Improving Interaction between NGOs, Universities, and Science Shops: Experiences and Expectations

SCENARIO WORKSHOP REPORT VIENNA

by

Regina Reimer, Michael Strähle, Christine Urban

August 2003

Supporting Science & Technology policies

A project funded by the European Commission/DG 12 under the Fifth RTD Framework Programme

Contract No. HPV1-CT-2001-60039

Acknowledgement

The team of Vienna is very grateful to all the participants of our EASW-Workshop on July 12th, who provided us with new ideas for our work and the cooperation with NGOs and other institutions. We also want to thank the moderator and those who contributed rooms and catering.

The Team of the Science Shop Vienna, August 2003

Table of Contents

1 Introduction

1.1 Why an EASW in Vienna?

The workshop described in the following is part of an cooperation project between several science shops and other institutions called INTERACTS which aims at strengthening the interaction between research institutions and society by improving cooperation in science, research and development of small to medium NGO's with universities through intermediaries such as science shops.
INTERACTS started in January 2002 and was expected to be finished at yearend 2003. The project was to be realized in five steps:
1. State-of-the-Art Reports gave an overviews of political and institutional conditions for the co-operation between small to medium non-governmental organisations (NGOs), science shops, and universities in Denmark, the United Kingdom, Germany, Austria, Spain, and Romania.
2. The National Case Studies Reports examined the expectations from and the practical experience with interaction between NGOs, scientists, and science shops.
3. Participatory workshops in each of the seven partner countries should allow discussion of future expectations and perspectives for co-operation with NGO representatives, researchers and policy makers. Together with the State-of-the-Art Report and the case studies, these discussions were to produce an inventory of operational options and challenges, and necessary changes for improving the future interaction between NGO's, researchers, and intermediaries like science shops. Giving voice to a broader range of stakeholders democratizes Science and Technology policy.
4. The final report will identify potentials and barriers of the research and development system to enable effective and sustainable co-operation and presents policy recommendations and strategies for improving conditions for future co-operations.
5. In a last step, the INTERACTS findings are disseminated at national and international workshops and conferences.
In first place it was planned to carry out group discussions in the 3rd step. Discussions between partners and more detailed conception after we had finished the case studies led to the conclusion, that it would be interesting to have Scenario Workshops instead of group discussions. Especially the partners from Spain and Innsbruck reported about their good experiences with this method and provided much material.

1.2 Summary of the Results

On 12th June 2003 our moderated Scenario Workshop took place in Vienna in the rooms of the WUK, where the Science Shop Vienna has office. Topic was **Bedingungen der Zusammenarbeit zwischen gemeinnützigen Organisationen, Universitäten und Wissenschaftsläden** (Conditions for Cooperation between Nonprofit-Organisations, Universities and Science Shops). The workshop lasted the whole day and 19 persons from different professional and social backgrounds, i. e. politics, research, NGOs and science shops, participated.

The results of the working groups show, that it would make sense to establish science shops as independent interdisciplinary mediatory agencies between NGOS and other interest groups like research organisations, universities and politics. Continuous public funding is necessary for these institutions to fulfill their tasks. National and international networking, public relation works, international partnerships were suggested to strengthen science shops, but it was also seen that their relatively poor ressources do not allow for that. It is also central to reconsider the contemporary criterions of good research and to change the evaluation standards. If research for people shall be supported, then it is a must to integrate the opinions and experiences of those who shall benefit, i. e. who can apply the research results or who contribute their views from practical experiences.

2 Organisational Issues

2.1 Date and Duration:

12th June 2003, 9.45-17.00

2.2 Location

WUK, Währinger Straße 59
1090 Vienna

The EASW Workshop took place at the WUK, where the Science Shop Vienna has offices since 2001. The WUK is a well-known cultural and social centre located in a listed former locomotive factory. A lot of cultural and social initiatives are situated there and they organise a wide range of events and exhibitions or carry out social projects. Many synergies develop between the Science Shop Vienna and the NGOs situated there. In this case the NGOs in the WUK lent us several rooms for the day our EASW took place.
The buffet was provided by WUK-Catering, which provided excellent refreshments and lunch fo a very reasonable price, which also is an important contribution to a meeting lasting for several hours, which never must be underestimated!

2.3 Preparation of the EASW in Vienna

As it was our first practical experience with an EASW, we had to get familiar with the method, its variations and possible appliances by reading descriptions and analyses of the methods. We want to thank here again PAXMED (Spain) and FBI (Innsbruck) who provided booklets and convenient overviews for the not experienced partners. After getting informed we started detailed conception. It was clear from the beginning that we would not moderate the event ourselves, but would engage a professional moderator to conduct the EASW, because this would not only ensure good results, but also give us the possibility to participate ourselves and we only partly would have to play the role of organizers. Secondly we aimed at 4 working groups and 16 participants at minimum, because we did not see more than four possible social groups.

Selection of appropriate participants was quite an effort then because the EASW affords a rather exact pattern of people. In our case it consisted in 4 defined social groups, each of them had to consist of min. 4 and max. 6 persons. Hence, we stopped inviting people as soon as a defined social group was occupied. Unfortunately time tables of busy people change often and then somebody else had to be found to replace them. There was a quite high fluctuation of people who would come “for sure”. Early acceptances before June had often to be drawn back due to reasons of health or for business duties. The heat-wave which provided the weeks before and after of our workshop with 35° C and higher increased the number of those who surprisingly would be unable to come. Some told us, that it was almost impossible for them to accomplish their professional duties due to the temperatures and so they could not afford to spend so much time. Others disliked or should not travel under such conditions. Many people suggested participation for some hours or half a day, which is not possible of course for the EASW-method. The feedback after sending out the invitations was very positive and also those who could not participate in the end showed much interest and told us, they would have enjoyed coming.

In spite of these difficulties we suceded in organising an interesting and well-balanced occupation of the social groups. We had team meetings, where we discussed the material and determined the agenda. Because we were conscious about the tight schedule for discussions on the one hand and the necessecity of longer refreshment breaks due to the heat on the other hand, we decided to have "refreshments plus discussions", which means that the participants had almost all the time access to the necessary beverages. The material for the conference was conceived in a way giving information about us, about the method and about the project. The working areas were organised in a way that the four working groups had an own room for their discussions each and for the plenum we had another large and friendly room. The moderator looked after the working groups during their discussions as well to give help if necessary. It also seemed important to us, that the meeting would follow the planned agenda and not to go over time limits, because everybody should be able to stay until the end of the final discussions and nobody should have to miss important parts due to other appointments.

We paid travel expenses to participants from outside Vienna. Additionally those persons who were free lancers and not employed by an university or public office received an allowance to cover at least a part of the income loss they eventually had to suffer because of participating in the workshop the whole day long. This was necessary to prevent that only well situated people would be able to participate.

2.4 Awareness materials sent to the participants

To enable those invited to the workshop to make an informed decision, they received a condensed version of the handout for participants of the workshop. It contained a description of the INTERACTS project and of the methodology applied for the workshop, additionally, the concept of science shops was explained. A listing of the guiding questions explained the objectives of the workshop, a reference to the societal sectors participants will come from, and a preliminary workshop agenda allowed of getting an idea of the workshop.
At the beginning of the workshop participants received a folder with a handout, in which the workshop agenda and the guiding questions for the small group discussions were listed. The handout contained a description of the INTERACTS project, a self description of the Science Shop Vienna and an enlarged version of the explanation of the concept of science shops already contained in the invitation materials. Additionally, we included a list of participants' e-mail addresses and – to allow of a self-evaluation of the workshop – a feedback questionnaire on the venue, the buffet, the invitation materials, the methodology of the workshop, on participants' expectations, impressions, suggestions, and on activities stimulated by the workshop.

2.5 Organiser presentation

The Science Shop Vienna is an independent research institute offering non-profit organisations impartial, applicable research. Research topics mainly derive from requests directed to the Science Shop Vienna or are developed together with NGO's. As distinct from most university-based science shops, research is carried out by professional researchers. If feasible, research is interdisciplinary and integrates non-scientists on an equal footing. Although a focus on social and cultural issues has developed in the recent years it is not restricted to them. The team consists of persons from different research fields. Examples for newer projects are the organisation of congresses to bring together practical and theoretical experts, supporting an empowerment project for tenants with science expertise, a research project about mother students at Vienna´s universities and a networking project based on its results. The Science Shop Vienna also focusses on the chances and risks of Internet Technologies for NGOs and on the public understanding of science. The Science Shop Vienna often pioneers topics and approaches, that are taken up by major research institutions and political authorities.

2.6 Participating Local Stakeholder Groups

2.6.1 Moderation:

Mag. Michaela Enner
philosopher and experienced moderator, who was employed to lead invited groups and persons through the workshop day.

2.6.2 Science Shop Group

Mag.a Manuela Fritz
Historian and philosopher, employed at the Science Shop Graz, she carries out projects and works as mediator of science and research (master thesises and dissertations).

Regina Reimer
Sociologist and ethnologist, works at the Science Shop Vienna, specialized on women, new poverty, cultural studies. At the moment she writes about bicultural couples.

Dr. Michael Strähle
Philosopher and sinologist working at the Science Shop Vienna, Austrian Society for Documentation and Information, research focus: ICT assessment *and* science studies.

Mag.a Laula Streicher
Sociologist and mediator, director general of the Science Shop Graz - Institute for Science Transfer

Mag.a Eva Timpe
Biologist working at the Science Shop Graz, she is specialized in natural sciences, juristical sciences, culture and arts.

Mag.a Christine Urban
Sociologist and studies from psychology, languages and computer studies, working for the Science Shop Vienna and focusses on women, education, medicine sociology, methods of social sciences.

