

PROSEPS – WG 3 MEETING – LEUVEN, SEPTEMBER 2017

1) MEETING AGENDA

- 09.00 Welcome and coffee
- 09.30-11.00 Plenary – Introduction to the draft questionnaire
- 11.00-11.15 Short break
- 11.15-12.45 Parallel WG 3 and WG 4 discussions of the questionnaire
- 12.45-13.45 Lunch break
- 13.45-15.45 Plenary feedback – questionnaire and follow up
- 15.45.-16.00 Short break
- 16.00-17.00 WG 3 and WG 4 planning of activities

2) PLENARY – INTRODUCTION

The leaders of WG3 and WG4 presented the results of the previous meeting in Malta (January 2017). After this, there was a general discussion about the main topics WG3 and WG4 should deal with, particularly the issue of translation.

3) WG 3 MEETING (QUESTIONNAIRE)

The group mostly discussed the questions included in the section of the questionnaire devoted to the public relevance of political science. The final list of questions included after this discussion were:

1. Overall, how do you consider the visibility of your political scientist colleagues' research in the public debate?

1. Not visible at all
2. Little visible
3. Enough visible
4. Very visible

2. In the last five years, did you take part in public debates through the media?

1. Yes 2. No

2A. [If the interviewee responded 'yes' to question 2.] Can you specify which media (MULTIPLE RESPONSE)?

1. Interventions in TV broadcasts
2. Radio broadcasts
3. Newspapers/periodical magazines (including online outlets)
4. Interventions through other online media (twitter, facebook, blogs, video-blogs, youtube channels)

2a. Can you specify the frequency of your average interventions and the type of media related to political issues (during the last five years)?

1) Interventions on TV broadcasts (participation in news, political shows or documentary programs)

1. At least once a week
2. At least once a month
3. At least once every three months

4. At least once every year
5. Less frequently

2) Interventions on radio broadcasts [*same response options*]

3) Interventions on newspapers or periodic magazines (including electronic ones and other news online media) [*same response options*]

4) Interventions through other online media (twitter, facebook, blogs, video-blogs, youtube channels, etc.) [*same response options*]

[*If the interviewee responded 1 to 5 in question 2a1*]:

3a. These interventions on TV broadcasts have taken place on (mark if appropriate):

1. Local outlets
2. Provincial or regional outlets
3. National outlets
4. Foreign outlets

[*If the interviewee responded 1 to 5 in question 2a2*]:

3b. These interventions on radio broadcasts have taken place on (mark if appropriate)

[SAME RESPONSE OPTIONS]

[*If the interviewee responded 1 to 5 in question 2a3*]:

3c. These interventions on newspapers or periodical magazines have taken place on (mark if appropriate)

[SAME RESPONSE OPTIONS]

[*If the interviewee responded 1 to 4 in questions 2b3*]:

4. What type of interventions do you have in newspapers or periodical magazines (including online ones and news portals) (mark if appropriate)

1. Editorials or regular (daily, weekly, monthly...) columns
2. Professional comments/opinion articles
3. Interviews
4. Other (letters)

4. Can you tell us how frequently you communicate or use social networks to discuss about political issues?

a. Twitter:

1. Daily
2. At least once a week
3. At least once a month
4. At least once every three months
5. Less than once every three months
6. Never

- b. Facebook (*same response options*)
- c. Professional/personal blogs (*same response option*)
- d. Other social networks (whatsapp, linkedin, etc. (*same response options*))

higher education-environment / institutional context (ask all);

5. To what extent participation in public or policy debates through media are recognized for career-advancement within the academic environment of your country? (ASK ALL)

1. It is formally recognized (e.g. a requirement for promotion)
2. It is informally recognized
3. Not recognized
4. Negatively valued

Along with the examination of these questions, there was some discussion about the general design of the questionnaire. There was a general agreement on skipping open questions. Concerning the translation issue, the WG agreed that national experts would decide whether the questionnaire should be translated into the national language or be directly implemented in English. The list below includes which countries opted for which alternative.

Countries where questionnaire needs translation into the national language	Countries where the questionnaire will be implemented in English
Bulgaria	Netherlands
Hungary	Belgium (Dutch community questionnaire)
Poland	Ireland
France	United Kingdom
Belgium (French questionnaire)	Italy
Russia	Island
Greece	Serbia
Spain	Montenegro
	Lithania
	Denmark
	Germany
	Slovenia
	Latvia
	Macedonia
	Bosnia-Hertzevovina

Countries still to be decided: Portugal...

In any case, translations of the questionnaire into national languages should be **ready by the end of 2017** (see below).

There was also discussion about the **implementation of the survey**. It was decided to adopt an ‘asymmetric decentralization’ perspective. The survey will be coordinated from Siena, where the English questionnaire will be implemented. For those countries where the questionnaire needs translation, national teams will be

in charge of the implementation if they are capable of doing so. In case national teams cannot take care, Siena will. For the moment, **Greece and Spain** will take care of their own surveys.

Concerning the possibility of running a pilot survey to test the questionnaire, it was agreed that this should be the case.

Also, with respect to the final structure of the questionnaire, this should still be decided when the different sections are finally assembled.

Finally, WG3 discussed a possible implementation schedule. In principle, these are the relevant milestones:

- Pilot survey (end of October) (obviously, this is not possible at the moment I am writing this, so we should postpone it to November or when the final version of the questionnaire is decided in December in Brussels)
- Translations of the questionnaires into the national languages: end of 2017 -Survey start: January 2018.

4) JOINT MEETING WG3 AND WG4

This session was devoted mainly to discuss WG4 modifications in their part of the questionnaire. There was some concern about the number of questions, and about the high proportion of multiresponse questions included by WG4 in their part of the questionnaire. The discussion followed up online between the leaders of WG3 and WG4 during the next week, but the final version of the WG4 questionnaire still has to be decided.

During the discussion, a participant also proposed the inclusion of a couple of questions about 1) whether interviewees had considered the possibility of having a position or a career outside the academia; and 2) include a question asking whether parents had a position in the academia.