

**Project: The Landscape and Isobars of European Values in Relation to Science and New Technology (Value Isobars)**

**Project number: 230557**

**Title of deliverable: Analysis synthesis of end user feedback:  
On improving EU Governance of S&T as Value-based Governance**

**Work package: 6**

**Authors:  
Silje Langvatn &  
Matthias Kaiser**

**Partner (institution):**

**Centre for the Study of the Sciences and Humanities at the  
University of Bergen**

**UiB**

**Deliverable: 6.2**

**Date: 30<sup>th</sup> of November 2011**

# **Analysis synthesis of end user feedback: On improving EU Governance of S&T as Value-based Governance**

## **1. Introduction**

In February 2011 our 16 end-users received the Second communication from the Value Isobar project. After three rounds of reminders we received nine responses, and these turned out to be the same end-user who had also responded to the First communication.

For the Second communication we offered the end-users the option of filling in an electronic response schema on our website. This, however, turned out to have several technical weaknesses, and at last we got most of the responses as an email attachment and decided to use this solution for the Third communication.

The Second communication had the title: Improving EU Governance of S&T as Value-based Governance: Preliminary Notes on Value-based Governance. The document was structured in the following way: Part A: A general introduction on the general starting assumptions and orientations of the project. Part B: Specific suggestions for a Value-based Governance with suggestions for three target groups. Target group 1 was DG Research, the European Parliament, and Member state research officers. Target group 2 was the broader public of citizens. Target group 3 was the scientific community in Europe.

## **2. Feed-back from the end users**

At the end of the Second communication we posed 20 questions to the end-users. These were questions on the various concrete proposals made in the communication and a few general questions about their overall impressions and their suggestions. In the following we use the structure from this questionnaire to go through the responses from the end users.

### **1 Suggestions for target group 1 (EU policy makers):**

#### **1.a. The European S&T Value Atlas**

The general attitude to this proposal was positive, all but one respondent said that they supported this proposal:

- "Interesting way of moving the focus upstream and make more transparent what drives S&T" (End-user 1)

- "Useful tool for policy makers to have in hand in discussions and preparatory work" (End-user 2)

- "The idea...is very valuable, and it is convincingly argued why" (End-user 3)

However, many also raised some concerns, and more information about the details of this proposal:

- "It is not relevant how many people share what values, but what values can be ethically justified. Therefore, a survey of values can only be a tool of some, but limited, value, in order not to miss any arguments" (End-user 4)

- "Quite a challenge to get all this data in an easily understandable (graphical) format. I would very much like to see how this really would look like" (End-user 5)

- “The basic challenge is to get policy-makers to use it” Information overload (End-user 6) (End-user 6)
- “More useful as a reference than as a tool for awareness- raising or reflection” (End-user 6)
- “Must be a quality beyond question” But how? (End-user 3)
- “I would like to see more concrete suggestions concerning that (a vibrant and “living tool” can be achieved”. (End-user 1)
- Requires a “reliable meta-methodology” (End-user 3)
- “Who’s supposed to commission it?...I miss ideas on how to achieve the goals sketched out” (End-user 3)

### **1.b. A new type of Value Survey with sector segmentation and focus on competing value sets**

All those who responded to this proposal were positive, two end-users did not comment on this proposal

- “...good and realistic proposal” (6)

Here too, some asked for more details and had some reservations:

- “My first response is “Not another survey”” (End-user 7)
- “Again, pretty good idea, but how to? Question development is intricate in a cross-language way especially when it comes to values, and sectors may be somewhat different across countries. Who is to be considered a stakeholder and “citizen only” may vary across political cultures...get a clear idea of which level is to be addressed- the individual or collective” (End-user 3)
- “To reach the ordinary citizen is an obvious challenge” (End-user 5)
- “I would like to see the work that underpins the assertion on “European Values” (End-user 7)
- “I do think it is worth carefully exploring the possibility of linking more in-depth exploration of value sets into existing surveys to improve their performance and avoid the introduction of another new initiative” ( End-user 10)
- You need to present more details...It will not be enough to just state that “further research is needed” (End-user 3)
- “Concentrating on new and contested areas of S&T is probably wise, as this will create interest” ( End-user 6)

### **1.c. The S&T-Value web-page**

The end-users were more divided over this proposal and one did not respond.