2.6.3 NGO Group

Fritz Endl

Director of the Regional Education Office Velm. Because he is an early retired teacher he can dedicate himself to for social engagement, actively promotes community organisation, now he volunteers for the Educational Native Union in Velm. He seeks for accompanying research for his activities,

Valerie Rückert

Director of the Wissensbörse, which was founded in 1990 and has offices in the Austrian Museum for Social and Economic Affairs. The NGO promotes exchange of knowledge between junior and senior experts.

DSA Christoph Stoik

Certificated Social Worker and lecturer at the Social Work Academy in Vienna, he is active in the education, consulting and accompanying projects in the field of community development. He works at „Bassena am Schöpfwerk“, a NGO the Science Shop supported some years ago.

Mag.a Margit Wolfsberger

Ethnologist und mediator of culture, her activies in several NGOs and research projects, she focusses on the intercultural field. She also works for WUK Radio. As a student she wrote a seminar paper on science shops.

Mag.a Karin Hofer

Artist and historian of arts, who works about esthectics, theory of arts, culture, and development of culture.

2.6.4 Politics and University Management Group

Peter Florianschütz

Works at the GPA (Union of Salaried Private Sector Employees) and the AK (Austrian Federal Chamber of Labour), focusses on vocational training (youth, adults), the support of working students, access to higher education and is an expert for the Austrian Social Democratic Party.

Dr. Hermann Huemer

Research Manager at the **Vienna** University of Economics and Business Administration, he does research information, research dokumentation and research evaluation as well as project consultation and public relations

Mag.a Katharina Novy
Sociologist and historian, referent for science and education, Grüner Klub im Rathaus (Green Party Vienna), earlier she lectured for NGOs about society and social politics topics, worked in ecucation or research projects like biografic table rounds, NS-exhibitions, historical anthropology at the IFF and sociology of childhood)

Mag. Sintayehu Tsehay
Economist, SPÖ polician (Socialist Party of Austria), he focusses on civil society and therefore is in the management board of several NGOs and institutes like SOS Mitmensch,the WUK, Union for Ethopian people and promoted a project for better understanding between the police and Africans in Vienna.

2.6.5 Research Group

Mag. Gerhard Liska
He has studied ecology at Vienna University and works now as education trainer for adults and supervisior. He has written his master thesis in the scope of a project of the Science Shop Vienna.

Mag. DI Dr. Michael Perenig
Studied business adminsitration at the Vienna University for Economics and forest economics at the University of Natural Resources and Applied Life Sciences in Vienna. Since 1995 he works there at the Institute of Forest Sector Policy and Economics. His research and teaching focus on policy for protection of nature and environment and participative conflict management and knowledge transfer.

Angela Strzalka
She is finalizing her studies of musicology and ethnology. She works at the Wiener Tourismusverband (Union of Tourism in Vienna) and is as an event manager. She is active member of the Union of Knowledge Transfer.

Dr. Udo Wid
Artist, he has worked as a biophysician for a long time. In the last years he focusses on projects that deal with the synergy of disciplines and that establish connections between science, arts, philosophy and the daily life.

2.7 Carrying out the workshop

In the morning of June, 12th 2003 we welcomed the participants with a cup of tea or coffee. After *their registration* they received a workshop-folder (see: appendix) and name badges, which should be placed visibly on the chest. To make orientation easy for everybody each social group was marked by one colour: “Politics and University Management” was red, “NGOs“ blue, “Research” green and “Science Shops” yellow. All participants received folders and name-cards in the colour of “their” social group.
After a short refreshment and small talk until everybody had arrived, the participants gathered in the large plena room.
The moderator, Mag.a Michaela Enner, explained the chronological order of events and how the meeting was organised:

TIME-TABLE

10.00 - 10.15 Welcome
Presentation of science shop and the project INTERACTS
Introduction round

11.15 - 12.30 1. round: „Best case- Szenario“, homogenous working groups

12.30 - 13.30 lunch hour

13.30 - 14.45 Plenum: presentation of the scenarios and key factors

14.45 - 15.00 break

15.00 16.15 2. round: key factors, heterogeneous working groups

16.15 - 16.30 break

16.30 Plenum: Presentation and discussion of the results
Feedback-sheets
Final Flashlight

After the science shop welcomed the participants and informed about science shops in general and especially about the European project INTERACTS, the participants were invited to present themselves and their professional backgrounds in a few sentences and to tell us, what they expected from the workshop. The professional backgrounds are documented in the chapter *Participating Local Stakeholder Groups* (see above).

We summarize the expectations mentioned by the participants in the following. We only give a very general picture of expectations and do not relate speaker´s contributions to individuals but to social groups. Experience shows us that what people say in such rounds cannot be regarded as independent opinions, but depends on what other speakers say. Later contributions are strongly influenced by previous contributions and if the speaker feels that something was said already he/she may only give a short confirmation instead of repeating it.

Nevertheless a short overview of expressed expectations in the different social groups might be interesting:

People from mediatory organisations, i. e. **science shops** said that they hoped for broadening their horizons by fresh outsiders´ views and to get new perspectives concerning their daily work, i. e. science transfer. The colleagues from Graz and Vienna also looked forward to the occasion to become known to each other on a more personal level, because they had met only occasionally before or had only phoned and mailed. They also hoped that the workshop would provide new results in many respects, because the EASW was a completely new approach for them.

Research group participants told us that they would like to deepen the contacts with the science shops during the workshop, they expected to learn more about the interactions of science and society, to get more insight in their cooperation and to contribute as outsiders, who are not involved.

NGO members were interested in issues of research and its applications, possibilities to cooperate, interfaces between theory and practice, they hoped for additional occasions for networking and exchange of experiences.

Participants from the **politics** group mentioned the insufficient support for NGOs by the government and expected interesting discussions and exchange of experiences as well. They wanted to learn more about the science shops because they regarded them as important interfaces between a wide range of stakeholders.

After the self-presentation round the participants were invited to constitute homogeneous working groups, i. e. to group by matching colours. The moderator asked them to work out a best case scenario for the year 2010. She emphasized that it was important that nobody got restrained by reflections about actual barriers or about putting the ideas into practice. The Best Case Scenario 2010 should be an overall optimistic scenario. Participants should relax and fall into wishful thinking without bothering at all about feasibility. When the groups would have finished describing their future best scenario in all important details, they should think about three leading questions:

Leading questions:
1.) Which steps were taken that the best scenario developed?
2:) Which conditions made it possible?
3.) Which were the 3-5 key factors that were necessary?

The key factors should be written on large cards which again were coloured to mark the concerned social group. Each group had to choose one of their circle who would be responsible for documentation and presentation.
After these explanations and the answering all questions concerning the method, the groups retired into separate working rooms, which allowed for undisturbed development of the scenarios without being influenced by other groups. They were equipped with flipcharts, thick pens in diverse colours to write on the posters, coloured cards and the materials in their workshop maps. There was unlimited access to the refreshments all the time. The moderator visited the groups in larger intervals and asked, if they needed something or if they had further questions. She also reminded them to stay roughly within the timeframe.
She reported an intense and concentrated atmosphere of discussion and working in all 4 groups. Hence, none of the four groups was ready in time, but still worked at lunch time. Only when the moderator urged to stop, they would slowly free themselves from the working process and the lunch break could begin with little retardation.
After lunch the four homogenous working groups, i. e. stakeholder groups, presented their results, which are described in detail in the chapter *Vision Making Results of the Four Homogenous Working Groups* (see below*)*.
Each of the four presentations began with a description of the desired best case scenario in 2010 and all speakers ended with pinning three to five cards showing the key factors the group considered as most relevant for the realisation of this optimal future on the blackboard. Now it was necessary to determine the topics for the second working round. The participants were asked to quote the most important topics. Each participant received two sticking points from the moderator, which were attached to the key factor cards on the blackboard, which they estimated as most important. key factors with related topics were grouped together and under general concepts. The generic terms found for them were to constitute the topics for the second working group round.
Those topics who had been marked with most sticking points became the four working topics for the heterogeneous groups. After the presentations, there was time for questions or feedback until break.

When the participants returned, the moderator facilitated the formation of the heterogenous, i. e. thematic working groups. Again four groups retired into separate rooms, but this time their members came from different working and research fields and had different approaches to the concerning topics.
The work finished with the second break in the afternoon, when people met at the buffet for relaxing and small talk.
Finally, the heterogeneous groups presented their results, which were attended with attention. You can read them in details in the chapter Results of the Thematic Groups. There was not very much discussion, we can only speculate why: One of the reasons might consist in the fact, that the schedule had become a bit tight and people had to catch trains. Secondly, although people had worked hard in spite of the breeding heat, they seemed a bit exhausted then. On the other hand, the reason could simply consist in harmonizing opinions: The remarks of the participants showed interest until the end of the meeting and there was no evidence of strong oppositions.
In a final round, the moderator asked for feedback concerning the EASW. There were very positive opinions concerning the organisation, the professional moderation, the diversity among participants. Their different professional backgrounds was considered as a good base for good results, because different views could be integrated. Participants enjoyed discussions in small working groups, especially with people who work in different fields and whom they would not have met otherwise. One participant would have desired a broader topic instead of focussing on science shops. Many participants wished future meetings like this. The work of science shops was estimated high and so science shops should be strengthened and supported by networking. Everybody appreciated highly the ambience in the WUK and also the buffet, both were estimated as a contribution to a good working atmosphere and hence to good results.
A more detailed insight gives the analysis of the feedback-sheets, which were returned to us at the end of the EASW:

2.8 Feedback from participants - questionnaire

18 out of 19 participants returned the answered questionnaires, which we adopted from one of our British partners, Irene Hall (Liverpool Hope College). For the full text of the questions translated into German please look at the appendix. The first six questions

Q1: How comfortable/accessible did you find the venue?
Q2: How did you find the catering and refreshments?
Q3: How helpful/informative did you find the pre-workshop information?
Q4: How appropriate do you feel the EASW Methodology was for this workshop?

