



Universität für Bodenkultur Wien

Intergenerational Learning - Age-specific motives and obstacles for  
participation in the Biosphere Reserve Salzburger Lungau and Kärntner  
Nockberge

submitted by

B.Sc. Julia Snajdr

Matriculation number: 1041707

Study program: Mountain Forestry

Study code: H066 429

For the Degree of Master of Science

Supervisor: Ao.Univ.Prof. Dipl.-Ing. Dr.nat.techn.Marianne Penker

Co-supervisor: Mag. Elisabeth Schauppenlehner-Kloyber

University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna

Department of Economics and Social Sciences

Institute for Sustainable Economic Development

Vienna, May 24<sup>th</sup> 2016



# Statutory Declaration

I declare that I have authored this thesis independently, that I have not used other than the declared sources / resources and that I have explicitly marked all material which has been quoted either literally or by content from the used sources.

.....

date

.....

signature

## **Acknowledgment**

I would like to express my gratitude to my family, particularly my parents for their continuous support during my study. I wish to thank them for their guidance and faith in me throughout the years.

I further wish to thank all interviewees and Mag. Tamara Mitrofanenko and M.Sc. Elisabeth Adler who were enthusiastically helping me with the research in the Biosphere Reserve Salzburger Lungau and Kärntner Nockberge.

Special thanks to Ao.Univ.Prof. Dipl.-Ing. Dr.nat.techn. Marianne Penker and Mag. Elisabeth Schauppenlehner-Kloyber who supervised my work and provided me with important feedback and support.

## **Abstract**

Im Biosphärenpark Salzburger Lungau und Kärntner Nockberge wird die lokale Bevölkerung seit mehreren Jahren in die Schutzgebietsplanung einbezogen. Im Salzburger sowie im Kärntner Teil des Parks sind Jugendliche und ältere Frauen für das Partizipationsvorhaben besonders schwer zu erreichen und zu mobilisieren. Beide Gruppen sind für den Park aber von großer Bedeutung, auch wegen der Möglichkeit des Intergenerationellen Lernens. Einzel- und Gruppeninterviews mit 70 Jugendlichen und älteren Frauen veranschaulichen Motive und Herausforderungen der Partizipation und des Intergenerationellen Lernens wie auch das Biosphärenpark- relevante Wissen, welches zwischen den Generationen ausgetauscht werden könnte. Zusammen mit den Perspektiven der Biosphärenpark-Managements und der Prozessbegleiter (Vier zusätzliche Interviewpartner) könnten Maßnahmen zur Beteiligung und Intergenerationelles Lernen der oben genannten Altersgruppen abgeleitet werden. In der Literatur noch nicht identifizierte Herausforderungen und Motive der Partizipation umfassen die Einschätzung älterer Frauen keinen relevanten Beitrag leisten zu können, die mangelnde Ansprache der Jugend sowie das thematische Interesse; im Sinne des Intergenerationellen Lernens wird die Kluft zwischen den Generationen, welche durch Vorurteile verstärkt wird, deutlich, aber auch die Wertschätzung bestimmter Kompetenzen der jeweils anderen Generation. Diese entsprechen sich thematisch mit den Arbeitsfeldern der Biosphärenparks (Naturschutz, Kulturlandschaft und Landwirtschaft; Mensch und Kultur), wodurch die Partizipation beider Altersgruppen in entsprechend ausgerichteten intergenerationellen Aktivitäten der Parks ermöglicht werden könnte.

## Kurzfassung

In the biosphere reserve Salzburger Lungau and Kärntner Nockberge the local population has been integrated into the planning of the protected area since several years. In both, the Salzburg as well as in the Carinthian region, it is especially challenging to reach and mobilize teenagers and elderly women for taking part in the participatory processes. Both groups are of particular significance because they can learn from each other (“Intergenerational Learning”).

Through group inquiries and interviews with 70 individuals the thesis explores the motives, but also the obstacles of participation and Intergenerational Learning as well as the reserve-relevant knowledge which could be exchanged between the generations. Together with the perspectives of the biosphere reserves managers and process facilitators (four additional interviews), measures for the future Intergenerational Learning and participation of the above mentioned age groups could be suggested. Motives and obstacles of participation not identified in literature before comprise the opinion of not being able to make a contribution (older generation), the lack of being addressed (younger generation) and the own interest in a topic. Regarding Intergenerational Learning the generations’ divide enforced by prejudice, but also the appreciation of the other generations’ competencies became apparent. The latter relate to biosphere reserves fields of activity (Nature conservation, cultural landscapes and agriculture; Men and culture) possibly enabling participation of both age groups in adequately developed intergenerational biosphere reserve activities.

# Table of Contents

STATUTORY DECLARATION .....	III
ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	IV
ABSTRACT.....	V
KURZFASSUNG.....	VI
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	VII
LIST OF TABLES .....	IX
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....	XI
1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
2 THEORETICAL SECTION.....	3
2.1 Information as a precondition for participation.....	3
2.2 Participation.....	4
2.3 Intergenerational Learning.....	6
2.4 Interaction of Intergenerational Learning and participation.....	7
2.5 Analytical framework of motives and obstacles of participation.....	8
2.6 Analytical framework of motives and obstacles of Intergenerational Learning .....	15
2.7 UNESCO biosphere reserves in the context of participation and Intergenerational Learning .....	19
2.8 Biosphere reserve case study regions Salzburger Lungau and Kärntner Nockberge.....	20
3 METHODOLOGY .....	22
3.1 Research design.....	22
3.1.1 Case study comparison .....	22
3.1.2 Semi-structured qualitative interviews.....	23
3.1.3 Focus groups .....	24
3.1.4 World Café .....	24
3.2 Sampling criteria.....	25
3.3 Recruiting process.....	28
3.4 Process and challenges of data acquisition.....	30
3.5 Data Analysis.....	33
4 RESULTS.....	37
4.1 Development of participatory process and absent age-groups.....	37
4.2 Biosphere reserve communication and stakeholder information .....	38
4.3 Participation.....	42
4.3.1 Previous participation.....	42

4.3.2	Motives for participation .....	44
4.3.2.1	Motives of all respondent groups.....	44
4.3.2.2	Motives on the level of case study and of generations .....	45
4.3.2.3	Motives of single respondent groups.....	47
4.3.3	Obstacles of participation.....	48
4.3.3.1	Obstacles of all respondent groups .....	48
4.3.3.2	Obstacles on case study level .....	50
4.3.3.3	Obstacles on level of generations .....	51
4.3.3.4	Obstacles of single respondent groups .....	55
4.3.4	Format promoting participation .....	58
4.3.4.1	Youth.....	58
4.3.4.2	Elderly Women .....	59
4.4	Potential of Intergenerational Learning on biosphere reserves´ development .....	60
4.4.1	Perspective of the biosphere reserves´ managers .....	60
4.4.2	Perspective of Youth and Elderly Women.....	61
4.4.2.1	Offering of knowledge and skills across generations.....	61
4.4.2.2	Motives for Intergenerational Learning .....	62
4.4.2.3	Obstacles of Integenerational Learning.....	65
5	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	72
5.1	Discussion of methodology.....	72
5.1.1	Mixed methods approach.....	72
5.1.2	Interviewee characteristics.....	74
5.2	Discussion of results in comparison to the participatory process in the biosphere reserve Großes Walsertal.....	74
5.3	Comparison of results with underlying literature and analytical framework .	75
5.4	New insights from the interviews .....	77
5.4.1	Participation .....	77
5.4.2	Intergenerational Learning .....	78
5.5	Recommendations for the Biosphere Reserve managements .....	79
6	CONCLUSION .....	82
7	REFERENCES .....	86



## List of Tables

Table 1: Identified deductive codes of motives promoting participation.....	p.9
Table 2: Non-identified deductive codes of motives promoting participation.....	p.11
Table 3: Identified deductive codes obstacles challenging participation.....	p.12
Table 4: Non-identified deductive codes of obstacles challenging participation.....	p.15
Table 5: Identified deductive codes of motives promoting Intergenerational Learning.....	p.16
Table 6: Non-identified deductive codes of motives promoting Intergenerational Learning.....	p.17
Table 7: Identified deductive codes of obstacles challenging Intergenerational Learning.....	p.18
Table 8: Non-Identified deductive codes of obstacles challenging Intergenerational Learning.....	p.19
Table 9: Overview about interviewees.....	p.26
Table 10: Inductive codes of motives promoting participation.....	p.34
Table 11: Inductive codes of obstacles challenging participation.....	p.35
Table 12: Inductive codes of motives promoting Intergenerational Learning.....	p.35
Table 13: Inductive codes of obstacles challenging Intergenerational Learning.....	p.36
Table 14: Salzburg Biosphere Reserve-communication and stakeholder information.....	p.40
Table 15: Carinthia Biosphere Reserve-communication and stakeholder information.....	p.41
Table 16: Collective motives of participation (all respondent groups).....	p.45
Table 17: Collective motives of participation (on the case study level).....	p.46
Table 18: Collective motives of participation (on the level of generations).....	p.46
Table 19: Motives of participation of single respondent groups.....	p.47
Table 20: Collective obstacles of participation (all respondent groups).....	p.50
Table 21: Collective obstacles of participation (on the case study level).....	p.51
Table 22: Collective obstacles of participation (on the level of generations).....	p.54

Table 23: Obstacles of participation of single respondent groups.....	p.57
Table 24: Collective motives of Intergenerational Learning (all respondent groups).....	p.64
Table 25: Motives of Intergenerational Learning of single respondent groups.....	p.65
Table 26: Collective obstacles of Intergenerational Learning (all respondent groups).....	p.67
Table 27: Collective obstacles of Intergenerational Learning (on the case study level).....	p.69
Table 28: Collective obstacles of Intergenerational Learning (on the level of generations).....	p.70
Table 29: Obstacles of Intergenerational Learning of single respondent groups....	p.71

## **List of Abbreviations**

SB = Salzburg, CA = Carinthia

Y = Youth, OL = Elderly Women

RQ = Research questions

BR = Biosphere reserve

IL = Intergenerational Learning

# 1 Introduction

The present thesis is concerned with the participatory processes in the Biosphere Reserve (BR) Salzburger Lungau and Kärntner Nockberge. Teenagers and elderly woman were, next to young families and persons with handicaps or migration background, underrepresented groups in the participatory processes (PICKL, 2014). Due to their minor participation experience, the first two groups, specifically the age groups Youth and Elderly Women, were selected for group and individual interviews. Proper information being a precondition for successful participation, first the communication of the BR-management and the stakeholders´ state of information are considered. In the second step, the stakeholders´ view on obstacles challenging participation and motives as well as formats of events or activities promoting participation are examined.

In the third stage, the BR-managers´ as well as the stakeholders´ perspectives about Intergenerational Learning (IL) are explored, particularly regarding the exchange of knowledge and skills between the younger and the older generation, the obstacles challenging IL and motives as well as formats of events or activities promoting IL.

The present thesis aims at contributing to literature by the following research questions:

- RQ-1: How did the participatory process look like and which age groups had been present?
- RQ-2: How do the biosphere reserve managers communicate with the stakeholder and in which way (face-to-face-communication vs. media) are they informed about the participatory process?
- RQ-3: Which motives promote and which obstacles challenge (e.g. time related issues, mobility, subjective impression of being welcome or being actually able to contribute) actual participation of potential participants?
- RQ-4: What potential does intergenerational learning (IL) have on the biosphere reserves´ development?

The first chapter establishes the theoretical section by providing information of participation, Intergenerational Learning (IL) and biosphere reserves in general and motives and obstacles of participation and IL in particular. The lack of specific research as well as on cross-cutting literature is displayed.

Chapter two introduces the applied methodology of case study comparison, semi-structured qualitative interviews, focus groups and World Café. Furthermore, the procedure of participants' sampling, data acquisition and analysis is explained.

Chapter three displays the results followed by the discussion and conclusion section (chapter 4).

