

# Barriers for Inclusion of User Practices in Technology Development in Blue Denmark

R.G. Kristensen & T. Børsen  
*Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark*

**ABSTRACT:** As the world collectively looks to technology to drive sustainable transition and salvage what is left of our world, users are increasingly exposed to technological solutions claimed to drive sustainable transition. These solutions are rarely developed with an offset in their practice, and this is a challenge as technology can only aid in deconstructing the climate crisis if end-user practices are reflected in the technical solutions. Nothing is gained if no one is motivated or able to pick up these solutions. Sustainability is rarely used in conjunction with how end-users will adopt and utilize technology. Wasted or inefficient distribution of resources should be addressed to optimize and increase the chances of a green transition. This also holds for the maritime sector in Denmark, where technology development is limited to the applicability of technological artifacts without taking notice of end-user practices. This paper applies qualitative ethnographic research to show that there is a disconnect between, on the one hand, funders, technology developers, and decision-makers and, on the other hand, technology end-users and practitioners in the Danish maritime sector. The first does not consider the latter's perspective even though it is claimed important. We argue that if technology is to replace or assist any human practice and solve for example the climate crises, then knowledge of users' practices must be key to developing technological solutions for sustainable development. During the ethnographic work, the stage of funding the development of sustainable technology was observed to be the very first point in the path of technological development, where user inclusion should be considered. Therein lies the connection to sustainability: If users are omitted, technology cannot effectively and positively assist sustainable transition.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

While climate change continuously manifests itself for the world's inhabitants, societies increasingly focus on solutions that will prevent Earth's hospitality level from deteriorating further. Sustainable initiatives such as the ability to reduce fossil fuel consumption are investigated intensively. Compared to other logistics and transportation industries, shipping has not been change-effective due to the complex challenges that international shipping actors point out themselves (1).

Shipping has become essential to today's standards of living as it connects the world. So much so that up to 80% of the world's goods are transported through shipping (2). These living standards have a heavy price as shipping mainly relies on fossil fuels for propulsion (3). Shipping is heavily judged for contributing to human-generated Greenhouse gases (GHG) and is held accountable for 2.7% of GHG emissions. Without averting actions, the number is projected to reach 17% by 2050 (3,4). The cases for radical change are overwhelming and something must change (5). The International Maritime Organization (IMO) has vowed for GHG to reach net

zero by or around 2050 (6). Yet, it is unclear what that means or how to get there (7)!

Research shows simple low-cost energy efficiency measures in shipping can cut up to 75% of GHG, while also reducing the cost of operation (8,9). However, this proves difficult to enact (10). A myriad of research has investigated the many barriers in shipping to implement energy-efficient measures and identified barriers such as changing practices, governance, company and vessel policies, and adoption of technology (1,4,8,11-13).

In 2022 Denmark ranked as the world's 6th largest commercial fleet (14,15). The Danish government released a report on ensuring Blue Denmark gains status as a global hub for maritime digital expertise. Blue Denmark refers to maritime businesses and industries, maritime researchers and educators, legislators, etc., nearly occupying a hundred thousand people. A major point of the report is that a digitalization strategy can change our current trajectory. By claiming quality assurance from being made in Denmark, political backing, and quantum leaps in technological development, the future looks brighter (16). Digitalization has long been a part of the agenda of Blue Denmark (17). Danish Shipping, an important voice in Blue Denmark, affirms the coming changes:

“Shipping companies face new challenges led by ambitious climate goals, environmental regulation, increased digitalization, and new business models, with large parts of possible solutions for the future being unknown. Innovation is, therefore, higher on the shipping companies' agenda than ever before. Development, new research, and innovation projects are, among other things, crucial for Danish shipping companies to achieve the climate goals and remain competitive in an increasingly digital world” (18)

Developing newer technology, such as autonomous vessels, has arguably been established as a superpower in society as the only solution to the climate crisis; and steals focus from the low-hanging fruits of current technology, governance, policy-making, and changing human practice. It parallels the plot dramatized in the Hollywood movie “Don’t Look Up”, where known methods to avert certain destruction are waived to make way for untested futuristic technology that eventually fails, without ample time to revert to old methods (19).

The belief that liberation through technology is succumbing to a total technocracy where solutions are based on technical expertise alone, is worrying. It appears forgotten to consider alternatives to new technology and its dependencies. Technological advancement must also deal with the social context of the user's practice (8,9). While eyes are set on the development of technology, not much attention is devoted to the user and the changing technology landscape their practice is going through and technology is thought to effectivize (20).

We need to broaden the perception of what constitutes technology to a nexus of the artifacts and the human practices, in which it is embedded. Critical authors in Technology Studies, e.g., Andrew Feenberg (21) and Langdon Winner (22), suggest that if we neglect the fact that technology is supposed to help

and emancipate people it adds the opposite, inevitably generating animosity towards technology. A more inclusive definition of technology could offer us the chance to consider how technology is utilized in the real world and to discover how to design more sustainable, democratic, and adaptable technology that can be applied in practical contexts, ultimately increasing the chances of our future generations' survival.

## 2 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The presented research is based on Rasmus Gammelby Kristensen's Master Thesis (46), and some of the paper's formulations are taken from there. Our study investigates the barriers to an equilibrium, in developing technology between technical artifacts and human practices and to understand its socio-technical configurations. In doing so we call for a democratic intervention in Blue Denmark's technology. In other words: What are the barriers to democratizing the system of technological development underpinning sustainable development in Blue Denmark?

