

## NOTE #11

Achieving impact: some arguments for designing a communications strategy

By **Josepine Fernow**



# RRI IMPLEMENTATION IN BIOSCIENCE ORGANISATIONS

GUIDELINES FROM THE  STARBIOS2 PROJECT



Andrea Declich with the STARBIOS2 partners



STARBIOS2 project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 709517.

## NOTE #11

### Achieving impact: some arguments for designing a communications strategy

**By Josepine Fernow**

Practicing RRI implies that we make an effort to communicate beyond our peers, opening up research organisations and extending our reach to public policy makers and researchers in other fields. To achieve impact, researchers need to find new ways of interacting with actors outside their own fields. Ideally also doing it well, without wasting time, while maintaining public trust, and without contributing to misconceptions about what science can deliver.

**Is this not what we do already?** Yes and no. Academic research is driven by dissemination of results: aiming to reach peers by presenting and discussing results at the conferences they attend, and publishing in the journals they read. How do we move from sharing results to having a real impact on the structures we want to change? The biosciences depend on public trust: To receive public funding for research, to recruit research participants, and to gain acceptance for the outputs. And if that trust is lost along the way, it will be difficult to regain (Caulfield, 2005). As if this is not enough: Transferring technology from the academic domain into clinical or commercial applications requires trust from both the public *and* policy makers (Bubela, Hagen & Einsiedel, 2012). Is this a problem? Well, maybe...

If scientists frame technological advances in new ways, they might be able to capture the imagination of investors, politicians and funding agencies. This matters in a democratic society, where members of the public can influence their representatives, who in turn make decisions on both research funding and regulation, which is a very good argument for maintaining public trust (Bubela,

2006). Funding agencies are increasingly asking researchers to show how their work will have an impact. This requires new skills from scientists, who need to be able to think about what their contribution to society will be and design strategies to achieve impact.

**Why does this matter to me?** Bioscience can bring benefits for both individuals and society in the form of new treatments, resilient plants, or new foods. It has been claimed that scientists themselves have a professional responsibility to communicate their knowledge, along with their views on potential applications (Reydon, Kampourakis & Patrinos, 2012). However, if scientists over-promise, it can erode trust, and bad communication can lead to the *research hype paradox*. This means that if the public buys the hype, it could become more difficult to do research (Caulfield, 2005). Because of the huge potential benefits, research hype is a real threat for bioscience. As members of the public, we are all in a sense future patients, future consumers and future beneficiaries of all that science brings, the good and the bad. This means we all have a stake in research. Your project's communication strategy becomes important with the realization that media is part of a filter that science has to pass through before reaching the public. Although there is no linear relationship between how media portrays science and public opinion about it, the public only has access to information in the public domain (Caulfield, 2005).

**Is this a problem?** Perhaps, depending on how you view the public. Scientists tend to think that the public lacks knowledge about scientific issues, and that this lack of knowledge shapes public opinion on risks, policies and decisions. Scientists also tend to view the public as homogenous: either as one uniform group of non-experts, or as a range of distinct (but homogenous) groups of 'lay people' (Besley & Nisbet, 2013). In reality, however, the public is actually a heterogeneous and abstract collective (Condit, 2001) that consists of *everyone* in society (Burns et al., 2003). In other words, you need to figure out who you really want to talk to, and develop a strategy to achieve your goals. Designing communication or

public engagement activities requires dividing this collective into a series of overlapping publics that also includes scientists, mediators and decision makers (Burns et al., 2003).

**How do I translate that into a communication strategy?** First, we have to remember that communication is not just for the lay public. Your strategy should also include measures to do cross-disciplinary and cross-professional communication. Bioethicists need to understand the science behind the ethical, legal and social issues they research, and clinicians need to understand the biology behind the test results they give to patients. In an ideal world, dissemination and communication activities would foster buy-in to your results, followed by a readiness to implement them. However, **how** to do this requires some thinking. First, it is important to decide **what** it is you want to achieve, by describing **why** there is a need to communicate. The next question to answer is **who** you want to reach, followed by **how** to do that, and **when** would be a good time to talk to them.