## 2 Theoretical section

### 2.1 Information as a precondition for participation

Information and knowledge is a prior condition for participation. According to RAVINDRA (2004) “good information” is a requirement for a “healthy, positive participation”, but the supply of information does not automatically mean that the population knows about a protected area (STOLL, 1999 in HUBER, 2011).

Information should be prepared in a generally understandable way (STOLL, 1999 in HUBER, 2011). The BR-management should continuously release results to keep public attention and promote transparency. Even the popularization of minor successes is recommended in lengthy implementation processes, preventing incomprehension and negative reactions. Every information hidden from the public might lead to mistrust (HUBER, 2011). In the context of BRs effectiveness REED and EGUNYU, (2013) even suggests „the need for BRs to engage in participatory processes that *inform* and engage local citizens in all aspects of BR management from planning to monitoring their activities (e.g., LOTZE-CAMPEN et al., 2008, STOLL-KLEEMANN and WELP, 2008;, SCHULTZ and LUNDHOLM, 2010 all cited in REED, (2013)). Furthermore, Price (PRINCE, 2002 in REED and EGUNYU, 2013) recommended the establishment of “an easily-accessible information system that allows those responsible for, and interested in, BRs, to assess the current status of implementation at sites around the world and to identify and benefit from relevant actions and experiences”.

Regarding the acceptance of protected areas information, knowledge and communication are of special importance (WALLNER et al., 2007 in SCHAUPPENLEHNER-KLOYBER &PENKER, 2014; SCHENK et al., 2007).

Acceptance rises with an increasing level of information and knowledge, while too much information can overwhelm people. An inclusion is intended, but the population may not always want or is not always able to take responsibility (RAVINDRA, 2004). In contrast, a non-sufficient remark on information management could lead to rumor

and skepticism (HUBER, 2011) and the pick up of poor or incorrect information (RAVINDRA, 2004)

When starting to place information, agreement can be triggered by commencing with a “commonly shared value or need” (e.g. “love of the landscape”). Contents adapted to everyday life and – language are absorbed far better (SCHENK, 2000).

Personal dialogue plays a major role for receiving and correcting of information. Next to personal conversations with friends and acquaintance, which are a primary source of information in a rural context (HUBER, 2011), personally transmitted explanations at information- and discussion events, inspections or excursions generally are of major importance (SCHENK, 2000). Here questions of the public can be answered clearly and concretely e.g. dissensions between conservationists and the local population (HUBER, 2011).

According to Huber, (2011) commitment for environmental education is a major task of protected areas and other institutions as schools, educational organizations or unions. STOLL, (1999) in HUBER, (2011) raises attention to the issue of “failure of mediation” (“Vermittlungsschwäche”) on the part of nature conservation. While the concept of a national park is known to plenty of persons, there exists hardly any previous knowledge about biosphere reserves which cannot be further differentiated than “another category of protected areas”. Knowledge transfer in biosphere reserves is going to be of particular importance (WRBKA et al., 2009 in HUBER, 2011). Here the integration of leading authorities can be a beneficial factor, as the public opinion is strongly influenced by regional opinion- and known community leader (BUHECKER et al., (2003), STOLL, (1999) all cited in HUBER (2011); RAVINDRA, (2004)).

## **2.2 Participation**

In the current debate, there is a diversity of practices that are labeled as participatory (CORNWALL, 2008). Terms such as “community-based” or “joint management” have become vogue terms in environmental management research (BUCHY and HOVERMAN, 2000; VAN NOORDWIJK et al., 2001; KASEMIR et al., 2003).

There exist several participation concepts, supplementing and extending each other. Participation is for this thesis defined as *a process where individuals, groups and organizations choose to take an active role in making decisions that affect them* (WANDERSMAN, 1981, WILCOX, 2003 all cited in REED, 2008; ROWE et al., 2004). ROWE and FREWER (2000) conceptualize the manners of public engagement by the course of communication transfer between the involved parties; information distributed to passive receptors is designated as “communication”, the compilation of participants’ information as “consultation” and “participation” is conceptualized as a two-way information exchange in forms of dialogue or negotiation e.g. between participants and exercise sponsors.

PFEFFERKORN, (2006) distinguishes between three “Degrees of Participation”, ranging from “Information” equating to one-way communication, “Consultation” referring to information exchange and possible dialogue and “Co-decision” relating to cooperative planning and mediation with multi-level decision processes including extensive expertise. Within the IUCN- guidelines for Management Planning of Protected Areas, THOMAS and MEDDLETON, (2003) provide a more detailed approach; in addition to the levels of „Informing“, „Consulting“, „Deciding together“ (cp. Level of “Co-decision” by PFEFFERKORN), the degrees of „Acting together“ and „Supporting independent community interests“ are defined. LYNAM et al., (2007) differentiates between “diagnostic and informing”, “co-learning” or “co-management”. ARNSTEIN’s (1969) “ladder of participation” starts from passive dissemination of information (“manipulation”) to active engagement (“citizen control”).

Furthermore objective-based systems are used; OKALI et al., (1994) distinguishing between “research-driven” versus “development-driven” involvement, while MICHENER, (1998) differentiates “planner-centered” and “people-centered” participation, the latter “building capacity and empowering stakeholders to define and meet their own needs” (REED, 2008) as well as considering gender issues and importance of people’s knowledge (SCOONES and Thompson, 1993 in TACCONI, 1997; OAKLEY et al., 1991; PRETTY,1995;).



In reality, certain groups remain underrepresented in sustainable development processes (SCHMITT, 2014; HUBER et al., 2013). The present thesis explores participation of the Youth and Elderly Women. Due to PAIN, 2005, both age groups “are more likely than other groups to lack access to decision making channels, and also to lack political representation and to participate less in public life”. KRUKER, (1984) also acknowledges the youth not being taken serious at assemblies at municipal level and the absence of political issues at rural youth organizations.

Regarding the older (female) generation, consideration of gender and involvement of women in this regard has been called for (SCHMITT, 2014; HUBER et al., 2013). CIPRA (1999/17) demonstrates the particular importance of the older generation in rural alpine mountain regions; the survivability of human culture depended on their experiences. At the moment the major share of this implicit knowledge is not or hardly recognised. Relationships between people and their trust-building are necessary preconditions for its´ multiplication and therefore knowledge management needs to be integrated into participatory processes. In chapter 2.4.1. motives and obstacles of participation are described in more detail.

The concept of Intergenerational learning includes a number of benefits encouraging participation.

### **2.3 Intergenerational Learning**

Regarding the term “Intergenerational Learning (IL)”, specific literature does not exist. Overlapping terms and concepts like “Intergenerational practice”, “Intergenerational relationships”, “Mutual learning”, “Life long learning” and “Social learning” are also described in the following passage.

BUFFEL, et al., (2013) describes „Intergenerational relationships (IR)“ as „bridges build across generations“, whereas “Intergenerational Practice (IP)“ is defined as “purposeful and ongoing learning among older and younger generations” (HATTON-YEO and OHSAKE, 2000 cited in BUFFEL, et al., 2013) and as a concept of

„bringing people together in purposeful, mutually beneficial activities, promoting greater understanding and respect between generations” (LUPOU, et al., 2010). CIPRA (1999/17) raises attention to the fact that without dialogue between older and younger generations, the survival of the alpine cultural landscape is not ensured. From the science perspective, a positive connotation of intergenerational learning seems to exist (GÖSKEN et al., 2000 in ROSENMAYER & BÖHMER 2003). Nevertheless, such activities are rarely implemented in practice (CIPRA, 1999/17). PIERI, & DIAMANTINIR, (2010) and SCHMIDT and TIPPLET, (2009) even state that inter-generative contacts are little and the generations are divided by various reasons. Motives and obstacles of Intergenerational Learning are presented in more detail in chapter 2.4.2.

#### **2.4 Interaction of Intergenerational Learning and participation**

Intergenerational Learning promises a number of benefits) for participation, such as the promotion of an active citizenship (HATTON-YEO, 2014) as well as the participation in environmental activities and the development of sustainable activities (SANCHEZ et al., 2008 cited in BUFFEL et al., 2013; SPRINGATE et al., 2008).

*Mutual learning* among different groups promotes and increases capacity of participation as well. *Knowledge integration* and *mutual learning* among the different groups could regional development processes by providing otherwise unavailable “traditional and local knowledge components” (GAGIL and others, 1993, BERKES & FOLKE, 1998, BERKES and others, 2003 all cited in PICKERING SHERMANN, 2010). SCHAUPPENLEHNER-KLOYBER and PENKER, (2014) place emphasis on the extensive and diverse implicit knowledge which is, next to explicit (expert) knowledge, present in a region.

LUPOU, et al., (2010) numbers various benefits from “*Lifelong Learning*” for individuals of all ages, ranging from promoting their “full economic and societal participation”, the possibility of being better informed and more active citizen as well as the increase of their efficiency as workers and volunteers.

The other way round participation also fosters „*social* -“as well as „*collaborative learning*“. SCHUSLER et al., (2003) describes processes of agencies interfacing with the public in “deliberation” processes possibly leading to “social learning” where “people engage one another, share diverse perspectives and experiences to develop a common framework of understanding and basis for joint action”. Participation within diverse groups is one among several factors fostering social learning (SCHUSLER et al., 2003). The *involvement of diverse interest groups* is important for adaptive co-management (HOLLING, 1978 cited in PICKERING SHERMAN, 2010; DALE and OTHERS, 2000), as it is characterized by mutual learning, where knowledge is shared and collaborative learning about ecosystem management takes place (KENDRICK, 2003 cited in OLSSON and FOLKE, 2004).

## **2.5 Analytical framework of motives and obstacles of participation**

The analytical framework is derived by summing up respective literature into codes. Table 1 displays the identified deducted codes (Codes confirmed through transcript statements), table 2 the non-identified codes (Codes not confirmed by transcript statement) of motives of participation.

**Table 1: Identified deductive codes of motives promoting participation**

<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>1. Aspects related to politics, co-management and cooperation</b><ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Co-decision and co-generation of knowledge (Co-management)</li><li>2. Personal, organizational and working relationships</li></ol></li> <li><b>2. Aspects related to individuals</b><ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Making of a contribution</li><li>2. Benefits and incentives</li><li>3. Learning and education</li><li>4. Personal invitation</li><li>5. Representation of interest of one's own interest group</li><li>6. Enjoyment</li></ol></li></ol>
---

The code *co-decision and co-generation of knowledge (co-management)* comprises the themes of a “fair and valid perception of a participatory process” (TIPPETT et al., 2007), the possibility of “co-deciding on decision in one’s living environment, in one’s municipality” (ENENGEL et al., 2010) and the “empowerment of stakeholders” by co-generation of knowledge with researchers and its usage (GREENWOOD et al., 1993; OKALI et al., 1994; MACNAUGHTEN & JACOBS, 1997; WALLERSTEIN, 1999), the stakeholders’ early engagement (e.g. MAZMANIAN & NIENABER, 1979, STEWART et al., 1984, BLAHNA and YONTS-SHEPARD, 1989, GARIEPY, 1991, BELTSON, 1995,; REED et al., 2006 all cited in REED, 2008; CHESS & PURCELL, 1999), the development of goals through dialogue (JOHNSON et al., 2004, LYNAM et al., 2007 all cited in REED, 2008), agreement over purpose, goals and intention (RAVINDRA, 2004), the acceptance of results by participation of diverse interest groups (ENENGEL et al., 2010), the sense of ownership over process and outcomes (REED, 2008) and the achievement of an affect while collaborating with other people (ENENGEL et al., 2010). Moreover “knowledge integration and mutual learning among the different groups” possibly increasing the capacity of participating in regional development processes (GAGIL and OTHERS, 1993, BERKES and FOLKE,

1998, BERKES and OTHERS 2003 all cited in PICKERING SHERMAN, 2010) and “the philosophy of empowerment, equity, trust and learning“ (REED, 2008) are aspects motivating for participation.

