling, A. (2008a). 'Opening up' and 'Closing down': Power, participation, and pluralism in the social appraisal of technology. *Science Technology & Human Values*, 33(2), 262-294.
- Stirling, A. (2008b). Science, precaution, and the politics of technological risk: Converging implications in evolutionary and social scientific perspectives. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1128, 95-110.
- Stirling, A. (2008c). Strategies to Address Intractability in Governance for Sustainability, paper presented to *Resilience 2008*, conference of Resilience Alliance, Stockholm
- Stirling, A. (2009). *Direction, Distribution and Diversity! Pluralising Progress in Innovation, Sustainability and Development*.
- Stirling, A. (2010a). From Enlightenment to Enablement: Opening Up Choices for Innovation. In A. Lopez-Claros (Ed.), *The Innovation for Development Report* (pp. 199-210). Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Stirling, A. (2010b). Keep it Complex. *Nature*(468), 1029-1031.
- Stirling, A. (2010). Multicriteria diversity analysis: A novel heuristic framework for appraising energy portfolios. *Energy Policy*, 38(4), 1622-1634.
- Stirling, A. (2011). Pluralising Progress: From integrative transitions to transformative diversity. *Journal of Environmental Innovation & Societal Transitions*, 1, 82-88.
- Stirling, A., Geels, F., Scrase, I., Smith, A., & Van Zwanenberg, P. (2009). *Transformative Innovation: A report to the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, SPRU*. Science and Technology Policy Research, University of Sussex, Brighton.
- Stirling, A., & Scoones, I. (2009). From Risk Assessment to Knowledge Mapping: Science, Precaution, and Participation in Disease Ecology. *Ecology and Society*, 14(2).



- Stone, G. D. (2002). Both sides now: Fallacies in the genetic-modification wars, implications for developing countries, and anthropological perspectives. *Current Anthropology*, 43(4), 611-630.
- Stone, G. D. (2007). Agricultural deskilling and the spread of genetically modified cotton in warangal. *Current Anthropology*, 48(1), 67-103.
- Subramaniam, C. (1979). *The new strategy in Indian agriculture: the first decade and after*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing house.
- Summerton, J., & Berner, B. (Eds.). (2003). *Constructing Risk and Safety in Technological Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Sunstein, C. R. (2003). *Why societies need dissent*. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press.
- Sunstein, C. R. (2005). *Laws of fear: beyond the precautionary principle*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Suri, K. C. (2006). The Political Economy of Agrarian Distress. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 41, 1523-1529.
- Tarter, R. E., & Vanyukov, M. (1999). Re-visiting the Validity of the Construct of Resilience. In M. D. Glantz & J. L. Johnson (Eds.), *Resilience and Development. Positive Life adaptations* (pp. 85-100). New York: Kluwer Academic / Pleinum Publishers.
- Tata Institute of Social Sciences. (2005). *Causes of Farmer Suicides in Maharashtra: An Enquiry: Final Report Submitted to the Mumbai High Court*.
- Tenner, E. (1996). *Why things bite back: technology and the revenge of unintended consequences*. New York: Knopf.
- Thakur, A. K. (2010). Critiquing SRI Criticism: Beyond skepticism with empiricism. *Current Science*, 98, 1294-1299.
- The World Summit for Social Development. (2009). *Report of the World Summit for Development*. United Nations. Copenhagen 6- 12, March.
- Thomasgard, M. (1998). Parental perceptions of child vulnerability, overprotection, and parental psychological characteristics. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*, 28(4), 223-240.
- Thrift, N. (2000a). Afterwords. *Environment and Planning D-Society & Space*, 18(2), 213-255.
- Thrift, N. (2000b). Still Life in Nearly Present Time: The Object of Nature. *Body and Society*, 6(3-4), 34-57.
- Timmermans, S., & Berg, M. (1997). Standardization in Action: Achieving Local Universality through Medical Protocols. *Social studies of science*, 27(2), 273-305.