Figure 1 is to illustrate the research question. On the left, we see the current technocratic view on technological development in Blue Denmark, focusing primarily on developing technical artifacts, while scrutinizing the practice. On the right, we see the desired situation where the development is balanced with an equal focus. The line in the middle illustrates the barriers to the requested transition that this paper will display.




Figure 1 This figure illustrates the research question structuring this study: What are the barriers to democratizing the system of technological development in Blue Denmark?

## 3 ETHNOGRAPHY

Ethnography strives to understand the meaning humans ascribe to their lives. Not by quantifying numerical global metadata, something the shipping industry has long suffered from (9), but by spending time with the people practicing that which technology aims to enhance. As stated by Sunderland and Denny: “if we accept the notion that technology refers to the use of artifacts in practice then it becomes clear that understanding human practice is an integral part of developing technology” (23).

Actors of Blue Denmark constitute a diverse group with multiple interests and expertise: fund and project managers, customers, shipping companies (who have the actual end-users as employees), etc. They vary in location, purpose, organization, as well as influence.

Observing them, visually and audibly, in their socio-technical configuration is a valuable way to attain perceptions of contexts and constructions (24). Thus, ethnographic work at different sites is the method used to understand Blue Denmark as a system of developing technology.

Traditional ethnography is characterized by focusing on a single location to immerse oneself into a socio-cultural instalment intensively. To observe and make sense of a specific or unique group of people's lives. As the world became an interconnected system, multi-sited ethnography appeared, as a local, single-site, could no longer be understood as isolated from its place in the global system (25). Multi-sited ethnography moves away from focusing on internal scenarios, objects, and meanings. Instead, zooming out to understand a local setting's place in its larger network, such as a user practices' place in developing technology. By including such a macro perspective, this method is suitable for understanding the system of the multi-situated processes of developing technology.

The methodology guided us as researchers to follow initially unknown sources to their origin. Thus, investigating the original site in question through the different perceptions of the system (25). When researching the context in a socio-technical setting (such as the system) it is possible to both follow the people and follow the thing, the thing referring to non-human actors, concepts, or in this case, a trend of grand technologification without the user (25). The people or the thing may be completely or partially unknown as research begins. As people or a thing is mobile and found in various settings so must the researcher then move to understand the entirety of the system.

To understand the system and how technology is perceived and developed we conducted semi-structured interviews, and formal and informal talks, together with participation in various events, discussions, and projects. The empirical material was collected in the following sites: development of fund strategies, project facilitation and management, product testing, and project implementation. The named sites represent different stations of technology's development. The sites' embedded barriers to user involvement will be brought forth in the analysis. The list of interviewees from the sites can be found in Table 1.

Table 1. This table provides an overview of the sites and informants that generated the empirical material for this study.

Main affiliated site	Organization	Description	ID
Development of Fund Strategies	A fund in Blue Denmark	A private fund with a focus on wild ideas	15
Product Testing Implementation, & Nursing	Accident Investigation	An organ conducting research and investigating the root causes of accidents in Blue Denmark	111
Product Testing, Implementation, & Nursing	A Captain and active practitioner	An active captain who engages a lot with his shipping company to address issues with technology	113
Project Execution	Maritime Startup	A newly formed company developing a platform for mutual learning at sea	12

Project Execution	University and Project Facilitator	An organ that organizes research and functions	13
Project Execution	Shipping Company	A shipping company implementing new solutions	18
Project Execution	Maritime Startup	A start-up that has developed an innovative location beacon for maritime personnel	115
Project Execution	Maritime Startup	A start-up that developed an intelligent searchlight for vessels	16
Project Facilitation	Project Facilitator	An independent collaborative platform for other companies in Blue Denmark	19
Project Facilitation	Maritime Knowledge & Project Facilitator	An initiative to facilitate and broadcast research across Blue Denmark	17
Project Facilitation	Project Facilitator	ShippingLab is a public-funded initiative to address the climate crisis through technical innovation directly	11
Societal Change of Direction Creating Trends	University	An anthropologist, Senior Researcher, and Author	112
Societal Change of Direction Creating Trends	University	A Professor in Techno-Anthropology and Science and Technology Studies	14

The list of workshops and other events where observations and informal talks were conducted is shown in Table 2.

Table 2. This table provides an overview of events, workshops and projects where empirical material was generated for this study.

Type	Name (Dates)
Events	An Update on Maritime Autonomous Navigation (07-03-22)
	Autonomous Ships from the Perspective of Operation and Maintenance (06-10-21)
	Autonomy ships and new paradigm (25-10-21)
	DanaDynamics Presentation 2021 (31-08-21)
	Digital Harbor (01-03-22)
	Digital Tech Summit 2021 (30-11, 01-12-21)
	Human + Tech = Problems? (28-10-21)
	InnoFounder and InnoBooster (04-03-22)
	Marine Sustainability by Digitalization (2021-2022)
	ShippingLab Conference (24-11-21)
	Summer Business Networking 2021 (25-08-21)
	TechBBQ 2021 (16,17-09-21)
	The New AI Regulation (09-03-22)
	Values and Norms of the Green Transition in Blue Denmark (28-01-22)
World Maritime Technology Conference 2022 (26-04-22)	
Workshops	Maritime Competencies of the Future (01-10-21)
	Predicting future trends based on past predictions (26-04-22)
Projects	User Involvement (16-11-21)
	The Connected Ship (2021)
	VHF Data Exchange System (2021)

Figure 2 is a model of the technology development processes in Blue Denmark. The model will scaffold our empirical investigation of actors in different stages of an artifact's development. To comprehend the processes that constitute development in Blue Denmark (and why it excludes the users' human practices) actors in Blue Denmark were followed to map them and place them in a development chain, labeled the system. Processes of the system were observed as follows: Directional change in society is fostered by the climate crisis. This change influences Blue Denmark to invest in greenifying shipping

operations. It is thus decided that funds will be allocated to develop green technology. Funds are requested by and provided to those who claim green solutions. I.e., entrepreneurs, research and technology organizations, project facilitators and managers, etc. Once funds are secured project execution can commence. The system ends in a potential implementation with the following nursing phase pursued.