Q5: Did you enjoy the workshop?
Q6: Do you feel that the workshop met with your expectations?

were to be quoted between 1 and five. They should give 1 for best and 5 for poorest quotation of the item. (We changed the British concept, because in Austrian schools a "Five" is always the worst mark, whereas a "One" is the best mark and opposite quotation sometimes leads to confusion). In the following we give a summary of the results:
For most of the participants it was easy to find the place, which was expressed by an average mark of 1,2. Also the buffet and the refreshments were met with approval (average mark 1,4). The informative material they received in advance was helpful for most participants (average mark 1,5). Our participants reacted a bit more restrictively to the question, how appropriate they judged the EASW-method for our topic. The average scale of only 2,1 indicates critical reflection. Nevertheless our participants enjoyed the workshop very much (average mark 1,5) and on the whole it met their expectations (average mark 1,6).
The next 6 questions were open questions, which means that the participants were to answer them in their own words. These answers are summarized in the following:

Q7: Which aspect of the workshop did you enjoy most and why?
Eight persons mentioned honourably the heterogeneity of the of the participants. The discussions and the results were named by 5 participants. 4 participants judged the method especially positive. The chances of making contacts was mentioned three times as often as the comfortable and constructive atmosphere in the workshop and the same number of participants felt especially well attended by the moderator. The place of the event and the exchange of informations were mentioned two times each. Further attention was given to the nice team of the science shop, the nice participants and the exchange of experiences. Ingenious and inviting to interpretation is the reply: "science - shop - world of life".

Q8: Which aspect of the workshop did you least enjoy and why?
Three times the strong heat *was the most disliked aspect.* Two participants did not *enjoy* the homogenous working groups. That there was not enough time for discussion in the plenum and in the working groups was emphasized two times each. One participant liked the second discussion round less and another participant judged the statement of the problem as too narrow. The discussion of alternative scenarios and that science shops in Austria had not been described as heterogenous organisations before were missed one time each. One participant thinks it is a pity that there is no science shop in Lower Austria. With "everything was optimal" another participant repeats his positive impression of the meeting.

Q9: Do you have further comments?

The answers of this question consisted on the whole in repetition or reinforcement of the positive or negative aspects said before.

Q10: Do you have any suggestions for further activities as a follow up to this workshop?

6 participants suggested the organisation of further workshops. Information exchange or meetings for exchange of informations 5 participants could imagine. Two times it was suggested to adapt the method or to evaluate it. One person each suggested the following steps: to demand lobbying of the scientific advisory board, to found an NGO-advisory board, to present the results to the politics. Another participant suggests to get feedback about this meeting. A NGO-member desired scientific support and more contact to science shops for the future. Another participant suggested practical training.

Q11: Do you think you will take any action as a result of attending this workshop?

4 participants will try to insert the suggestions and ideas they received during the meeting into their own work and the same number of persons wanted to maintain the contacts they made. 3 participants wanted to realize a closer cooperation between NGOs and research. One of the questioned was convinced, that there will be further projects and another one wishes further reflection. Another participant decided to wait for the present for the final report.

Q12: What are the most important results for you?

The answers are again very wide-spread. It only takes shape that public relation and/or networking would be necessary and that there was more insight into the situations of the other social groups.

2.9 Documentation

The documentation of the Workshop was mainly achieved by taking notes, which was done by the members of the Science Shop Vienna *by alternating*. For the results of the working groups always one person was chosen as responsible for writing down everything and to create the posters with the results.

The presentations of the working group results were recorded. Before we switched on the recorder we asked the participants, if they would allow us to apply it. We guaranteed that nobody would be named, which makes sense, because speakers presented only the results of the teamwork and it was not about individual lectures of

anybody. We explained that the records would not be used for any detailed social science analysis but only offer us something better than written notices, because we wanted to minimise the risks of loosing important issues. Nobody objected to the recording of the presentation rounds. Nevertheless we took notices as well, which turned out as useful for those parts, which were poorly recorded due to ambient noise.
The presentation round with expectations and the lines concerning the individual person was mailed to each participant after the workshop, so they could correct it or complete it, if necessary.

3 Workshop results

3.1 Vision Making Results of the four homogenous social groups

3.1.1 Presentation of the group Politics

Their concept deals rather with action than reflection or theory. Their discussions from a more political perspective went into a more holistic view again and again. The more general aspects of the needs of society appeared, f. e. the question *What is the task of a science shop regarding the whole system?* Hence, what they wrote down as best scenario for a Science Shop 2010 implied also the vision, that society would develop into a completely different direction.

As a Best Scenario they desire a **structured civil society** in which the work of the NGOs valued/appreciated to a higher degree. It will be a different sort of „knowledge", i. e. **knowledge for people**, dedicated to people.

Should it be **knowledge as public property or knowledge as marketable goods**? The word Science Shop can also suggest terms like **goods, money, business**. They decided that in 2010 science shops should not work in a different way, but they should do the same as they do now. It should be still work for research as public property, for a not-hegemonial, emancipatory and democratic science and they should not aim at producing marketable knowledge, because there exist already other institutions to perform this task. Hence, they must not initiate secret knowledge that would be personal property of requesting persons, but knowledge that is open to everybody, the access for simple civil persons must be free of charge, it emerges from broader **public interest** and is not meant as individual consultation for individual problems, it shall be easy to access and if political backgrounds or interests should be declared and documented. **Generation of knowledge and preparation happens** in different **regions and in the capital, transfer is proactive.**

Who needs knowledge? It imports to them that the science shops initiate the right sort of knowledge, because **knowledge is not neutral**. It has to be not-hegemonial knowledge, knowledge not for the powerful, but emancipatory knowledge which would strengthen the not-governing actors in the society. Hence the important t**asks of science shops** consists in **giving access to the knowledge of public authorities** and **science management,** they are intermediares that need not **necessarily carry out research by themselves**. To comply these tasks, it imports that science shops can work **independent and impartial.**

These tasks make public subvention necessary: science shops cannot work in dependance from the market nor can they be funded by applying for little projects, which they have to calculate and to justify each. There must not exist this kind of dependancy from sponsors, government or local authorities, which means that they have to apply for funds every year risking immediate sanctions, if the results of their work was too critical against their money givers. Instead there has to be some kind of basic subvention. After discussing about different models, they would prefer financing science shop work by a fund. Evaluation of the quality of their work should be done by an advisory board, i. e. a committee consisting of members of the society, the NGOs, those who are to profit from their work. It would be necessary to develop a prototype for this form of evaluation by the society.
Background of their reflections is not only democratisation of knowledge but also democratisation of the whole society, in which knowledge and information are not only in possession of those who rule, but wide spread in the public. The **authorities** will be even **obliged to make knowledge public**.
It is not only important to bring the knowledge from the universities to the public, but "knowledge of public authorities" is important too, because experience shows that negotiating NGOs sometimes get overrun by "facts" they cannot hold against, and it would be very important to get these statistical datas of the authorities to be able to argue.

STEPS

* Austrian plan for democracy
* EC recommendation for democratising science and especially for science shops
* Land, Stadt, government guarantees finances for periods of 3, 5 or 7 years
* creating a fund
* working out a modell for the NGO-advisory groups
* pubic relation work

Their biggest desire would be the democratisation of knowledge. This step could come from the European Commission, who should install this as a positive standard. A model for the NGOs has to be developed for networking. A very important issue is the continuity of financial support for a long time instead of appliance for funds every year and that it would be up to the NGO-gremium to decide about the quality of the accomplished work.
The discussion about what science shops could do by themselves ended up to the conclusion that they cannot do anything with their small ressources which do not allow for public relation work. so they need lobbying and networking and they need a basic subvention. There should come international pressure on Austria as well.

Key factors found by the group politics:

1. Networking with Stakeholders
2. guarantee for subvention
3. Lobbying for science shops
4. Initial subvention by the EU and “standards”

3.1.2 Presentation of the Group Science

They started to discuss about the actual situation of science and research and the universities. The main point of their paper is promoting a more holistic form of science. Now-a-days everything is split up into different disciplines. A holistic approach demands for integration of the different research fields. In 2010 there exist interfaces between the different approaches and the different realities of people, their different interpretations of reality through education and experiences. It is absolutely not satisfying to have different sciences, it is necessary that there are more connections, people having the overview.

Holistic, that means integrative, i. e. interfaces and integration of different approaches and reality interpretations. 2010 an own subject of study will be established, which deals especially with coordination, connections and overview between different subjects and mind-mapping. A master degree for integrative science can be acquired and there has to be an own institute for integrative science at universities as well. They are specialists for what science fields do exist, what are they dealing with, what are their approaches and differences?

There will be guest lectures and everybody can give lectures, not only people with higher education, i. e. shoemakers, farmers, tailors as well as professors from university. Everybody should be listened at without prejudging. All topics are possible.

A tree of knowledge is produced where all the different sciences are placed, like science and social or cultural research, pedagogic, etc. It is also necessary to strengthen intuitive thinking “coming from the belly”. For this purpose the collaboration with universities of arts will be promoted.

They also reflected about the access barriers to science for not academic people. They identified mainly power, reliability and terminology.

Educational work has to be performed concerning rationality of sciences in contrast to everyday´s knowledge.
The subject “Integrale” is established in 2010, which is tutored at schools as well as at universities, children of school already get an overview of the structure of knowledge. More important than knowing many things by heart is knowing, where you can find information and how to get access. They also see it as a task of science shops to promote this form of knowledge about the knowledge.

