

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

Project number:
230557

Title of deliverable*:

Protocol for new group exercises

Work package:
WP3

Author(s):

Grünert, Stefan

Tscheru, Hans-Peter

Partner (institution):
dialog<>gentechnik

Deliverable 3.3

Date: 26 April 2011

*: Acknowledgements:

Introduction	3
Description of and background to Science Parliament II:.....	3
Differences between Science Parliament I and Science Parliament II.....	4
Objectives of Science Parliament II	5
Protocol on Value Dialogue in shape of the Science Parliament II:	6
Science Parliament II Pre-Events:.....	6
Course of action of the Science Parliament II.....	6
Timeline Science Parliament II:	8
Conclusion: Value Dialogue’s place and inclusion in the governance blueprint with specific reference to its potential significance for Value Based Governance.....	10
References:	12

Introduction

This document describes a participative exercise (Science Parliament II – SP II) suitable to hold and analyse value dialogues in relation to S&T and S&T policies based on a tried and tested format, the science parliament. This participative exercise is based upon the long standing experience of partner 4 with participative formats and an extensive review of current practice in Europe. It is further strengthened and pays particular reference to the insights gained from interviews and by holding the value sensitive and value informed “Science Parliament” which partner X organized as a participative exercise on September 15th and 16th in Wiener Neustadt (WN), both described in deliverable 3.2 “Report on experiences with role play exercises”.

SP-II is designed as a qualitative supplement to existing surveys dealing with public perception of European S&T developments and it is designed as a tool to exercise consultation on policies corresponding to our proposal pertaining a blueprint of value informed governance which you find below and in the final chapter of this document. In this respect Science Parliament’s function is to give policy makers additional information on how lay people provided with fundamental information perceive certain technologies and it makes visible potential issues and probable consensus of informed publics in respect to technological and scientific developments. This way Value Dialogue aims to increase citizen proximity of the outcomes of science and research policies and to democratize the scientific practice to a greater extent.

Description of and background to Science Parliament II:

Value Dialogue in shape of SP II is designed as an outcome and consensus oriented consultation exercise on objectives and value hierarchies regarding European S&T policies. It is applicable for National Contact Points (NCPs) to give the European Commission (EC) otherwise difficult to obtain value reflecting or value based input by a group of people from the general public, not only on current research policies and their implementation in regard to their published Calls, Work Programmes and their granted/funded projects. In addition this exercise is suitable to provide input about planned activities, for example on drafts of work programme which are circulated by the EC to NCPs and other stakeholders for feedback. One of the advantages of this proposal is therefore that it could be readily and directly integrated in an existing feedback process the EC already uses to improve the implementation of their research agenda.

The function of this Value Dialogue would be pertaining to current research policies as a

- source of legitimization
- supplemental tool to detect relevant social values
- provide public views and perspectives
- identify areas of public consensus

Furthermore SP II is a direct interface between science and public bringing researcher and SP participants in dialogue about value specific requirements and impacts of the scientist’s research project.

If institutionalized as a permanent feedback loop regarding lay people’s values and views about objectives and promoted values of work programme drafts, it could be an adjustment to political perspectives that mainly focus on market adequateness, efficiency, effectiveness and competitiveness.

Differences between Science Parliament I and Science Parliament II

Science Parliament I (SP I) focused on the preferences of participants and their underlying values regarding the impacts of specific technologies. The focus of deliberation and therewith of the resolution was on the regulation of technology employment and scientific research directions in general. While SP I proved generally useful to reach the aims of a value dialogue specific difficulties in the appraisal of values require in our view an adaptation to improve the current format and also incorporate it better into a real decision making process.

As distinct from SP I the participative exercise SP II directly focuses on research policies and their implementation. SP II will deal with regulations and policies in practice, e.g. participants will discuss their preferences regarding distribution of research funding using the examples of specific research projects. This discussion will take place in the scope of aimed objectives and legitimizing values expressed in current Calls and Work programmes.