- Traweek, S. (1988). *Beamtimes and lifetimes: the world of high energy physicists*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Turner, B. (1994). The Future of Risk Research. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 2(3), 146-156.
- Turner, B. A. (1978). *Man-made disasters*. London and New York: Wykeham Publications.
- Turner, B. A., & Pidgeon, N. F. (1997). *Man-made disasters* (2nd ed.). Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Turner, B. L., Kasperson, R. E., Matson, P. A., McCarthy, J. J., Corell, R. W., Christensen, L., et al. (2003). A framework for vulnerability analysis in sustainability science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 100(14), 8074-8079.

- Twigg, J. (1998). Understanding Vulnerability - an Introduction. In J. Twigg & M. Bhatt, R. (Eds.), *Understanding Vulnerability. South Asian Perspectives* (pp. 1-11). London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Uberoi, J. P. S. (1978). *Science and culture*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Union Carbide Corporation. (2010). History, <http://www.unioncarbide.com/history/index.htm>, .
- United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) (1992) Final Declaration of the UN Conference on Environment and Development, Rio de Janeiro
- United Nations Division for Sustainable Development. (2002). *Indicators of Sustainable Development: guidelines and methodologies*. United Nations Division for Sustainable Development, New York.
- United Nations General Assembly. (2000). *Millennium Development Declaration*. Resolution A/RES/55/2. Available at: <http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.pdf>.
- United Nations Secretary-General's High-level Panel on Global Sustainability (2012). *Resilient People, Resilient Planet: A future worth choosing*. New York: United Nations.
- Unkown. (1985). *Bhopal, industrial genocide? A unique compilation of documents from Indian publications*. Hong Kong: ARENA Press.
- Uphoff, N. (1999). Agroecological implications of the System of Rice Intensification (SRI) in Madagascar. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*(1), 297-331.
- Uphoff, N. (2002). System of Rice Intensification (SRI) for enhancing the productivity of land, labour and water. *Journal of Agricultural Research and Management*(1), 43-49.
- Uphoff, N. (2007). Agroecological Alternatives: Capitalizing on Existing Genetic Potentials. *Journal of Development Studies*(43), 218-236.
- Uphoff, N., Anas, I., Rupela, O., Thakur, A. K., & Thiyagarajan. (2009). Learning about positive plant-microbial interactions from the System of Rice Intensification (SRI). *Aspects of Applied Biology*, 98.
- Uphoff, N., & Kassam, A. (2008). *Agricultural Technologies for Developing Countries. Annex 3: Case Study The system of rice intensification*: European Parliament's Science and Technology Options Assessment.
- Vaidyanathan, A. (2006). Farmers' Suicides and the Agrarian Crisis. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 41, 4009-4013.
- Vale, L., & Campanella, T. (Eds.). (2005). *The Resilient City. How Modern Cities Recover from Disaster*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- van Asselt, M. B. A. (2000). *Perspectives on uncertainty and risk: the PRIMA approach to decision support*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- van Asselt, M. B. A. (2004). Onzekere risico's en riskante onzekerheden. In G. v. Calster & E. Vos (Eds.), *Risico en voorzorg in de rechtsmaatschappij*. IUS commune seminarreeks "Europaeum": Maastricht.
- van Asselt, M. B. A., & Petersen, A. (Eds.). (2003). *Niet bang voor onzekerheid*. Utrecht: Lemma.
- van Asselt, M. B. A., & Vos, E. (2006). The precautionary principle and the uncertainty paradox. *Journal of Risk Research*, 9(4), 313-336.
- van Eijndhoven, J. (1994). Disaster Prevention in Europe. In S. Jasanoff (Ed.), *Learning from Disaster: Risk Management after Bhopal* (pp. 113-132). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Van Waarden, F. (1998). *European Harmonization of National Regulatory Styles?*
- Varma, R., & Varma, D. R. (2005). The Bhopal Disaster of 1984. *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society*, 25(1), 37-45.