*Personal, organizational and working relationships* could be reasons for participation. They include dealing with “close and sound working relationships” (THOMAS and MEDDLETON, 2003), “the level of cohesion of relationships” including personal, organizational, networking and other relationships (RAVINDRA, 2004) as well as “the specific history of relationships with organizations, bureaucracies and people” (RAVINDRA, 2004).

Under the second caption, codes refer to *aspects related to individuals* (table 1). A variety of aspects can be recapitulated under the umbrella term *making of a contribution*. ENENGEL et al., (2010) mentions the appreciation of one´s contribution and making of a contribution to the preservation and development of the natural landscape and to nature protection. The possibility of bringing in one´s knowledge, experience and competences (ENENGEL et al., 2010) and the desire to give something back to the own community (DAVIS et al., 2012) are further themes related to the issue mentioned above.

*Benefits and incentives* motivating for participation are health and social benefits as a possible result of civic engagement in environmental policy and planning (BUFFEL et al., 2013), the usage of provided resources (financial, material, informative) (ENENGEL et al., 2010) as well as economic incentives direct and indirect economic benefit (THOMAS and MEDDLETON, 2003).

In the subject *learning and education* the possibility to learn “how to do s.th. useful” (DAVIS et al., 2012), an increased of level of knowledge (ENENGEL et al., 2010) and education (LARSON &LACK, 2008) are motives for participation.

The code *personal invitation* refer to an official invitation (HUBER, 2011) the fact of being asked to participate (ENENGEL et al., 2010).

Moreover ENENGEL, et al., (2010) relegates to the representation of interest of one´s own interest group, DAVIS et al., (2012) to enjoyment as additional considerations encouraging participation.

Table 2 displays the codes derived by theory but not identified by transcript statements.

**Table 2: Non-identified deductive codes of motives promoting participation**

<p><b><i>Aspects related to politics, co-management and cooperation</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Building connections to social networks</li><li>• Familiarity with and trust in public authorities</li></ul>
--

The motive of *building connections to social networks* comprises functional social structures (HUBER, 2011), good social links (SCHEFFER and others, 2002), the participants' connection to strong social networks (REED, 2008) as well as the building of new networks and the fostering of contacts (ENENGEL et al., 2010).

The *familiarity with and trust in public authorities* is an incentive for participation described by KRUKER (1984), regarding the familiarity with the regional secretary as a precondition of integrating the youth into the politics, and SCHENK (2000), emphasizing high trust in public authorities as a factor promoting participation.

The identified and non-identified codes of obstacles of participation are displayed in table 3 and 4.

**Table 3: Identified deductive codes obstacles challenging participation**

<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>1. Aspects related to politics, co-management and cooperation</b><ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Power inequalities and hierarchy</li><li>2. One-sided representation or perception of stakeholders</li><li>3. Missing trust</li><li>4. Adversarial or negative social relationships</li><li>5. Disagreement</li></ol></li> <li><b>2. Lack of personal conditions (e.g. abilities, confidence and attitude)</b></li> <li><b>3. Aspects related to lack of resources</b><ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Lack of time and tediousness</li><li>2. Lack of mobility</li></ol></li> <li><b>4. Aspects related to information and media</b><ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Non-concrete or wrong information</li><li>2. Missing information</li></ol></li> <li><b>5. Lack of benefits or incentives, e.g. for change</b></li></ol>
--

The codes are subsumed under aspects related to *politics, co-management and cooperation* and *lack of personal conditions resources, information of media* supplemented by the *lack of benefits or incentives, i.a. for change*. Relegating to *politics, power distribution and hierarchy* a variety of aspects are attributed to theme *power inequality and hierarchic thinking* (one of the strongest obstacles of participation in rural areas) (HUBER, 2011).

- Discussion makers are not trusted to actually implement participatory developed suggestions (HUBER, 2011) or to have pre-decided plans and outcomes (ENENGEL et al., 2010)
- Thus participants expect only little influence on decisions despite involvement in participatory process (BURTON et al., 2004, COSGROVE et al., 2000, DUANE, 1999, HANDLEY et al., 1998, WARBURTON, 2002;, WONDOLLECK and YAFFEE, 2000 all cited in Reed, 2008)

The issue of a *one-sided representation or perception of stakeholder* is described by ENENGEL, (2009) as an unequal representation of stakeholders and HUBER, (2011) as a tight system (clubs, parties, federations, chambers) attended by the same persons every once in a while, whereas other authors take to age-, gender- and background related aspects. REED, (2008) refers to the stakeholder inequalities in gender, background and age, strengthened through HUBER, (2011), who points on the dominance of mid-aged, male decisions makers and representativeness in participatory processes.

Due to BALAND and PLATTEAU, (1996), SCHEFFER and OTHERS, (2002) and REED, (2008) *missing trust* challenges participation next to the lack of common grounds and the absence of relationships between participants (REED, 2008). Moreover *adversarial-* (REED, 2008) or also *negative social relationships* (HUBER, 2011) and *disagreement*, in detail the lack of agreement and negative group dynamic (ENENGEL et al., 2010).

A number of issues are subsumed under the code *lack of personal conditions*. *Personal* reasons inhibiting participation might be the perceived lack of education, knowledge (for highly technical decisions) (REED, 2008), the perceived need of special knowledge and capabilities (to dare to take part in a participatory process) (MANNETTI, 2004; HUBER, 2011; ENENGEL, 2009). Further themes related to this issue are the fear of group discussions with experts and representatives of public authorities (applies mainly to woman) (HUBER, 2011), the lack of personal commitment, communication skills, openness and authority (WEISS, 1998; LARSON & LACK, 2008; SCHENK, 2000) as well as a lack of confidence to take part in



participatory processes (WEIß, 1998; REED, 2008). Personal stress (rather applying for woman than for men) (HUBER, (2011), Lavishness (HUBER, 2011), the shortage of motivation (LUPOU et al., 2010), local interest (RAVINDRA, 2004) and positive attitude on the issue of discussion (HUBER, 2011) are, next to a lack of a little reward for involvement (BURTON et al., 2004, COSGROVE et al., 2000, DUANE, 1999, HANDLEY et al., 1998, WARBURTON, 2002, WONDOLLECK and YAFFEE, 2000 all cited in REED, 2008), further aspects possibly hindering participation.

The obstacles assigned to *lack of time and tediousness* include the absence of enough time (ARBTER et al., 2008 cited in HUBER (2011); MARTINEZ and MCMULLIN, 2004; MOSLER & TOBIAS, 2000; HUBER, 2011), consultation fatigue over time (BURTON et al., 2004, COSGROVE et al., 2000, DUANE, 1999, HANDLEY et al., 1998, WARBURTON, 2002, WONDOLLECK & YAFFEE, 2000 all cited in REED, 2008), time-intensity (ENENGEL, 2009) as well as tediousness of the parks' expulsion process and the long duration of participatory processes. RAVINDRA, (2004) states that five to more years are needed for developing a new biosphere reserve from its conception to its designation. In addition ARBTER, (2008) in HUBER, (2011); MARTINEZ and MCMULLIN, (2004); MOSLER and TOBIAS, (2000) and HUBER, (2011) relate to a lack of mobility as a factor challenging participation, while woman are less prepared or able to drive to other communities than man (HUBER, 2011).

*Aspects related to information and media* embrace the codes *non-concrete or wrong information* and *missing information*. In detail the first code is dealing with the lack of concreteness and employability of the biosphere parks' concept (HUBER, 2011), public confusion of the concept with regional conservation initiatives and discomfort with biosphere reserve terminology (RAVINDRA, 2004), disinformation about regional policy and planning (KRUKER, (1984)) as well as communication and transmission means (LUPOU et al., 2010). The second code relates to the absence of political issues at rural youth organizations and the lack of good answers to questions of municipal policy for the youth (KRUKER, 1984) as well as of information (ENENGEL et al., 2010).

The *lack of incentives and benefits* refer to the absence of an immediate (IANNI, et al., 2009), a personal (HUBER, 2011) or an expected benefit (ENENGEL, 2009) as also the need to change a paradigm (IANNI et al., 2009). The mistrust in the BR's capability to develop ideas and projects for the community's future (IANNI, et al., 2009) is another consideration impacting participation.

Table 4 displays the non-identified deductive codes of obstacles of participation.

**Table 4: Non-identified deductive codes of obstacles challenging participation**

<p><b><i>Aspects related to politics, co-management and cooperation</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reluctant, incomplete or missing government support</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Aspects related to the lack of resources</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of material, technical and infrastructural resources</li> <li>• Lack of financial resources</li> </ul>
--

Reluctant or incomplete government support (RAVINDRA, 2004) and missing political support (ENENGEL et al., 2010) challenge participation (*Reluctant, incomplete or missing government support*). Other obstacles of participation comprise the *lack of material, technical, infrastructural* (ENENGEL et al. 2009; ENENGEL et al. 2010) as well as *financial resources* (MARTINEZ & Mc MULLIN, 2004; MOSLER & TOBIAS, 2000; HUBER, 2011; RAVINDRA, 2004; ENENGEL, 2009; ENENGEL et al., 2010).

## **2.6 Analytical framework of motives and obstacles of Intergenerational Learning**

The analytical framework is derived from respective literature. The following tables 5 and 6 display the identified (Codes confirmed through transcript statements) and non-identified deductive codes (Codes not confirmed by transcript statement) of motives for intergenerational learning.

**Table 5: Identified deductive codes of motives promoting Intergenerational Learning**

1. ***Aspects referring to the older generation***
  1. Significance of exchange with the younger generation
  2. Existing contact to younger generation
  3. Capability of acting independently and autonomously
  4. Reduction of isolation
  5. Volunteering
  
2. ***Aspects referring to both generations***
  1. Social meeting points and spaces for reflection
  2. Creation of a communication channel based on understanding and mutual respect
  3. Interest towards “different” persons, generations and perspectives
  
3. ***Aspects related to the younger generation***
  1. Increased self-esteem

The codes concerning the motives for intergenerational learning are for the most part generation-specific and therefore are divided into issues related to *the older generation*, *to both generations*, as well as to *the younger generation*.

First, the motives of the older regarding the younger generation are shown; existing contacts to younger generation as via (grand)grand-children ((SCHMIDT and TIPPLET, 2009) as well as the exchange with the younger generation ((SCHMIDT and TIPPLET, 2009) are of significance.

The older generations’ reasons for IL can be related to actionability and social integration, specified by SCHMIDT and TIPPLET (2009) stating the capability of acting independently and autonomously through education and training as well as by BUFFEL et al., (2013) referring to the reduction of isolation as benefit applying for older persons.

Furthermore, volunteering in general and diverse kind of volunteer work in particular (BUFFEL, et al., 2013) might be incentives for elderly persons joining IL.

For both generations, the creation of social meeting points (SCHMIDT and TIPPLET, 2009) as well as the development of spaces for reflection and exchange between younger and older employees (in an NGO setting) (FRANZ, 2010) are motives promoting IL. Moreover, the development of an “communication channel based on understanding and mutual respect” (PIERI and DIAMANTINIR, 2010) might be a reason to join IL activities. FRANZ and SCHEUNPFLUG, (2009) emphasises *the interest towards “different” persons, generations and perspectives* as possible incentives for IL; emotional distance provoking interest on “different” persons, the interaction with the non-related, different generation and the variety of perspectives of different participants are seen as opportunites for learning.

Furthermore, according to Buffel et al., (2013) increased self-esteem might be a benefit applying to younger persons.

Table 6 displays the non-identified codes of motives promoting Intergenerational Learning

**Table 6: Non-identified deductive codes of motives promoting Intergenerational Learning**

<p><b><i>Aspects related to both generations</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Usefulness of the wider communities’ skills for educational institutions</li></ul> <p><b><i>Aspects related to the older generation</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Educational activities and sufficient level of education</li></ul>
---

BUFFEL et al. (2013) refers to the *usefulness of the wider communities’ skills by educational institutions* (for achieving educational activities), while SCHMIDT & TIPPLET (2009) found out that *educational activities* as well as a *sufficient level of education* could be motives for elderly peoples’ involvement.