Figure 2. The figure illustrates the synthesis of the technological development system in Blue Denmark.

#### 4 BARRIERS TO USER INVOLVEMENT IN THE SYSTEM

The analysis will identify barriers to involving users of technology in its development. Therefore, it was imperative to understand what constitutes the system, and its representatives' perception of what constitutes technology. Following technology and people in the system from the perspective of the user through the sites of the system showed that it fails to involve them from the beginning. This fact is acknowledged by a project facilitator: "[...] it is a hole in the process [of development] that is being dug with open eyes, which is paradoxical since one assumes that one has the interest [to implement technology] at heart" (I1). The terminology barrier might be perceived as physical and concrete, but a barrier can also be on a social-technical conceptual level.

Researching the system indicated that attention to user involvement appears late, after initial implementation attempts. As the complexity of the real world unfolds it becomes clear that human practices are not confined to a restricted set of scenarios. Thereby indicating that user-technology collaboration is dealt with reactively instead of proactively i.e. recognizing problems that could have been identified at a much earlier stage. Indeed, value is not necessarily only created if the technology prospers. However, suppose failure purely occurs because of deficiency to appreciate the actual problem, failure with no gain seems accurate. If nothing is learned from failure it is arguably a complete waste of time, money, and resources.

##### 4.1 Barrier One - Users

When developing technology, it is difficult for the creator to understand the various ways in which it can

be used. The focus of technology's development needs to be readjusted from the artifact to the practice. Allegedly technology cannot succeed without both. "If you think all you need to develop technology is technical insight, or to just get it to work according to some criteria of functionality, then you have not understood what technology is" (I4). Research underlines the importance of user involvement. Research such as human-computer interaction, different methods of user involvement, participatory design, and user ethnography (23,26–30).

Informants have acknowledged the uneven distribution of focus on artifact and practice: "there has been an exaggerated focus on the technology [artifact]" (I9). We see this in the maritime sphere with investments in autonomous vessels and navigational aids. Such systems, among others, are not understood nor functioning optimally because the user was excluded from the development of the system (31).

All sites recognize the importance of user input for a successful implementation. An informant concedes: "if it [technology] is not adopted, the other half of the calculus is missing, and that is the end-user" (I9). The system appears to want to involve users but is often obstructed by the shipping structures (7). Overall, there is consensus that user involvement is important, but it is debatable as to what extent it is practiced: "I am not sure, but I think it has always been the intention to incorporate end-users" (I9).

##### 4.1.1 Who Constitutes Users

User involvement is not just involving people. There seems to be ambiguity as to what and who the users are, like what a user is and when/what users should be involved in. Looking at technology deployability, this is exactly the knowledge that developers need and that users can help with. By listening to inputs from seafarers, they feel included, and they can illuminate problems that developers alone could never foresee. Seafarers are often exposed to complex technology in a top-down implementation (20).

An important defining parameter is that while preferable to the exploitative and applicable technology, user involvement might be less relevant on a conceptual level.

"Regarding exploitative technology, I think it is extremely important to incorporate them, otherwise it will not work. With explorative technology, I do not think it is that important at the first stage that is about understanding the potential but to apply the technology to solve a problem, involvement is vital" (I9).

While exploring the system, different conceptions appeared of who the users are. These are summed up as 5 misconceptions.

The first misconception is that the customer is the user. Reaching out to a private maritime fund they were assured that their project facilitator has user contact through applied sciences. When interviewing a project facilitator they replied: "[...] that [applied science] is together with the companies [...]" (I3). I.e., not the user but the company. When discussing user involvement, it sometimes appears misunderstood

and instead referred to as customer involvement: “you could say that our end-users are the manufacturers and the shipping companies” (I1). Customers do not understand the practice as a user. As agreed by an informant. “I would say it should be the end-users, as the customers are constructed by a financial relation” (I9).

The second misconception is, that when users are involved, it is often only specific ones: “[...] there were the darling captains who always were brought in on the projects [...]” (I5). This leaves few candidates and limits the available practitioner knowledge to one or a few positions. Various positions and individuals can have greatly different tasks on a vessel.

The third misconception is that users could also refer to former users. This introduces the risk of patenting knowledge from when leaving life at sea. “I have observed, there are many [ex-seafarers] know-it-alls with the solution for all the world’s problems” (I2). This is problematic because there is a risk that extracted knowledge is not grounded in contemporary seafaring practices: “[...] the end-users are often represented by former seafarers [...]” (I9). This has caused “[...] many half-hearted solutions from a former navigator or marine engineer with old knowledge” (I2). The industry keeps on evolving, so it can be a big problem if former seafarers are used to reflect current life at sea.

