

Usership and the Mutable Mobile

inclusive objects in the ruru huis

“That boy is your company. And if he wants to eat up that tablecloth, you let him, you hear?”

- Harper Lee, *To Kill a Mockingbird*

In the spring of 2016 I conducted a research in the ruru huis for my MA degree Arts, Culture and Society at the Erasmus University Rotterdam. My aim was to explore the role of objects and materials in an art practice that is not specifically centred around the production of ‘autonomous’ art objects. The ruru huis in Arnhem proved to be a very interesting case study. Instead of being an exhibition space involving art objects and spectators, it proved to be a ‘user-space’. It did not centre around programmed events, but instead its doors were open for everybody three to four days a week.

The goal of ruru huis was to create a living room accessible for everybody and to facilitate the emergence of networks between all possible stakeholders, be it neighbours, artists, students or local entrepreneurs. There was no fixed or preconceived idea what these networks were or how they could be meaningful for either the expo SONSBEK ‘16: transACTION or the participants. Through instant (improvised) programming in the space, the organisers presumed that content would be generated in a horizontal way. They chose to provide an ‘empty’ space as explicit strategy, so that issues or topics that concern people in the direct neighbourhood could materialise into projects or programs. Of course, this did not mean that the space was empty like a white cube. On the contrary, it was full of objects that all played their part in establishing the ruru huis as a meeting place. These – often inconspicuous – objects were the main actors in my research.

Keywords: Objects - Usership – Hospitality – Ambiguity – Mutability – Mobility – Inclusiveness

Introduction

The Jakarta-based artist collective ruangrupa is strongly rooted in Indonesian culture where community, collectivity and friendship are central concepts. Since its foundation in 2000, they use the context of social gatherings to increase sharing information and create another meaning of social and economic transaction. They combine an artistic practice with communal understandings of culture, society, politics and everyday life¹.

The *ruru huis* is a good example of a curatorial/art practice that not only allows people to participate, but actually encourages them to be *(prod)users*². The space serves as a meeting point for anyone who wants to initiate or engage in activities that are topical and relevant for – in this case - the citizens/users of Arnhem. This approach arguably positions them in the field of a social art practice, an umbrella term that explicitly evolves around audience participation and collaboration. Instead of producing art objects, they produce relationships between different social actors. Some discussions on the definition

¹ See N. Juliastuti (2012) and r. vanhoe (2016).

² See Bruns (2007) & S. Wright (2012)

of this practice can be found with Claire Bishop, Grant Kester and Maria Lind³ (the latter being one of the shortlisted curators of Sonsbeek '16). In a social art practice, the production of relationships has become *as important* as the production of an autonomous art object. Does that mean it is an immaterial practice? On the contrary. As a scenographer I have always been intrigued by the material and spatial consequences this shift entails. That is why I was curious to explore what possible other objects are taking the place of the autonomous art object in the process of meaning making.

Objects can facilitate, instigate, inspire or obstruct dialogue. Thus, when dialogue is a core activity, it makes sense to investigate objects as one of the actors in that dialogue. By analysing how objects are used and perceived, I tried to find out when and how they become actants in an art practice that does not centre around autonomous artworks. I found that in the *ruru huis* non-art objects and materials constitute the interface through which communication and artistic interaction is performed. As opposed to the *exclusive* immutability of an autonomous art object, their mutable qualities made them important hosts in the constitution of an *inclusive* space. Before showing you how I arrived at this inclusive conclusion, I first need to explain a few concepts that lie at the base of my research, namely *usership* and the *mutable mobility* of an object.

Collaborative practices: from participation to (prod)usership

Art theorist Stephen Wright argues that recently people have started to approach art in a different way than the classic position of spectator or even participant. Because of the opportunities created by the user generated content of the 2.0 culture many have become *users*. Usership, as Wright describes in his essay "Toward a Lexicon of Usership"⁴, is neither revolutionary or submissive, but rather practical, direct and self-regulating. To illustrate the dynamics of usership, he refers to Wittgenstein's user-based theory of meaning from *Philosophical Investigations*:

Wittgenstein argues that in language, all the meaning that there is, and all the stability, is determined by the users of that language, and by nothing else. [...] It changes, but no one user can effect change; we are, at best, co-authors in the language game of usership (p. 67).