Table 7 and 8 display the identified and non-identified codes of obstacles challenging IL.

**Table 7: Identified deductive codes of obstacles challenging Intergenerational Learning**

***Aspects related to both generations***

- Generation gap enforced by prejudices, stereotypes and ageism

All obstacles challenging IL are related to both, the younger and the older generation. SCHMIDT and TIPPLET, (2009) argue that *few positive learning experience* restrict training; ROSENMAYER and BÖHMER, (2003) state that *experience-oriented learning argues for training between the same age groups*. ARMITAGE et al. (2007) points out further restrictions as officials, market barriers, funding, costs, risk and the lack of involving issues of power, culture, institutions, worldviews and values into learning.

The theme *prejudices and stereotypes* towards the other generation recapitulates oppositions against „the new“ (by the older generation) and against „the traditions“ (by the younger generation) (SCHMIDT & TIPPLET, 2009), Ageism („Altersdiskriminierung“) (Buffel et al., 2013) as well as prejudice and stereotypes against the older or the younger generation (FRANZ, 2010).

The *generation gap* describes the separation of the generations that is provoked by demographic changes, aging organizations and companies, shrinking size of families, technological changes, human resources development (in an operational context), limited inter-generative contacts as well as the wish of a certain distance by the younger as well as by the older generation ((Schmidt and TIPPLET, 2009). The „intergenerational digital divide“(PIERI and DIAMANTINIER, 2010)) refers to the different use of information and communication technology by the different generations.

Table 8 displays the non-identified codes of obstacles challenging Intergenerational Learning.

**Table 8: Non-Identified deductive codes of obstacles challenging Intergenerational Learning**

*Aspect related to the older generation*

- Experience- oriented learning between the same age-groups
- Few positive learning experience

The fact of experience-oriented learning arguing for learning between the same age groups (ROSENMAYER and BÖHMER (2003)) and little positive learning experience could be obstacles for the older generations´ exchange with the other generation (SCHMIDT and TIPPLET, (2009)).

## **2.7 UNESCO biosphere reserves in the context of participation and Intergenerational Learning**

Biosphere reserves are conceptualized as model regions for sustainable development, where the paradigm of combining nature conservation with economic development and maintaining cultural values is tested, refined and implemented (UNESCO 1996).

The concept „Biosphere Reserve Integrated Monitoring (BRIM) “ of 1991 defines, that “local communities should be enabled to become *fully involved* in the conservation and sustainable use of resources”

In 1995 the Sevilla-Conference set a milestone on biosphere park development. Economic activity and *live of man* should be an integral part of a biosphere reserve, aiming at the long-term preservation of it´s natural environment. The *participation of local interest groups* and the consideration of regional characteristics are essential for the planning of new biosphere reserves. Further the key directions from “The Vision from Sevilla for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century” raises attention to *public awareness* and *information*, flowing freely among all concerned (UNESCO, 2006) In this context, the „presence of media“ (Medienpräsenz) plays a role and is assigned to the „Logistic function“ of biosphere reserves (E.C.O. INSTITUT FÜR ÖKOLOGIE, 2013)

Consequently *participation*, which is assigned to the “development function“, occupies an important position) (E.C.O.INSTITUT FÜR ÖKOLOGIE, 2013) . The Man

and Biosphere Program understands „the stimulation of efforts towards sustainable rural development and improved *community participation*“ as a main issue of its concept (SCHLIEP and STOLL-KLEEMANN , 2009).

The biosphere reserve concept implies various functions and consequently management tasks. Many of the diverse tasks within protected areas could make use of different perspectives ,competencies and social backgrounds of different social groups (HUBER et al., 2013),; thus these groups can contribute to the planning and management of protected areas

Regarding Intergenerational Learning in the context of biosphere reserves hardly any theoretical background exists. The key directions from “The Vision from Seville for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century” suggest a long-term, *inter-generational perspective* as a basis for „further our understanding of humanity's relationship with the natural world“ (what biosphere reserves should be used for).

MITRONANENKO et al., (2015) aimed at introducing the nature protection community to the concept of Intergenerational Practice (IP), proposed solution pathways, offered by IP for specific protected area challenges, and suggested several scale levels, at which IP could be integrated into PA management: from single PA to the international level. The authors acknowledged little empirical evidence existing to demonstrate the applicability of this approach in concrete cases. However, they proposed that applying IP could be particularly promising in the case of Biosphere Reserves “due to their specific role as test-beds for social innovation” (MITROFANENKO et al., 2015).

## **2.8 Biosphere reserve case study regions Salzburger Lungau and Kärntner Nockberge**

The Salzburger Lungau & Kärntner Nockberge is the biggest Biosphere Reserve (BR) in Austria and the first one to be shared by two federal provinces: Salzburg and Carinthia. The BR region is characterized by a varied patchwork of cultural and natural landscapes, high range of altitudes, and traditional land uses. One of the

motivations of the local communities for its designation was the tourism potential of the region (FANNINGER, 2012).

This biosphere reserve has been selected as a case study because it is relatively young, declared in 2012, which allows reflecting on its recent development process from the beginning, and because of its particular development history, which makes it possible to compare participation experience and to test the applicability of Intergenerational Learning in each of the two federal provinces.

The process of setting-up the biosphere reserve developed independently and distinctly in each province, and the efforts were joined together at the last moment (FANNINGER, 2012). In the Salzburger Lungau, the idea of the BR establishment was highly publicized and involved a number of meetings with the local population (FANNINGER, 2012).

In the case of the Carinthian Nockberge, the BR encompasses the territory of a former national park, which has failed to receive IUCN recognition, and has been redeveloped, with agreement of the local population, as a BR (JUNGMEIER et al., 2009). Both cases involved public consultation. Like elsewhere, it was difficult to mobilize certain age groups, people with disabilities or those of migration background. According to the BR managers, as well as previous studies (KÖSTL and JUNGMEIER, 2012; HUBER et al., 2014) the younger people and the elderly women were the groups least represented in setting-up of the biosphere reserve. Recently, school projects have been successfully implemented.



## 3 Methodology

### 3.1 Research design

Mixed methods were used to collect data (KUCKARTZ, 2014) including literature analysis, case study comparison (YIN, 2009), semi-structured qualitative interviews (LAMNEK, 2010), focus groups (MORGAN, 1997) and World Café (BROWN and ISAACS, 2007).

#### 3.1.1 Case study comparison

The biosphere reserve Salzburger Lungau and Kärntner Nockberge consists of two administrative units located in two different Austria states. Despite their fractional cooperation, the development of the Salzburg and the Carinthian part of the reserve went on independently. These two sub-areas served as the basis for the case study analysis which is consequently designed as *comparative case study*.

The case study analysis is frequently applied as a research method in the social science disciplines as sociology, political science, social work, business, psychology and more. This research types' major objective is the collection of empirical data about actual human events and behaviour. It helps to understand contemporary phenomena in their real-life context, e.g. small group behaviour and organizational and managerial processes. Covering complexities, relationships and processes, it is recommended for in-depth studies (YIN, 2009).

*Single case studies* can represent a significant share to knowledge and theory building, whereas the evidence from *multiple cases* is in addition often considered more convincing and robust. Analytic conclusions gained from two cases independently are more powerful and substantial than those coming from a single case alone. With two cases direct replication can be possible (YIN, 2009).

A major strength of case study data collection is the possibility to use multiple *sources* of evidence, whereby the examination of the evidence from different or even rival perspectives might increase the chances that a case study will be exemplary.

Thus any case study finding or conclusion is likely to be more convincing and accurate. Studies based on multiple methods were rated more highly, in terms of their overall quality, than those that relied on only single sources of information (YIN, 2009).

In the comparative case study of the Carinthian and in the Salzburger part of the reserve applied methods, including qualitative interviews, focus groups and Word Cafes for getting an insight into the perspectives of the biosphere reserve process facilitators and -managers, as well as the target groups “Youth” and “Elderly Women”. A well-grounded data set is hopefully provided by a diversity of methods and participants.

### **3.1.2 Semi-structured qualitative interviews**

Interviews are seen as an essential source for case study research because most of them are about human affairs or behavioural events (YIN, 2009). In semi-structured interviews, manuals with the most important topics and questions are used to guide conversations. The interviewer can adapt to the situation by as the questions’ formulation and order is not predetermined (LAMNEK, 2010). The stream of questions in a case study interview is likely to be fluid rather than rigid (YIN, 2009).

The interviewer acts discreetly, possibly asking for more explicitness or interpretation. As interviewers responds to the informant, they structure his/ her extensive and narrative statement, including own formulations. Important aspects are mentioned at the beginning of the interview. Personal wants as fears and the own social reality can be documented, reconstructed, explained and interpreted.

This method was applied to target groups Youth and Elderly Women to encourage open discussions as well as to the biosphere reserves’ process facilitators and – managers. The latter two served as key informants, as they have a particular first-hand knowledge and understanding about the respective region (LAMNEK, (2010)).

### **3.1.3 Focus groups**

A focus group is a group interview. Six to eight persons with a similar background discuss a shared topic within an open and pleasant environment. Participants and questions are determined, but flexible in the way they are asked from group to group. The way of responding is up to the participants.

Focus groups are frequently used to investigate either on topics or groups that are poorly understood, as e.g. complex behavior, or issues people are not in touch with. The researcher can find out a lot without really knowing what to ask. His /her questions possibly promote new questions by the participants. Interpretation of focus group data can give information about how and why questions.

The focus group is a complementary method, where the range of opinions and experiences is of more importance than the individual. Compared to other qualitative methods, the process of sharing and comparing is a major strength of this method (MORGAN, 1997).

Focus groups were applied to the target group Elderly Women promoting a forthright lively debate with female interviewers and group members in a familiar and relaxed environment.

### **3.1.4 World Café**

The World Café is a form of moderating big groups, enabling open conversations from 12 to a hundred persons. It creates room for an informal exchange and meeting without confrontation and criticism, for instance for building up cooperation or networks. A major aim is the collection of knowledge, opinions, fears and wishes of multiple persons, diverse stakeholders and groups about complex problems and circumstances. The findings can be commonly broadened, structured and presented, possibly developing a common understanding and perception (BROWN and ISAACS, 2007). The typical procedure of the World Café is described in chapter 3.3.

The World Café was applied to the target group Youth within school class workshops. It was chosen to cope with a big number of participants (16-18 participants),

facilitating the unconstrained exchange in small groups based on the input of other workshop members.

### **3.2 Sampling criteria**

The table 9 provides an overview about the interviewees in the Salzburg and the Carinthian case study regions.

**Table 9: Overview about interviewees**

<b>Lungau (SB)</b>	<b>Nockberge (CA)</b>
<b>BR Process facilitators</b>	
1 semi-structured qualitative interview (SB-PF)	1 semi-structured qualitative interview (CA-PF)
<b>BR Management</b>	
1 semi-structured qualitative interview (SB-M)	1 semi-structured qualitative interview (CA-M)
<b>Elderly Women – Interviews</b>	
3 semi-structured qualitative interviews (60+) ((SB-L-1, SB-L-2, SB-L-3))	4 semi-structured qualitative interviews (60+), (CA-L-1, CA-L-4, CA-L-5) 4 semi-structured qualitative interviews (middle-aged > 40-50) (CA-L-2, CA-L-3, CA-L-6)
<b>Elderly Women – Focus groups</b>	
4 Women (60+) (SB-L-4)(one person 50+) 9 Women (60+) (SB-L-5)	6 Women (60+) (CA-L-8)
<b>Youth - Interviews</b>	
3 semi-structured qualitative interviews (16-19); (SB-Y-1, SB-Y-2, SB-Y-3)	3 semi-structured qualitative interviews (17-18); (CA-Y-1, CA-Y-2, CA-Y-3)
<b>Youth - World-Café</b>	
1 school class, 18 pupils (16-17) (SB-Y-4) Fachschule für wirtschaftliche Berufe mit Aufbaulehrgang – Multi Augustinum	1 school class, 16 pupils (13-14) (CA-Y-4) Mittelschule und Musikhauptschule Gmünd
Total: <b>39 respondents</b> (8 interviews, 13 focus group, 18 World Café)	Total: <b>35 respondents</b> (13 interviews, 6 focus group, 16 World Café)

**Abbreviations Table 9: PF= Process facilitation; M= management; L = Elderly Women; Y= Youth; CA= Carinthia; SB= Salzburg**

The biosphere *reserve process facilitators* and *-managements* as well as the target groups *Youth* and *Elderly Women* were chosen for the following reasons. The process facilitators, planning and implementing the participatory process, provide an external view on the process whereby the managements display an internal managerial perspective. The age groups Youth and Elderly Women were singled out,

because these groups were particularly difficult to mobilize for participation in the BR..