The fourth misconception reflects that user perspectives are represented by maritime academies. The maritime academies have also been pointed to as a source of contemporary knowledge: “we depend on the maritime academies, SIMAC [a maritime school in the Danish city of Svendborg] e.g., and their facilities [...]” (I1). While training facilities, teachers, etc., can provide valuable knowledge, they cannot replace real-life scenarios, experience, and expertise.

The fifth misconception is that industry and user perspectives are aligned. The industry and the agenda of the funds were identified as an outcome-altering factor: “we are driven by the industry’s interest as they are our core stakeholders [...]” (I1). If project facilitators cannot secure their interest and funds, there will be no technology development for sustainable transition.

It must be understood who the users are. It is the active seafarers. The above illustrates the first barrier to real end-user involvement as important actors can be under the illusion that end-user involvement takes place. A user’s input is needed in Blue Denmark, as an informant states: “some of the projects we have are very technical and very engineer savvy, but there are no marine engineers connected [...]” (I1). It is indisputable that domain-specific knowledge can help verify potential in development. But it must stay diverse and current; “it is important to be observant of the diversity of knowledge [...] also within maritime knowledge, that you are aware that there is a seafarer from China and India who also are end-users of the product” (I2).

## 4.2 Barrier Two - Technology

The second barrier is the false idea of what technology should be developed for and why. Arguably there is more than one truth, but for the sake of the green transition we can look to a dictionary definition of the word technology, “the use of tools and machines to help people conduct tasks more efficiently and with less effort” (32). I.e., technology can reduce emissions from shipping, as a project facilitator mentions: “moving people and goods creates a lot of value for the world. However, there is also a dark side, in this case, a negative impact on the environment, we work to bring that down” (I9). We have to remember that technology should be developed, invested in, and committed to, so we can ensure our future on this planet. The disconnect between land and sea along with the construction of the world of shipping often results in sub-optimal conditions for change when deploying new technology. Therefore, it is important to see how the perceived purpose of developing new technology changes throughout the system. The system has shown two main categories of false beliefs: removing humans and technological glorification.

### 4.2.1 Removing Humans

The first false belief is that technology should replace humans. Aside from the expense, that crew needs to be paid and therefore will result in fewer expenses, it will allegedly also result in fewer errors, i.e., it equals fewer disasters, higher efficiency, and more revenue (20). However, removing human operators from ships is implausible for three reasons.

First, technology is not capable e.g., the unmanned autonomous vessel is not able to deal with the dynamics of the seas or to possess the level of adaptability of humans while being built on the collision regulations that are dependent on human intervention. And, if technology was able, it would have happened already as the business case would be too lucrative for any shipping company to pass, as an informant argues: “if the technology were a product, you could just go and buy off the shelf, then it would already be implemented” (I14).

Secondly, the false belief that seafarers solely exist on the vessel to steer the vessel. The auto-pilot technology has existed for years, the ship is steering itself. Most of the work that happens on a ship is maintenance (33). Along with other workloads, maintenance is not something an autonomous vessel is exempt from, even though Danish Shipping anticipates robots will be able to overtake this task (34). The workload from digital systems is still increasing (35). An informant said: “companies, at the moment, have more crew than legislation requires, because there is too much maintenance work” (I10).

Thirdly, the argument that computers are safer, and the concept of human error. The main argument is that roughly 85% of accidents can be attributed to human error (36). The problem is that human error does not classify as an error isolated to a human making a mistake, but rather because of multiple factors failing. As noted by Rothblum: “human errors are generally caused by technologies, environments, and organizations which are incompatible in some way with optimal human performance” (37). It is also

explained as a human error if the operator is incapable of comprehending the complexity of a system (31). When asked, an informant answered: “[...] show the other perspective, if that statement is to have any validity, I want to know how many accidents did not happen because a human told a computer it was wrong” (I14). As no apparent data exists on how many times a human prevented a system from making a critical error, it is a very one-sided argument, though a study on the near-miss system shows that 87% of such occurrences had been discovered by humans (38).

Furthermore, an informant says: “it is important to say that safety cannot be understood by some numerical value as it is bound by the context in which it emerges” (I11). Ultimately, an informant assesses that we should: “let humans do what humans do best and let machines do what they do best, then assist each other” (I14). The crew is present to act on sudden, unforeseen, dangerous situations and handle such situations all the time without drawing on external parties (38).

#### 4.2.2 *Technological Glorification*

The second false belief is that one should do technology simply because it is technologically possible and cool (I14). There appears to be a discrepancy between the land-based actors’ idea of a modern vessel and what is currently possible with the infrastructure of the sea. Such misalignments and unreal expectations lead users to abandon technology as critical issues and constant problems inhibit adoption (39). The reliability of systems at sea carries important significance. The technician is not just around the corner and consequences can be devastating at unfathomable levels. Where an entrepreneur might be willing to take risks of losing their investment, the risk measures greater for a Captain and their crew. Risks include human lives, man-made natural disasters, and innumerable amounts of monetary loss. Toying with new and fancy technology just because one can, should not be an argument for the pursuit. Such a discrepancy can be harmful to the much more useful technological development that we so desperately need (39–41). As an informant describes the technical characteristics of a ship are spot on and need to be understood by all;

“We need to remember when characterizing a ship, it is extremely low-tech [...] nothing like a plane or a train [...] a ship is multiple different systems connected from multiple different brands and manufacturers using different methods and having different rules, so nothing is standardized. A ship works, yes, but at the same time, it never really works [...] so you place 20 crew members on board, running around 12 hours a day to try to keep the vessel afloat and get from A to B. This is the context we should think about when thinking about automating ships” (I11).