A scientific dissemination strategy can help support impact by making outputs **discoverable and findable**. Taking some time to identify how and where your audiences would look for information about your work can be helpful when you design your publication strategy. Picking the 'right' journal for your publication, and ensuring open access (not forgetting that you can do self-archiving once the journal embargo ends), also helps ensure it is **available**. Adding communication tools, like editorial text, press activities and social media can amplify the dissemination of results and help make outputs **visible** for a larger group of people. This kind of complementary communication tools can help make the results **relevant** for other audiences. You can reach other stakeholders if you re-frame and adapt your results. Communication activities can also help make the outputs **understandable**. Either by translating your text to another language, or by adapting the message to other audiences, ranging from high-school children, to people with PhD's in social science, humanities, or physics.

**Where do I start?** To develop a strategy for communicating about this very guideline, STARBIOS2 started with a simple post-it brainstorming SWOT analysis exercise to identify the project's strengths and weaknesses, the opportunities we have to communicate about them, and potential threats to our communications. This is a good starting point to build a set of tools and tactics, which in essence is a list of different ways to exploit the opportunities, followed by a list of ways to mitigate the threats. An opportunity can be attending a conference to present results, the tactic to submit an abstract for a presentation, and the tool the presentation itself. A threat could be a competing initiative coming out with results at the same time, the tactic to mitigate that risk to approach that project and see if there are any avenues of collaboration, and the tool a joint publication or workshop.

**What does this mean in practice?** The point of the STARBIOS2 project is having impact in the organisations that implement Action Plans. To achieve change, it has been essential to identify the right messages, the right people, and the best arguments to make them want to contribute. Impactful change is a process of co-creation, between different agents and organisational structures. We can use the voices of these agents to advocate for structural change. Using dissemination, communication and advocacy to extend this project's impact to other organisations. Moreover, we can use these tools to share our results and contribute to developing research about RRI.

This very guideline was developed to create organisational change in the *biosciences*. Our stakeholders consist of individual *bioscientists*, in different fields, as well as structures in universities and other research-performing organisations, that do not constitute a homogeneous audience. Our stakeholders extend to the EU and national research policy makers and research funding organisations. Before we speak, we need to know what to say, who to say it to, and why we address them.

## REFERENCES

- Ahuja, S.K., Aiuti, F., Berkhout, B., Biberfeld, P., Burton, D.R., Colizzi, V., Deeks, S.G., Desrosiers, R.C., Dierich, M.P., Doms, R.W., Emerman, M., Gallo, R.C., Girard, M., Greene, W.C., Hoxie, J.A., Hunter, E., Klein, G., Korber, B., Kuritzkes, D.R., Lederman, M.M., Malim, M.H., Marx, P.A., McCune, J.M., McMichael, A., Miller, C., Miller, V., Montagnier, L., Montefiori, D.C., Moore, J.P., Nixon, D.F., Overbaugh, J., Pauza, C.D., Richman, D.D., Saag, M.S., Sattentau, Q., Schooley, R.T., Shattock, R., Shaw, G.M., Stevenson, M., Trkola, A., Wainberg, M.A., Weiss, R.A., Wolinsky, S., Zack, J.A. (2006). A plea for justice for jailed medical workers. *Science*, 314(5801).
- Alberts, B., Kirschner, M.W., Tilghman, S., & Varmus, H. (2014). Rescuing US biomedical research from its sistemi flaws. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(16).
- Alsop, R., Bertelsen, M., Holland, J. (2006). Empowerment in practice: from analysis to implementation, The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank.
- Ambrosio, A.M., Mariani, M.A., Maiza, A.S., Gamboa, G.S., Fossa, S.E., Bottale, A.J. (2018). Protocol for the production of a vaccine against Argentine Hemorrhagic Fever in Maria S. Salvato (ed.) Hemorrhagic Fever Viruses: Methods and Protocols. *Methods in Molecular Biology*, vol. 1604. Springer. Doi 10.1007/978-1-4939-6981-4\_24.
- Andoh, C.T. (2011). Bioethics and the challenges to its growth in Africa. *Open journal of philosophy*. 1(02), 67-75. 10.4236/ojpp.2011.12012.
- Bamgbose, A. (2011). African languages today: The challenge of and prospects for empowerment under globalization. *In Selected proceedings of the 40th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*. ed. Eyamba G. Bokamba, et al., 1-14. Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville. www.lingref.com, document #2561.
- Barugahare, J. (2018). African bioethics: methodological doubts and insights. *BMC medical ethics*. 19(1), 98. 10.1186/s12910-018-0338-6.
- Battilana, J., Leca B., and Boxenbaum E. (2009). "How actors change institutions: towards a theory of institutional entrepreneurship." *Academy of Management annals* 3.1 (2009).
- BBSRC Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (2018). "Forward look for UK Bioscience" released on 29 September 2018. <https://bbsrc.ukri.org/documents/forward-look-for-uk-bioscience-pdf/> (accessed on: 05/09/2019).
- Beckert, J. (1999). Agency, entrepreneurs, and institutional change. The role of strategic choice and institutionalized practices in organisations. *Organisation studies*, 20(5).
- Bendels, M.H., Dietz, M.C., Brüggmann, D., Oremek, G.M., Schöffel, N., Groneberg, D.A. (2018). Gender disparities in high-quality dermatology research: a descriptive bibliometric study on scientific authorships. *BMJ Open* 2018;8:1-11. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2017-020089

- Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1969). *La costruzione sociale della realtà*. Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Besley, J.C., & Nisbet, M.C. (2013). How scientists view the public, the media and the political process. *Public Understanding of Science*, 22(6), 644–659. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963662511418743>
- Bijker, W.E. & d'Andrea, L. (eds.) (2009). *Handbook on the Socialisation of Scientific and Technological Research, Social Sciences and European Research Capacities*, Rome: River Press Group.
- Boylan, J., Dacre, J., Gordon, H. (2019). Addressing women's under-representation in medical leadership. *The Lancet*. 2019; 393(10171): e14.
- Bromme, R. (2000). Beyond one's own perspective. The psychology of cognitive interdisciplinarity. In P. Weingart & N. Stehr (Eds.), *Practising interdisciplinarity* (pp. 115-133). Toronto: Toronto University Press.
- Bubela, T. (2006). Science communication in transition: Genomics hype, public engagement, education and commercialization pressures. *Clinical Genetics*, 70(5), 445–450. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1399-0004.2006.00693.x>
- Bubela, T., Hagen, G., & Einsiedel, E. (2012). Synthetic biology confronts publics and policy makers: Challenges for communication, regulation and commercialization. *Trends in Biotechnology*, 30(3), 132–137. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tibtech.2011.10.003>
- Burchell, K. (2015). *Factors affecting public engagement by researchers: literature review*, Policy Studies Institute, London, <https://wellcome.ac.uk/sites/default/files/wtp060036.pdf> (accessed on: 24/07/2019).
- Burns, D., Squires, H., (2011). *Embedding public engagement in higher education: Final report of the national action research programme*, NCCPE. [https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/sites/default/files/publication/action\\_research\\_report\\_0.pdf](https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/sites/default/files/publication/action_research_report_0.pdf) (accessed on: 26/07/2019)
- Burns, T.W., O'Connor, D.J., & Stockmayer, S.M. (2003). Science communication: A contemporary definition. *Public Understanding of Science*, 12(2), 183–202. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09636625030122004>
- Capps, D.K., & Crawford, B.A. (2013). Inquiry-Based Instruction and Teaching About Nature of Science: Are They Happening? *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 24.
- Cartwright, N., & Hardie, J. (2012). *Evidence-based policy: A practical guide to doing it better*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Caulfield, T. (2005). Popular Media, Biotechnology, and the “Cycle of Hype”. *Houston Journal of Health Law & Policy*, 337(2004).
- Chen, H.T. (2012). Evaluation von Programmen und Projekten für eine demokratische Kultur. In R. Strobl, O. Lobermeier, W. Heitmeyer (eds.). *Evaluation von Programmen und Projekten für eine demokratische Kultur*. Fachmedien Wiesbaden: Springer.
- Clark, B.R. (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organisational Pathways of Transformation*. Pergamon, [http://blog.ub.ac.id/yogidwiatmoko/files/2012/12/gibb\\_hannon.pdf](http://blog.ub.ac.id/yogidwiatmoko/files/2012/12/gibb_hannon.pdf) (accessed on: 17/09/2019).