Concepts such as usership, mediation and co-production are very much related to how the *ruru huis* functions: as a place to be used by people of Arnhem on their own terms. The concept of usership - allowing for production without having preconceived ideas about possible outcomes - seems strongly connected to the notion of *nongkrong*. In this very Indonesian tradition people sit together in a social setting and chit-chat about topics that naturally emerge. They exchange stories in an informal way, and conversely build a network of shared meanings and mutual understanding. Because nobody has a stronger voice in steering the conversations in a certain direction, pressing topics or focus points that concern all emerge naturally from the conversations. These can then become real projects, or, if nobody jumps into action, they either remain latent possibilities for future action. This is an ongoing process.

In a similar way the *ruru huis* is constructed around the idea of *facilitating* collective action and usership by making the space inclusive. In my view this aim for inclusion is very much related to the notion of hospitality: you receive people in your house (*huis*). And if hospitality is mainly established, mediated and experienced by means of material objects⁵, how can this materiality support and constitute usership?

³ Bishop, C. (2012). *Artificial hells: Participatory art and the politics of spectatorship*. Verso Books.

Kester, G. H. (2004). *Conversation pieces: Community and communication in modern art*. University of California Press.

Lind, M. (2009). Complications; On Collaboration, Agency and Contemporary Art. *Public New Communities*, 30, 53-73.

⁴ Wright, S. (2013). *Toward a lexicon of usership*. N. Aikens (Ed.). Van Abbemuseum.

⁵ Lynch, P., Germann Molz, J., McIntosh, A., Lugosi, P., & Lashley, C. (2011). Theorising hospitality. *Hospitality & Society*, 1(1), 3-24.

Inclusive objects: the mutable mobile

For a long time, the human component has been the main focus of sociologists in examining the production of art. Therefore, the sociology of art has been mainly occupied by studying how an artwork is constituted through human social interaction. Many scholars point towards the theory of belief as central to this approach⁶. In this theory of belief, which has been kept in place by theorists like Durkheim and Bourdieu, our values and feelings - even the most seemingly intimate like aesthetic taste and emotions – are assumed to be produced by institutions and collective mechanisms.

In the last decades however there has been an increasing interest within the social sciences for the importance of artefacts and material schemes. Many socio-material researchers question how material forces affect everyday life and explore how and when nonhumans (objects, materials) function as agents or social actors⁷. An important influence in this socio-material turn are the ideas behind the Actor-Network Theory (or: ANT). According to Bruno Latour, one of the proponents of this approach, it should not be perceived or applied as a theory, but rather as a *tool* to understand so-called ‘associations’ or ‘network configurations’ between human and non-human actors⁸. Indeed, the key element of actor-network theory is the ‘actor’. This actor can be an individual or group, but also an animal, object, (i.e., tools, shoes, furniture), text, symbol or even a mental concept (a feeling, memory, dream). In other words, an actor can be anything as long as it is recognised as influencing the action.

This does not mean that material actors are always the instigators of the action, but they might indeed “... authorise, allow, afford, encourage, permit, suggest, influence, block, render possible, forbid, and so on”⁹. Everybody knows the attraction of a microphone that is ‘on’, standing in a space. It almost summons you to act, to say something, to hear your own voice amplified. So although many sociologists such as Durkheim argue that ‘things’ have no motivating power, Latour disagrees. He argues that it is impossible to understand a network of collective interactions (collective as in all different types of actors working together) when you leave out some of the entities because they are non-human. If we want to understand social ties, we have to acknowledge the fact that the continuity of these ties almost never involves only human-to-human associations, and neither object-object connections, but that the action oscillates between both human and non-human actors and together they create a sustainable network over space and time.

Latour argues that if our ‘social’ world would consist solely of local, human interactions it would probably stay very ephemeral and chaotic, and we would not have the ability to create more durable relationships between groups or individuals. To illustrate this, he compares our social interactions to that of a very closely related species: the baboon. The research done by Shirley Strum in the 1970s is one of Latour’s sources of inspiration for ANT. In this research Strum shows how baboons construct their social life and reveals the incredible effort it takes to maintain an ever crumbling social structure without the use of objects. Precisely because they have ‘no thing’, they have to be ‘nice’ to each other as a social strategy: social skill and social reciprocity such as grooming appears vital to barter or leverage over other baboons. This fact makes the next step to understanding the role of objects more intelligible: objects and materials (things)¹⁰ are important actors in sustaining and making *durable* the structures that make up our society: this is the ‘network’ in ‘actor-network’.