STEPS:

* translation aids between different worlds of knowledge and different interpretative systems
* Organisation of guest lectures
* Description of other concepts of knowledge transmission, f. e. historical authentic witness of surviving temporaries
*get invited by schools
* establishing subject integrale, study plan integrale, professorship for integrative sci
* “tree of science” makes net of knowledge accessible
* collaboration with universities of arts (workshops, strengthening the belly)

Key factors

* Knowing as knowledge
* Accepting different realities and transdiciplinarity
* Appreciation of and confidence in the action of the other and myself.

3.1.3 Presentation of the Group NPOs

The year 2010 would be established as the year of science exchange or knowledge exchange. The steps leading to this situation is included in this vision.
There are **continuous round tables between NGOs and science shops.** In spite of the widespread use of electronic communication there are jour fixes of NGOs and science shops and the people, where they really talk to each other. **Guaranteed financial autonomy of science shops** they consider as very important as well as **their independence** in general.

There is much **international and national networking** between science shops which strengthens them and which they should present to the public in a higher degree.
Science shops promote networking between NGOs, because many NGOs are working on similar issues and the science shops can help them to learn to know each other and to exchange their experiences.
Interdisciplinary development of models by sciences shops. The intermediary institutes have more overview about existing models in different fields and by knowing a wide range of NGOs and projects. Hence, they can promote the development of models.
It would be nice, if the science shops could deal with **research on trends of actual problems**, create a pool, i. e. they could actively perform research about relevant problems, not only as reaction to requests.
The **role of science shops as translators and mediators** will still be necessary in 2010, although they hope that citizens will have much better access to science and research than today.
Science shops will i**ntegrate the rural regions** in particular, because in the urban regions there is more accumulation of researchers. In the town collaboration is more likely to happen than in the country.
It is very important for them that **NGOs are supported by science and research**, on the one hand through the results themselves, and on the other hand being object of a study is **public relations**, which improves the image of the organisations.

STEPS

* **searching for allies**
    in science
    on EU level
    in political movements (civil society and definition)
    on a national and on a international level
    integration of public persons

* **stronger puplic relations**
    develop adequate offensive concepts (information evenings, ...)
    „radio science shop“
    integration of public persons

Key factors found by the group NPOs

* role as translators
* sufficient ressources
* networking, contacts, exchangement
* public relations work
* autonomy

3.1.4 Presentation of the Group Science Shops

In 2010 the science shops will possess an **adequate infrastructure**. Their rooms are big enough and representative and there is also an open work area with an open access library, a coffee shop, a rooms for events and tutorials or workshops, with adequate equipment and internet infrastructure.

They have **adequate personal equipment** to cover as many fields of research as possible. There was consent that science shop teams should not be specialists, but generalists who are able to work inter- and transdisciplinarily. Nevertheless stuff-member should have clear functions.

This includes a **secretary** as well as an **computer administrator**. A very important improvement is the **office for public relations**, because now-a-days they have not enough ressources to present their successes and to make it well known through media or elsewhere.

Some of the questions that motivate people to contact a science shop do not really deal with science. It happens f. e. sometimes, that a NGO calls, because they want to know where to get money or how to write an appliance for subventions or a student is frigged when writing his/her master thesis or somebody searches contacts to NGOs and research organisations who are working on a special field, etc. Hence, all this requests will be taken care of by the science shop´s **hotline for associated services**, which will be installed then.

In 2010 they will have **adequate long-term funds**, which allow for paying the described personal and the infrastructure. Additionally there exists a funds for social compatible projects (like in Canada) where science shops can get means for their participatory research projects.

Transfer done by science shops is estimated equally to other research fields. Impact is not defined as number of publications any more, but working in a research project initiated by a science shop counts as much as f. e. five publications in Nature or

in Science. So, if f. e. the EU evaluates a institute of an university, this will be a factor that weights.
When students collaborate with science shops they acquire or prove special or additional skills, which are not documented yet. There will be **certifications, references, quality papers for students having worked for science shops**, saying f. e. that a person is able to collaborate with citizens or NGOs in a social compatible research project.
Science shops are also **essential partners of universities** and they are present **in all their important decision committees**.

STEPS
to be taken are included in the following list of key factors:

Key factors

* Establishing science transfer and financed by long-term funds
* Support by politics, university, public
* Change in the quality criteria for science

4 Results of thematic groups

Four not homogeneous thematic groups had
* to articulate the actual situation and the desired situation
* what would be necessary to overcome the difference?

4.1 Presentation of the Group working on the topic Support by Politics, Universities and Public

They started by drawing tables of actual situations and desired situations concerning possible support of science shops by politics, pubic and universities and compared them. Then they tried to work out ways to make support by the three named groups possible.

4.1.1 Politics

A lack of basic concept is perceived. Hence support is a matter of single persons good wills. The support for science shop is not institutionalized, which means everything depends on the persons who actually occupy relevant offices. *Additionally science shops are not supporters of political parties, but independent organisations. This fact can also cause them problems.*
For these reasons the group demands for more democracy. They ask for commitment in the subvention for that kind of science that is autonomous and does not depend on or work for a certain political party.

4.1.2 Public

In this context they focussed on that parts of the public which are organized, like NGOs or unions. On the one hand there is much informal support by some NGOs, on the other hand competitive situations exist. This means that informal support develops on a personal level and is left to chance. Cooperation is especially difficult in those cases where funds or special ressources with overlapping dedication exist. On such conditions it is more complicated to cooperate and to bundle energies of the different organisations who would be stronger together and perhaps have better results than on their own.

The resulting demands are more networking and exchange of informations. For example, if an NGO is confronted with a request it cannot answer, then it should pass it on. To do this, it has to know that there are science shops and the people who work in those institutions. Another demand consists in esteem for each other which has to do with competition. If it was possible to establish a general condition of mutual appreciation, than competitive situations would lose their tensions which would lead to more support for each other.

4.1.3 Universities

In the actual situation universities or professors and other people send their members in the science shop´s advisory boards to support them non-materially and to give ideas. It is desirable that advisory board members would more intensely exercise their multiplier function at universities to make more propaganda for the functions of science shops, e. g. provoke a mutual exchange to a higher extent.
For the university the cooperation with science shops is partly perceived as a question of outsourcing, i. e. the science shops would profit, if the universities would pass over the tasks of science shop to them. Some signs indicate, that universities could try to offer exactly such services as science shops offer traditionally. Especially when it turns out profitable for them or if they can gain much publicity, they will be interested to offer these services themselves and not to have anybody else their knowledge or know-how or the results of their research.
There should develop a circulation. If political decision-makers showed a stronger commitment to science and research, it would have a positive impact on universities resulting in enlarged room to move, to establish more contacts with politicians, institutions, etc.

4.2 Presentation of the Group working on the topic *Finances and Subventions*

They began with sketching the **actual situations** in Vienna and in Graz.
Graz:They have three half-time employees and one half-time office for management. This basic work is financed by the University of Graz by two thirds and another third is divided between municipal authorities and state government. Smaller amounts they get from membership fees and donations. There is the possibility of additional work by carrying out research projects.
Vienna: There are mainly three free lancers. In the 90ies they got basic funds and could perform more mediatory work, but actually they focus on research. Often they bundle requests and develop projects. Hence, the science shop initiates research

coming from the public, but they cannot perform some characteristic tasks like finding students for writing their master thesis dedicated to NGOs requests.

In spite of differences between the situations of Graz and Vienna, both of them obviously have not enough means to afford sufficiently personal, infrastructure and rooms. Although the situation might look better in Graz at the first sight, they stress that their basic funds have not changed since 13 years although the work which has to be done has strongly increased. For this money they could afford 8 employees at the beginning, actually they have only 4 employees. Hence, their institution is completely overloaded, because they are well-known meanwhile and they cannot take more requests and meet the increased demand.

The **desired situation** simply would be science shops with adequate staff, room and infrastructure.They discussed different means to improve the actual situation and to create the desired situation.

One very important step they consider lobbying from insiders. Present funding structures are advantageous for already well-known and well-funded organisations and disadvantageous for smaller ones such as science shops. Thus well-known scientists and researchers could play a role as mentors here to give science shops better access to funding. The ressources for doing lobbying for themselves are limited in science shops.

A second step would be sponsoring. But like lobbying sponsoring would require high investments like promotion materials and staff that has the time to get into contact with many people. Regarding the small ressources of the science shops, these steps for establishing continuous basic subvention depend on the help of outsiders: it is not possible for science shops to intensify their promotion work or to organize advertising campaigns, because their energies are completely absorbed by their daily intermediary work.

Another idea would be that science shops would bundle their efforts to get basic subvention on an national or even international level. The European Commission could support them by encouraging national governments to promote independent science shops in their countries. This would guarantee more democratic science and research, which is dedicated to the civil society.

4.3 Presentation of the Group working on the topic *Networking*

The **actual situation** shows big differences in the working methods and financial funds of science shops and they focus on different issues. Time and ressources allow only for little public relations work.
For they **desired situation** they had several ideas about improved networking of science shops and also between science shops and NGOs. They had the idea of better cooperation with journalists and media, no matter if university media or daily newspapers, to get more present there. This should lead to more articles about the services of science shops to transport positive examples and the results of their work. This would support making new contacts or to develop existing contacts which would be useful for acquiring money.
Another step could be, that science shops participate more often in information events like Science Week, carrier fairs, etc. They could get more contact to students or create "markets" for NGOs so that they can learn to know each other.
The vicious circle consists in the fact, that these activities to improve the situation only would be possible, if the science shops had enough time and money to perform them.
They think it would be interesting to know more about the demands of universities and NGOs concerning the work of science shops. For example it would be productive to find out more exactly which kind of scientific consultations is useful for NGOs. Perhaps they would require a higher number of workshops and meetings for networking.
Finally they got the idea that science shops could install a NGO-advisory board in addition to their scientific advisory boards, in which NGO-members would meet and articulate their questions from practical work or demand for consultations.