During the sampling process it was taken into account that the Lungau as well as the Carinthian interviewees bear resemblances in the factors *age*, *gender* and *place of residence*.

The officially defined age of adolescence and elderly people served as an approximate value for the selection; Young people are specified as "persons between childhood (until 12 years old) and adulthood (approximately 20 years and older)" (BUNDESZENTRALE FÜR POLITISCHE BILDUNG, (2011)), for elderly people a "generally binding legal definition (...) does not exist" (DEUTSCHER BUNDESTAG, 2008). Instead the conventional perception of elderly peoples' age of 65 years or older was applied.

The Youth' age ranged from 16 to 19 (SB) and 13 to 18 (CA) years; All except five out of 30 Elderly Women ,who were between 40-50 years old (1x in SB, 4x in CA) (vgl. 3.3.), were 65 and older. Five persons were older than 80 years (CA).

Regarding *gender diversity* of Youth informants, a balanced selection took place. In the Salzburg sub-area, two female and one male teenager were interviewed; The Carinthian respondents were composed of two male and one female interviewee.

On the one hand the interviewees' *habitations* should be located within the reserves' municipalities, on the other hand evenly distributed among these. In the Salzburg region all interviewees lived inside the reserve, randomly distributed to the towns Mauterndorf, Mariapfarr, Tamsweg, Hintergöriach, Tweng, Zederhaus, Katschberg, St. Margerethen, Göriach and St. Michael, lying within seven out of 15 municipalities of the Salzburg part of the reserve (Göriach, Lessach, Mariapfarr, Muhr, Ramingstein, St. Andrä, St. Margarethen, Thomathal, Unternberg, Weißpriach, Zederhaus and St.Michael).Regarding the Carinthian interviewees, two teenager and two elderly woman resided in the neighbouring communities Malta, Feld am See, Rennweg and Trebesing. Concerning the school class respondents, it is worth mentioning that nine out of sixteen pupils did not live in reserves' municipalities but

were visiting a "Biosphärenpark-Schule"<sup>1</sup>. These pupils took part in excursions to the reserve. All other interviewees were distributed between the towns Radenthein, Ebene Reichenau, Kremsbrücke and Eisentratten in the biosphere reserves' municipalities Krems in Kärnten, Radenthein, Bad Kleinkirchheim, Reichenau.

### 3.3 Recruiting process

The following passage describes the recruiting process of the interview partner. Sampling techniques included key informant ((DEAUX and CALLAGHAN, 1985 cited in HECKATHORN, 1997) and snowball techniques (HECKATHORN 1997, 2011).

All interviewees of the *biosphere reserves' process facilitation and - management* were contacted via email including a manual and telephone. In the Salzburg region, the respondents were contacted by means of *personal liaison on location, digital contact (email, telephone) or via persons and institutions*.

First, the interviewer travelled to the *location* and, being there *personally*, it was much easier to identify participants as via digital contact. The first interviewee (Youth/ single interview) was contacted personally at the accommodation where the researcher stayed. Further the researcher visited city halls and received recommendations through the *mayor or assisting staff*. Thus three interviewees (1x Youth/ single interview) (2 x Elderly Women/ single interview), were called or visited and agreed to the survey.

Secondly, the researcher contacted the potential interviewees by *digital means (email, telephone)*. The first secondary school was not interested in the cooperation, because a workshop on a similar topic took place there before. The second secondary school agreed to the workshop procedure. After the positive solicitation by the Salzburg state and the circular letter for the pupils of the school class, the process of the workshop was planned with the responsible teacher. Further a volunteers' organization (Freiwilligenzentrum Tamsweg<sup>2</sup>) was contacted digitally including an invitation letter and organized a focus group with Elderly Women.

---

1 New Grammar School Gmünd: <http://www.nms-gmuend.ksn.at/> (01.05.2016)

2 Volunteer Center Salzburg: <http://www.freiwilligenzentrum-salzburg.at/index.html> (01.05.2016)

Thirdly, the leader of the *public institution* recommended an Elderly Woman, who agreed to the survey. Also other respondents were contacted *via organizations or snowball principle*. The researcher was invited to the "Jugendtreff Tamsweg"<sup>3</sup>, where a teenager agreed spontaneously to a single interview. Moreover, a leader of an association of elderly people ("Senioren Lungau"<sup>4</sup>) organized (an invitation letter was provided) the attendance of older woman from the above mentioned association as well as from a retirement home (Tageszentrum Mauterndorf<sup>5</sup>) to a focus group.

In the Carinthian region, the informants were recruited through the *biosphere reserves' management, a professors' network* and *the researcher's presence in the BR*. First, the reserves' manager contacted two local organizations for the implementation of focus group workshops. The first disagreed, while the workshop could be planned with the second institution (Zentrum für Familie, Soziales und Gesundheit Vitamin R<sup>6</sup>) via telephone and the invitation letter. Further the manager contacted a "Biosphärenpark-Schule"<sup>7</sup> who agreed on the workshop; the same steps of organization (positive solicitation, circular letter etc.) as with the Salzburg school were done (cp. passage above).

Second, a *professor* of University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences (BOKU) established contacts to four women at the age of 40-50years.

This selection of younger interviewees (as compared to 60 years and older) resulted from the general difficulties of finding respondents in the Carinthian case study area. Next to age, further variations from the research design due to the lack of respondents were the interrogation of two interviewees at the same time (done twice) and the interviewees' residence outside the BR.

Third, the researcher presented the thesis topic at a conference in Carinthia (Klagenfurt; "Sustainable Development, Innovation and Youth"), where she got invited to the congress "Generationenarbeit in der Nockregion" (Draunhofen in CA).

---

3 Youth club Tamsweg "Timeout": <http://euregio-juzi.de/einrichtungen/timeout-jugendtreff-tamsweg> (01.05.2016)

4 Lungau Senior Citizen: <http://www.lungauersenioren.at/> (01.05.2016)

5 Senior Day Care Center: <http://www.hilfswerk.at/salzburg/pflege-betreuung/tageszentren> (01.05.2016)

6 Center for Family, Social and Health Vitman R: <http://vitamin-r.at/> (01.05.2016)

7 New Grammar School Gmünd: <http://www.nms-gmuend.ksn.at/> (01.05.2016)



There, the meeting of employees of the "Dorfservice"<sup>8</sup> (Dorfservice Rennweg, Eisentratten, Kremsbrücke and Dorfservice Malta/Gmünd/Trebesing) enabled the researcher to contact four interviewees by telephone, who agreed in single on interviews (3x Elderly Women, 1x Youth). Further, the researcher asked the owner of the accommodation on location for contacts. Thus, one Elderly Woman and one teenager agreed for a single interview. Finally, the teenager recommended a friend, who was keen on doing a single interview via telephone.

### **3.4 Process and challenges of data acquisition**

All interviews were executed by the same interviewer, who is also the researcher. A professor, a doctoral student and a student of the University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences were partly attending or supporting the survey.

In the Salzburg region, the semi -structured interview with *the biosphere reserves´ process facilitator* was done personally, audio-recorded and lasted 0, 45 hours; the professor was present. The *biosphere reserves´ manager* was consulted by the same method via telephone for one hour.

In the Carinthian area, the survey with *the reserves´ process facilitator* was implemented personally. Due to time restrictions *the reserves´ manager* joined the interview after half the time, leading to the inconvenience that the *reserves´ manager* could only be interviewed in the presence of the *process facilitator*. Furthermore the professor and doctoral student attended the interview, whose questions interfered with a focused conversation about the research question. The total interview lasted for 2, 5 hours and was audio-recorded.

The process facilitators gave insights on the development of the participatory processes (goals, type of participatory events) and absent age-groups; the BR-managers responded to the topics of stakeholder communication (Face-to-face vs. web- and print media) and their perspective on Intergenerational Learning including

---

<sup>8</sup> Krems Village service: <http://www.dorfservice.at/standort/dorfservice-krems-k%C3%A4rnten> (01.05.2016)

their experience with it, the regions' skills and knowledge exchange across generations as well as the format of BR-events and activities promoting IL.

The target group *Elderly Women* was personally questioned in *focus groups* and *single interviews*. All three focus groups were, next to the researcher either attended by the student or doctoral student or lasted about 2, 5 hours.

The general procedure started with a round of introduction, where the researcher, the student/ doctoral student introduced themselves and the workshops topic, including exemplary photos of intergenerational activities. The participants introduced themselves by naming their place of residence and hobbies and / or family status. After telling their associations with the reserve, the general concept of the protected area category biosphere reserve was brought forward via a primed poster. The themes *Stakeholder information and participation (RQ 2)*, *Motives and obstacles challenging participation (RQ 3)* and *Perspective of the potential participants on IL (RQ 4)* were openly addressed and, in the course of time, specified by the researcher on the basis of literature research and or previously collected data. The answers were summed up on a flip chart and again and again presented to the participants. During the whole workshop, the student / doctoral student took notes.

Two out of three focus groups (One in the Salzburg part, one in the Carinthian region) were implemented without interferences, whereby one focus group (Salzburg region) included ladies of 80 years or older, who did not maintain a conversation for more than some minutes and were easily distracted. The second invited set of persons (65 years and older) were joining the workshop behind time, which led to a loss of time due to the repetition of before mentioned issues. Moreover the implementation of the planned procedure was hindered through the presence of other persons in the room, noise and the group inhomogeneity itself. Consequently not all participants answered all aspects evenly or not at all.

All semi-structured interviews with the *Elderly Women* were conducted personally, whereby two times either the doctoral student or the student were present. Except for three interviews, where notes were taken (the participants did not agree on audio-

recording), all surveys were audio-recorded. The average period was 1, 40 hours; the questions equaled the ones in the focus groups (see above).

Further challenges were excessive conversations, comprehension problems (due to limited hearing), a noisy environment and a negative attitude towards the meaning of the survey, demonstrated by very short answers. One interview was interrupted and commented several times by the interviewee's husband, who has, as a land owner, a rather negative attitude towards the reserve.

The target group *Youth* was queried by means of World Cafés (school class workshops) and semi-structured interviews. The school class workshops were implemented under the presence of the researcher, who moderated the World Café, a teacher and the doctoral student or student, who took notes. Both workshops lasted approximately 1, 5 hours.

The process started with the introduction of the topic as well as the researcher and doctoral student or student. Through hand signal and dialogue with the whole class, the issue Stakeholder information and participation, amongst others associations with the term "biosphere reserve" were answered. Both, the pupils in SB and CA could respond to this theme. After talking about the pupils associations, information material (BR flyer and - folder) were shown and the biosphere reserves concept was introduced by a poster, where the teenagers living inside the reserve showed their place of residence (other places were also noted). The process of the World Café started with an equal distribution of the pupils to three tables. Each table was permanently overseen by either the teacher, the researcher, the doctoral student or student, whereas the groups of pupils rotated between the three tables. At each table, pupil's answers were summed up on a poster by the teacher, the researcher, the doctoral student or student, while not interrupting but guiding the lively discussions of the pupils. After rotation the tables, finding on the posters were presented to the new group of pupils who continued contributing their thoughts. The following issues were discussed at the tables:

- Participation formats promoting participation.