Noting that this quote only deals with the complexity of one ship and does not recognize that similar ships in a fleet further differentiate in equipment and systems. It is sort of a microcosmos composed of elements from all over the world. It is

quite normal for systems to be supplied by more than 15 different manufacturers (39).

The need for streamlining systems is problematic for progress. Manufacturers often worry about production costs, not integration capacities resulting in a low ability for the system to work together with the operator. This causes technology, even though introduced to reduce error, to in some cases directly contribute to accidents (31).

As technology increasingly becomes a vital support function for humans, the role of the navigator is changing from being a controller to a supervisor of systems. Technology is becoming increasingly complex, and systems’ full capabilities can be overwhelming, while the human operator has remained stationary and does not follow the exponential path (20,31,42). It is a known challenge within shipping companies to provide attention to crew competency development (43). It is a major democratic problem as responsibilities are not subjected to change. As the final decision maker, the seafarers should be included to ensure the operator has the required skill and knowledge to sufficiently operate and supervise the system (20). Seafarers still have the final call. They will decide what action to take and be held responsible. The importance of the system’s ability to facilitate the navigator in the unique settings where the pot is boiling and an overview of the situation is vital, e.g., in the unavoidable case of system or machinery breakdown. Those are the situations where input from end-users is needed most (31). These are the situations that can only be prepared for by involving those who have the experience. And the deliberate absence of the same means that the scope of technological glorification is undemocratic.

#### 4.3 *Barrier Three - Funding*

The last selected barrier requires a short prelude. As an example of the technology criticized in the previous chapter, autonomy in navigational systems has been described as a pinnacle for bringing down emissions from the shipping industry (by Danish Shipping). Looking at a Danish university’s Shipping Lab, half of the budget is earmarked for autonomy research and development (44). When opening the discussion on the topic of technologification, whether one believes in total digitalization and autonomy, it does seem peculiar to address self-sailing crewless vessels as a solution when global connectivity infrastructure is unable to sustain usable connections for daily operation. Sunbae Hong from the Korean Ministry of Oceans and Fisheries, in a presentation at Digital@Sea 2021 conference, calls for addressing the challenges in global maritime digitalization. He calls for collaboration between stakeholders to reach a state within shipping that can support the very basic level of digitalization on a global scale (45). Going back to Blue Denmark, it leaves one wondering about the actions taken when autonomous shipping becomes a top priority when, simultaneously, the world’s maritime stage is trying to figure out how to ensure basic connectivity to the world’s oceans.

The third barrier is funding strategies. Is the technology to be developed chosen in accord with

trending hot and sexy topics while leaving more boring yet necessary-for-us-as-all projects for others? It poses a problem if funding focuses on individual success and not the progress of the world, as declared by Hong; “focus on progress, not perfection, one step made together is more powerful than 10 steps made by one country” (45).

An informant mentions that: “we see the same logic in many other places in society” (I4). This can mean that research and projects can be influenced by trending topics. There are similarities to global social trends, something that an informant concurs with: “if we take society as a whole, I think we can establish that there is an overexcitement towards technology [...] that technology will come and fix all the problems of the world” (I9). Arguably this trend has gotten a foothold within Blue Denmark, as the informant continues: “like the rest of society, there is overweight of focus on the technology, but I do not think it is with bad intentions, it is just following society where fancy exponential technologies are mentioned everywhere, so naturally, that is what attracts funding” (I9).

Hard science and quantitative data have mainly been in focus in shipping when presenting the state of business (9). Similarly, it appears that trends decide what research gets prioritized and that appears to be reflected by funding structures. Funding strategies rarely specify expectations for user involvement but focus on hard science statements, as an informant shares: “it is my opinion that it is easier to get funding for technical research in place of social sciences, I do not carry in statistics, but it is my opinion, the technical stuff is the big trend right now” (I7). Which is peculiar as it is common to “assume that having a more humanistic instead of purely technical approach would enable a higher applicability” (I7).

The funding system appears to influence how Blue Denmark seemingly chooses to focus on technical experts and their artifacts more than the users and their practices. When discussing what impacts the operation of project facilitators it seems plausible that they are influenced by more powerful actors, as an informant states: “it is about creating jobs, and promoting the Danish maritime industry, if you cannot do that, then it is not a Fund’s project [depending on the Fund]” (I9).

Furthermore, technical experts try and keep their current societal validation, as an informant talks about the power of technical experts: “[...] they hold on to the idea that pure technology is fantastic, so when they tell the story they make it seem like it was technology in itself that did it” (I4). AI, e.g., is extremely resource-demanding and dependent on human work such as setting the framework, sorting the data, and maintaining it. Granted, quantification is next to impossible for a human to do but as an informant explains: “[...] at the end of all that work, indeed, you can say, AI did it. It is like saying it was the nuclear physicists that won World War 2” (I4). After which they address “[...] the same as every other sector, not because the tech industry is worse than others, they are simply extremely privileged at the moment. A sort of unjustified power that lets them dominate the narrative” (I4).

Unfortunately, this upholds the assumption that technological greatness is a technical expert thing. As an informant argues, campaigning and lobbying are not free services: “researching technology is big business so there is an ongoing quest of justifying continued research” (I4). Arguably, when such systems are driven by what is trending, it adds a layer of ineffectiveness to technology-driven sustainable transition.