Additionally to the aforementioned strategically different approach, SP II includes some modifications which are assumed to be improvements based on the experience with the original framing carried out in SP I. These improvements are aimed to enhance the motivation to contribute and increase identification with the process, but also to raise interest for the selected topics and the process of the participative exercise:

Increase motivation:

In order to increase motivation we will reduce time pressure and work load for the participants by expanding the timetable. Demanding exercises like the MCM will be divided into shifts. More attention will be paid to breaks and more easy sequences in order to improve the quality of the more demanding aspects of SP II. Another measure to increase motivation is to hold the Science Parliament in a authentic location of policy production; SP II will take place within the premises of the town hall of vienna, the site of local government of Vienna. Further there will be the offer to the participants to make a Science Graffiti. The Science Graffiti is designed as a supplementary possibility to express oneself on the process of the science parliament and the topics dealt with. The arts aspect is designed as a gratification for interested participants, who are guided in this process by professional artists.

Create increased engagement/identification with the process:

In order to increase participants' engagement and identification more emphasis will be put on the explanation of the significance of deliberative and non-representative framings, of participation, of civil society and of different theoretical approaches regarding democracy.

Increase commitment with regard to the selected topics:

In order to increase commitment towards the topics, we will encourage the participants to explore the topic themselves. Therefore participants previous to the parliament will receive less information, in order to promote the opportunity to discover the potential issue on their own.

Increase transparency and foster understanding in respect to the participative exercise:

Workload and timetable have to be communicated better. Further we intend to increase transparency by discussing the objectives and the background of the participative exercise more extensive.

Objectives of Science Parliament II

The objectives of holding and testing the new group exercise include:

- Identification of the participants' views, expectations and values regarding European S&T policies dealing with biometrics and pathogen research.
- Identification of the scenarios perceived as attractive by participants regarding scientific and technological developments in the field of biometrics and pathogen research.
- Identification of participants' views and attitudes on specific biometrics and pathogen research projects
- Identification of the participants' perception of favoured promises or opportunities and particularly feared threats, risks or uncertainties related to specific biometrics/pathogen research projects.
- Identification of the expectations of participants regarding the general work of ethical councils and policy makers with regard to S&T policies.
- Assess the usefulness and feasibility of value based dialogues on specific technology-policies and their implementation with respect to the potential of social values to guide scientific and technological developments.

To achieve these goals SP II will feature a MCM with questionnaires, chaired work group sessions for participants to develop resolutions on the selected topics and a declaration pertaining to selected S&T policies and specific research projects and a final plenary session. This new group exercise is an improved, modified and adapted version of the first participative exercise SP I.

As Value Dialogue is an exploratory pilot study working with non-representative and small groups the output of these participative exercises can not claim to represent general public's hegemonic views, expectations, attitudes or value hierarchies regarding biometrics and pathogen research. Not to mention methodological issues regarding framing biases in general. But the goal is to develop a method which, provided the necessary resources are available, could suitably identify a representative estimate of values held with regard to specific science and technology topics by specific societal groups or sections.

Protocol on Value Dialogue in shape of the Science Parliament II:

Science Parliament II Pre-Events:

Referring to the improvements aimed at, and based on previous experience with the exercise two sessions with the participants are planned prior to the main event. These sessions have the function to increase identification with the participative exercise by creating understanding for the underlying approach and to increase commitment regarding the selected topics in order to foster the willingness to dispute and increase the diversity of views. These goals should be achieved by:

- Discussing deliberative democracy and the significance of civil society and participation with participants.

- First approach to selected technologies to generate interest by asking the participants to investigate the topics on their own in preparation for the Science Parliament.

Course of action of the Science Parliament II

Below the planned protocol of Science Parliament II is summarized. Due to organizational requirements or due to insights based on relevant progress adaptations and modifications may be necessary.

Step 1; MCM first run:

First run of the MCM. In this run participants develop the most attractive and promising as well as the most feared and unprepossessing scenarios regarding the selected topic on their own. Further they work out the criteria which they deem relevant for assessing these scenarios. This step will take approximately 2 hours. For further information on the MCM please see deliverable 3.1 and deliverable 3.2.

Step 2; value explication discussion:

Based on the experience obtained with the problem-centred interviews after Science Parliament I, to be more accurate, due to the obviously heterogeneous understanding of values and due to the intuitive, non-reflected and vague use of values as an argument resource, we intend to increase shared meaning and understanding by problematizing the different meanings of values. This problematization shall take place in a discussion between the participants on how they understand certain values, and how they would personally explain them. On the one hand this should lead to a higher degree of comprehension on the other hand we at least sharpen the awareness regarding a possible lack of common sense between the participants. This step will take approximately 1 hour.