- Motives and obstacles participation (The issue was repeatedly asked through homework (SB) and postal sendings (CA)).
- Offering of knowledge and skills across generations (Perspective on Intergenerational Learning)

After this the posters of all three tables were briefly presented through the pupils and summarized by the researcher. The themes Participation format promoting Intergenerational Learning and Motives and obstacles of Intergenerational Learning could only be answered sparsely due to their complexity. The second aspect was repeatedly taken on but not answered through the concerted homework (SB) respectively the postal sendings to the pupils families (CA) through the school.

All Youth semi-structured interviews except one (done by telephone) were implemented personally and audio-recorded. Once, the doctoral student was present. They averagely lasted one hour and no special incidents occurred. During one survey two interviewees took part; the attendance of the second respondent was affirmed due the persons´ interest of participating in the survey as well as concerning the current lack of interviewees. The inquiries themes were the same as for the school classes (compare above); all issues could be answered,

### **3.5 Data Analysis**

The qualitative content analysis was implemented separately for each case study. First the handwritten notices and posters of the school class workshops and focus groups were digitalized and the recorded interviews were transcribed (one fourth of the interviews were transcribed by another person than the researcher (BOKU-employee)). Further the single passages of the transcripts were marked by headlines, thematically correlating with the research questions.

Second, by the help of the software MaxQDA, the single statements were assigned to the deductive codes (condensed theory of main subjects) and, if not assignable, the researcher compiled inductive codes (arising from the thematic condensation of data) (Tables 10-13).

Third the codified data was summarized considering a) the case study region (Carinthia or Salzburg) and b) the age-group (Youth or Elderly Women), i.e. for a) similar codes of Carinthian (respectively Salzburg) Youth and Elderly Women were combined (“collective codes on level of case study”); for b) similar codes of the Salzburg and Carinthian Youth (respectively Elderly Women) were combined (“collective codes of level of generation”) (cp. 4.).

Fourth a further aggregation was applied for codes which correlated on both levels (level of case study and generation) i.e. these codes existed for the Elderly Women in Salzburg and Carinthia as well as for the Youth in Salzburg and Carinthia (“collective codes of all respondent groups”, cp.4.).

Finally codes merely assignable to one respondent group i.e. either the Youth in Carinthia or Salzburg or the Elderly Women in Carinthia or Salzburg, remain (“single respondent group”, cp. 4.).

In the result chapter (4.) deductive codes are marked by “D:” inductive codes with “I:” and at least one meaningful original statements per code was selected for a better illustration of the respective topic.

**Table 10: Inductive codes of motives promoting participation**

**1. Aspects mentioned by the target group Youth**

1. The Youth representation through a party
2. Being taken by someone knowing about the biosphere reserve
3. Meeting of friends

**2. Aspects mentioned by the target group Elderly Women**

1. Sense of belonging
2. Opening up oneself for new things

**3. Aspects related to both generations**

1. Personal interest in certain issue

Table 11 displays the inductive codes of obstacles challenging participation.

**Table 11: Inductive codes of obstacles challenging participation**

<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>1. <i>Obstacles mentioned by the target group Youth</i></b><ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Lack of identification with the region</li><li>2. Missing respect</li><li>3. No addressig of youth</li><li>4. Lack of absorbability of new information</li></ol></li><li><b>2. <i>Obstacles mentioned by the target group Elderly Women</i></b><ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Reservation, wariness, closeness and lack of self-confidence</li><li>2. Inconvenience</li> <li>3. Occupation and other responsibilities</li><li>4. Age-related non-participation /</li><li>5. Comprehension problems</li><li>6. Withdrawal of old traditions</li><li>7. Mislabeling and standardization</li><li>8. Surplus of events</li><li>9. Lack of benefits and consternation</li><li>10. Aimlessness</li><li>11. Frustration, negative perception or doubts about reserve</li></ol></li><li><b>3. <i>Obstacle mentioned by both generations</i></b><ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Disinterest and desensibility</li></ol></li></ol>
--

Table 12 shows the inductive codes of motives promoting Intergenerational Learning.

**Table 12: Inductive codes of motives promoting Intergenerational Learning**

<p><b><i>Motives mentioned by the target group Elderly Women</i></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Positive perception of the younger generation</li></ol>
---

Table 13 displays the inductive codes of obstacles challenging Intergenerational Learning.

**Table 13: Inductive codes of obstacles challenging Intergenerational Learning**

**1. *Obstacles mentioned by both generations about the other generation***

1.1. Generation gap enforced by prejudice, stereotype and ageism

1.2. Lack of interest

**2. *Obstacles mentioned by the target group Youth***

**2.2. Youth about obstacles of Elderly Women**

2.2.1. Missing respect

2.2.2. Lack of openness

2.2.3. Lack of self-confidence

2.2.4. Lack of benefit or incentive e.g. for change

**3. *Obstacles mentioned by the target group Elderly Women***

3.1. Lack of personal conditions

3.1.1. Reservation, wariness, closeness and lack of self-confidence

3.3.2. Lack of self-confidence

3.3.3. Lack of openness

3.3.4. Comprehension problems

3.3.5. Lack of feeling of responsibility

3.2. Enjoy the interaction with the other generation at event or public meeting places

3.3 Lack of benefits, incentives e.g. for change

3.4. Illegality of knowledge

3.5. Conflict between generations

3.6. Lack of time

**3.7. Elderly Women about obstacles of Youth**

1. Lack of personal conditions

2. Wish for autonomy

## 4 Results

### 4.1 Development of participatory process and absent age-groups

In both case study regions the participatory process has been conducted by external process facilitators, interviewed about its´ development (SB-PF, CA-PF).

The Salzburg process began in 2004, whereby first events took place in 2006. From 2012 the core group, also including citizens, played a major role in building up the participatory process; the reserves´ inauguration happened in the same year. During the whole development participation was actively promoted, including the cooperation with 15 reserves´ municipalities, the foundation of forums as well as the citizen council (“Bürger- und Bürgerinnenrat”), working with randomly selected previously non-participating citizens and resulting in a public presentation and discussion. All findings were introduced into the reserves´ overall management plan, published and sent to previously participating persons for feedback as well as approved by the reserves´ municipalities.

In the Carinthian case, the participatory process began with first information and an event by the state governor in 2003. The planning process included technical work groups (mainly without citizens) and information events in the reserve´s municipality (2005). During one event randomly selected citizens were present. Despite the support of the external process facilitation, intensifying public inclusion since 2006, the bigger part of the reserves´ population felt neglected, despite being informed sufficiently (CA-PF). This happened due to constant efforts focusing on a complaining set of persons. Finally pushed by Salzburg preparation of reserves´ UNESCO-recognition, the Carinthian direction managed to do the same in 2012 despite some land owners conflicts.

Generally the Carinthian participatory process which could build on the former National Park process was one the one hand characterized by conflicts between single land owners, on the one hand and public authorities and the reserve management pushed the BR. In contrast, the Salzburg process was described by a



bottom up approach, driven by a local non-governmental initiative (CA-PF) (CA-PF) (Cf. 4.3.1. direct selection of certain interview partners).

“Die (BR-Management Salzburg) haben das ganz stark promoted, jahrelang, aber (...) bei uns war es immer offiziell politisch und dort war es (...) so eine NGO-Partie, die ganz anders daher gekommen ist” (CA-PF).

Since the reserves´ foundation, both managements did not succeed in involving elderly woman; regarding teenagers some participatory experience via biosphere reserve schools exists.

The Salzburg as well as the Carinthian managements explained the absence of both age-groups.

Salzburg:

“Die Jugend ist total schwer zu erreichen” (SB-M)

“Ja wir haben einen Schnitt von 50 schätze ich einmal bei den Veranstaltungen. Und was Frauen betrifft, ältere Damen habe ich so gut wie noch nie gesehen, ganz selten” (SB-M)

Carinthia:

“38 regionale Veranstaltungen, wo wir die Erfahrungen machen mussten, dass die Jugend überhaupt nicht hinget und dass die Ältesten die Bauern sind, (...), die knapp vor der Hofübergabe sind. Die noch aktiven Bauern, das ist so die Größenordnung was die ältesten Teilnehmer waren” (CA-M)

## **4.2 Biosphere reserve communication and stakeholder information**

The communication means of the biosphere reserves managements´ are various e.g. newsletters, information-folder, (school) projects, workshops, exhibitions, forums and “core” groups (SB) (table 14) as well as the local and regional tourism agencies and the BR-committee and curatorship (CA) (table 15).

Regarding the information of the Youth, the Salzburg (eighteen pupils out of 21 Youth interviewees) as well as the Carinthian school class (sixteen pupils out of 19 Youth interviewees) heard about the biosphere reserve before. They got informed by school (“Im Unterricht” (SB-Y-3)) (Salzburg) and “Schul-Exkursionen” (Engl. expression: School excursions) (CA-Y-4) (Carinthia). All three Salzburg interviewees (individual interviews) were aware about the reserve, while two of three Carinthian interviewees knew about it, both groups informed by different means e.g. “Projekt” (Engl.

expression: Project) (SB-Y-2) and “Zeitung” (Engl. expression: “Newspaper”) (CA-Y-1) (tables 14-15).

Relating to the Elderly Women out of sixteen Salzburg interviewees thirteen and out of fourteen Carinthian interviewees ten women heard about the biosphere reserve before.

The Salzburg Elderly Women were informed via *associations and institutions* e.g. “Bezirksbäuerinnen-Tag von der Bezirkskammer” (SB-L-1), *print media* “Ich habe über viele Bereiche in der Zeitung gelesen” (SB-L-4) and via *BR-manager* e.g. “Durch den Fanninger Sepp” (SB-L-3) (table 14). The Carinthian Elderly Women were mainly informed via *associations* e.g. „Über den Alpenverein Millstatt” (CA-L-8), *print media* e.g. „In der Bauernzeitung gelesen“ (CA-L-8) and *postal sendings* e.g. „Vier Gemeinden des Biosphärenparks bekommen die Zeitung „Meine Biosphäre“ ins Postfach“ (CA-L-5) (table 15).

Contrasting the BR-communication means with the stakeholder information, its obvious that the BR-manager communicate on all three levels “information”, “consultation” and “co-decision” (cf. PFEFFERKRONs´ Degrees of Participation) while the stakeholder perception is restricted to the first two levels of “information” and “consultation“ (table 14-15). Consequently neither teenagers nor elderly woman participated in co-decision (and were probably not informed about this possibility).