- Clark, H. (1996). *Using Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clarke, L.J., & Kitney, R.I. (2016). Syntheticbiology in the UK—an outline of plans and progress. *Synthetic and systems biotechnology*, 1(4), (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5625736/> (accessed on: 18/07/2019).
- Colizzi V., de Oliveira T., Roberts R.J. (2007). Libya should stop denying scientific evidence on HIV. *Nature*; 448 (7157):992.
- Colizzi V., et al. (2019). Structural Transformation to Attain Responsible BIOSciences (STARBIOS2): Protocol for a Horizon 2020 Funded European Multicenter Project to Promote Responsible Research and Innovation. *JMIR Res Protocl* 8(3):e11745, <https://www.researchprotocols.org/2019/3/e11745/> (accessed on: 30/09/2019).
- Condit, C. (2001). What is “public opinion” about genetics? *Nature*, 2(10). <https://doi.org/10.1038/35093580>
- d’Andrea, L., Marta, F.L., Kahma, N. and Vase, S., (2017). FIT4RRI, Project Report on the Literature Review, Deliverable 1.1 (public), December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2017, <https://zenodo.org/record/1434349#.W8iFg3szbcs> (accessed on: 30/09/2019).
- d’Andrea, L., & Declich, A. (2005). The sociological nature of science communication. *JCOM*, 4(2).
- d’Andrea, L., Quaranta, G., & Quinti, G. (2005). *Manuale sui processi di socializzazione della ricerca scientifica e tecnologica*. CERFE, Rome.
- Dahler-Larsen, P. (2006). Evaluation after Disenchantment? Five Issues Shaping the Role of Evaluation in Society. In Shaw, I.F., Greene, J.C., Mark, M.M. (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Evaluation*. London: Sage Publications.
- Dahler-Larsen, P. (2012). *The evaluation society*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- D’Armiento, J., Witte, S.S., Dutt, K. Wall, M., McAllister, G. (2019). Achieving women’s equity in academic medicine: challenging the standards. *The Lancet*. 2019; 393(10171).
- Declich G., d’Andrea, L. (2018), “Triggering Institutional Change Towards Gender Equality In Science. Final Guidelines of the TRIGGER Project”, project funded by the European Commission under the FP7 for Research.
- de Oliveira, T., Pybus, O.G., Rambaut, A., Salemi, M., Cassol, S., Ciccozzi, M., Rezza, G., Gattinara, G.C., D’Arrigo, R., Amicosante, M., Perrin, L., Colizzi, V., Perno, C.F. (2006). Benghazi Study Group. Molecular epidemiology: HIV-1 and HCV sequences from Libyan outbreak. *Nature*. 2006; 444.
- Döring, N., & Bortz, J. (2016). *Forschungsmethoden und Evaluation in den Sozial- und Humanwissenschaften*. Berlin: Springer.
- Eden, G., Jirotko, M., & Stahl, B. (2013). Responsible research and innovation: Critical reflection into the potential social consequences of ICT. In *Research Challenges in Information Science (RCIS), 2013 IEEE Seventh International Conference on*. IEEE.
- Elster, D. (2016). Deliverable 5.1 First Interim Report, University of Bremen, Bremen.
- Elster, D., Barendziak, T., Birkholz, J. (2016). Science Education as a Trigger to Attain Responsible Research and Innovation. In *Pixel: New Perspectives in*



Science Education, Conference Proceedings 2017, Florence/LibreriaUniversitariaEdizioni.