The structures of funding sometimes remove the true context from innovation as it becomes a goal to secure funds. A project facilitator mentions: “[...] sometimes it is very easy to see in the application that they are trying to appease us with what they think we want” (I1). It can be traced to trends like the use of certain terminologies that are used simply because of their power in society. The project facilitator continues: “sometimes it is more the fact that there is an argument, than the quality of that argument, that means something [...] like it does not matter what you answer as long as you answer” (I1). Such projects are doomed at once, as he states: “in those cases, for sure it will not get implemented, because it does not matter to them” (I1). Possibly we as a society do not have unlimited time therefore it is a harmful way of looking at progress, as an informant observes: “there are seemingly no consequences from exaggerating what a project is capable of achieving, they just get another try” (I4).

The first two mentioned barriers to not involving seafarers in the development of technology: replacing humans and technologification, can be traced to a defining trait of the system: funding strategies. Involving users and assuring application in practice must be considered already at the funding stages.

## 5 DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

User involvement usually first emerges when technology is implemented, and operational malfunctions manifest themselves. There are no formal standardized methods for ensuring user involvement. Often, solutions are top-down implemented and alien to their users, thus assessing the system as rather undemocratic. There is a risk that solutions will oppress seafarers, reducing the chance of adoption. This means that the technologification for sustainable transition is postponed. The system is very complex which makes it difficult to determine who should be responsible for keeping in touch with the seafarers.

Sustainable transition through technological development is a topic everyone knows and needs to collaborate on. However, a disconnect to real-life practices is detected in this study. The technology development system in Blue Denmark is mainly concerned with the artifact of technology as influenced by trends and funding practices. User involvement is not alien to any of the actors, but it is not a normal and standardized practice either.

It is a challenge as Blue Denmark is too massive an entity for anyone one individual to be held responsible. The system is a mesh of so many different actors with varying agendas. It is genuinely

a microcosmos. An informant mentions that project facilitators collaborate on funding and stakeholders' time (I9) and ensure a collaborative space for technology development. This is something that is constantly under development: "we have creators who focus on action-based research and bring more disciplines in [...] and through that evolve some methodologies that can help in future development" (I1). This appears to have a positive effect on the system. However, it is only a place for ideas to grow and nothing will change without the businesses' support.

If a project facilitator does not interact with the end-user but leaves it up to the shipping company to take care of that part, the shipping company in charge, end-users might not be involved at all. An informant at a shipping company says: "no, we do not have that much focus on the end-users on the ship, but we ensure to collect as many perspectives as possible when discussing these technologies" (I9). Shipping companies can appear to act as gatekeepers and designated user facilitators by other actors. Actors seem aware of the value user involvement has, as they continue; "gaining mutual understanding can help avoid many of the traps of inducing change with unwanted consequences that affect others negatively, because you just did not see it from that perspective" (I9).

Shipping companies might increasingly face this responsibility if user involvement activities were funded from the beginning when the technologies were conceptualized and later when they are developed and implemented. This would force and award the different actors in Blue Denmark to reflect and act on user involvement. It would also promote sustainable transition in the maritime system through well-functioning technological solutions.

However, understanding users' practices has been revealed to be more problematic as ex-seafarers and academics often represent actual users. In some cases, actual seafarers are consulted but typically only Captains. The system must ensure that the people who get to represent the seafarers' practices represent actual practices, not the academy's, not the captain's, and not former seafarers', but the real deal. The actual end-users must be involved.

While there is consensus on the importance of user involvement in the system, there are uncertainties as to how it can be achieved. A challenge noticed by an informant: "the end-user cannot be a technology expert, of course, it is not their job, they have a ship to navigate. So naturally, there is a difficult task incorporating them in a workshop, etc." (I9). Furthermore, it can be a practical challenge to test the technology on a vessel, as an informant assesses: "I think it will be difficult to establish procedures for testing the technology on vessels due to their trade and the complexity of ship operations [...]" (I7).

While this might be speculative, something that is not is that shelved technology caused by seafarers and land-based actors not understanding each other, resulting in technology holding no ground in reality, does not solve anything. It does not make the operator or their ship any safer, more environmentally friendly, or better in any way. It is a waste of time, money, and resources. Therefore, what can be done

regarding user involvement in the early stages of developing technology for sustainable transition, should be done. The true purpose of technology as a tool for sustainability development should be known and appreciated by all actors. It is damaging to technological advancement for sustainable development and the green transition if seafarers understand technology as an enemy and not as a digital colleague.

Based on multi-sited fieldwork at different sites of technology development for green transition and sustainable development in Blue Denmark (what we call the system) we have in this contribution identified three central barriers to the involvement of end-users. The first barrier is an ambivalent understanding of who constitutes the user to be involved. The second barrier regards the purpose of developing new technologies in Blue Denmark that are centered on efficiency, automation of human work tasks, and technological glorification rather than on promoting sustainable development through addressing socio-ecological challenges. The two mentioned barriers are both underpinned by the third one that is existing funding structures. Thus, if funding structures would increasingly award user involvement, it could generate clarification of who the users are and reorient the goals of technological innovation for a sustainable transition.