Step 3 Expert hearing

There will be an expert hearing integrated in the framing of the participative exercise.

The expert hearing consists of a short input lecture by the experts on the specific technology in general, on possible impacts, on related risks and uncertainties. After that the participants have the possibility to pose questions. The expert-input has the function to give the

participants the information that empowers them to make meaningful decisions on the subjects and to increase the participants' feeling of competence so that they are capable of tapping the full potential of the ethical and rational competence and of the traditional knowledge which they can apply later in the exercise.

It also focuses on capacity-building by reflecting the topic-specific capabilities of participants and promoting their views as inputs for governance-outcome. (see Renn, 2008: p.325)

The expert hearing is scheduled for 1,5 hours.

Step 4 committee work on the resolutions

In this step participants develop a resolution with regard to the selected topic. This resolution may include different points of view and summarizes the entire group's statements and demands, about which consensus could be obtained. The resolution frames the issue according to the participants and the participants develop the resolution in regard to the objective to find solutions for a common good.

Committee work is scheduled for 4 hours.

Step 5 Discussion of existing policies or policy drafts

After working out resolutions in this step participants engage themselves with real policies and give feedback about these policies. In this pilot, participants will use existing policy documents, which should do for testing the approach. As part of an institutionalized participative exercise which functions as an additional feedback loop to policy makers the "Policy Discussion" would introduce the issue of policy drafts.

In this step participants work out which value and objective priorities they share and which values are neglected according to their view. In this pilot participants grapple with the 2007 calls of the FP7 cooperation, the themes security and health, respectively, instead of work programme drafts. Output of this discussion is a document which summarizes this assessment and states expectations, recommendations and critique regarding the objectives and promoted values of the specific work programme paper.

This value- as well as interest-based discussion of research programmes serves as a test run to explore its potential as an act of collaborative policy making and suitability as an additional feedback loop, which might become the core for incremental policy change by process modification to a more social value conscious decision-making.

The Policy-Discussion is scheduled for 2 hours.

Step 6 MCM second run:

In the second run participants develop MCM scenarios which reflect the objectives and values of the work programme. The possible impacts of the newly gained technological capabilities by the executed/implemented projects are discussed and ranked hereafter.

The second run of MCM will take approximately 2 hours

Step 7 Project Discussion

In this step adequate FP7 funded research projects are presented to the participants. E.g. for Biometrics: SAMUREI, INDECT, DETECTER and for Dual-Use-Dilemma in Pathogen Research BIG_IDEA, VIRALPHYLOGEOGRAPHY or GameXP. Participants discuss which values are promoted or which values are underlying the research project and to what extent this corresponds to the work programme and its expressed values and they discuss to what

extent this research project is corresponding to their own point of view regarding necessity, relevance, importance and desirability of the project. Output of this deliberation is a document appraising the project.

Besides we are contemplating to invite researchers, members of the NCP or scientific officers responsible for the project to a hearing in scope of this project discussion. Information about and engagement to the discussed topic as well as the framing that gives experts/researchers the space/room to explain and legitimize their work could thus transform the identity of the participating citizens to 'scientific citizens'. Due to the framing and the experiences representativeness is not given, but it enables all participants to take part in a learning process that possibly contributes to closing the gap between scientific and non-scientific knowledge.

In general an institutionalized dialogue between researchers and lay people would promote a common speech open to public. The participants would in this way serve as a bridgehead for lay people in the scientific community as well as in the general public, where they might disseminate their above average knowledge about the scientific endeavour as multipliers and opinion leaders in relevant routine discussions.

This institutionalized dialogue could on the one hand sharpen scientists' awareness regarding what people held valuable and what aspects of research are issues for the general public - the approval of research projects by lay people could broaden the perspective of scientists and increase the chance of reflecting social values in future research concepts and in this way foster a democratization of research. On the other hand this kind of events would perhaps also influence the techno-political culture of citizens by sparking interest in science and by increasing public understanding of science.

Another output of the process might result from further documentation of this project discussion, which could provide legitimacy to the proposed or current research activity. Subsequently this document would be available for evaluation, which would deliver supplementary information alongside quantitative studies on public attitudes and values on specific research branches and technologies.