- Vasavi, A. R. (1996). The 'Millet Drought': Oral Narratives and the Cultural Grounding of Famine-Relief in Bijapur. *South Indian Studies*, 2, 205-233.
- Vasavi, A. R. (1999). Agrarian Distress in Bidar: Market, State and Suicides. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 34, 2263-2268.
- Vasavi, A. R. (2008). *Suicides and the Making of India's Agrarian Crisis*. Bangalore: National Institute of Advanced Studies.
- Vaughan, D. (1996). *The Challenger Launch Decision. Risky Technology, Culture and Deviance at NASA*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Vayda, A. P., & McKay, B. J. (1975). New directions in Ecology and Ecological Anthropology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 4, 293-306.
- Venkateshwarlu, D., & Srinivas, K. D. (2000). *Deep Well. Status of small and marginal farmers in Warangal district: A Study jointly commissioned by CARE AP, MARI, ICNGO Programme AP*.
- Ventegodt, S., Andersen, N. J., & Merrick, J. (2003). Quality of life philosophy V. Seizing the meaning of life and becoming well again. *ScientificWorldJournal*, 3, 1210-1229.
- Verhoeven, I. (2006). Alledaags politiek burgerschap en de overheid. In P. L. Meurs, E. K. Schrijvers & G. H. D. Vries (Eds.), *Leren van de praktijk. Gebruik van lokale kennis en ervaring voor beleid*, (pp. 119-143). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Versluis, E. (2003). *Enforcement matters. Enforcement and compliance of European directives in four member states*. Delft: Eburon.
- Visvanathan, S. (1985). *Organizing for science: the making of an industrial research laboratory*. Delhi and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Visvanathan, S. (1998). A Celebration of Difference: Science and Democracy in India. *Science*, 280(5360), 42-43.
- Visvanathan, S. (2002). The laboratory and the world: Conversations with CV Seshadri. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 37(22), 2163-2170.
- Visvanathan, S. (2003). *From the Green Revolution to the Evergreen Revolution: Studies in Discourse Analysis*.
- Visvanathan, S. (2005). Knowledge, Justice and Democracy. In M. Leach, I. Scoones & W. B. (Eds.), *Science and citizens: globalization and the challenge of engagement*. London: Zed.
- Visvanathan, S., & Parmar, C. (2002). A biotechnology story. Notes from India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 2714-2724.
- Volksgezondheid Toekomst Verkenning. (2005). *Nationaal Kompas Volksgezondheid*. [National institute for Public Health and the Environment] Bilthoven, december 15.
- Voss, J.-P., Bauknecht, D., & Kemp, R. (2006). *Reflexive governance for sustainable development*. Cheltenham and Northampton: Edward Elgar.
- Wackers, G. (2004). *Resonating Cultures. Engineering Optimization in the Design and Failure of the (1991) Loss of the Sleipner A GBS*. Research Report no. 32/2004. Oslo: Unipub Forlag.
- Wackers, G. (2006). *Vulnerability and robustness in a complex technological system: Loss of control and recovery in the 2004 Snorre A gas blow-out*. Oslo: Unipub Forlag.

- Wackers, G. (2009). Offshore Vulnerability: The Limits of Design and the Ubiquity of the Recursive Process. In C. Owen, G. Wackers & P. Béguin (Eds.), *Risky Work Environments. Reappraising Human Work with-in Complex Technological Systems* (pp. 81-98). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Wackers, G., & Coeckelbergh, M. (2008). Vulnerability and imagination in the Snorre A gas blowout and recovery. *World Oil*, 229(1), 33-41.
- Wackers, G., & Kørte, J. (2003). Drift and Vulnerability in a Complex Technical System: Reliability of Condition Monitoring Systems in North Sea Offshore Helicopter Transport. *International Journal of Engineering Education*, 19(1), 192-205.
- Walker, G., & Shove, E. (2007). Ambivalence, Sustainability and the Governance of Socio-Technical Transitions. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, 9(3), 213-225.
- Wallach, B. (1996). *Losing Asia: modernization and the culture of development*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Wallmann, S. (1984). *Eight London households*. London: Routledge.