- Elster, D., Barendziak, T., Birkholz, J. (2019). Towards a sustainable and open science. Enhancing responsible research and innovation in the biosciences at the University of Bremen. Bremen: University of Bremen.
- Equality Challenge Unit (2005). Athena SWAN Charter. 7th Floor, Queen's House, 55/56 Lincoln's Inn Fields, London, WC2A 3LJ <https://www.ecu.ac.uk/equality-charters/athena-swan/>
- ERA CoBioTech (2018). Strategic Agenda – a vision for biotechnology in Europe, November 2018, [https://www.cobiotech.eu/lw\\_resource/datapool/systemfiles/elements/files/7D5DE99D41EC4DCCE0539A695E869159/current/document/114492\\_ERA\\_CoBio\\_a\\_genda\\_final\\_high-res.pdf](https://www.cobiotech.eu/lw_resource/datapool/systemfiles/elements/files/7D5DE99D41EC4DCCE0539A695E869159/current/document/114492_ERA_CoBio_a_genda_final_high-res.pdf) (accessed on 18/07/19)
- ERA CoBioTech (2018). Strategic Agenda – a vision for biotechnology in Europe, [https://www.cobiotech.eu/lw\\_resource/datapool/systemfiles/elements/files/7D5DE99D41EC4DCCE0539A695E869159/current/document/114492\\_ERA\\_CoBio\\_a\\_genda\\_final\\_high-res.pdf](https://www.cobiotech.eu/lw_resource/datapool/systemfiles/elements/files/7D5DE99D41EC4DCCE0539A695E869159/current/document/114492_ERA_CoBio_a_genda_final_high-res.pdf) (accessed on: 18/07/19)
- ESFRI European Strategy Forum on Research Infrastructures (2006), Roadmap for European Research Infrastructure. Report of the Biology and Medical Science. Roadmap Working Group, October 2006, [https://ec.europa.eu/research/infrastructures/pdf/esfri/esfri\\_roadmap/roadmap\\_2006/bms-report-roadmap-wg-2006\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/research/infrastructures/pdf/esfri/esfri_roadmap/roadmap_2006/bms-report-roadmap-wg-2006_en.pdf) (accessed on: 05/09/2019).
- European Commission (2016). SheFigures 2015, Directorate-General for Research and Innovation, Brussels.
- Eze, M.O. (2008). What is African communitarianism? Against consensus as a regulative ideal. *South African Journal of Philosophy*. 27(4). 10.4314/sajpem.v27i4.31526
- Faria, N.R, Quick, J, Claro I.M, Theze, J, de Jesus, J.G, Giovanetti, M. et al. (2017). Establishment and cryptic transmission of Zika virus in Brazil and the Americas. *Nature* 546.
- Faria, N.R. et al. (2016). Mobile real-time surveillance of Zika virus in Brazil. *Genome Medicine*, 96.
- Felt, U., Fochler, M., & Sigl, L. (2017). IMAGINE RRI: A Card-based Method for Reflecting Responsibility in Life Science Re-search
- Filardo G, da Graca B, Sass DM, Pollock BD, Smith EB, Martinez MA. Trends and comparison of female first authorship in high impact medical journals: observational study (1994-2014). *BMJ* 2016;352:1-8. doi:10.1136/bmj.i847
- Flipse, S.M., Van der Sanden, M.C., & Osseweijer, P. (2014). Setting up spaces for collaboration in industry between researchers from the natural and social sciences. *Science and engineering ethics*, 20(1).
- France, B., Gilbert, J.K. (2006). A model of communication about biotechnology. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers in cooperation with The New Zealand Biotechnology Learning Hub.
- Gade, C.B. (2012). What is ubuntu? Different interpretations among South Africans of African descent. *South African Journal of Philosophy*. 31(3). 10.1080/02580136.2012.10751789

