

**ID: 44**

Keywords: testing, biomedicine, governance, ethics

### **Towards Social Studies of (Biomedical) Testing?**

**Erik Aarden<sup>1</sup>, Mara Köhler<sup>2</sup>, Victoria Meklin<sup>3</sup>, Ingrid Metzler<sup>4</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Universität Klagenfurt; <sup>2</sup>Karl Landsteiner University of Health Sciences, Austria; <sup>3</sup>Universität Klagenfurt; <sup>4</sup>Karl Landsteiner University of Health Sciences, Austria

**This panel seeks to engage scholars in a conversation on the topic of testing within biomedicine. We welcome contributions that explore the development, uses, regulation, and governance of various biomedical tests across clinical, public health, and recreational contexts.**

Over the past three decades, scholars in Science and Technology Studies (STS) and related fields, such as Medical Sociology, Medical Anthropology, Health Policy Analysis, and Bioethics, have engaged with the phenomenon of “testing in bio-medicine.” Much of this work has focused on specific types of tests or their uses in distinct settings. For instance, beginning in the late 1980s, scholars have studied genetic testing as it was envisioned, developed, and used in clinical, public health, or recreational practices, or compared the moralities of the regulatory frameworks sustaining and limiting its uses. Simultaneously, scholars contributing to a sociology of diagnosis have investigated how testing in clinical practices is involved in “making up people” (Hacking, 2002). More recently, research has addressed the development, use, and regulations of testing in emerging fields such as translational medicine and precision medicine, paying special attention to the political economies of testing and the authorities involved in their governance. Last but not least, emerging bodies of scholarship have explored the role of testing as a governing tool in global health initiatives and pandemic management, particularly in response to COVID-19.

In this panel, we aim to use testing as a boundary object to open up a conversation between these different areas of research. Building on work performed under the label of the “anthropology of medical testing” (Street and Kelly, 2021) and the “sociology of diagnosis and screening”(Petersen and Pienaar, 2021), we propose the label of “social studies of (biomedical) testing” or “biomedical testing studies” to encourage interdisciplinary engagements.

**We invite both empirical and theoretical contributions that engage with the envisioning, development, use, evaluation, and regulations of testing across diverse biomedical domains.** These may include, but are not limited to: testing practices in clinical, public health or social service settings; DIY-testing; and economic, legal, moral, and political dimensions of testing as well as the absences or non-use of tests.

#### **References:**

Hacking I (2002) *Historical Ontology*. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press.

Petersen A and Pienaar K (2021) Testing for Life? Regimes of Governance in Diagnosis and Screening. *Science, Technology and Society* 26(1). SAGE Publications India: 7–23.

Street A and Kelly AH (2021) Introduction: Diagnostics, Medical Testing, and Value in Medical Anthropology. *Medicine Anthropology Theory* 8(2). 2: 1–16.