4.4 Presentation of the Group working on the topic *A different kind of science and research*

The topic is very broad and in the short time they could not solve all the problems. The focussed on the question what would be necessary to get different and more satisfying quality criteria for research, f. e. they discussed about a possible model for the NGO-committee and they also spoke about the integration of different rationalities. One dimension they reflected are the mono-cultural aspects of the academic world. Research should examine the reality by carrying out transdisciplinary projects. Wherever possible more than one discipline should be involved . Different perspectives and living realities should be included and appreciated. Additionally different existing cultural realities and people should be integrated to a higher extent, f.

e. there could be projects or subjects like “Philosophizing with children”. The meta-question “of the proper task has science” should not be answered only by the science itself. There should be more emphasis on ethical questions.

The **actual situation** of science and research shows up many problems. Quality criteria consist almost exclusively in publishing as much as possible, which means that good contacts to important journalists are required. Evaluation of quality by counting the number of publications lead to strange phenomena. One of them is the well known *Matthew’s Effect*, which says that a certain number of publications will automatically procure longer and longer publication lists, because other researchers ask these authors to contribute their names without really participating, because well known names give better chances to place articles about their studies in journals.

Another well known fact is that the temporary science is a science which is dominated by males. In general women still have not good career chances in science and research compared to men. There is a lot of literature about mechanisms and structures that exclude women from science systematically, we cannot go into details here.

When they regarded university they found out that it was a quite feudalistic system. This shows up in many details. For example how professors choose and support their successors. They also observe, that students depend for a very long time on the goodwill of one single person when they write their master thesises.

One of them described the scientific world as a ugly matted stuff with several forms of personal connections, interactions, embroilment, mobbying and lobbying.

The **desired situation** would bring more objectivity into standards. One possibility is research about science and research, which would have to evaluate how a project was developed, the background, the processes, involved persons and interests, and their general attitudes. Of course this research about research would have to be evaluated as well.

Another idea was the installation of the NGO-advisory board suggested before. Discussing the details they found out, that it could easily happen, that this model would transmit the actual problems of arbitrary decision making about quality of science and research into a similar system. Evaluation by NGOs would not make sense without an elaborated model.

Only changing the persons, which would not come from the academic world but from NGOs this time, would not be sufficient to improve anything, because the same mechanisms and problems could occur, for instance the development of buddy systems, nepotism and all kinds of monopolisation. To get a a more objective evaluation system for research standards an intelligent decision making system has to be developed, where persons could be chosen per random sampling and rotate systems. Also the proportions of gender, age and ethical origines could be included easily. This system should also promote less heroism: we see that very often it is single

persons that are credited for progress in science and research, although it were groups of people, who achieved it together. Hence a system which can take teams into account will bring not only more justice, but also more actual scientific progress, because it promotes actual scientific work instead of training the social skills to claim the successes for oneself.

5 Commentary and Reflections

5.1 Commentary on the Results of the Working Groups

Presentations of the homogenous stakeholder groups reflect different approaches and main interests. We could suppose that there exist in some regards different needs in the different social groups towards emancipatory intermediary institutions like science shops. But at the same time the presentations show some similar concepts concerning important issues and they are also suggesting partly similar solutions in some aspects.

The “politics group” sees science shops mainly as part or result of the whole system of society. They look at the opportunities for access to science and research in connection with social power structures, with distribution of power within the state. Hence, improving access of citizens and the abolishment of monopolisation of science is a very important part of a process of democratisation in our society. They strongly desire that this process would take place! These thoughts form the background of their thoughts about the optimal science shop and his functions. The group works very analytically and pragmatically, too. Their best case scenario is very concretely articulated as well as the steps, which they think would lead to the realisation of this optimal scenario, what tasks science shops should accomplish, how the science shops should gain more acceptance from the authorities, how the science shops should be financed and how their work should be evaluated.

The “research group” is mainly concerned about the present defiencies the sciences and of education and how they are structured and organised. The group strongly focusses on the necessity to increase public understanding for science and research on the one hand, and from the members of different disciplines on the other hand. For this reason, they see the task of the science shop strongly as a transdisciplinary institution which also has the task to mediate between the different groups of society, who see the world in different ways and have learned different thinking habits, because they belong to different research fields or live in different surroundings. Science shops should establish contacts between these Lebenswelten (“living worlds”) and they should restore an overview of different reality interpretations again. Their approach contains also pedagogical elements: pupils and students should be instructed in the integration of knowledges from different areas, studies and Lebenswelten. This should be taught in school as well as in specialized tutorials and in a special study at university.

The “NGO-group” looks at the topic as potential beneficiaries, i. e. clients of science shops. It focusses strongly on modes and possibilities of collaboration between

researchers and nonprofit organisations and science shops. Science shops should not only provide research. They have or know about further important needs of NGOs. F. e. they should facilitate networking among NGOs, they should also establish an overview about research issues concerning NGOs and translate important studies for them. They should do research without request on issues relevant to NGOs. They should organize events or structures for continuous exchange of knowledge and experiences between NGOs, researchers and other stakeholders. On the other hand they see that science shop are organised as NGOs like themselves and so they produce quite realistic ideas about lobbying, public relations, finances and networking etc.

The “science shop group” is directly concerned with the topic. For this reason, they have to state that they consider themselves as highly subjective and strongly influenced by their own experiences and interests. Whereas the other groups give outsider views, this group knows evidently very much about science shop work as insiders, they know details that are important or that often lead to problems and where changes or improvements would be necessary, and they have realistic ideas about what a science shop can accomplish and where the limits are. The contact and discussion between Graz and Vienna opens up new perspectives and new modes of working are reflected. Hence their discussions lead to very concrete ideas and desires for the development of science shops in the future. They focussed on their work, their structures, organisation.

In spite of perhaps different interests and approaches, the homogenous stakeholder groups come in some important points to similar results or stressed similar topics. Following issues were important for several participants and appeared repeatedly during the workshop:

- Science shops need a long-term financial security.
- Science shops have to be independent because of their intermediation tasks. They cannot intermediate if they are partial, especially they should not depend on authorities offering them short-term financing only.
- Science shops work interdisciplinary, it is also their task to intermediate between different ways of thinking and living and integrate them. This concerns the different scientific communities as well as the situation between researchers and the public.
- More public relation and lobbying is necessary than science shops can commit themselves to on present contitions.
- The RTD system has to be more democratic, it should become more open-minded and accessible to civil society.
- One of the reasons for this condition is seen in the lack of reasonable evaluation: there have to be found different quality standards to promote participatory research and democratic knowledge production for the civil society.

Discussions in all stakeholder groups - the groups consisting solely of representatives of the politics, the ngo, the research or the science shop area - depicted actual or desired science shop services as broader than the research services science shops usually only offer. Science shop services should encompass also networking activities with or even between NGOs or their research services should include expert knowledge of administrative bodies, e.g. In three groups, this broader conception of science shop services is also reflected in the concept of knowledge science shops should offer that emerged from the discussions.

The Politics group conceives this kind of knowledge as expert knowledge from different domains of society, which is usually not easily available. This knowledge is explicitly political and has considerable power effects. By making this knowledge available, science shops contribute to the democratization of knowledge and to society at large.

The broadest concept of knowledge emerged from the Research group, in which the labelling of scientific knowledge as the most admirable knowledge was critically discussed. Their concept of knowledge encompasses also craftsmen's expertise; scientific knowledge is not superior to other kind of knowledge. What is needed, is a new integrative science, which should provide an integration of different kinds of knowledge and scientific disciplines understood as a kind of overview of the interrelatedness of these knowledges ("network of knowledge"). Science shops should promote and tie the "network of knowledge".

Discussions in the group on science shops also centered on the kind of knowledge NGO's request. There was unanimous agreement that NGO's often do not request research expertise but their request concern other issues which would not be dealt with adequately, if they would be answered scientifically, because they often concern organisational issues .-. maybe some clients do not exactly know what is available to science and/or what research services can offer to them.

Taken together, these outcomes suggest to consider science shops under a broader perspective than under a research service perspective alone.

5.2 Reflections about the Workshop Tools

5.2.1 Pros and Cons

In the following we give our impressions after this first experience with the EASW and our reflections.

5.2.2 General Pros:

* We got to know it as an entertaining method that interests people and makes it easy to motivate them. It provides a comfortable working atmosphere for productive cooperation. We suppose that if an EASW is prepared sufficiently and nothing completely unforeseeable happens, in most cases participants will enjoy the event and leave with good impressions and keep it in pleasant remembrance. Thus, a side effect for an EASW might be good public relations for the organisers.

* The method brings people together. Other good side-effects of the EASW consists for us in the possibilities for networking, making contacts, understanding the point of views of persons you seldom talk to. In this way, participants can benefit as well as organisers.

* The expertises of many people can effectively and economically be brought together in a relative short time. In contrast to simple group discussions the division into working group rounds gives chances to find out quickly and effectively the needs, opinions and blind spots of different defined social groups. Working together in the mixed social groups will make people discuss until they find common solutions, common point of views, common ways to deal with problems, i. e. The method might provide good compromises if opponents are brought together.

5.2.3 General Cons:

* The EASW shares all drawbacks of methods based on social groups. Group dynamical effects and hidden motivations or influences, which are simply caused by the presence of other group members are completely uncontrollable. Desires to dominate or to please somebody often remain unconscious even to the acting persons themselves. Supporting or contradicting an opinion can always be caused by sympathy or by an underlying conflict instead by the contents of speakers contributions. In general, we all act differently when we are in a group. Hence, there are lots of the uncontrollable confounding factors, which can appear in the EASW without any sound possibilities to find them out or to isolate them. I. o. w. in the applied setting of the EASW (and many other group methods) we cannot be sure, which outcomes are mere expressions of group dynamics and which outcomes we can accept as “objective” results.