- Walters, C. J. (1986). *Adaptive management of renewable resources*. New York and London: Macmillan.
- Waring, J. J. (2005). Beyond blame: cultural barriers to medical incident reporting. *Social Science & Medicine*, 60(9), 1927-1935.
- Watts, J. R., Mackay, D., Horton, A., Hall, B., Douthwaite, R., Chambers, et al. (2007). Institutional Learning and Change: An introduction. *ILAC Working Paper 3. Institutional Learning and Change Initiative, Rome*.
- Weick, K. E. (1990). The Vulnerable System: An Analysis of the Tenerife Air Disaster. *Journal of Management*, 16(3), 571-593.
- Weick, K. E. (1993). The collapse of sense making in organizations: The Mann Gulch disaster. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38(4), 628-652.
- Weick, K. E., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2001). *Managing the Unexpected. Assuring high performance in an age of complexity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Westrum, R. (1991). Cultures with requisite imagination. In J. Wise, P. Stager & J. Hopkin (Eds.), *Verification and validation in complex man-machine systems*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid (WRR). (2008). *Onzekere veiligheid. Verantwoordelijkheden rond fysieke veiligheid* (No. 82). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid (WRR). (2009). *Uncertain Safety. Allocating Responsibilities for Safety*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Wetmore, J. M. (2007). Distributed risks and responsibilities: Flood hazard mitigation in New Orleans. *Social studies of science*, 37(1), 119-126.
- Whiteside, K. H. (2006). *Precautionary politics: principle and practice in confronting environmental risk*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wilson, J. M. G., & Jungner, G. (1968). *Principles and practice of screening for disease*. World Health Organisation, Geneva.
- Winner, L. (2004). Trust and Terror: The Vulnerability of Complex Socio-Technical Systems. *Science as Culture*, 13(2), 155-172.
- Wisner, B., Blaikie, P., Cannon, T., & Davis, I. (1994). *At risk: natural hazards, people's vulnerability, and disasters*. London and New York: Routledge.

- Woods, D. D., & Cook, R. I. (2006). Incidents of Resilience or Brittleness? In E. Hollnagel, D. D. Woods & N. Levison (Eds.), *Resilience Engineering. Concepts and Precepts* (pp. 69-76). Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.
- Woodward, K. (1999). Statistical Panic. *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies*, 11(2), 177-203.
- World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our Common Future*: Oxford University Press.
- Wynne, B. (1989). Building public concern into risk assessment. In J. Brown (Ed.), *Environmental Threats: Perception, Analysis and Management*. London and New York: Belhaven Press.
- Wynne, B. (1995). Technology assessment and reflexive social learning: observations from the risk field. In A. Rip, T. Misa & J. Schot (Eds.), *Managing technology in society* (pp. 19-36). London and New York: Pinter.
- Wynne, B. (1996). May the Sheep Safely Graze? A Reflexive View of the Expert-Lay Knowledge Divide. In S. Lash, B. Szerszynski & B. Wynne (Eds.), *Risk, Environment and Modernity - Towards a New Ecology*. London: Sage.
- Wynne, B. (2002). Risk and Environment as Legitimatory Discourses of Technology: Reflexivity Inside Out? *Current Sociology*, 50(3), 459-477.
- Xenos, N. (1987). Liberalism and the Postulate of Scarcity. *Political Theory*, 15, 225-243.
- Yamaguchi, T., & Harris, C. K. (2004). The economic hegemonization of Bt cotton discourse in India. *Discourse & Society*, 15(4), 467-491.
- Yergin, D. (1991). *The Prize. The Epic Quest for Oil, Money and Power*. London: Simon & Schuster Ltd.
- Young, M. S., Shorrock, S. T., & Faulkner, J. P. E. (2005). Taste Preferences of Transport Safety Investigators: Who doesn't like Swiss cheese? In P. D. Bust & P. T. McCasbe (Eds.), *Contemporary Ergonomics*. London: Taylor and Francis.