- Gardy, J.L., and Loman N.J. (2018). Towards a genomics-informed, real-time, global pathogen surveillance system. *Nature Reviews Genetics* 19(1).
- Gerber, A. (2018). RRI: How to 'mainstream' the 'upstream' engagement. *Journal of Science Communication*, 17(3), C06, [https://jcom.sissa.it/sites/default/files/documents/JCOM\\_1703\\_2018\\_C06.pdf](https://jcom.sissa.it/sites/default/files/documents/JCOM_1703_2018_C06.pdf) (accessed on: 21/07/2019)
- Gibb, A. and Hannon, P. (2006). "Towards the entrepreneurial University?, in *International Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, v. 4, [http://blog.ub.ac.id/yogidwiatmoko/files/2012/12/gibb\\_hannon.pdf](http://blog.ub.ac.id/yogidwiatmoko/files/2012/12/gibb_hannon.pdf) (accessed on: 30/10/2018)
- Gittelman, M., (2016). The revolution re-visited: Clinical and genetics research paradigms and the productivity paradox in drug discovery. *Res. Policy*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2016.01.007>
- GREAT (2013). *Annual report on the main trends of SiS, in particular the trends related to RRI*, [http://www.great-project.eu/deliverables\\_files/deliverables05](http://www.great-project.eu/deliverables_files/deliverables05).
- Griffiths, R. (2004). Knowledge production and the research- teaching nexus: The case of the built environment disciplines. *Studies in Higher Education* 29, no. 6.
- Healey, M. (2005). Linking research and teaching: Exploring disciplinary spaces and the role of inquiry- based learning. In *Reshaping the University: New Relationships Between Research, Scholarship and Teaching*, edited by R. Barnett. Maiden head, UK: McGraw- Hill/Open University Press.
- Herschberg, C., Benschop, Y., & van denBrink, M. (2018). Precarious postdocs: A comparative study on recruitment and selection of early-career researchers. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 34(4).
- Herzog, C. (2016). Successful comeback of the single-dose live oral cholera vaccine CVD 103-HgR. *Travel medicine and infectious disease*, 14(4). doi: 10.1016/j.tmaid.2016.07.003.
- Hill, S.C. et al. (2019). Emergence of the Zika virus Asian lineage in Angola. *bioRxiv* 520437; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/520437>.
- Jagsi, R., Guancial, E., Worobey, C., Henault, L., Chang, Y., Starr, R., Tarbell, N., Hylek, E. (2006). The 'Gender Gap' in Authorship of Academic Medical Literature – A 35-Year Perspective. *N Engl J Med* 2006;355.
- Jenkins, A. (2004). *A Guide to the Research Evidence on Teaching- Research Relations*. York, UK: The Higher Education Academy. Available online: [https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/id383\\_guide\\_to\\_research\\_evidence\\_on\\_teaching\\_research\\_relations.pdf](https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/id383_guide_to_research_evidence_on_teaching_research_relations.pdf) (accessed on: 20/06/2019).
- Kalpazidou Schmidt, E., Ovseik, P.V., Henderson, L.R., & Kiparoglou, V. (2019). Understanding the Athena SWAN award scheme for gender equality as a complex social intervention in a complex system: analysis of Silver award Action Plans in a comparative European perspective. *bioRxiv*. doi:10.1101/555482.
- Kalpazidou Schmidt, E. & Cacace, M. (2017). Addressing gender inequality in science: the multifaceted challenge of assessing impact. *Research Evaluation*, vol. 26, no 2.
- Kalpazidou Schmidt, E. & Cacace, M. (2018). Setting up a Dynamic Framework to Activate Gender Equality Structural Transformation in Research Organisations. *Science and Public Policy*, vol. 59.

- Kalpazidou Schmidt, E. (2009). Evaluation, in Bijker W. E. & d'Andrea (eds.), *Handbook on the Socialisation of Scientific and Technological Research, Social Sciences and European Research Capacities*, pp. 169-189, Rome: River Press Group.
- Kalpazidou Schmidt, E. (2016). Development of monitoring and assessment tools of structural transformation actions to attain responsible biosciences. STARBIOS2 report.
- Kalpazidou Schmidt, E.K., & Cacace, M. (2018). Setting up a Dynamic Framework to Activate Gender Equality Structural Transformation in Research Organisations. *Science and Public Policy*.
- Kuhlmann, S., Lindner, R., & Randles, S. (2016). Conclusion: making responsibility an institutionalised ambition. In *Navigating Towards Shared Responsibility in Research and Innovation: Approach, Process and Results of the Res-AGorA Project* (pp. 161-166). Fraunhofer ISI.
- Kwiek, M. (2015). "Academic Entrepreneurialism and the Changing Governance in Universities. Evidence from Empirical Studies", in Reihlen, W.M., Frost, J., Hattke, F. (eds.) *Multi-level Governance of Universities: The Role of Strategies, Structures, and Controls*
- Lawrence, T., Suddaby, R., & Leca, B. (2011). Institutional work: Refocusing institutional studies of organisation. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 20(1).
- Lederman, N. G., Antink, A., & Bartos, S. (2014). Nature of science, scientific inquiry, and socio-scientific issues arising from genetics: A pathway to developing a scientifically literate citizenry. *Science & Education*, 23(2).
- Lindlof, T.R. (1995). *Qualitative Communication Research Methods*. London: Sage.
- Lutz, D.W. (2009). African Ubuntu Philosophy and Global Management. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 84(3), 313-328. 10.1007/s10551-009-0204-z
- Mann, A., & Di Prete, T.A., (2013). Trends in gender segregation in the choice of science and engineering majors. *Social science research*, 42(6), <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24090849> (accessed on: 26/07/2019)
- March, J.G., Gherardi, S., & Cimmino, S. (1993). *Decisioni e organizzazioni*. Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Mezzana, D. (2018). Some Societal Factors Impacting on the Potentialities of Electronic Evidence, in M.A. Biasiotti et al. (eds.), *Handling and Exchanging Electronic Evidence Across Europe, Law, Governance and Technology Series 39*, Springer, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-74872-6\\_14](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-74872-6_14).
- Mezzana, D. (ed.) (2011), *Technological responsibility. Guidelines for a shared governance of the processes of socialisation of scientific research and innovation, within an interconnected world*, Roma, CNR: [www.scienzecittadinanza.org/public/SetDevGuidelines.pdf](http://www.scienzecittadinanza.org/public/SetDevGuidelines.pdf) (accessed on: 08/11/2018)
- Msoroka, M.S. & Amundsen, D. (2018). One size fits not quite all: Universal research ethics with diversity. *Research Ethics*. 14(3), 1-17. 10.1177/1747016117739939.
- Musselin, C. (2007). *The Transformation of Academic Work: Facts and Analysis*. Research & Occasional Paper Series: CSHE. 4.07. *Center for studies in higher education*;

