



## The Proof of the Pudding

Interactive workshop at the ITD conference, 6 November 2024

Anke de Vrieze, Centre for Unusual Collaborations (CUCo) – [anke.devrieze@wur.nl](mailto:anke.devrieze@wur.nl)

Annemarie Horn, Liberal Arts and Sciences, Utrecht University – [a.horn@uu.nl](mailto:a.horn@uu.nl)

*Why this workshop?* – in this workshop we use the metaphor of cooking in order to stimulate reflections about integration in inter- and transdisciplinary (ITD) research. We also aim to further explore the usefulness (and limitations!) of this metaphor, and provide exercises that participants can also take home to their own ITD practices to spark reflections on integration.

### Cooking as metaphor for integration

Through a process of transformation(s), distinct inputs (ingredients) are combined into a new whole (dish) which has new properties (emergence).

Although recipes can be useful to create tasty dishes, the generalized skill of cooking goes beyond following a recipe. It requires expertise and competencies, and a universal blueprint cannot be provided.

## EXPLORATION

### Step 1: The ingredients

Explore the ingredients:

- How does it smell?
- What does it look like?
- What do you think or know it tastes like?
- What is its texture like?
- What do you think or know happens with it when you heat it?
- Where and how does it grow?
- In which cuisines is it usually used?
- What other flavours does it go well with?
- What other ingredients is it often combined with?
- What actions can you do with it?



*Tip: Do you want to take conversations about inputs of integration to the context of your own ITD research, without having to go by the supermarket first? We suggest a reflection exercise about diversity represented in the project or team based on coloured building blocks. How do different team members visualize the team or project in terms of different colours, shape, positions, constellations? What does that mean for teams composition (design stage) or collaboration (execution stage)?*

### Step 2: Combining ingredients into a dish

1. Find 2-3 other ingredients (and their owners). In looking for other ingredients, think of what properties go well together or are often combined, but also think of “unusual suspects”
2. Make a list of possible dishes you could make with those ingredients. You may start out with the more obvious candidates, but also think out of the box.



Reflection: how did you come up with those dishes?

- What qualities of the ingredients did you take into account?
- What ingredients or properties did you start out from?
- Were you thing of the end goal/product?
- What criteria did you weigh in? (e.g. beauty, taste, nutrition)



CHALLENGING  
FUTURE  
GENERATIONS

## TRANSLATION

### Step 3: What is the equivalent of the ingredients in ITD integration?

Reflect & write on the table cloth:

- *What are or could be the inputs of the integration process in your own ITD context?*
- *What feeds into the integration process in your own ITD experiences?*
- *Between which components do you create new relationships?*
- *Which components go through a transformation?*

What others say about this...

Possible “inputs” of knowledge integration according to the review by O’Rourke et al. (2016):

- Concepts
- Methods
- Data
- Models
- Theories
- Fields
- Disciplines

> Ranging from integrating whole fields, leading to new “interdisciplines”, to the integration of individual insights or concepts

O’Rourke, M., Crowley, S., & Gonnerman, C. (2016). On the nature of Cross-disciplinary integration: a philosophical framework. *Studies in history and philosophy of science part C: studies in history and philosophy of biological and biomedical sciences*, 56, 62-70.

### Step 4: What is the equivalent of the cook in ITD integration?

Reflect & write on the table cloth:

- *Who engages in the process of transformation of the inputs into a more integrated whole?*
- *Who is responsible for the integration process?*
- *To what extent is the responsibility for integration explicitly assigned?*

Ways of thinking about this based on theory:

1. Responsibility for integration: A spectrum from appointing an “integration expert” (Hoffmann et al., 2022) to equal shared responsibility of all collaborators >> something to explicitly weigh along in ITD research design
2. Integration as a one-directional or bidirectional process (Pohl et al., 2021)
3. Integration between two or more individuals, or among the whole team? (Pohl et al., 2021)

Hoffmann, S., Deutsch, L., Klein, J. T., & O’Rourke, M. (2022). Integrate the integrators! A call for establishing academic careers for integration experts. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 9(1), 1-10.

Pohl, C., Klein, J. T., Hoffmann, S., Mitchell, C., & Fam, D. (2021). Conceptualising transdisciplinary integration as a multidimensional interactive process. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 118, 18-26.

## HARVEST

### Step 5: Cooking as metaphor for integration

But a metaphor always highlights some and masks other aspects of a phenomenon... (Lakoff & Johnson, 2008)

Therefore, write on post-it’s the answers to the following questions:

- How does the metaphor of cooking resonate with you, what does it bring? (highlight)
- What about ITD integration is being masked by the use of the cooking metaphor? (mask)
- What alternative metaphors for integration do you find useful? (possibly: ones that highlight the things that the cooking metaphor masks)

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2008). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago press.

### Take home messages

- > Cooking and learning to cook can provide a framing to think of integration in ITD
- > Other metaphors may highlight other aspects of integration and provide meaningful lenses to look at ITD integration
- > Reflection on the ingredients and process of cooking may support integration in design and execution stages of ITD