⁶ See for instance Hennion, A., & Grenier, L. (2000). 16 Sociology of Art: New Stakes in a Post-Critical Time. *The international handbook of sociology*.

⁷ See for instance A. Appadurai (1988), B. Latour (2005) and J. Law and A. Mol (1995)

⁸ Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the Social - An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford University Press.

⁹ Latour, B. (2005) p. 72

¹⁰ In his text “On the discrepancy between objects and things: An ecological approach” F.D. Rubio (2015) actually makes an interesting distinction between objects and things.

In the creation of this network, *the immutable mobile* is an important concept. Actors (both human and non-human) can move between places while remaining the same in their material form. This immutability allows for relations to be performed in the same way in a variety of different locations. For instance, a table has a clear function that almost everybody knows and understands: it is an object to sit at or place things on. On the other hand, the table can allow for small adjustments. For instance, when it has been used for a long time it can be painted or the legs can be replaced. Despite these small changes it keeps its identity as a table. At the same time, it is mobile because it can travel from a factory to a shop to a home. It stays a table in all these different localities also. Therefore, a table is an immutable mobile.

Annemarie Mol and John Law explain there are two spatial systems required for an immutable mobile to exist: '[it] achieves its character by virtue of *participation in two spaces*: it participates in both *network* and *Euclidean space*'¹¹. Euclidian (or Cartesian) space is the three-dimensional space that is defined by coordinates and made visible by for instance maps and GPS. It is the space we cover with our body when we cross the street. The network space on the other hand is different and is not situated in physical space or time, but made of a specific web of relations and concepts. For instance, the sculpture by Louis Cordero in Sonsbeek '16 holds its identity as an artwork by an invisible network of art historical facts, curators, art critics, discourse, nationality, museums, paint and plastic. It is immutable as an artwork, because it is simultaneously held together both in a material way and through this web of relations.

Law and Mol further explore this concept by introducing the variation of the *mutable mobile*. This is where it becomes interesting for the *ruru huis*! They argue that an object is mutable, when it is changeable and can be altered over time. This mutable property makes it a 'fluid' object¹², an object without clear boundaries and therefore have the ability to simultaneously act in different networks. For example, in an empirical research done by De Laet and Mol in 2000, the Zimbabwe Bushpump is the lead actor in performing this fluidity¹³. They argue that the Pump is not only a mechanical object, but it is also a hydraulic system, an instrument installed by a community, a health agent and a nation-building device. It has all of these identities - and each comes with its own set of boundaries. Therefore, its success is not a binary matter. For instance: the Bushpump can be successful in providing water, but not in proving health (because the well is infected). Or it can give water to individuals, but fails to be an actor in connecting larger communities. In other words, the success or failure depends on valuation in different realms (political, ethical and aesthetic). The fluidity of the Bushpump has many similarities to an object from the practice of *ruangrupa* and can serve as another good example of a mutable mobile: The Gerobak Bioskop.

In 2015 *ruangrupa* initiated an open air cinema project in which they donated a mobile cinema cart to several communities in remote areas in Indonesia. This 'Gerobak Bioskop' provided the technical means and content to screen alternative media on critical issues. Furthermore, it encouraged and assisted villagers to produce their own video's related to local issues and screen them in a town gathering.

The screening device is collaboratively made by artists, designers and IT technicians in such a way that the community itself can finish the design according to their own local aesthetics. The Gerobak's will be donated to the community and regularly monitored to ensure regular screenings. A workshop is included so that the community can produce their own program¹⁴.

¹¹ Ibidem, p. 4

¹² The term 'fluid' was first used by Mol and Law in 'Regions, Networks, and Fluids: Anaemia and Social Topology' (1994). Also interesting in this context is Zygmunt Bauman (2000), *Liquid Modernity*.

¹³ De Laet, M., & Mol, A. (2000). The Zimbabwe bush pump mechanics of a fluid technology. *Social studies of science*.

¹⁴ Afisina, R. (2015). Gerobak Bioskop. Retrieved 3/4/2016, from <http://gerobakbioskop.org>

The Gerobak Bioskop is a mobile, critical space to watch film or video collectively in places that lack access to other than mainstream information. Ruangrupa did not use their own aesthetics to decorate the Gerobak, but left it bare in such a way that the locals could paint it themselves. I would argue that this makes the Gerobak – like the Bushpump - a great example of a mutable mobile that is fluid and an actor in multiple networks (political, ethical and aesthetic).



