

ACUTE - Accessibility and Connectivity Knowledge Hub for Urban Transformation in Europe

WP3 – Practitioner Interaction

D3.4.1 Report on the Swedish National Pilot Workshop

Start date: 01.11.2022

End date: 31.10.2024

Authors: Isak Vencu Öhrlund
Chiara Vitrano

Version: Final Public

Project Partners

Organisation	Country
University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna BOKU	AUSTRIA
Université Gustav Eiffel UEiffel	FRANCE
Centre d'études et d'expertise sur les risques, l'environnement, la mobilité et l'aménagement Cerema	FRANCE
Latvia University of Life Sciences and Technologies LBTU	LATVIA
University of Latvia LU	LATVIA
Research Institutes of Sweden RISE	SWEDEN
University of Westminster UoW	UNITED KINGDOM
Malmö University MAU	SWEDEN
Grazer Energieagentur GmbH, Graz Energy Agency GEA	AUSTRIA
VTI/Sweden's national centre for research and education on public transport K2	SWEDEN
Power Circle PC	SWEDEN
University of Innsbruck UIBK	AUSTRIA

Disclaimer

Any dissemination of results reflects only the author's view and the European Commission and JPI Urban Europe is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

Table of Contents

1. Workshop goals & set-up	3
1.1. Goal and focus.....	3
1.2. Structure / workshop guideline.....	3
1.3. Participants.....	4
2. Outcomes from the national pilot workshop	5
2.1. Interview with Prof. David Banister	5
2.2. Results from the Menti survey 1	5
2.3. Group discussion 1 – generate impact from research results	6
2.4. Menti survey 2.....	6
2.5. Group discussion 2 – Challenges and Possibilities	6
3. Lessons learned from the Swedish national pilot workshop	7
3.1. Arrangement	7
3.2. Agenda.....	7

1. Workshop goals & set-up

1.1. Goal and focus

The workshop was arranged within Task 3.4, which required the organization of five National pilot workshops in the countries involved in the ACUTE Knowledge Hub. The goal of the Swedish National Pilot Workshop was first and foremost to foster discussion about impact of research results. Specifically, it aimed at creating an occasion to discuss the relationship between researchers and practitioners.

The organizers agreed to not limit the workshops topic to accessibility and connectivity, but to adopt a broader framework on transition towards sustainable mobility and the crucial role played by research in such transition.

1.2. Structure / workshop guideline

The Swedish National Pilot Workshop took place on the 18th of January 2024 in Linköping (Sweden) at the Transport forum conference, arranged yearly by VTI. The workshop started at 10 AM and lasted 90 minutes. The workshop title was “How do we benefit from research results in the transition to sustainable mobility? - A workshop on relationships between practice and academia” (Hur får vi nytta av forskningsresultat i omställningen till hållbar mobilitet? - En workshop om relationer mellan praktik och akademi) and was structured as follows:

1) Welcome & Introduction (20 min)

Method: general introduction for all and a guest interview

- | | |
|--------|--|
| 5 min | Introduction about workshop and ACUTE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Theoretical overview about knowledge, knowledge transfer, research valorisation, impact of research, role of research in transition processes - including challenges and opportunities. - Either a researcher focusing on research impact or a researcher working on sustainable mobility who is interested in impact. - Ending in questions/discussion points |
| 15 min | Interview with Prof. David Banister |

2) Menti surveys and group discussions

Method: Menti survey, full group discussion, discussion in smaller groups

- | | |
|--------|--|
| 10 min | Menti survey 1 and brief discussion on the results
<i>Menti questions:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>How do you access research results?</i> ▪ <i>How do you disseminate research results?</i> ▪ <i>Alternatives to choose from:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Scientific publications (Research papers, books and book chapters)</i> - <i>Popular science reports and policy briefs</i> - <i>Conferences and seminars</i> - <i>Decision-making material</i> - <i>Newsletters and mailing lists</i> - <i>(Projects’) websites</i> - <i>Social media</i> - <i>Traditional news media</i> - <i>Other</i> |
| 10 min | Group discussion 1 |

The participants were divided into two groups: one of researchers and one of practitioners.

Questions for researchers only:

- *How do you work towards making your results easier to access by practitioners and more likely to have an impact?*

Questions for practitioners only:

- *How do you use research results in your work and what kind of results are more likely to impact your work/be used in your work?*

5 min Take aways from discussion 1

5 min Menti survey 2 (not carried out)

Challenges/opportunities at organisational/structural level

10 min Group discussion 2

The participants were divided into two mixed groups, that is, groups included both practitioners and researchers.

Questions for mixed groups:

- *What are the main challenges of generating impact from research results?*
- *What are the opportunities and challenges of collaboration between practice and research?*

5 min Take aways from discussion 2

20 min Final discussion

1.3. Participants

The participant group was a mix of practitioners and researchers. No registration was needed. Direct invitation was sent to a set of researchers, funding agencies, public and private organisations. The recruiting was underdone with the aim to generate a balanced group of people between the two groups of researchers and practitioners.

The following list presents details about the workshop participants and their institutional affiliations including the information whether they can define themselves as researchers (R) or practitioners (P) and their self-defined genders, male (M) or female (F). Beside the list there were three participants that did not sign up on the participation list.

