

<b>Theme</b>
<b>Results 1:</b> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Tentative List of Content Embeddedness</b></p>
<b>Objectives:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• collect those knowledge components which have appeared in the project implementation so far and which are the most recognized as being necessary know-how by all or most participants</li> <li>• encourage participants to find elements of isomorphism (copying from similar groups) where the project participants have reproduced expertise previously accumulated thus failing to take the direct project context into account</li> <li>• encourage and collect disagreements on the embeddedness of some knowledge components</li> </ul>
<b>Method:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. OHP of general latent content process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ask participants to review the brainstorming for task 3, whether there is any knowledge component which is seen by most participants as specific to its context</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. prepared OHP with suggested change of embeddedness when it is introduced from a group of participants, i.e. a firm or administration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ask all participants to suggest embeddedness examples, without agreeing on them. Remark that the workshop facilitator will use his judgement when reporting these results</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
<b>Materials:</b> OHPs, Handout CP, Knowledge Management and STS literature
<b>Time:</b> 15 - 30 min
<b>Resource person notes:</b> Differences in embeddedness between firms, administrations, and countries involved can not be overcome during implementation. Depending on the particular TOR and results some progress has been achieved. The Content Process OHP is an idealised version which helps participants reinterpret their experience so far. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• while participants disagree, they find sufficient improvement in their interpretation of the failures and successes so far due to additional elements of embeddedness discussed</li> <li>• participants reveal some of their assumptions about the others' difficulties, but probably not the most severe ones</li> <li>• postpone all reflections on parameters because only small insights on embeddedness are generated</li> </ul>

<b>Theme</b>
<b>Results 2:</b> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>List of Components which shape the Content Process and the Project Parameters directly affecting these</b></p>
<b>Objectives:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• collect those parameters which affect knowledge embeddedness</li> <li>• encourage participants to find elements of embeddedness related to contributions from individuals</li> <li>• encourage and collect disagreements on the context relevant for specific know-how</li> </ul>
<b>Method:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. OHP of general latent content process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ask participants to review the brainstorming for task 2</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. prepared OHP with suggested dichotomies of parameters, pre-selected to suggest other opportunities to adapt parameters to project objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ask all participants to suggest opportunities to change embeddedness and to propose where this has already been done</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. encourage all to contribute to a stack of cards as result</li> <li>4. when some examples are widely approved of, these can be linked to particular TOR of participants to increase their attention</li> </ol>
<b>Materials:</b> OHPs, Handout Project Parameters for CP
<b>Time:</b> 15 - 30 min, groups possible
<b>Resource person notes:</b> Most likely, participants suggest an excessive list of parameters and are unable to resolve their differences of opinion. There is no need to press for consensus, as these parameters are again invoked for the other latent processes (EP and IP are more restrictive). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• when participants draw superficial parallels with knowledge management, disagreements should be pursued</li> <li>• when participants deny sociocultural determinations of knowledge content, most aspects of their work can be questioned equally well to bring out differences of opinion</li> <li>• while past misunderstandings can create a very dynamic debate, there is no need to bring it to a conclusion or to cover all ground</li> </ul>

<b>Theme</b>
<b>Results 3:</b> <b>Views on Stakeholder Relations in the Project</b>
<b>Objectives:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• encourage participants to relate their views on local / global relations to their professional past and to assess why similar views appear</li> <li>• verify whether participants agree that one exchange pattern has been dominant in their relations</li> <li>• collect parameters seen as the most stringent for the exchange pattern</li> <li>• suggest other aspects of professional objectives related to local / global relations, tradition and modernity</li> <li>• propose parallels between expert roles and changes in expert products when passing between local and global applications</li> <li>• collect habits of using foreign and local labels on knowledge</li> </ul>
<b>Method:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. OHP of examples of exchange processes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ask participants to review the brainstorming for task 6, which parameters can influence the exchange patterns</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. as the parameters related to the exchange process are relatively evident, ask all participants to refer to past cases in the project to bring out differences in the team</li> </ol>
<b>Materials:</b> OHPs, Handout EP, Handout Project Parameters affecting EP
<b>Time:</b> 30 - 45 min
<b>Resource person notes:</b> Participants often agree to an exchange pattern but don't grasp the symmetry of the patterns. Use economics issues to solicit positions of identity politics expressed in project implementation. The Latent Exchange OHP gives an impression of the differences of local authenticity and the efforts to support it. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• participants suggest some parameters to affect the exchange process, the choice of these parameters is quite self-evident when their positions are expressed, so there is no need to go through all parameters</li> <li>• when one exchange pattern presented stimulates debate, there is no need to add another pattern, social identities are implicated in each one</li> <li>• while participants disagree, they can find common ground in expressing the difficulties of having a local interest coalition with a coherent strategy</li> <li>• it can be useful to point to conflicting interpretations especially when the stakes are not agreed among all</li> </ul>

<b>Theme</b>
<b>Results 4:</b> <b>Examples of Attempts to Change the Interface</b>
<b>Objectives:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• collect efforts to change the relations between local and foreign experts, and between different groups within the team</li> <li>• collect stereotypes used in auto-denunciation and in claims about past project experience</li> <li>• encourage participants to find elements of idiosyncrasy, where mutual understanding has changed the course of the project</li> <li>• suggest an interface format which would fit these elements</li> <li>• explain other interface formats to get participants' explanations why these do not resemble their efforts to communicate</li> </ul>
<b>Method:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. OHP with common examples of interface process formats <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ask participants to review the brainstorming for task 2, whether they see any choice in the near future where a format could be taken into account</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. prepared OHP with suggested interface format from recent events <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ask participants to suggest experience or historical reasons which influence their relation to local (foreign) experts. Remark that the facilitator will record these results only as format for the group not in relation to individuals.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. prepared OHP with project parameters relevant for a different IP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ask participants whether the same parameters would affect their efforts to communicate</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
<b>Materials:</b> OHPs, Handout IP, Handout Parameters for IP
<b>Time:</b> 30 - 45 min
<b>Resource person notes:</b> All recent events are most likely of similar explanatory value, the ones to start with should be chosen so that individuals are most at ease to comment. Revealing individual views is risky for many, and no individual view is likely to shed light on the whole dynamics of the project interaction. The degree to which developer (developee) images can be verbalised is the principal property of the interface process, differences in rhetoric skills among participants are unlikely to play a role. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• if a participant starts to refer to specific events, it is important to relate the event to a general interface format so that it is clear that individual skills are not relevant</li> <li>• it can be stressed that workshop participants rarely get to this stage of self-reflection</li> </ul>