- Naveca, F.G. et al. (2019). Genomic, epidemiological and digital surveillance of Chikungunya virus in the Brazilian Amazon. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*, 13, 3-0007065.
- Nowotny, H. (2007). Knowledge Production and its Constraints: epistemic and societal considerations, paper presented at the Gulbenkian Foundation, Lisbon, 2007, [http://helga-nowotny.eu/downloads/helga\\_nowotny\\_b58.pdf](http://helga-nowotny.eu/downloads/helga_nowotny_b58.pdf) (accessed on: 18/07/2019)
- Nowotny, H., Scott, P., Gibbons, M., & Scott, P.B. (2001). *Re-thinking science: Knowledge and the public in an age of uncertainty*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Owen, R., Forsberg, E-M., Shelley-Egan, C. (2019). RRI-Practice Policy Recommendations and Roadmaps, RRI-Practice project report. Deliverable 16.2, <https://www.rri-practice.eu/knowledge-repository/recommendations/> (accessed on: 21/07/2019)
- Pan-African Bioethics Initiative (PABIN), (2003). PABIN Third Conference: *Good Health Research Practices in Africa*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Pawson, R. & Tilley, N. (1997). *Realistic Evaluation*. London: Sage.
- Pierini, M. (2008). Le prix de la liberté: Libye, les coulisses d'une négociation, Actes Sud.
- Pinheiro, R., & Stensaker, B. (2014). Designing the entrepreneurial university: The interpretation of a global idea. *Public Organisation Review*, 14(4).
- Quaranta, G. (1985). L'era dello sviluppo, Franco Angeli, Milano.
- Quick, J., et al. (2017) Multiplex PCR method for MinION and Illumina sequencing of Zika and other virus genomes directly from clinical samples. *Nat Protoc*, 2017. 12(6).
- Reale, E., Nedeva, M., Thomas, D., & Primeri, E. (2014). Evaluation through impact: A different viewpoint. *Fteval Journal*, 39.
- Reydon, T.A., Kampourakis, K., & Patrinos, G.P. (2012). Genetics, genomics and society: the responsibilities of scientists for science communication and education. *Personalized Medicine*, 9(6). <https://doi.org/10.2217/pme.12.69>
- Rog, D.J. (2012). When background becomes foreground: Toward Context-Sensitive Evaluation Practice. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 135.
- Rome Declaration on Responsible Research and Innovation in Europe [https://ec.europa.eu/research/swafs/pdf/rome\\_declaration\\_RRI\\_final\\_21\\_November.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/research/swafs/pdf/rome_declaration_RRI_final_21_November.pdf) (accessed on: 26/07/2019)
- Royal Society (2006). *Survey of factors affecting science communication by scientists and engineers*, the Royal Society, [https://royalsociety.org/~media/Royal\\_Society\\_Content/policy/publications/2006/1111111395.pdf](https://royalsociety.org/~media/Royal_Society_Content/policy/publications/2006/1111111395.pdf) (accessed on: 24/07/2019).
- Ruggiu, D. (2015). Anchoring European governance: Two versions of responsible research and innovation and EU fundamental rights as 'Normative anchor points'. *NanoEthics*, 9(3).
- Sadler, T.D. (2011). *Socio-scientific issues in the classroom*. Heidelberg, Springer.
- Sambala, E.Z., Cooper, S. and Manderson, L. (2019). Ubuntu as a Framework for Ethical Decision Making in Africa: Responding to Epidemics. *Ethics & Behavior*. 10.1080/10508422.2019.1583565
- Shendure, J., Ji, H., (2008). Next-generation DNA sequencing. In *Nature Biotechnology*, 26.