#	Fist Name	Family Name	Institution	R	P	M	F
1			Chalmers - SAFER	x			x
2			RISE	x			x
3			RISE	x			x
4			LTU – Technical university of Linköping	x		x	
5			LTU – Technical university of Linköping	x			x
6			Trafikverket		x	x	
7			Trafikverket		x	x	
8			Vinnova		x		x
9	John	Hultén	K2 (Moderator)	x		x	
10	Chiara	Vitrano	VTI (Moderator)	x			x
11	David	Mowitz	Power Circle (Moderator)		x	x	
12	Isak	Vencu Öhrlund	Power Circle (Moderator)		x	x	

2. Outcomes from the national pilot workshop

2.1. Interview with Prof. David Banister

The aim with the interview was to set a common ground and provide inspiration for upcoming discussions. The main takeaways from Prof. David Banister's interview were:

- We are heading towards a new paradigm in transportation.
- Improvements in transport systems around Europe has been made, but too slow compared to what is needed.
- Today's discourse has a much stronger emphasis on equality.
- We must rethink the nature of the street, with less focus on the passenger cars.
- Research has not been as good as it could be, different disciplines need to co-operate to a larger extent.
- Research on city and regional level is sometimes easier to implement than national level.

2.2. Results from the Menti survey 1

How do you access research results?

The participants were able to submit multiple answers. The answers were distributed as follows:

- Conferences and seminars (10 responses)
- Scientific publications (Research papers, books and book chapters) (7 responses)
- Popular science reports and policy briefs (6 responses)
- Newsletters and mailing lists (6 responses)
- Traditional news media (6 responses)
- (Projects') websites (3 responses)
- Decision-making material (3 responses)
- Social media (2 responses)
- Other (0 responses)

Conferences and seminars were the most popular ways to access research results for both researchers and practitioners, followed by scientific publications (researchers), traditional media and newsletters (researchers and practitioners), and popular science reports (researchers).

Social media was the least common way to access research results.

How do you disseminate research results?

The participants were able to submit multiple answers. The answers were distributed as follows:

- Conferences and seminars (7 responses)
- Scientific publications (Research papers, books and book chapters) (7 responses)
- (Projects') websites (6 responses)
- Popular science reports and policy briefs (4 responses)
- Newsletters and mailing lists (4 responses)
- Social media (4 responses)
- Traditional news media (2 responses)
- Decision-making material (2 responses)
- Other (1 responses)

Most research results are disseminated through scientific publications for the researchers, followed by conferences/seminars (researchers) and (projects') websites.

Traditional media and decision-making material are least common way to disseminate research results.

As "other" one respondent mentioned talking to others directly as a way of disseminating research results.

2.3. Group discussion 1 – generate impact from research results

The group was divided into two groups, one for researchers and one for practitioners.

Researchers

Question: How do you work towards making your results easier to access by practitioners and more likely to have an impact?

The main takeaways from the research group discussion 1:

- There is a need for a new profession in the academia focusing on transferring knowledge from researchers to practitioners.
- There is a need for more communication of results to the public, but today it's not rewarding for the researchers.
- It's seldom possible to directly implement research results in an organization's operations.

Practitioners

Question: How do you use research results in your work and what kind of results are more likely to impact your work/be used in your work?

The main takeaways from the practitioner group discussion 1:

- It's a challenge to access/assimilate research results in the everyday work.
- The view on the value of research results in the organization matters.

2.4. Menti survey 2

Due to the tight time schedule the moderators decided to skip the second Menti survey.

2.5. Group discussion 2 – Challenges and Possibilities

The group was divided into two mixed groups with both researchers and practitioners.

*Questions: What are the main challenges of generating impact from research results?
What are the opportunities and challenges of collaboration between practice and research?*

The main takeaways from the group discussion 2:

- Cooperation between researchers and practitioners has been improved last decades.
- There is still great potential for further improvement in cooperation between researchers and practitioners.
- Cooperation needs to be more encouraged in the academic merit system than today.
- Research funders can fund the project, and then have additional (specific) funding for communication of results.

3. Lessons learned from the Swedish national pilot workshop

3.1. Arrangement

- The organizer/host needs to define clear responsibilities for both preparation and on-site work (e.g. host, co-host, note-taker, Menti, technicalities and materials, communications, invitations, ...).
- The workshop leader has a very important role. They need to be someone who is familiar with both practice and academia.
- Even a small group of participants (in our case, 11 people) can provide valuable contributions if they are engaged.
- The title and description of the workshop need to clearly address concrete issues, especially when organized within the framework of large conferences. In our case, workshop title was a bit too abstract. A more concrete title could have helped to attract more participants. The workshop was held as a part of a big conference (Transportforum); therefore, the competition with other sessions was significant.
- It is important to consider the pros and cons of the chosen registration policy. In our case, the fact that registration was not compulsory made it possible for participants to show up on site but made it harder to plan a suitable workshop regarding group size.
- Make sure the room is suitable for the planned activities.

3.2. Agenda

- Starting off with a guest interview can provide valuable inspiration and set the stage. In our case, the guest interview was very positively received and inspiring according to the participants.
- Allocate enough time to talk through takeaways from group discussions. In our case, just 5 minutes was too short.
- Consider a round of introductions if the group is small.
- Make sure to have enough time for all activities but be flexible: skip activities if realized they are not needed. In our case, we decided to skip a Menti poll to leave additional time to discussion.
- Organizing dynamic discussion groups can help the discussion. In our case, the group setting with both researchers and practitioners divided (Group discussion 1) and then mixed (Group discussion 2) for different group discussions worked well.