* The EASW seemed to us especially difficult in preparation. If everything is organised well and if you have a good moderator, a good venue, buffet, materials, etc., everything

will be fine under condition that the invited people actually come. This condition is crucial for the method. Simply the spontaneous decision of only few persons not to appear will jeopardize the whole event: there is no way to carry out soundly an EASW-workshop, if there are not enough participants for one or more of the social groups. This reflection made us tremble until the workshop day. There was still fluctuation among acceptances some days before the date! Only when everybody had arrived we could relax. But this was just good luck. If people do not appear, you can do nothing about it. We believe that the dependance on literally every single invited person makes the EASW-method especially vulnerable.

5.2.4 The EASW Concerning our Problem Field

* In our case we are not sure, if the social groups were sufficiently distinct from each other. Some overlapping can be supposed. For instance people working in science shops have very often experience in working for NGOs or research institutes or university. Politicians dealing with research often are or have been researchers or NGO members themselves, many NGO participants get interested in a political carrier, some of them acquire an academic degree. Especially in the our case there are multi-organisational stakeholders, which makes really distinct grouping not possible.

* Another issue is the overlapping of our roles as organisers and participants in the EASW in one of the social groups. This problem we estimate as sub-problem of the whole idea of self-evaluation. In many respects it seem to us altogether that the advantages of outsider´s research outweigh the advantages of research done by insiders. Role-confusion is only one of the complicated aspects in working about oneself.

* It might have been better to have exactly 4 persons in each social group. This would have led to purer heterogenous groups, because nobody would have worked together in both rounds. With 19 participants, slight overlapping could not be prevented. We suppose, if there is more than one homogeneous stakeholder group´s participant in a heterogeneous thematic group, their views could dominate the views of the others. Although we have the impression that this did not happen in our EASW, we cannot be sure and this gives us food for reflection now.

5.2.5 Comparing to Other Methods

In contrast to questioning single persons, who are conscious about the fact that their answers will not imply any advantageous or disadvantageous side effects to them (simply because they know that they are anonymous, a fact which has been proven to influence strongly the answering behaviour several times). Additionally single persons will in no way influence each other and you have not to deal with uncontrollable group effects (but only get hold of possible interviewers effects). For this reasons, we estimate most group methods as less safe for getting valid and reliable research results. On the other hand discussions among homogenous social groups and heterogene groups can provide very interesting results, because the participants can reflect immediately on objections of other experts and they can actively search for common opinions and solutions. What you obtain is group opinion if it is not dominated by some single persons, which can be partly but not completely prevented by good moderation.
We know the EASW as a decision making tool developped for urban planning, where it seems to be highly appreciated and applied more frequently. We suppose that, especially when the results are binding and decisions have to be realized, the method will live up to its promises. Participants can be distinct groups with distinguishable different interests, who might be essentially affected by the decisions to be made. If the methodt is suitable for other purposes is not proven yet.
Hence, on the whole we think that an EASW is an impressing and valuable method to complement social research. It is good for bringing experts or other people together and to promote decisions. We would not recommend it as an isolated method, if new research results are required.

5.2.6 Ideas for Improvement of the EASW-Tool for Social Science

We believe that the method could be made more safe by following changements:
The EASW-workshop has to be occupied with the exact number of 9, 16, 25 or even 36 persons, depending of the number of social groups which are equally occupied with the exact number of 3, 4, 5 or even 6 persons, and there have to be 3, 4, 5 or even 6 thematic workings groups in which only one representative per homogenous stakeholder group takes part.
To have a realistic chance to accomplish this task, a few more people there must be invited than are actually needed to carry out the EASW, because people always can fall ill or be hindered by other important reasons. On the day of the workshop it turns out how many people really are able to stay for the whole day. Per random sample it is determined, who participates in the real EASW. For the remaining persons there has to

be an extra program outside the EASW, because it would not only be impolite to send them away but also a waste of time and energy. But there will always be reasonable task for these people, and a group discussion or something else, depending on the aims of the concerned project, will provide additional informations. Important is to emphasize that this program does not influence the outcomes of the EASW, but is conceived as extra-event.

If it is not possible to invite more people and to have a second parallel event for the remaining people, then we would recommend at least to have an emergency program in case some of the invited persons are absent. This solution would moderate the strong dependance of the EASW of the presence of all invited people.

Another important change concerns the second round. For the action plan, we suggest to take more time and to let the participants choose less topics. The heterogeneous groups should not work only on different topics then, but some or all groups should work also on same problem field(s).

The advantage is evident: you have immediate insight if reliability of your EASW is plausible, just by comparison of the 2nd working groups results! If the method is reliable and nothing goes completely wrong, then the results of heterogeneous groups cannot contradict completely in every respect! Evidently there will be few differences due to different personalities and it will be interesting to see the differences as well as the issues seen similarly. Even in the worst case, that the heterogene groups arrive at completely different conclusions concerning identical problem fields, it will be better to know about it and to analyse it, than to lull oneself into a false sense of security! It can be assumed that in most cases the action plan results will be neither identical nor completely different and thus individual factors of the results can be distinguished from generalizable results.

Remain the homogeneous groups. Would the same social groups occupied by different persons provide similar future best scenarios? Or does the method only reflect the needs and wishes of some individuals who have been chosen by chance from the organisers? Here we see less possibilities to improve chances for reliability, although it would be important, because the first round leads to the problem fields which are worked out by the mixed groups in the second round. Perhaps different people would choose completely different topics! If the event is carried out with a big number of persons, it might be possible to divide the homogeneous groups and to let them work parallel. Then best case scenarios of identically defined social groups would turn out similar or different.

Although the mentioned steps would slightly increase the expenses for an EASW at first sight, we think such measurements would pay off largely in the end, making preparation easier, the results of the EASW safer and there would be even additional outcomes from the parallel event with the remaining invited participants.

6 Conclusive Remarks

There is broad consens in the working group results that establishing science shops and similar intermediary institutions are an important step towards democratisation of science, research and knowledge, which must not be property of and controlled by the ascendant groups of society. Research is also strongly influences what we believe and leads to political decisions. Hence, access and influence must be given to all members of society.

Science shops have to work as nonprofit-organisations, because their task is providing research for those groups and people, who do not possess the means to buy research as economical enterprises are able to. As intermediary organisations they cannot work properly, if they economically depend on one party, because this would interfere with impartiality and contradict liberty of research. If European countries and their NGOs are to be equipped with science shops or similar intermediary organisations long-term funds are crucial. The suggestion was made that the European Commission should advise national governments to establish independent science shops and to fund them by public means.

The suggested demand for public relations, lobbying and networking requires additional ressources which science shops rarely have at their command in the actual situation. One solution could consist in additional funds for science shops to do PR. It also could be considered to establish networking and public relations on an international level. Some steps in this direction have already been taken. Another idea could be an organisation wich complies this tasks for European science shops, but how can we be sure that the members of such an institute were elected in a democratic process? What could be the criteria for getting a right to vote, i. e. what institutions are to be defined as science shops? These tasks are extremely sensible, hence it is not so easy to delegate them to some kind of PR agency or to centralize them. On the other hand we suppose that the suggestion below could improve public relations, lobbying and networking for science shops, if the outcomes are presented regularly:

This issue touches the questions of quality definition for science and intermediation work. The work of science shops does not fit at all into the traditional academic hierarchies. The aims of science shops contradict the common quality standards in science and research, that lead to a great number of scientists who specialise on quite narrow and isolated problem fields. If they want to make a name for themselves they have to publish the same things as often they can in relevant research medias. In contrast the quality of the work of the science shops and other mediatory organisations consist in successfully initiating research, finding good cooperation partners, giving

impulses, conflict management and monitoring. It promotes interdisciplinary research and cooperation between practical and theoretical workers. The outcomes will be valuable for the groups who demanded for them and who will use them for their own work, but the intermediary work will not lead necessarily to a great number of publications. Hence, science shop´s work needs generalists and publications are not so important. This kind of work is appreciated by everybody on a reflective level. But in contrast to the specialised publication intense science, there does not exist any systematical systems for evaluating the work of transdisciplinary intermediary organisations. To establish science shops on a broader level, the development of such a client-centered evaluation system will be essential. It was suggested during the workshop to develop an evaluation-system by NGOs with anonyme and changing persons. Such models could be worked out in detail to find quantifiable quality standards for the typical intermediary work of science shops and other intermediary organisations.

Challenges science shop face also concern routines of the RTD system, which impede socially acceptable science and society relations and hinder innovation processes alike. To give an example: The prevailing evaluation approach – to assess the impact of research by quantitative citation analysis, e. g. – runs counter to science shops, because research at the service of small organisations is not aimed at making a high scientific impact – by being often cited by one´s peers -, but by making a high social impact – by making a visible socially acceptable difference in the world. Socially acceptable research improves science and society relations because researchers engaged in it care about the social impact their research has!

7 Appendix

- Informative Materials
- Handout for Workshop Map

Wir laden Sie/Dich herzlich ein, an unserem Workshop
Bedingungen der Zusammenarbeit zwischen gemeinnützigen Organisationen, Universitäten und Wissenschaftsläden
am **12.6.2003, 9.45-17.45**,
im WUK, 1090 Wien, Währinger Str. 59, Stiege 5, 1. Stock, kleiner Initiativenraum
teilzunehmen.