This is a Gerobak initiated by students of the Willem de Kooning Academy Rotterdam for ruru huis. This specific Gerobak was geared towards cooking and screening video's, but it also held a library inside.

Mutable mobiles are not just part of an 'event', or facilitating a 'nice' gratuitous experience. They harbour a deep engagement that is aimed at building collectively. The mutable mobile is not about entertainment or killing time, but it provokes engagement instead of being just a subservient object. They are essential elements in a constructive practice, but often they are not seen or accepted as such, because they are indeed not 'established' immutable mobiles in an art network. It seems that long as they are not acknowledged as important actors by the so-called 'authorised' gatekeepers, their powers remain limited.

My point is here that the concept of fluidity can be used as a tool to understand how objects and materials (and even people) can create inclusive usership. What if we allow ourselves to see objects and materials as mutable mobiles instead of making them immutable by putting them in a museum or gallery? Here I am referring to the tendency to exhibit the residues of a performance or action as installation, fixating them in an art network instead of maintaining their fluidity.

Furthermore, it seems that exactly this fluidity is pursued by many contemporary artists: to be able to move through different networks, mutating from artist to gardener, social worker or scientist, while keeping their position in the network as an artist. This is a delicate balance, because – as De Laet and Mol argue in their example of the Bushpump - if mutation happens too quick, fluidity disappears and the actor cannot keep its position in multiple networks. When the artist and mutable mobile ceases to exist in the art network, and the (social) art practice becomes something else: politics, welfare, or - god forbid! – hobby.

Constructing inclusive usership: fluid objects in the ruru huis

"It is better to live in a state of impermanence than in one of finality".

— Gaston Bachelard, *The Poetics of Space*

Now we have established that mutable mobiles have the ability to act in more than one network, let's go back to the objects in the ruru huis. In my aim to understand the role of objects in the ruru huis, I started with examining their function. I made 'families' of the objects according to purpose, or better: perceived purpose. The first family I distinguished were the **hospitable objects**. They are the objects that facilitate people's presence in a space (a door, table, window or chair). Usually the function of these objects is unambiguous and well-known. The second family of objects facilitate or even instigate action. They are the **operative objects** (a pen, paper, microphone or map). Often we know how to use them, but sometimes skill or knowledge is required. Finally, there are the **evidential objects** (a flyer, a drawing, or a video) which narrate stories of (past) activities. In order to 'read' or use these objects, people often need to be informed or initiated in some way. Below I will discuss these three object families more in detail. I chose to call them families because in discussing these three purposes it is important to stress that materials and objects (can) have multiple functions. What I want to argue here is that their agency lies in the way their function is perceived and how this function can be negotiated in order to be perceived as mutable and thus more inclusive. Understanding *how* objects and materials in the *ruru huis* were used, gave insight into how they were perceived by its patrons. Some objects have more intrinsic mutable qualities because of their material properties (clay is more malleable and more inclusive than marble), or their fixed perceived purpose (a chair is to sit on, not to write on). Playing with these presuppositions, the role of the artist lies in allowing the object mutability, and changing the network in which the object can be an actor.

1. Facilitating presence: hospitable objects (TABLE, WINDOW, VITRINE)

Some materials and objects can be seen as a necessity for collective presence. Think about floors, walls, doors and windows: they enable you to physically enter a space. Once inside, there are many other objects that allow you to stay a certain amount of time (tables and chairs, heating, food and drinks, toilet paper, etcetera). When functioning properly, they are rarely noticed as actors. This is probably the reason why - although playing a major part in the construction of a social space - these objects are seldom mentioned by art critics. Nobody ever addresses the fact that the toilet was clean and there were ample amounts of toilet paper available. Still, an uncomfortable chair, a dirty toilet or the absence of coffee can influence the course of a gathering. For instance, artist Juul Sadée would not start her meetings with the Moluccan community before she knew that everyone had helped themselves to coffee or tea, and maybe a cookie: "When we all have our biscuit and a cuppa, we can start" (Als we allemaal ons natje en droogje hebben, kunnen we beginnen).

Hospitable objects are what we might call 'secret agents'. Because of their often inconspicuous and mundane appearance. As long as these objects function as expected, they create a stable basis for interaction and consequently provide a platform for other materials and people to be actors. Their agency only becomes clear through absence or malfunction. For example, if the foldable table does not unfold, it immediately distracts from the purpose of the event (setting up a market) and creates a temporary, new configuration: other people present in the room gather around the table to try and get the table to unfold. Some people start pulling the legs, others stand around looking at it, commenting from the side, or ask questions related to the folding mechanism. Once the table is in its 'right' position again, people leave the scene and the planned activity takes its course: the former network is re-established.