**Table 14: Salzburg Biosphere Reserve communication and stakeholder information**

“Degree of participation”	Communication means BR management (SB-M)	Source of information Youth	Source of information Elderly Women
<p>“<b>Information</b>” e.g. postal item, placard, exhibition, print and digital media.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Newsletter, information-folder, invitations</li> <li>- Lungau – newscast, newspaper reports</li> <li>- Assignment of biosphere reserve communities for information distribution</li> <li>- Homepage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- „Kronenzeitung“ (Engl. expression: Newspaper) (SB-Y-1)</li> <li>- “Lungauer Nachrichten und Bezirksblätter “(Engl. Expression: Lungau newscast and district newspaper) (SB-Y-3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>print media</i> (SB-L-4, SB-L-5) e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Ich habe über viele Bereiche in der Zeitung gelesen” (SB-L-4)</li> <li>• “Bezirksblatt” (SB-L-5)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>“<b>Consultation</b>” e.g. discussions, workshops, work group, advisory boards, commission, site inspection and the open space events.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Information-events, presentations, “Sommerkino” (summer cinema)</li> <li>- Contest, (school) projects, workshops, Student event (“Sommeruni”)</li> <li>- Working groups</li> <li>- Telephone dialogues and personal communication and meetings</li> <li>- Facebook</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “Projekt” (Engl. expression: Project) (SB-Y-2)</li> <li>- "Im Unterricht" (SB-Y-3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>associations and institutions</i> (4x SB-L-4, SB-L-5) e.g. “Bezirksbäuerinnen-Tag von der Bezirkskammer” (SB-L-1), “Durch Tourismusverband” (SB-L-5), “Lungauer Frauennetzwerk” (SB-L-4)</li> <li>- <i>persons</i> (SB-L-4, SB-L-1) e.g. “Durch den Fanninger Sepp” (SB-L-3), Die Liesie Löcker von Margarethen, von der hab ich das erste Mal vom Biosphärenpark gehört (SB-L-2)</li> </ul>
<p>“<b>Co-decision</b>” equates to cooperative planning and mediation with multi-level decision processes including extensive expertise.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Special interest groups, property owners</li> <li>- Public authorities as the conservation department and district farmers chamber</li> <li>- Forums, “core” groups</li> </ul>		

**Table 15: Carinthia Biosphere Reserve communication and stakeholder information**

<p><b>“Degree of participation”</b></p>	<p><b>Communication means BR management (CA-M)</b></p>	<p><b>Source of information Youth</b></p>	<p><b>Source of information Elderly Women</b></p>
<p><b>“Information”</b> e.g. postal item, placard, exhibition, print and digital media.</p>	<p>- Homepage, folder, postal sending - Local and regional tourism agencies</p>	<p>- “Zeitung” (Engl. expression: “Newspaper”) (CA-Y-1), “Newsletter” (CA-Y-2)  - “Biosphärenpark-Schilder” (Engl. expression: “Biosphere reserve plates”)</p>	<p>- <i>postal sendings</i> (CA-L-2), e.g. „Vier Gemeinden des Biosphärenparks bekommen die Zeitung „Meine Biosphäre“ ins Postfach“ (CA-L-5) - <i>print media</i> (CA-L-3, CA-L-4, CA-L-2, CA-L-8) e.g. „In der Bauernzeitung gelesen“ (CA-L-8)</p>
<p><b>“Consultation”</b> e.g. discussions, workshops, work group, advisory boards, commission, site inspection and the open space events.</p>	<p>- Regional events e.g. with presentations - Education programme (Communication via schools) - Exhibition</p>	<p>- “Schul-Exkursionen” (Engl. expression: School excursions) (CA-Y-4) (Carinthia)</p>	<p>- <i>Associations and institutions</i> e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• „Über den Alpenverein Millstatt“ (CA-L-8),</li> <li>• „Über die Grünen“ (CA-L-8)</li> <li>• „Habe in der lokalen Aktionsgruppe von Vitamin R mal gehört“ (CA-L-8)</li> </ul>
<p><b>“Co-decision”</b> equates to cooperative planning and mediation with multi-level decision processes including extensive expertise.</p>	<p>BR-Committee and curatorship</p>		

Both, the Salzburg as well as the Carinthian management, indeed the importance of face-to-face communication,

SA: "Also ich rede sicher mehr mit Leuten als das ich irgendwie mit Zeitungsartikeln oder Folder verschicke oder mache. Also ist sicher der Mensch-zu-Mensch-Kontakt wichtiger (SB-M)

CA: Also wir stehen da, die Mitarbeiter, relativ weit vorne in der Öffentlichkeit und relativ plakativ und in der Auslage in der Region" (CA-M)

while communication had far more priority for the Salzburg than for the Carinthian part (the latter already had a National Park-management established before).

SB: "Also das Thema Kommunikation zieht sich durch das ganze Leitbild. Also die Foren sind im Leitbild (...), die Organisations-Struktur wie die in Zukunft aufgebaut werden soll, also auch mit Kerngruppe und Steuerungsgruppe, Transparenz, Präsenz" (SB-M)

CA: "(...) wir stehen auf dem Standpunkt: Der Biosphärenpark ist öffentliches Interesse, die Medien haben über diese Thematik zu berichten. Das funktioniert relativ gut" (CA-M)

Regarding the content of stakeholder information, all respondents from the youth and elderly woman group associate the term biosphere reserve with *nature conservation, cultural landscapes or agriculture*,

"Na als erstes einmal Naturschutz, ja Naturschutz ist einmal groß (...) und dass es eben einen Artenschutz gibt, einen Pflanzenschutz, einen Tierschutz" (CA-Y-1)

"Naturschutzgebiet mit Kernzone im Lessachtal" (SB-L-4)

a mayor part of informants with *sustainability* (all except Elderly Women in CA) as well as *economy and regional development* (all except Salzburg Youth);

„Modell für die Nachhaltigkeit“ (Engl. expression: "Model of sustainability") (SB-Y-4)

„Bewirtschaftete Almen und die Vermarktung“ (CA-L-5)

Ein paar Ranger-(Sommer)jobs gibt's im Park"(CA-L-8)

only the interviewed Youth related the protected area to forestry.

"Wald" (Engl. expression "Wood land") (SB-Y-4)

"Forstwirtschaft" (Engl. expression: Forestry) (CA-Y-1)

## 4.3 Participation

### 4.3.1 Previous participation

One out of all 21 Salzburg Youth interviewees joined an activity of the biosphere reserve. The specific event was a project of the rural youth association

("Landjugend") in cooperation with the biosphere reserves' management. The older generation was not part of the project.

"Wir haben jetzt eh ein Projekt mit der Landjugend gehabt mit dem Biosphärenpark gemeinsam, das war halt so eine Erstlings-Pyramide, die Kartoffeln. Und des war halt, jede Landjugend hat mit einer Volksschule zusammengearbeitet (...) dann mit den Kindern geredet, um was es da geht, für was die Pflanzen wichtig sind" (SB-Y-2).

Regarding the older generation, two out of 16 interviewed Elderly Women of the Salzburg case study region joined an event or activity. For the first person no more than the presence at an event is known (SB-L-5). The second persons joined an information event including a discussion. She got informed via a postal sending. Youth in the age of 16-20year old was present, but intergenerational exchange did not happen (SB-L-3).

Despite the Carinthian school class' participation in school excursions to the biosphere reserve, none of the Youth interviewees joined a BR event or activity. The school class was contacted by the biosphere reserves' management. An exchange with the older generation did not happen.

In comparison, six out of fourteen interviewed Elderly Women of the Carinthian case study area joined an event or activity. One person joined an exhibition (CA-L-4), one an information event including a discussion. Two persons visited an event in the city of Gmünd (CA-L-2). All these persons were not sure about the source of information/ invitation; the Youth was not present. One person attended a scientific as well as film presentations and an opening of an alp. She got a personal invitation; the Youth was not part of the activity (CA-L-5).

Regarding the fact that more interviewees of the Carinthian case study area had participated (22 out of 33 in CA; 3 out of 37 interviewees in SB) can result from the direct selection of four elderly woman and the school class by a BOKU-professor or the BR-manager.

### 4.3.2 Motives for participation

The motives of participation are displayed collectively for all respondent groups (codes existing for the Elderly Women and Youth in SB and CA), for the level of the case study (similar codes for Youth and Elderly Women in CA or SB), for the level of the generation (similar codes of the SB and CA Youth (or respectively Elderly Women in SB and CA)) and for the single respondent groups (codes merely existing for the Elderly Women in SB or CA or for the Youth in SB or CA).

#### 4.3.2.1 Motives of all respondent groups

Both generations in the two case study regions perceive *benefits and incentives* as motives for participation, while the youth mentioned food (SB+CA), a little bit of money or winnings (CA) and their older counterpart alluded to funding (2x SB), meeting of other people (CA), getting out of routine (CA), getting to know something new (CA) and promoting biological products and farmers (CA) (table 16).

Youth: "Es muss etwas zum Gewinnen geben, sonst kommen die Jungen nicht, und Lose verkaufen is gut" (CA-Y-3)

Elderly Women: „Biosphärenpark ist zusätzliches Standbein für Bauern“ (SB-L-5)

The two generations in both case study regions also shared a positive view about *co-deciding*: The younger respondents suggested the right to have a say in a matter (SB), acceptance of ideas (CA), paying of attention (CA), allowance to finish speaking (CA), cooperation (CA) and being taken serious and comfortable (CA). Bottom up reformation (SB), ability of playing a part (CA), approach of persons (CA), speaking at eye level (CA) and mutual exchange (SB) were expressed by the older woman.

Youth: "Dass man sich aufgenommen fühlt und ernst genommen und geborgen, sich wohlfühlen einfach. Das ist das Wichtigste, dass man sich ernst genommen fühlt (CA-Y-3)

Elderly Women: Reden können und konkreter, beidseitiger Austausch (SB-L-4)

All respondent groups value having a *personal interest in certain issue*, the Youth stating nature and hiking in the region (SB Youth), the health, quality and marketing of biological products, opening of a farm (CA Youth),

CA: "Ja wenn sie eben sagen, was es für Probleme gibt, wenn man bei uns zum Beispiel einen landwirtschaftlichen Betrieb eröffnet und was es für Vorteile gibt und eben durch die Qualität der Produkte wie man die am Besten vermarkten kann, Bioprodukte am Besten" (CA-Y-1)

the Elderly Women mentioned theater, culture, music, cabaret and health (SB) as well as the significance and timeliness of the topic and interest in the theme (CA Elderly Women).

**Table 16: Collective motives of participation (all respondent groups)**

Motives of all respondent groups
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D: <i>Benefits and incentives</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Youth: food (SB+CA), a little bit of money or winnings (CA)</li> <li>◦ Elderly Women: funding (2xSB), meeting of other people, getting out of routine, getting to know something new and promoting biological product and farmers (CA)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• D: <i>Co-decision and co-management</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Youth: the right to have a say in a matter (SB), acceptance of ideas (CA), paying of attention, allowance to finish speaking, cooperation and being taken serious and comfortable (CA)</li> <li>◦ Elderly Women: bottom up reformation (SB), ability of playing a part, approach of persons, speaking at eye level and mutual exchange (SB) (Elderly Women)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• I: <i>Personal interest in certain issue</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Youth: health, quality and marketing of biological products, opening of a farm (CA), nature and hiking in the region (SB)</li> <li>◦ Elderly Women: significance and timeliness of the topic and interest in theme (CA), theater, culture, music, cabaret, health (SB)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

#### 4.3.2.2 Motives on the level of case study and of generations

In the Salzburg region, no collective codes exist for the level of the case study; in the Carinthian region both generations appreciate to learn something (Elderly Women) or even a lot (Youth) (*Learning and education*) (Table 17).



**Table 17: Collective motives of participation (on the case study level)**

Comparison on case study level	
<b>Salzburg</b>	No further collective motives
<b>Carinthia</b>	D: <i>Learning and education</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to learn something (Elderly Women), to learn a lot lot (Youth)</li> </ul>

Regarding the level of the generations, the results of the teenagers in both regions were *enjoyment* (SB, 2x CA) plus a convenient atmosphere and laxity (CA),

“Und das Klima muss passen und es nicht so streng machen mit Anzug und so, bissl a lässige Runde, ein bisschen Spaß dahinter und lachen und dass man nicht nur so da sitzt „Und was machst du da?“ und nicht „jetzt machen wir das Thema und das Thema“ sondern man redet einfach in Runde hinein und einer schreibt alles auf“ (CA-Y-3)

meeting of people (SB) or friends (CA) and being in a community (“Gemeinschaft”) (SB) (*Meeting of friends*) were incentives for participation. For the Elderly Women no collective codes exist for the level of the generations (Table 18).

**Table 18: Collective motives of participation (on the level of generations)**

Comparison on level of generations	
<b>Youth</b>	D: <i>Enjoyment</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• enjoyment (SB, 2x CA), convenient atmosphere and laxity (CA)</li> </ul> I: <i>Meeting of friends</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting of people (SB) or friends (CA), community (Gemeinschaft) (SB)</li> </ul>
<b>Elderly Women</b>	No further collective motives

### 4.3.2.3 Motives of single respondent groups

Regarding motives of individual groups the SB Youth states the *making of a contribution* as a motive, in detail the ability to contribute something. (2x) or tell ones´ opinion.