The Project Discussion is scheduled for 1 hour. The upscale version including the attendance of researchers defending their projects would need 2 - 3 hours.

Step 8 Plenum preparation and resolution adjustments

In this step participants have the opportunity to make adjustments to their resolution based on the experiences and the deliberation insights gained in the steps after the committee work. Further this step is designed as preparation for the plenum: Participants have the possibility to improve their speeches and presentation strategies and to prepare for the plenum discussion before the voting

Two hours are scheduled for the plenum preparation.

Step 9 Plenum

Participants present the developed resolutions in public, after the presentation a discussion on Pro and Cons of the resolution takes place. Finally there will be a voting and each resolution will be approved or disapproved.

Two hours are scheduled for the plenum.

Timeline Science Parliament II:

Due to coordination issues it has not been possible to appoint the exact date of Science Parliament II up to now, but in any case it is scheduled on three consecutive days between 30th of May and 17th of June.

Timeframe:

Step:	Approximate time duration:
MCM first run	2 hours (Day 1)
Value explication discussion	1 hour (Day 1)
Expert hearing	1,5 hours (Day 1)
Committee work on the resolutions	4 hours all up (Day 1 and day 2)
Discussion of existing policies or policy drafts	2 hours (Day 2)
MCM second run	2 hours (Day 2)
Project discussion	1 to 3 hours (Day 2)
Plenum preparation and resolution adjustments	2 hours (Day 3)
Plenum	3 hours (Day 3)

Science Parliament timetable:

Day one	
8:30-9:00	Opening
9:00-9:30	Parliament boards team building
9:30-12:00	Multi-Criteria mapping, first run (short breaks included)
12:00-13:00	Lunchbreak
13:00-14:00	Value explication discussion
14:00-14:15	Coffee break
14:15-15:45	Expert hearing
15:45-16:00	Coffee break
16:00-17:30	Committee work
Day two	
8:30-11:00	Committee work (short breaks included)
11:00-11:15	Coffee break
11:15-12:30	Policy discussion
12:30-13:30	Lunchbreak
13:30-14:00	Policy discussion
14:00-16:00	Project discussion (short breaks included)
16:00-16:15	Coffee break
16:15-	Science Graffiti
Day three	
8:30-10:30	Multi-Criteria mapping, second run
10:30-10:45	Coffee break
10:45-12:45	Plenum Preparation
12:45-13:45	Lunch break
13:45-15:45	Plenum Topic I and II
15:45-16:00	Coffee break
16:-17:00	Plenum Topic III

Conclusion: Value Dialogue's place and inclusion in the governance blueprint with specific reference to its potential significance for Value Based Governance

Policy decisions about S&T have a long term impact on our societies and there is general agreement, that a lack of support for scientific policies can create a major stumbling block to introducing new technologies. Since the publication of the Bodmer report on public understanding of science and renewed efforts to promote public engagement in the European democracies there remain identified but unresolved issues, how to tackle the following issues pertaining to science and technology policy making in specific research areas:

- to decrease the probability of public dissatisfaction with technologies
- to decrease the probability of public dispute of technologies and their possible impact
- to increase democratic legitimacy
- to decrease democratic deficit
- to address the issue of low citizen participation
- to foster participation and involvement

Therefore value dialogue was explored as a measure to appraise the values members of the general public may hold with respect to specific scenarios pertaining to the use of modern technologies. An institution - similar to the EESC that bridges organised civil society and EU in a transparent way - that is another bridge between unorganised citizens and the EU appears recommendable:

The social dialogue coordinated by the EESC has inter alia the function to provide access to knowledge based information and expertise of concerned actors, and the role of non-organised and ordinary citizens is hereby reduced – if they are interested and also conscious about when and where to seek information- to be an observer of this consultation process. Also initiatives like “your voice” in Europe (interactive policy-making) which is an offer to active citizens to take part in a consultation process leaves ordinary citizens, who do not have time and commitment for participating or who do not have information about that participation opportunities, out. Besides the complexity of political, economic and scientific matters often is discouraging citizens and it would need backup by experts and moderators to let people take part on a broader basis.