Of course, these objects can have a very conspicuous design or style that provokes issues of taste and belonging. Whether we feel at home in a space relates strongly to a person's 'environmental past': "a past consisting of places, spaces and their properties which have served instrumentally in the satisfaction of

the person's biological, psychological, social and cultural needs"¹⁵. Thus, in order to be as inclusive as possible, the people of the *ruru huis* chose the tactic of trying *not* adhere to any sort of style. Reinaart explained:

"We chose deliberately four tables that we could fold easily, but also don't look like we bought them new. They are a kind of in-between. We can fold them, but they are not like those beer benches. We looked quite hard to find the right thing, that feels like: Oh, hm, these are kind of nice tables, but not designed, not from Ikea –or not made of shabby plastic. We searched for the right tone. If they are office tables, it's too cold, and if they are in a retro style, that's a specific style".

Indeed, when examining more of the hospitable objects in the *ruru huis*, most of them had this quite nonspecific appearance. Cups, plates, chairs, cans, flowers, bottles - all had a rather indistinguishable, plain quality which did not attract special attention. This aim for non-descriptiveness creates diffusion in the way the space is perceived and interpreted. When asked about their opinion of the interior, the replies of visitors and participants varied substantially, ranging from 'messy' to 'vibrant', and from 'hermetic' to 'open'. Some found the space inviting and hospitable, while others saw it as distant, anarchistic or 'high-brow'. One visitor remarked that she still doesn't know what the *ruru huis* stands for or what they aim to do (Ik begrijp nog steeds niet waar ze op uit zijn).

2. Inciting action: operative objects (MICROPHONE, MAP, FLIPCHART¹⁶)

The second family of objects and materials in the *ruru huis* are actively used, transformed and sometimes used up. They are the *operative* materials that make it possible for the artist/organiser/audience to operationalise and materialise collective action, such as scissors, paper, needles, thread and fabric. But also less 'crafty' and more 'dialogic' materials such as flip charts, pens and paper, microphones, projectors, laptops and screens fall into this category.

For example, oftentimes there was a microphone standing in the space. Connected to an 'active' speaker, it made the *ruru huis* a dynamic space: a microphone that is 'on', is a very appealing object. People gravitate towards it, even though they often don't know what they want to say. In other words: it *makes* you say things. Things that five minutes before you did not think worthy of saying out loud - often just silly things – are suddenly voiced through the microphone. By speaking into it, it seems that you 'act' out your reason for being there, whether intentional or not¹⁷.

Another important *operative* object in the *ruru huis* are the maps of Arnhem. Ruangrupa often uses maps to provoke stories about a city. They deliberately do not include street names, as a way to prompt small spatial confusions. By making the maps incomplete, they intervene with its normal agency. As a result, the maps invite people to act, to write information on it, or to use the little stickers that ruangrupa made (carrying symbols of houses, animals, barbecue's etcetera.) This way people 'annotated' themselves the locations in the city where they spend time or where they live. Sometimes the absence of street names created confusion and heated debates occurred about the exact location of a certain venue or organization. Using incomplete maps as a way to provoke stories has become one of ruangrupa's well-known strategies. It makes clear how an object such as a map is not just used to illustrate narratives, but can be 'prod-used' collectively. If a map is allowed to be unfinished, and instead have its information accumulated over time, then its users become co-producers of information that is relevant to them, instead of being limited to consume pre-fab information.

¹⁵ Proshansky, H. M., Fabian, A. K., & Kaminoff, R. (1983). Place-identity: Physical world socialization of the self. *Journal of environmental psychology*, 3(1), 57-83.

¹⁶ Somewhere in this book you can find the story of **Flipchart**. It can be read as empirical parable and illustration to this research.

¹⁷ See for instance the seminal works on speech acts by John L. Austin (1962) *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.

3. Evidential objects (FLYERS/POSTERS; VIDEO; EXPO's, MEALS)

Finally, in the *ruru huis* you can find many objects that are tokens, or signifiers of (past) collective action: flyers, posters, drawings, the words on the window, stickers, notes, video's, photographs and almost every object or 'souvenir' in the vitrine. Most of these *evidential* objects carry some kind of story connected to activities that took place the *ruru huis*.