- Runs the risk of being useful, but not adopted (End-user 7)
- “In theory the idea is good, but I’m not sure how feasible it will be. 1) who would moderate the web-page? Commission...or project managers?” (End-user 10)
- “This central access and discussion point will be of high value. The practical operation might be challenging motivation all projects to contribute to this page” (End-user 8)
- “Another web page.... Again it will depend on the quality. ...To set up another webpage in the usual way will probably be of limited use” (End-user 3)
- “VERY good initiative...may prove to be a useful tool for policy makers to check into periodically and keep these issues clear in their minds” (End-user 2)
- “I find this an important suggestion...not just “mapping ” the world but being involved in changing the terrain” (End-user 1)
- “Tricky business” (End-user 6)
- “I am not a web-page fan myself” (End-user 5)

And some made concrete proposals for improvements:

- “The atlas, webpage and survey could all link and be linked to a range of EU sites” (End-user 7)
- “Could the activities/dynamics at the web page also be “fed back” to the Atlas, not just taking it as a point of departure”? (End-user 1)

- In my view, the atlas and web page should be merged into one project" (End-user 6)

#### **1.d. Update of the White Paper of Governance**

The attitude to this proposal was divided. One end-user stated that "...anything that is 10 years old needs to be updated" (End-user 5), whereas other suggested that this was not the business of the project. These end-users seemed to have misinterpreted the proposal saying that we (the project Value Isobars) should update the White Paper on Governance, whereas this was not intended by us. Three end-users had no response.

#### **1.e. Introduce soft law instruments in more areas of S&T**

The general attitude to this proposal was positive. Three end-users refrained from responding. Some, however voiced concerns while endorsing the proposal:

- "How would these be disseminated and monitored? People are flooded with papers and tool-kits so you need to ask how would this differ from the Atlas?" (End-user 7L)

- "This could make sense but I think it would have to be done in conjunction with point 1d (White paper on Governance update) in order to have any real effect" (End-user 10)

### **2. Suggestions for target group 2 (Ordinary citizens):**

#### **2.a. Increased focus on engaging people as citizens**

The general attitude seemed to be that it is desirable to shift focus from consumers and stakeholders to citizens (as stated by End-user 6), and that this perspective is often missing in projects (as stated by end-user End-user 10)

Although all respondents were positive they also raised concerns:

- "But how?" (End-user 6, End-user 8)

- "Danger that we will elicit the views only of concerned citizens, people might not be willing" (End-user 2)

- "There seems to have been a certain disenchantment regarding the possibilities and outcomes of procedures for citizens' engagement in issues technological. This has been framed as a "decline of the Danish model" (End-user 3)

#### **2.b. Seek out methods of participation that elicit the value views of citizens**

It was not clear what the end-users attitude to this proposal was, and it might seem that the proposal was not formulated in a detailed enough way to be properly understood.

- "Mig3 be akin to carrying coal to Newcastle" (End-user 3)

- "Citizens... have difficulties addressing the value dimension because they do not feel knowledgeable enough" (End-user 3)

- "...difficult to do as talk is cheap...Do you want to go direct or indirect ways to get their views? (End-user 2)

- "The challenge is maybe not so much to make the values of citizens explicit as to create real dialogue.." (End-user 6)

- "Ok, but this is a bit vague" (End-user 10)

#### **2.c. Use of e-fora for citizen involvement & 2.d. The S&T-Values web-site should have a social network site**

The end-users were sharply divided over these proposals. Some were very positive (End-user 10), others see e-fora more as an addendum (End-user 4), but worth trying (End-user 8). One respondent suggested that if the Value Atlas will be a success social networks will mirror it automatically" (End-user 3)

Others raised sharp criticism, saying that there is an overload and saturation among citizens for this kind of activity (End-user 2) and that it only attracts already engaged citizens (End-user 2) (End-user 7)

- "I don't think e-fora can play an important role in promoting citizen engagement in this area...requires genuine face-to-face contact....E-fora can be useful as a supplement. " (End-user 6)

## **2.e. Value discussions at Researchers' Nig3**

Again the group of end-users were highly divided. Some were very enthusiastic:

- "Excellent idea!" (End-user 8)

- "Yes, I like this idea- especially the Philosophical Café!"(End-user 10)

Whereas others were negative:

- "This would be an old-fashioned approach" (End-user 5)

- Difficult to participate for ordinary citizens (End-user 4)

- "...such discussions have taken place in several countries already. ...it is mostly a specially interested and very restricted audience that usually attends these matters" (End-user 3)

One of the end-users suggested that: - "only if very prominent persons are involved, attractiveness can be extended to more ordinary citizens" (End-user 3)

## **3 Suggestions for target group 3 (The scientific community):**

### **3.a. Best practice models for integrated S&T projects**

The end-users were positive to this proposal:

- "Definitely useful" (LP) (KB), but some asked for more details: - "Would require thought concerning how to get people use the best practice models as a guide rather than overlooking it" (End-user 10)

- "How can normative considerations be integrated into best practice models"? ( End-user 4)

Others added comments on how this proposal should be framed and presented: "give some examples of best practice models? What are the general lessons?" (End-user 6) (End-user 5)

- "Before indulging into particular models it would therefore be necessary to define what the term "best" may entail, i.e. To define the desired functions of such research and define the criteria of success" (End-user 3)

### **3.b. S&T projects should provide a "key-values list"**

There was a mixed attitude to this proposal. Some were positive: - "This sounds like a very interesting idea" (End-user 5), others thought that - "Some think it might be too demanding" (End-user 10). And all of the end-users asked for a more detailed account of this proposal:

- "Unclear at what stage this should happen" (End-user 10)

- "Will this become a scoring criteria for reviewers?" (End-user 10) (End-user 3)

- "Need to specify what is meant by values in this connection" (End-user 3).