Der Workshop ist Teil des EU-Projektes *Improving Interaction Between NGOs, Universities and Science Shops (INTERACTS).* Seit Ende April finden ähnliche Workshops in Dänemark, Deutschland, Großbritannien, Österreich, Rumänien und Spanien statt.

Der Workshop bietet TeilnehmerInnen aus den Bereichen

- Forschung
- gemeinnützige Organisationen
- Politik und Universitätsverwaltung sowie
- Wissenschaftsläden

die Möglichkeit, gemeinsam Ideen und Strategien zu entwickeln, wie die zukünftige Zusammenarbeit zwischen NGOs, Universitäten und Wissenschaftsläden verbessert werden könnte:

- Welche Maßnahmen würden die Zusammenarbeit verbessern?
- Vor welchen Herausforderungen stehen Wissenschaftsläden und wie können sie diesen begegnen?
- Wie kann den Bedürfnissen der KundInnen besser entsprochen werden?
- Was hindert an der Verbesserung der Zusammenarbeit und welche Lösungen dafür gibt es?

Die maximale TeilnehmerInnenzahl beträgt 24. Wir erwarten TeilnehmerInnen aus Nieder- und Oberösterreich, der Steiermark und Wien.

Der Workshop orientiert sich an Szenario Workshops. In vier Kleingruppen werden Szenarien erarbeitet, wie 2010 die Zusammenarbeit zwischen gemeinnützigen Organisationen, Universitäten und Wissenschaftsläden aussehen könnte. Aus diesen vier Szenarien werden von allen Teilnehmenden gemeinsam vier Themen herausgearbeitet, zu denen in vier neuen Kleingruppen gearbeitet wird. Im abschließenden Plenum werden die Ergebnisse präsentiert und diskutiert.

Wir bitten um schriftliche Bestätigung der Teilnahme. Wir würden uns freuen, Sie/Dich zu diesem Workshop begrüßen zu dürfen.

Mit freundlichen Grüßen

Das Team des Wissenschaftsladen Wien

Vorläufiges Programm

9.45 Registrierung und Kaffee
10.00 Vorstellungsrunde, Vorstellung von INTERACTS und des Programms
11.00 Erste Runde in vier Kleingruppen
12.30 Mittagspause
13.30 Plenarrunde
14.45 Pause
15.00 Zweite Runde in vier Kleingruppen
16.15 Pause
16.30 Plenarrunde
17.45 Ende des Workshops

Was sind Wissenschaftsläden?

Wissenschaftsläden bieten BürgerInnen und gemeinnützigen Organisationen einen niederschwelligen Zugang zu Wissenschaft, Forschung und Technologie. In den 1970ern in den Niederlanden entstanden, verbreitete sich die Idee über die ganze Welt. Ein Standardmodell der Wissenschaftsläden gibt es nicht; so vielfältig ihre lokalen Bedingungen sind, so vielfältig sind ihre thematischen und disziplinären Ausrichtungen, ihre Arbeitsweisen und ihre Organisationsformen. Die Wissenschaftsläden genießen das Vertrauen und die Unterstützung der Europäischen Kommission.

Das Projekt *Improving Interaction Between NGOs, Universities and Science Shops (INTERACTS)*

INTERACTS ist die erste länderübergreifende Untersuchung, welche strukturellen Änderungen notwendig sind, um die Zusammenarbeit zwischen gemeinnützigen Organisationen, Universitäten und Wissenschaftsläden zu verbessern. INTERACTS wird im Auftrag der Europäischen Kommission, Generaldirektion für Forschung, durchgeführt.

In der ersten Phase faßten ForscherInnen aus sieben Ländern die unterschiedlichen politischen und institutionellen Bedingungen dieser Zusammenarbeit zusammen. In der zweite Phase wurden Fallstudien zu den Erfahrungen mit und den Erwartungen an diese Zusammenarbeit erstellt. In der dritten Phase diskutieren VertreterInnen von Forschung, gemeinnützigen Organisationen, Universitätsverwaltung und Politik sowie von Wissenschaftsläden in Workshops Perspektiven der Zusammenarbeit. In der vierten Phase werden die Ergebnisse der vorangegangenen Phasen zusammengeführt und politische Empfehlungen zur Verbesserung der Zusammenarbeit zwischen gemeinnützigen Organisationen, Universitäten und Wissenschaftsläden ausgearbeitet.

Weitere Informationen unter http://members.chello.at/wilawien/interacts/main.html

interacts

Improving Interaction between NGOs, Universities, and Science Shops: Experiences and Expectations

WORKSHOP

Bedingungen der Zusammenarbeit zwischen gemeinnützigen Organisationen, Universitäten und Wissenschaftsläden

12. 6. 2003, WUK

HANDOUT

Supporting Science & Technology policies

A project funded by the European Commission/DG 12 under the Fifth RTD Framework Programme

Contract No. HPV1-CT-2001-60039

7.1 Programm

9.45 Registrierung und Kaffee bzw. Tee

10.00 Begrüßung, Vorstellung des Projekts INTERACTS und des Programms, Vorstellungsrunde

11.15 Diskussion in vier Kleingruppen: Szenarios

12.30 Mittagspause: Vegetarisches Büffet

13.30 Plenarrunde

14.45 Pause

15.00 Diskussion in vier Kleingruppen: Schlüsselfaktoren bzw. Themen

16.15 Pause

16.30 Plenarrunde

17.45 Ende des Workshops

7.2 Leitende Fragen für die Arbeit in Kleingruppen

7.2.1 Erste Runde, 11.15-12.30

Entwurf eines Best case-Szenarios

Wir schreiben das Jahr 2010. Wie sieht die Zusammenarbeit zwischen gemeinnützigen Organisationen, Universitäten und Wissenschaftsläden im besten Fall aus?

- Wie kam es dazu?
- Welche Schritte wurden gesetzt?
- Welche Bedingungen haben diesen Zustand ermöglicht?

Herausarbeiten von Schlüsselfaktoren; die 3-5 wichtigsten Faktoren zusätzlich auf Kärtchen notieren.

Präsentation im Plenum

7.2.2 Zweite Runde in Kleingruppen

Diskussion eines herausgearbeiteten Themas bzw. Schlüsselfaktors

- Wie ist der Ist-Zustand?
- Wie ist der Soll-Zustand?
- Was ermöglicht die Überbrückung der Differenz zwischen Ist und Soll?

Präsentation und Diskussion im Plenum

7.3 Was sind Wissenschaftsläden?

Wissenschaftsläden bieten BürgerInnen und gemeinnützigen Organisationen einen niederschwelligen Zugang zu Wissenschaft, Forschung und Technologie. In den 1970ern in den Niederlanden entstanden, verbreitete sich die Idee über die ganze Welt. Ein Standardmodell der Wissenschaftsläden gibt es nicht; so vielfältig ihre lokalen Bedingungen sind, so vielfältig sind ihre thematischen und disziplinären Ausrichtungen, ihre Arbeitsweisen und ihre Organisationsformen. Viele Wissenschaftsläden sind Teil einer Universität und entweder zuständig für eine Disziplin, eine Fakultät oder eine gesamte Universität; andere Wissenschaftsläden sind als außeruniversitäre interdisziplinäre Forschungsinstitute organisiert, manche von ihnen arbeiten mit Universitäten eng zusammen, manche nicht.

Wissenschaftsläden sind serviceorientierte Forschungseinrichtungen für gemeinnützige Organisationen.
Gemäß dem Selbstverständnis der Wissenschaftsläden, KlientInnen als Fachleute ihrer Situation anzuerkennen, werden in der Forschung partizipative Ansätze bevorzugt. Die KlientInnen sind in den Forschungsprozeß einbezogen. So gewinnen WissenschaftlerInnen ein vertieftes Verständnis von sozialen und ökologischen Herausfor-derungen und wächst bei den KlientInnen das Vertrauen in Wissenschaft und Forschung.

Wissenschaftsläden arbeiten nachfrageorientiert.
Gemeinsam ist allen Wissenschaftsläden, daß sie bewußt nachfrageorientiert arbeiten.
Die einen beschränken sich darauf, die Nachfrage gemeinnütziger Organisationen nach Forschung mit der Nachfrage Studierender nach Themen für umsetzungsorientierte Seminar-, Diplom- und Doktorarbeiten zusammenzuführen, andere führen auch oder ausschließlich selbst Forschungen durch.
Dem Leitbild der Wissenschaftsläden gemäß muß jede Nachfrage nach Forschung bestimmten Kriterien genügen. Die Fragestellung muß

- einen größeren Personenkreis betreffen,
- es muß ein gemeinnütziger Zweck dahinter stehen, und
- sie muß anwendungsorientiert bzw. umsetzungsbezogen sein.

Je nach Erfordernis und Ansatz werden beispielsweise Forschungsprojekte oder Literaturrecherchen durchgeführt, Fachleute oder interessierte Studierende vermittelt, Forschungsberichte allgemeinverständlich aufbereitet oder Workshops bzw. Vorträge organisiert.

Wissenschaftsläden genießen die Wertschätzung der Europäischen Kommission.
Die Europäische Kommission sieht in den Wissenschaftsläden eine hervorragende Maßnahme, eine breite Öffentlichkeit vom Nutzen von Wissenschaft, Forschung und Technologie profitieren zu lassen. Bewiesen wird diese Wertschätzung u. a.

- durch die Förderung der EU-Projekte SCIPAS, INTERACTS und ISSNET sowie
- durch die Aktion 21 im Aktionsplan Wissenschaft und Öffentlichkeit. Diese Aktion schreibt die Unterstützung der Wissenschaftsläden durch die Europäische Kommission fest.