Ultimately user involvement in the system fails because it generally focuses on the artifact and the claims of technical experts while the constellation is hostile to changing structures. It appears that there is a need for a democratic intervention in Blue Denmark to support further technological advancement in the service of sustainable and green transition. This democratic reorientation we suggest is initiated in the funding structures of technological innovation in the maritime sector. Actors of the system mean well and strive for a better world. However, becoming lost in the complexity of the shipping world. The funding of transdisciplinary work could be a positive way to structure and facilitate further sustainable technologification of Blue Denmark. By bridging the many different sites of the system, a holistic view of how technology for sustainable development should be developed can be acquired. The system's understanding of technology must become more inclusive referring not only to the technical artifact but also to the practices of people.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research received no external funding.  
Author Contributions: Conceptualization, Rasmus Gammelby Kristensen (R.G.K.) and Tom Børsen (T.B.); methodology, R.G.K. and T.B.; validation, R.G.K. and T.B.; formal analysis, R.G.K.; investigation, R.G.K.; resources, R.G.K. and T.B.; data curation, R.G.K.; writing—original draft preparation, R.G.K.; writing—review and editing, R.G.K. and T.B.; visualization, R.G.K.; supervision, T.B.; project administration, T.B. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank Thomas Roslyng Olesen of the Maritime Research Alliance, for his support and constructive comments.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Poulsen RT, Sampson H. A swift turnaround? Abating shipping greenhouse gas emissions via port call optimization. *Transp Res Part Transp Environ*. 2020 Sep;86:102460.
- [2] OECD. <https://www.oecd.org/>. 2019 [cited 2021 Dec 29]. Ocean shipping and shipbuilding. Available from: <https://www.oecd.org/ocean/topics/ocean-shipping/>
- [3] Martin Cames J, Cook V. Emission Reduction Targets for International Aviation and Shipping. *EPRS Eur Parliam Res Serv* [Internet]. 2015 Nov 16; Available from: <https://policycommons.net/artifacts/1334721/emission-reduction-targets-for-international-aviation-and-shipping/1940504/>
- [4] Adland R, Cariou P, Wolff FC. When energy efficiency is secondary: The case of Offshore Support Vessels. *Transp Res Part Transp Environ*. 2019 Jul;72:114–26.
- [5] Mazzucato M. *Mission economy: a moonshot guide to changing capitalism*. London: Allen Lane, an imprint of Penguin Books; 2021. 244 p.
- [6] IMO. 2023 IMO STRATEGY ON REDUCTION OF GHG EMISSIONS FROM SHIPS RESOLUTION MEPC.377(80) (adopted on 7 July 2023) [Internet]. London; 2023. Available from: <https://wwwcdn.imo.org/localresources/en/OurWork/Environment/Documents/annex/MEPC%2080/Annex%2015.pdf>
- [7] Møhl P, Krause-Jensen J, Skårup B. Grøn Omstilling i det Blå Danmark. Copenhagen: Aarhus Universitet; 2022 Jan p. 58. Report No.: 3.
- [8] Johnson H, Andersson K. Barriers to energy efficiency in shipping. *WMU J Marit Aff*. 2016 Apr;15(1):79–96.
- [9] Viktorelius M, Varvne H, von Knorring H. An overview of sociotechnical research on maritime energy efficiency. *WMU J Marit Aff* [Internet]. 2022 Feb 3 [cited 2022 May 5]; Available from: <https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s13437-022-00263-5>
- [10] Poulsen RT, Johnson H. The logic of business vs. the logic of energy management practice: understanding the choices and effects of energy consumption monitoring systems in shipping companies. *J Clean Prod*. 2016 Jan;112:3785–97.
- [11] Poulsen RT, Sornn-Friese H. Achieving energy efficient ship operations under third party management: How do ship management models influence energy efficiency? *Res Transp Bus Manag*. 2015 Dec;17:41–52.
- [12] Johnson H, Johansson M, Andersson K. Barriers to improving energy efficiency in short sea shipping: an action research case study. *J Clean Prod*. 2014 Mar;66:317–27.
- [13] Trianni A, Cagno E. Dealing with barriers to energy efficiency and SMEs: Some empirical evidences. *Energy*. 2012 Jan;37(1):494–504.
- [14] Steffensen A, Torstensen P. Danish Shipping. 2021 [cited 2022 Apr 14]. Dansk skibsfart rykker plads ned. Available from: <https://www.danishshipping.dk/presse/nyheder/dansk-skibsfart-rykker-plads-ned>
- [15] DMA. Danish Maritime Authority. 2022 [cited 2022 Apr 30]. Det Blå Danmark. Available from: <https://www.soefartsstyrelsen.dk/vaekst-og-rammevilkkaar/maritim-erhvervspolitik/det-blaa-danmark>
- [16] Braat J. *Business Review*. 2022 [cited 2022 Apr 29]. Made in Denmark - En maritim industri i verdensklasse. Available from: <https://businessreview.dk/transport-logistik/made-in-denmark-en-maritim-industri-i-verdensklasse/>
- [17] Gyldensten R. Ministry of Industry, Business, and Financial Affairs. 2017 [cited 2022 Apr 14]. New political agreement will strengthen Danish businesses. Available from: <https://eng.em.dk/news/2017/november/new-political-agreement-will-strengthen-danish-businesses/>
- [18] Vesterlykke S. [www.danishshipping.dk](http://www.danishshipping.dk). 2019 [cited 2021 Sep 14]. Ny maritim forsknings- og innovationsstrategi. Available from: <https://www.danishshipping.dk/presse/nyheder/ny-maritim-forsknings-og-innovationsstrategi/>
- [19] Don't Look Up [Internet]. Netflix; 2021. Available from: <https://www.imdb.com/title/tt11286314/>
- [20] Man Y, Lundh M, MacKinnon SN. Facing the New Technology Landscape in the Maritime Domain: Knowledge Mobilisation, Networks and Management in Human-Machine Collaboration. Stanton N, editor. *Adv Hum Asp Transp*. 2019;786:231–42.
- [21] Feenberg A. *Technosystem: the social life of reason*. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard university press; 2017.
- [22] Winner L. *The whale and the reactor: a search for limits in an age of high technology*. Na-chdr. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press; 2001. 200 p.
- [23] Sunderland PL, Denny RMT. Anthropologists and Anthropology in Consumer Research. In: *Doing anthropology in consumer research*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press; 2007.
- [24] Eriksen TH. *Fieldwork and Ethnography*. In: *Small places, large issues: an introduction to social and cultural anthropology* [Internet]. 3rd ed. London: Pluto; 2010 [cited 2022 May 6]. p. 27–43. Available from: <http://www.dawsonera.com/depp/reader/protected/external/AbstractView/S9781849645676>
- [25] Marcus GE. *Ethnography in/of the World System: The Emergence of Multi-Sited Ethnography*. *Annu Rev Anthropol*. 1995;24:24.
- [26] Hyysalo S, Jensen TE, Oudshoorn N, editors. *The new production of users: changing innovation collectives and involvement strategies*. London New York: Routledge; 2016. 339 p. (Routledge studies in innovation, organization, and technology).
- [27] Oudshoorn N, Pinch T, editors. *Introduction - How Users and Non-Users Matter*. In: *How users matter: the co-construction of users and technologies*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press; 2003. (Inside technology).
- [28] Woolgar S. *Configuring the User: The Case of Usability Trials*. *Sociol Rev*. 1990 May;38(1):58–99.
- [29] Børsen T, Botin L, editors. *What is techno-anthropology?* 1st ed. Aalborg, Denmark: Aalborg University Press; 2013. 483 p. (Series in transformational studies).
- [30] Büscher M, Slack R, Rouncefield M, Procter R, Hartswood M, Voss A, editors. *Configuring User-Designer Relations* [Internet]. London: Springer London; 2009 [cited 2022 May 8]. (Computer Supported Cooperative Work). Available from: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-1-84628-925-5>
- [31] Grech MR, Lemon N. *Human Centred Design for Enhanced Navigation Systems: Shifting the Focus on User Needs*. 2015;13.
- [32] Cambridge University Press. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/>. 2021 [cited 2021 Jul 12]. Cambridge University Press. Available from: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/automation>
- [33] Eriksen S, Utne IB, Lützen M. An RCM approach for assessing reliability challenges and maintenance needs of unmanned cargo ships. *Reliab Eng Syst Saf*. 2021 Jun;210:107550.
- [34] RINA. Royal Institution of Naval Architects. 2018 [cited 2022 Apr 14]. "More than just Maersk": Denmark stakes its. Available from: [https://www.rina.org.uk/More\\_than\\_just\\_Maersk.html](https://www.rina.org.uk/More_than_just_Maersk.html)