- Smith, R.D.J., Scott, D., Kamwendo, Z.T., Calvert, J. (2019). An Agenda for Responsible Research and Innovation in ERA CoBioTech. Swindon, UK: Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council and ERA CoFund on Biotechnology
- [https://www.cobiotech.eu/lw\\_resource/datapool/systemfiles/elements/files/85886BE9C7161C71E0539A695E865A64/live/document/ERA\\_CoBioTech\\_RRI\\_Framework.pdf](https://www.cobiotech.eu/lw_resource/datapool/systemfiles/elements/files/85886BE9C7161C71E0539A695E865A64/live/document/ERA_CoBioTech_RRI_Framework.pdf) (accessed on: 18/07/19)
- Spruit, S.L., Hoople, G.D., & Rolfe, D.A. (2016). Just a cog in the machine? The individual responsibility of researchers in nanotechnology is a duty to collectivize. *Science and engineering ethics*, 22(3).
- Stephan, P. (2013). How to exploit postdocs. *BioScience*, 63(4).
- Stilgoe, J., Owen, R., & Macnaghten, P. (2013). Developing a framework for responsible innovation. *Research Policy*, 42(9).
- Sutcliffe, H. (2011). A report on Responsible Research and Innovation for the European Commission. Retrieved from [http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/document\\_library/pdf\\_06/rri-report-hilary-sutcliffe\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/document_library/pdf_06/rri-report-hilary-sutcliffe_en.pdf) (accessed on: 30/9/2019).
- Temoshok, L.R., & Wald, R.L. (2008). Integrating multidimensional HIV prevention programs into healthcare settings. *Psychosomatic medicine*, 70(5). doi: 10.1097/PSY.0b013e31817739b4.
- Thézé, J. et al. (2018). Genomic Epidemiology Reconstructs the Introduction and Spread of Zika Virus in Central America and Mexico. *Cell Host Microbe*. 23.
- Van Belle, S.B., Marchal, B., Dubourg D. and Kegels, G. (2010). How to develop a theory-driven evaluation design? Lessons learned from an adolescent sexual and reproductive health programme in West Africa. *BMC Public Health*, 10, 741.
- Van Schomberg, V. & van Schomberg, R. (2013). A Vision of Responsible Research and Innovation. In Owen, R., Heintz, M. & Bessant J. (Eds.), *Responsible Innovation* (pp. 51-74). London: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Von Schomberg, R. (2019). Why Responsible Innovation. In *The International Handbook on Responsible Innovation. A Global Resource*. Von Schomberg, R. and Hankins, J. (Eds.). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing. Forthcoming.
- Watermeyer, R. (2015). Lost in the 'third space': the impact of public engagement in higher education on academic identity, research practice and career progression. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 5:3, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/21568235.2015.1044546> (accessed on: 24/07/2019).

## ABOUT THE STARBIOS2 GUIDELINES

This guideline aims to help readers formalize and trigger structural change aimed at introducing appropriate RRI-related practices to their own organisations. This is not a series of prescriptions, but an itinerary of reflection and self-interpretation addressed to different actors within the biosciences. To support this itinerary of reflection and self-interpretation, the document provides...

- a description of a general RRI Model for research organisations within the biosciences, that is a set of ideas, premises and “principles of action” that define the practice of RRI in bioscience research organisations,
- some practical guidance for designing interventions to promote RRI in research organisations in the Biosciences, putting into practice the RRI Model,
- a set of useful practices in implementing the structural change process,
- and information on particular STARBIOS2 cases and experiences, as well as materials, tools and sources, are also provided in the Appendix and in the Annex.



LSC Laboratory of  
Citizenship  
Sciences

Universität Bremen



ABI

UPPSALA  
UNIVERSITET



AARHUS UNIVERSITET

Ministero di Sanità  
Fondazione Osservatorio  
Crisi e Innovazione



UNIVERSITY SYSTEM  
of MARYLAND