Still, they can be seen as pro-active in the sense that they invite you look and interpret, be it on a more symbolic level. They are representatives and their role is to narrate stories to people who have not been participating in the action: visitors looking for information, or people waiting for their appointment with the organising staff. Sometimes these objects are made of *operative* materials. The way they are perceived determines to what extent they are still mutable. For example, if artist Juul Sadée selects a clay pebble (made during the workshops she organised) to 'act' in an art installation in a museum, it is made immutable. But if one of the participants takes a pebble home to put on her mantelpiece, it acts in multiple networks: as a craft object, as souvenir, and as part of a social sculpture. Many objects in the vitrine of the *ruru huis* embody this ambivalence: They are neither only souvenirs, or artworks, or a source of information. Although not everyone can relate to them, they embody a certain action that can be activated at any moment in different ways. In the spirit of hospitality, there is no real selection process or validation happening in the collection of these materials. Everything is regarded as worthy to keep and welcome to occupy the space.

incompleteness

While grappling with the data, it suddenly struck me that many objects in the *ruru huis* (no matter their function) were labelled with adjectives such as: unfinished, indistinct, empty, unclear, messy, amorphous, unstructured, malleable, etc. So I started focusing on these properties and tried to find out if and how these qualities maybe connected to the concept of fluidity. Indeed, incompleteness allows for tinkering, for adjustment. Maybe this incompleteness is a very powerful characteristic, instead of a negative one, and all the adjectives above should be reevaluated and reassessed before we dismiss them as unwanted. Although insignificance and incompleteness are sometimes uncomfortable, they can also be key aspects of inclusiveness and enable usership.

Conclusion

"Sitting like a good friend with the not-knowingness of such experimentation means recognizing that when we feel discomfort, perhaps that's a helpful indicator that we're comfortably on to something. Such uncomfortableness—as in being constructively nudged to explore the edges of one's knowledge and worldview, experience and habits—entails trying out practices that reach toward the ethics we value, even if we trip and fall a lot". – Cindy Milstein¹⁸

Objects are active agents in transforming, informing and obscuring collaborations. To connect people and create a dialogical environment where participants are active users, mutable objects that allow for continuous tinkering are important actors. Because of this mutability they can 'flow' between different networks. Their shapeshifting capability is different from the autonomous art work that is immutable and exclusive.

Therefore, the shift from immutable to the mutable object can challenge us to think different about the agency of all stakeholders in this artistic process. Furthermore, I came to the very tentative conclusion that **ambiguous, incomplete properties are important and actually provoke a certain 'constructive discomfort' that can be seen as one of the preconditions for active usership.** This way materials and

¹⁸ <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/cindy-milstein-organizing-social-spaces-as-if-social-relations-matter#toc2>

objects can act as important nodes in the construction of an inclusive network, instead of creating an exclusive one. This does not mean we must ‘fetishize’ incompleteness or ambiguity, but use it cautiously and with care. For instance, without editing the *ruru huis* in regards to what objects stay or go, it is in danger to become diffuse, cluttered and illegible for visitors. Professional knowledge and sensitivity of the artist does play an important role in this: by carefully employing, negotiating and combining different sorts of material, the artist can act as a fluid person that allows objects to have agency and meaning in more than one way. In other words: the agency of the mutable mobile can be extensive, but has to be negotiated all the time. If it is done well, the mutable mobile can function as a fluid in a network of associations – such as the maps or the Gerobak – and this network space is then automatically extended beyond the art space. Moreover: **when we decide that an art object does not necessarily have to stay in the art network space, we are actually changing the network itself.**

Discussion and suggestions for future research

There were many situations in this project that provided me with interesting vista’s for further research. For instance, I found a possible connection between the three material categories and the categories of worth discussed by Boltanski and Thévenot¹⁹. It seems to me that the agency of the *facilitating* materials strongly connects to *domestic* and *civic* values: on the one hand they make you feel comfortable as a person (domestic worth) while at the same time they connect people through a standardised, recognisable, and stable performance (civic worth). The *operative* materials on the other hand are more connected to *industrial* worth (their functioning) and *inspirational* worth (they can make you happy to work with it). Finally, the *evidential* products seem related to *market* worth and *fame* as they have a more symbolic agency that have the potential to gain exchange value. Still, to explore this more in detail would require another extensive period of research. One that I might endeavour in the future.

¹⁹ Boltanski, L., & Thévenot, L. (2006). *On Justification: Economies of worth*. Princeton University Press