Taking this into consideration, we propose Value Dialogue as a civic dialogue, that consists of value focussed participation exercises and has the function to provide policy makers with supplementary information about value informed attitudes of lay people. A particular concern of such a deliberation process is the fact that participants might change their opinion in response to the information imparted to them during the exercise. However, there is evidence that additional information about and deeper understanding of science and technology not necessarily produces acceptance. It is therefore legitimate to suppose that lay people who as participants take part in participative exercises and therefore enter into a learning and deliberation process produce outputs that correspond to social values of the general public despite their privileged situation. A discrepancy between these outcomes and the results of expert-commissions and specialized administrators would reflect the perceived gap between policy decisions and public opinion responsible for the eroding trust in policy decisions with regard to science and technology.

As good practice in consultation processes have to be tailored according to the needs of each policy field our presented proposal is rather sector specific and is focussing value reflecting attitudes on emerging technologies currently a research focus under the 7th framework

programme. In the policy field S&T the existing and Europe-wide infrastructure of National Contact Points (NCPs) could function as key network to complement already existing peer review on work programme drafts with a citizen review. We propose to do this by linking national Value Dialogues to the NCPs.

That means to integrate participation exercise “Value Dialogue” directly in the policy making and implementation process by taking work programme drafts as a basis for value reflecting considerations, deliberations and discussions on objectives and value hierarchies of EC-Policies. The permanent feedback of ordinary citizens about objectives and promoted values of work programme drafts could be an adjustment to political perspectives that mainly focus on market adequateness, efficiency, effectiveness and competitiveness. As soon as work programmes are established “Value Dialogues” could occupy themselves with research projects that are funded by the programme and give feedback on possible value issues.

That way Value Dialogue in this proposal serves also as a direct interface between science and public bringing researchers and participants in dialogue about value specific requirements and possible impacts of the specific research projects funded within a theme of a work programme.

Summarizing: The immediate surplus of this “Value Dialogue” would on the one hand be to deliver views and perspectives that might find general consensus respectively have a high potential of reaching consensus in general public and on the other hand to detect potentially public issues faster. Besides “Value Dialogue” serves as further resource of legitimacy and an additional layer of Governance that holds the potential to bring the European Union R&D and S&T policies closer to EU-citizens’ values. Additionally this could also have positive effects on national techno-political cultures in the long run. Certainly such an exercise implemented on a regular basis throughout Europe holds the potential to complement regular reviews performed by the Eurobarometer studies. Such an effort corresponding to a reciprocal interaction paying full respect to participating citizens has been claimed to promote public engagement with science and technology issues, while it not necessarily promotes acceptance of specific applications.

Taking the White Paper on European Governance seriously Value Dialogue’s task would be to improve R&D /S&T policies’ responsiveness to the expectations of the Union's ordinary citizens. It is a less top-down approach by integrating ordinary citizens in the policy cycle and inserting their values in policies. It improves policy-making qualitatively by making it more inclusive and accountable. Thus ordinary citizens’ confidence and trust regarding to the policy-making institutions and their policy outputs could increase.

The main asset of the Value Dialogue concept is, that in contrast to most other proposals it is not focused on organized groups and their interests or experts only but on ordinary citizens and their context-specific relevant values. Value Dialogue is not reducing the actors most concerned to stakeholders, lobbies and interest groups but takes in citizens who would feel the impact of new technologies not until they are implemented, and is fostering involvement and participation as an offer to ordinary citizens and as an encouragement to become a more active citizen. Thus it enhances legitimacy of political institutions and policies.

But an active exercise of citizenship involving ordinary citizens in participation exercises regarding S&T policies as well as their implementation is based on the condition of meaningfulness of the output of this exercise. Thus Value Dialogue if institutionalized in the policy cycle should go far beyond participation amputating concepts that are reduced to stakeholder-consultation and non-decision relevant exercises of ordinary people.

Value dialogue is designed as consultative ‘downstream’ participation exercise and is intended to be placed in the policy-making, policy implementation and evaluation stage of policies, concretely it gives feedback on working paper drafts and on the practice of research project funding within a programme. An advantage of this positioning is, that Value dialogue can easily be integrated in the consultation/feedback process between commission and NCPs and so supply additional feedback on ordinary citizens and their held values besides the already on regularly basis delivered expert feedback. Thus it serves as a channel for feedback, criticism and protest on objectives and values of technological policies and their implementation. But it also provides citizens with insight about the complexities of such decisions and the different opinions one might hold towards them.