7.4 Der Wissenschaftsladen Wien

Der Wissenschaftsladen Wien ist eine anwendungsorientierte Forschungseinrichtung für gemeinnützige Organisationen.
Der Wissenschaftsladen Wien ist eine unabhängige und praxisnahe Forschungs- und Beratungsstelle für gemeinnützige Organisationen. Die Klientel des Instituts sind beispielsweise Menschenrechtsorganisationen, karitative Verbände, Dachverbände sozialer und ökologischer Initiativen, Selbsthilfegruppen, Beratungsstellen, Hilfsorganisationen, Behindertenorganisationen, BürgerInneninitiativen und kommunale Einrichtungen.

Der Wissenschaftsladen Wien ist als gemeinnütziger Verein organisiert.
Durch den Wissenschaftsladen Wien profitieren auch finanzschwache gemeinnützige Organisationen von Wissenschaft und Forschung.
Der Wissenschaftsladen Wien führt Forschungsprojekte durch, organisiert Workshops und Arbeitsgruppen, erstellt Gutachten, berät und entwickelt gemeinsam mit KlientInnen innovative Anwendungen von Informations- und Kommunikationstechnologien.
Der Wissenschaftsladen Wien steht für gemeinnützige Forschung und Expertise zur Lösung gesellschaftlich relevanter Probleme und zur Förderung einer nachhaltigen Lebensweise.

Im Wissenschaftsladen Wien arbeiten Fachleute aus unterschiedlichen Diszplinen zusammen.
Der fachliche Schwerpunkt liegt auf den Sozial- und Kulturwissenschaften, der thematische auf Informations- und Kommunikationstechnologien, Gender Studies und Wissenschaftsforschung. Bei Bedarf werden Vereinsmitglieder aus Fachbereichen, die von den MitarbeiterInnen nicht abgedeckt werden, beigezogen. So ist durchwegs breitgefächertes und praxisbezogenes Fachwissen vorhanden.

Der Wissenschaftsladen Wien achtet auf die Gleichstellung zwischen den Geschlechtern
Im Wissenschaftsladen Wien finden Frauen und Männer gleiche Chancen und Lebensbedingungen vor. Frauen und Männer erhalten für gleiche Arbeit gleichen Lohn und verfügen über gleiche und ausbalancierte Teilhabe an den Führungspositionen, an den Aufgaben, an innerbetrieblicher Qualifikation und Weiterbildung und an sonstigen Ressourcen.
Im Vorstand des Instituts sind zwei Frauen und ein Mann vertreten. Gemäß den Vereinsstatuten haben sämtliche Vorstandsmitglieder die gleichen Rechte und Pflichten. Die Betreuungspflichten von Frauen und Männern werden berücksichtigt. Der Wissenschaftsladen Wien hat sämtliche erforderliche Maßnahmen zum Gender Mainstreaming umgesetzt.

Gemeinsam mit seinen KlientInnen gibt der Wissenschaftsladen Wien Themen und Ansätze vor
Gemeinsam mit unseren KlientInnen geben wir Themen und Ansätze vor, die regelmäßig von größeren Institutionen aufgegriffen werden.
Der Wissenschaftsladen Wien

- war an einem Empowerment-Projekt beteiligt, das von der Europäischen Kommission als beispielgebend anerkannt und in LOCIN, die Datenbank für beispielgebende Projekte gegen soziale Aussschließung, aufgenommen wurde,

- hat die erste arbeitsmarktpolitische Tagung mit starker Beteiligung von NGOs in
- Wien organisiert und
- hat die Situation studierender Mütter an Wiener Universitäten untersucht,

um nur einige Beispiele zu nennen.

Der Wissenschaftsladen Wien ist Teil eines internationalen Netzwerks.
Weltweit gibt es schätzungsweise an die 100 Wissenschaftsläden. Und jährlich werden es mehr. Außer in Österreich existieren Wissenschaftsläden in den Niederlanden, Deutschland, Israel, den USA, Großbritannien, Rumänien, Dänemark, Norwegen, Südafrika, Kanada und Südkorea. Viele Wissenschaftsläden unterstützen einander in einem großen internationalen Netzwerk.

Der Wissenschaftsladen Wien wird von einem prominent besetzten Beirat unterstützt.
Abg. z. GR Petra Bayr, Wien · o. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Ulrike Felt, Universität Wien · a. o. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Marina Fischer-Kowalski, IFF/Wien · o. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Peter Gerlich, Universität Wien · a. o. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Josef Hochgerner, Zentrum für soziale Innovation, Wien · o. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Herbert Lachmayer, Hochschule für künstlerische und industrielle Gestaltung Linz · Univ.-Ass. Dr. Brigitte Lueger-Schuster, Universität Wien · o. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Bernd Marin, Europäisches Zentrum für Wohlfahrtspolitik und Sozialforschung, Wien · o. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Herbert Pietschmann, Universität Wien · Univ.-Ass. DI Dr. Stefan Sauermann, Universität Wien · o. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Robert Trappl, Universität Wien · Abg. z. NR o. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Alexander Van der Bellen, Universität Wien · Vizerektor o. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Dr. h. c. Manfried Welan, Universität für Bodenkultur Wien · o. Univ.-Prof. Dr. Ruth Wodak, Universität Wien

Das Projekt *Improving Interaction Between NGOs, Universities and Science Shops (INTERACTS)*

INTERACTS ist die erste länderübergreifende Untersuchung, welche strukturellen Änderungen notwendig sind, um die Zusammenarbeit zwischen gemeinnützigen Organisationen, Universitäten und Wissenschaftsläden zu verbessern. INTERACTS wird im Auftrag der Europäischen Kommission, Generaldirektion für Forschung, durchgeführt.

In der ersten Phase faßten ForscherInnen aus sieben Ländern die unterschiedlichen politischen und institutionellen Bedingungen dieser Zusammenarbeit zusammen. In der zweite Phase wurden Fallstudien zu den Erfahrungen mit und den Erwartungen an diese Zusammenarbeit erstellt. In der dritten Phase diskutieren VertreterInnen von Forschung, gemeinnützigen Organisationen, Universitätsverwaltung und Politik sowie von Wissenschaftsläden in Workshops Perspektiven der Zusammenarbeit. In der vierten Phase werden die Ergebnisse der vorangegangenen Phasen zusammengeführt und politische Empfehlungen zur Verbesserung der Zusammenarbeit zwischen gemeinnützigen Organisationen, Universitäten und Wissenschaftsläden ausgearbeitet.

7.5 Liste der Teilnehmenden

Name	Organisation	E-Mail
Fritz Endl		
Peter Florianschütz	Gewerkschaft der Privatangestellten	
Mag.[a] Manuela Fritz	Wissenschaftsladen Graz	
Dr. Hermann Huemer	Vizerektorat Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien	
Mag. Gerhard Liska		
Mag.[a] Katharina Novy	Grüne Wien/Gemeinderat	
Erika Parovsky	Wiener Seniorenzentrum	
Mag. DI Dr. Michael Pregernig	Institut für Sozioökonomik der Forst- und Holzwirtschaft, Universität für Bodenkultur	
Regina Reimer	Wissenschaftsladen Wien	
Valerie Rücker	Wissensbörse	
DSA Christoph Stoik	Stadtteilzentrum Bassena	
Dr. Michael Strähle	Wissenschaftsladen Wien	
Mag.[a] Laula Streicher	Wissenschaftsladen Graz	
Angela Strzalka	Wissensbörse	
Mag.[a] Eva Timpe	Wissenschaftsladen Graz	
Mag. Sintayehu Tsehay	WUK, SOS Mitmensch	
Mag.[a] Christine Urban	Wissenschaftsladen Wien	
Dr. Udo Wid		
Mag.[a] Margit Wolfsberger	Institut für Ethnologie, Kultur- und Sozialanthropologie, Universität Wien	

7.6 Fragebogen zur Evaluierung des Interacts-Szenario-Workshops

12. Juni 2003, Wissenschaftsladen Wien

Die Interacts-ProjektpartnerInnen würden sich über Ihren/Deinen Kommentar zu diesem Workshop freuen. Ihr/Dein Feedback wird als Basis für weitere Veranstaltungen herangezogen.

Bitte beanworten Sie/beantworte die folgenden Fragen durch die Verteilung von Punkten.
1 = sehr gut and 5 = sehr schlecht

1. War es für Sie/Dich schwierig oder einfach herzufinden?	1	2	3	4	5
2. Wie zufrieden waren Sie/warst Du mit Buffet und Erfrischungen?	1	2	3	4	5
3. Wie hilfreich fanden Sie/fandest Du die Vorinformationen zu Workshop?	1	2	3	4	5
4. Wie sehr, glauben Sie/glaubst Du, paßte die EASW Methode für den Workshop?	1	2	3	4	5
5. Haben Sie/Hast Du die Teilnahme genossen?	1	2	3	4	5
6. Hat der Workshop Ihren/Deinen Erwartungen entsprochen?	1	2	3	4	5
7. Welche Aspekte gefielen Ihnen/Dir am besten und warum?					
8. Welche Aspekte gefielen Ihnen/Dir am wenigsten und warum?					

1. War es für Sie/Dich schwierig oder einfach herzufinden?	1	2	3	4	5
2. Wie zufrieden waren Sie/warst Du mit Buffet und Erfrischungen?	1	2	3	4	5
9. Fallen Ihnen/Dir noch weitere Kommentare ein?					

10. Haben Sie/Hast Du Vorschläge für ev. weitere Aktivitäten im Anschluß an diesen Workshop?
11. Denken Sie/Denkst Du, dass Sie/Du irgendwelche Aktivitäten aufgrund der Teilnahme an diesem Workshop setzen werden/wirst?
12. Was waren für Dich/Sie die wesentlichsten Ergebnisse?

Danke, dass Sie sich/Du Dir für das Ausfüllen des Fragebogens Zeit genommen haben/hast!