- [35] Ljung M, Lützhöft M. Functions, performances and perceptions of work on ships. *WMU J Marit Aff*. 2014 Oct;13(2):231–50.
- [36] AGCS. Allianz Global Corporate & Speciality Safety and Shipping Review 2017. Cardiff University; 2017. (An insurer's perspective).
- [37] Rothblum AM. Human Error and Marine Safety. *US Coast Guard Res Dev Cent*. 2011;9.
- [38] Eriksen S. On-board Human Operators: Liabilities or Assets? 2020;13.
- [39] Krause-Jensen J, Hansen S, Skårup B. Robotten/teknologien som "kollega." Copenhagen: Aarhus Universitet; 2020 p. 62. Report No.: 1.
- [40] Hancock PA, Jagacinski RJ, Parasuraman R, Wickens CD, Wilson GF, Kaber DB. Human-Automation Interaction Research: Past, Present, and Future. *Ergon Des Q Hum Factors Appl*. 2013 Apr;21(2):9–14.
- [41] Kristensen RG. Socio-technical configurations in Blue Denmark. Copenhagen: Aalborg University; 2022 Jan
- [42] Lundh M, Rydstedt LW. A static organization in a dynamic context – A qualitative study of changes in working conditions for Swedish engine officers. *Appl Ergon*. 2016 Jul;55:1–7.
- [43] Froholdt LL. Getting closer to context: a case study of communication between ship and shore in an emergency situation. *Text Talk - Interdiscip J Lang Discourse Commun Stud*. 2010 Jan;30(4):385–402.
- [44] ShippingLab. ShippingLab. 2022 [cited 2022 Jun 4]. ShippingLab. Available from: <https://shippinglab.dk/about/>
- [45] Hong S. [Sunbae Hong, MOF] Global Maritime Digital Clusters & GMDRT (Global Maritime Digital Route) [Internet]. Conference Presentation presented at: Digital@Sea Asia Pacific; 2021 Sep 9 [cited 2022 Apr 15]; Sejong Convention Center. Available from: <http://digitalsea-ap.org/p4/c4/>
- [46] Kristensen, Rasmus Gammelby. A Democratic Intervention in Blue Denmark: A Call for Neutral Transdisciplinary Facilitation and Bridge-Building across Disciplines to Enhance the Possibility of a Future Capable of Sustaining Human Lives. [Master thesis]. Aalborg University, 2022.