This additional feedback on work paper drafts is not only helpful and useful for creating citizen proximal policies by consulting elected actual decision-makers (EP, Council) by giving an overview over relevant issues and values perceived by public regarding specific S&T directions, but also would have a decision-influencing dimension for administrative decision-makers – who have left a certain scope to technically adjust and implement policies - in the implementation process, if Value Dialogues’ outputs are taken into consideration on reasons of good practice.

Thus the end-users and addressees of Value-Dialogues output would be allocated throughout the policy chain.

References:

Hafeneger, Benno/Niebling, Thorsten (2008): Kinder und Jugendparlament. IN: Kersting, Norbert(2008)(Hg.): Politische Beteiligung: Einführung in dialogorientierte Instrumente politischer und gesellschaftlicher Partizipation. Wiesbaden. PP. 123-141.

Renn, Ortwin (2008): Risk Governance. Coping with uncertainty in a complex world. London.

Kersting, Norbert (2008a): Innovative Partizipation: Legitimation, Machtkontrolle und Transformation. Eine Einführung. IN: Kersting, Norbert(2008)(Hg.): Politische Beteiligung: Einführung in dialogorientierte Instrumente politischer und gesellschaftlicher Partizipation. Wiesbaden. PP. 11-39.

Kersting, Norbert (2008b): Evaluation dialogischer Beteiligungsinstrumente. IN: Kersting, Norbert(2008)(Hg.): Politische Beteiligung: Einführung in dialogorientierte Instrumente politischer und gesellschaftlicher Partizipation. Wiesbaden. PP. 270-291.

The Public Understanding of Science. Report of a Royal Society ad hoc Group endorsed by the Council of the Royal Society. January 1985.

Internet sources:

Commission of the European Communities: European Governance: A White Paper. Brussels, 25.7.2001. COM(2001) 428 final.

http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/com/2001/com2001_0428en01.pdf

Commission of the European Communities: Communication from the Commission. Towards a reinforced culture of consultation and dialogue – General principles and minimum standards for consultation of interested parties by the Commission.

Brussels, 11.12.2002. COM (2002) 704 final.

http://ec.europa.eu/governance/docs/comm_standards_en.pdf

Commission of the European Communities: Report from the Commission on European Governance.2003

http://ec.europa.eu/governance/docs/comm_rapport_en.pdf

Felt, U. et al. (2010). Experimente partizipativer ELSA-Forschung. Eine methodenpolitische Reflexion. Published by the Department of Social Studies of Science, University of Vienna, June 2010.

http://sciencestudies.univie.ac.at/fileadmin/user_upload/dep_sciencestudies/pdf_files/Preprints/Felt_Fochler_Strassnig_experimente_elsaForschung_June2010.pdf

Felt, Ulrike/Fochler, Maximilian/Winkler, Peter: Coming to Terms with Biomedical Technologies in different Technopolitical Cultures: A Comparative Analysis of Focus Groups on Organ Transplantation and Genetic Testing in Austria, France, and the Netherlands In: Science, Technology & Human Values July 2010 35: 525-553, first published on October 27, 2009 doi:10.1177/0162243909345839

http://sciencestudies.univie.ac.at/fileadmin/user_upload/dep_sciencestudies/pdf_files/Preprints/Felt_Fochler_winkler_coming_to_terms_preprint_Aug2010.pdf

Lövbrand, Eva/Pielke, Roger, Jr./Beck, Silke: A Democracy Paradox in Studies of Science and Technology. In: Science, Technology & Human Values. First published on August 26, 2010

<http://sth.sagepub.com/content/early/2010/09/03/0162243910366154.full.pdf+html>

http://sciencepolicy.colorado.edu/admin/publication_files/2010.28.pdf

Pavan-Woolfe, L./Kröger, M: Report of working Group (2a): Consultation and Participation of Civil Society. White Paper on European Governance. Work Area n° 2. Handling the Process of Producing and Implementing Community Rules. 2001.

http://ec.europa.eu/governance/areas/group3/report_en.pdf

Soma, Katrine/Vatn, Arild (2010): Is There Anything Like a Citizen? A Descriptive Analysis of Instituting a Citizen's Role to Represent Social Values at the Municipal Level. IN:

Environmental Policy and Governance. 20. 2010. Pp. 30-43.

Published online 23. December 2009 in Wiley InterScience:

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/>