- "What would be the ultimate purpose?"(End-user10)

### **3.c. Funding for a European doctorate**

The end-users were divided over this proposal. Some thought that this would be an - "Excellent idea" (End-user 6) others suggested that it "...could be hard to achieve and the operation in practice might be nightmarish!" (End-user 7).

More details were called for by most of the end-users:

- "I would like to see the training syllabus before I can give this proposal my full support" (End-user 5)

- "This proposal appears a bit vague" (End-user 3)

One of the end-users made a suggestion: - "What about courses as part of the research methods component of doctoral studies and asking for a compulsory module to be completed by doctoral students"? ( End-user7)

- "The questions it raises are who will teach it, how will it impact be monitored and how will the content be updated."? (End-user 7)

One end-user came with a proposal of how to do this: - "Might it be possible to develop an associate approach in which people are trained and then become trainers..?" (End-user 7)

### **3.d. Teaching uncertainty mapping**

The proposal was well received by some. Others were critical. Four end-users did not respond.

- "Good idea" (End-user 7) (End-user 2)

- "Ok- I can't see what harm this could do!" (End-user 10)

- "There mig3 exist a general methodology but in practice, I think, uncertainty cannot be mapped reasonably without knowing the subject as the relevant questions may differ profoundly. With limited resources, what should the mapping exercise then be on? Dry methodology, or a plethora of scientific problems that may become politically rel5ant and we do not know enough about?" (End-user 3)

One respondent seem to feel that the 2<sup>nd</sup> communication criticises the scientific community for being too over confident, in reality they are much more careful in stating their claims and the security of their findings. Media is to blame" (End-user 5)

### **3.e. Courses in science for policy**

Attitude: - "This should be done" (End-user 6) similar (End-user 5) (End-user 9) (End-user 10) (End-user 7) others were more cautious and asked for more details:

- "For whom, policy makers? Scientists? On what beyond uncertainty mapping? This section is too little elaborated." (End-user 3)

- "The questions it raises are who will teach it, how will it impact be monitored and how will the content be updated."? (End-user 7)

A concrete suggestion was made by one end-user: "Might it be possible to develop an associate approach in which people are trained and then become trainers..?" (End-user 7)

## **4 Do you find the conceptualization of "values" and "value sets" under section 1 clarifying for the purposes of this project?**

The was some disagreement among the end-users on this question. Most thought that the definitions of values provided in the Second communication was clearer than in the First communication, but at least one respondent disagreed.

- "Yes. I find the first 3 pages clear and easy to follow" (End-user 7) (End-user 10) (End-user 9) (End-user 5) (End-user 6)

- "The description should be clearer. It is still too theoretical. Provide more examples. The description in the first document was partially easier to grasp." (End-user 8)

- "One found this communication easier than the first" (End-user 1)

- "I still struggle to get a grip on "value sets. Can we think of them as the small "sensemaking stories we tell ourselves connected to (conforming) our roles/identities?...How do they make themselves known and felt?" (End-user 1)

- "It mig3 be helpful to include some concrete examples showing the difference between a value and a set of values." (End-user 6)

- "From the perspective of a lay reader, the explanation given is highly abstract, focusing on an implicit definition of values. From a practical point of view, it does not become clear enough what is really meant by the term, so some examples on actual policy problems arising from a clash in values or value sets would be helpful. In particular, the distinction

between values for the individual and values in a citizen's perspective need to be clarified, preferably giving some examples as well." (End-user 3)

### **3. Conclusion:**

The general impression was that the end-users received most of the proposals positively, but asked for more details as to the actual implementation and practicalities of the various proposals. They seemed to get the overall idea of our proposals and a firmer grip on the direction of the project in comparison with the first communication. The end users had most to say about the proposals for the policy-makers and the broader public, whereas many refrained to comment on the proposals for the scientific community. It is unclear whether this was because these proposals did not engage them, or whether they did not feel qualified to give a response. The latter was suggested by at least one end-user. The end-users seemed to respond most positively to the idea of a European S&T Value Atlas, whereas they were more divided over some of the other proposals. In particular they questioned the feasibility and effectiveness of setting up new forms of e-forums for discussion.