“Ich finde es eigentlich gut, dass wenn wir so ein Projekt starten, dass wir dann auch einen Beitrag dazu geben können. Entweder mit Sport oder mit Tourismus, dass wir einfach ein bisschen was beitragen können und unsere Meinung halt abgeben können, dass die Leute auch aufmerksam werden dass die Jugendlichen, dass die auch mittun wollen und interessiert sind” (SB-Y-3)

Furthermore *being taken by someone knowing the biosphere reserve* is an incentive for participation.

The results of the SB Elderly Women suggest the *gathering in respective society*, the sense of belonging.

“Sie müssten das Gefühl haben “Wir sind das“, weil das ist wirklich so, dass sie eine Verordnung brauchen (...) wir alle sind eben dieser Biosphärenpark. Wir alle mit unseren Höfen, mit unserer Geschichte, also das ist ja alles Biosphärenpark” (SB-L-3)

The Carinthian Youth suggests the establishment of a youth party (The Youth representation through a party),

“Es wäre gut wenn eine neue Partei gemacht wird, mehr für Jugendliche” (CA-Y-3)

while the Elderly Women value being open for new things (*openness*) (Table 19).

**Table 19: Motives of participation of single respondent groups**

Comparison on case study level	
<b>SB Youth</b>	D: <i>Making of a contribution</i> : to be able to contribute s.th (2x) or tell ones´ opinion. I: <i>Guidance</i> : need of someone to go with knowing about the respective topic
<b>SB Elderly Women</b>	I: <i>Gathering in respective society</i> : sense of belonging
<b>CA Youth</b>	I: <i>Political institutionalization</i> : establishment of a youth party
<b>CA Elderly Women</b>	D: <i>Openness</i> : being open for new things

### 4.3.3 Obstacles of participation

The obstacles of participation are displayed collectively for all respondent groups (codes existing for the Elderly Women and Youth in SB and CA), for the level of the case study (similar codes for Youth and Elderly Women in CA or SB), for the level of the generation (similar codes of the SB and CA Youth (or respectively Elderly Women in SB and CA)) and for the single respondent groups (codes merely existing for the Elderly Women in SB or CA or for the Youth in SB or CA).

#### 4.3.3.1 Obstacles of all respondent groups

All respondent groups spoke out on the issue *power inequality and hierarchy*. The younger generation suggested the lack of being approached and listened (CA), respected (in particular older woman) (SB), playing a part (SB) as well as politicians showing off (SB), people “up there” having the say (SB) and the municipality reaching decisions (SB).

Es wird dann so wie ist bei uns im Lungau, mehr die Bürgermeister und die was in der Gemeinde, die entscheiden dann. Also weniger wir, zum Beispiel wir Jugendlichen sind da sicher eher wenig beansprucht (SB-Y-1)

The results of the older generation include encapsulation of woman from social contacts while men get around (CA) as well as difficult cooperation due competition-thinking and taking center stage, while forgetting what is is about (SB). They disbelieved in the possibility of doing something, playing a part and participation in general (CA).

„Es gibt keine Beteiligung“ (CA-L-8)

The BR management (SB) as also the federal politicians (CA) “stand above” the population; politicians are not popular, get and use up public money while municipalities are broken, leading to jealousy (CA).

Man muss weiter oben anfangen, Politiker gehen nicht zuba, sie sind nicht volksnah. Man darf nicht bei der untersten Schicht anfangen (bezogen auf die Bevölkerung). Sie (die Politiker) verbrauchen nur das Steuergeld, die Gemeinden sind Pleite. Die Politiker haben das Geld, da kommt Neid auf (CA-L-6)

The participatory campaigns were neither aimed at the younger nor at the older generation (*Missing and non-concrete information*): The youth stated that one does not realize a lot (CA, 2x SB), does not have an idea or is not concerned about the reserve (CA), as well as a lack of information what it is really about (SB) and its protection status (CA).

Bei den älteren Leuten weiß ich es nicht, aber bei den Jugendlichen, also ich kenne keinen einzigen der eine Ahnung hat vom Biosphärenpark im Lungau oder der sich ein bisschen damit befasst hat oder so (SB-Y-3)

Na, ich habe schon länger davon gehört dass es ein Biosphärenpark werden soll, aber es war ja immer die Rede, dass es ein NP ist. Es war nie richtig klar, dass es ein Biosphärenpark werden sollte, eigentlich. Bis jetzt die Schilder darauf hinweisen (CA-Y-1)

The Elderly Women hardly received any information (CA) despite tourism (SB), lack of knowledge on what to contribute (CA) and personal access to the reserve (“keinen Zugang haben”) (SB) as well as the confused term biosphere reserve and its´ concept (CA+SB).

CA: „Ja erstmal müssen die Leute das Konzept verstehen“ „Viele können ja mit dem Begriff nichts anfangen“. „Das ist so eine hochgeschwollene Sprache“ (CA-L-8)

SB: Naja, es ist allerweil noch der Biosphärenpark, der hat genau noch den richtigen Namen, weil er so ein bisschen in den Sphären schwebt” (SB-L-1)

The *lack of time and the tediousness* e.g. of common projects is regarded as an obstacles for participation: The Youth stated that discussions and agreements drag on (SB), while the Elderly Women mention the need of people to adhere to an idea for a long time (SB), short enthusiasm (CA) as well as the lack of time in general (3x CA) (Table 20).

**Table 20: Collective obstacles of participation (all respondent groups)**

Comparison of both generations in both case study regions
<p>D: <i>Power inequality and hierarchy</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Youth: lack of being approached and listened (CA), respected (in particular older woman) (SB), playing a part (SB); politicians showing off (SB), people “up there” having the say (SB), the municipality reaching decisions (SB)</li> <li>• Elderly Women <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ encapsulation of woman from social contacts while men get around (CA); difficult cooperation due competition-thinking and taking center stage(SB); disbelief in possibility of doing something, playing a part and participation in general (CA)</li> <li>◦ The BR management (SB) and the federal politicians (CA) “standing above” the population; politicians are not popular, (CA)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>D: <i>Missing and non-concrete information</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Youth: one does not realize a lot (CA, 2x SB), does not have an idea or is not concerned about the reserve (CA) and that there is a lack of information what it is really about (SB), confusion about the protection status (CA)</li> <li>• Elderly Women: lack of information (CA) (SB), lack of knowledge of what to contribute (CA) and personal access to the reserve (“keinen Zugang haben”) (SB) as well as confused term biosphere reserve (CA+SB)</li> </ul> <p>D: <i>Lack of time and tediousness</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Youth: discussions and agreements dragging on (SB)</li> <li>• Elderly Women: need of people that adhere to an idea for a long time (SB), short enthusiasm (CA) as well as the lack of time in general (3x CA)</li> </ul>

#### 4.3.3.2 Obstacles on case study level

Comparing the results on case study level in the Salzburg sub-area no further collective obstacles exist; In the Carinthian sub-area both generations agreed on politicians not keeping promises (*missing trust*)

Youth: Sie sollen es einmal geben das Vertrauen, sie sollen es der Jugend mal beweisen, aber vielleicht ist sie schon zu oft enttäuscht worden auch (CA-Y-3)

and expressed skepticism regarding the *benefits and incentives* of the BR, the Elderly Women not being concerned with the reserve (2x), the reserve not offering

anything for them (nevertheless the farm is located within BR) but only for business and tourism and are unclear the individual benefit.

„Was der Nutzen sein soll, ich meine auf persönlicher Ebene...das ist mir noch nicht klar“ (CA-L-8)

The Youth also show displeasure about limited benefits and incentives (table 21).

Wenns mir wenig bringt, wird es mir natürlich nicht gefallen (CA-Y-1)

**Table 21: Collective obstacles of participation (on the case study level)**

Comparison on case study level	
<b>Salzburg</b>	<i>No further collective motives</i>
<b>Carinthia</b>	<p>D: <i>Missing trust</i>: politicians not keeping promises (Youth)            I: <i>Lack of benefits and incentives</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elderly Women: not being concerned with the BR(2x), the reserve not offering anything for them) but only for business and tourism and are about the individual benefit</li> <li>• Youth: displeasure about receiving something</li> </ul>

#### 4.3.3.3 Obstacles on level of generations

Contrasting on the level of generations both Youth groups expressed disinterest (SB+ CA), no association with a certain issue (SB), indifference (SB) and boredom (SB) in general and if known also towards the biosphere reserve (*disinterest and desensibility*)

Ja, aber die machen sich jetzt nicht so die Gedanken, wenn sie das sehen. Das ist ihnen irgendwie wurscht, weil sie eh nichts damit zu tun haben und auch zu tun haben wollen damit, nie da aufi gehen in den Biosphärenpark und sich das anschauen (CA-Y-1)

The non-acceptance of ideas of teenagers (CA) and the need to work hard for respect (SB) (*missing respect*)

Dass die Offiziellen, die schon länger dabei sind, glauben, dass der 16-jährige Bur aus Tamsweg, was weiß ich, der redet eh nur viel daher und da ist nichts dahinter und, was weiß ich, dass man sich erstmal den Respekt erarbeiten muss (SB-Y-3)

as also being not addressed (2x CA, SB), instead the older generation is (SB) and the youth not being present (SB) (*no addressing of youth*) are further issues challenging participation.

CA: Ja sie bieten jawohl Wanderungen und so Führungen an, aber es spricht ja nicht Jugendliche an irgendwie. Also ein paar, aber eher die ältere Bevölkerung (CA-Y-1)

SB: Ich würde einfach sagen, dass wir einfach generell, die Jugendlichen im Lungau, bei den wenigsten Themen egal, ob jetzt Biosphärenpark oder was weiß ich, was halt neu gebaut wird, einfach generell die Sachen, die sich im Lungau tun, eigentlich eh nichts zum mitreden haben...(SB-Y-3)

The Elderly Women in Carinthia and Salzburg agree on *age-related non-participation*, specified through no will for participation in events (for longer than one hour) (4x), limited hearing-capacity, illness or lacking activity (CA), the disability of contributing something (SB),

CA: In meinem Alter, ich bin ja über 60. Ich täte sagen, es gehören jüngere Frauen, die aktiv sind, also die aktiv im Leben sind beim Arbeiten in der Landwirtschaft. (CA-L-1)

SB: Was kann die ältere der jüngeren Generation weitergeben? „Wir sind in Pflege, so viel können wir nicht mehr machen“ (SB-L-5)

as well as on the *lack of mobility*, most people walking (CA), using the bus or local taxis (CA), some woman not having a driving license (CA) and not all woman owning a car (SB) or not being able to still drive it (CA).

Jaja na, das ist klar, es ist die ... sie können nicht mehr selber fahren, sie kommen dort nicht hin, sie müssen abgeholt werden im Normalfall (CA-L-4)

Elderly woman got enough to do (SB), get appointments (CA), have to visit the doctor or to care for someone(CA), look after (grand-)children (2x) and family (CA), have to work (4xCA) and are generally on the move (CA) (*occupation and other responsibilities*)

...ich bin die ganze Zeit unterwegs, aber dass man das muss mit den Kindern, da musst dort zum Doktor, dann musst was ... ja arbeiten tun wir ...(CA-L-2)

and thought that the abundance of events is already sufficient; excess supply of events (CA, SB) too many possibilities and too much to do (CA) (*surplus of events*).

„Es gibt sehr viele Veranstaltungen, Vereinstätigkeiten, fast schon ein Überangebot“ (CA-L-8)

They also expressed non-importance and frustration about the reserve (SB+CA) as well as the lack of permission to build tracks (CA) and mentioned a stakeholder conflict (CA) (*Frustration, negative perception and doubts about reserve*).

„Mit den neuen Arbeitsplätzen bin ich ein bisschen skeptisch“(CA-L-8)

“Der Konflikt zwischen Grundbesitzern und Parkbetreibern ist mehr in den Medien als Bewerbung des Parks (CA-L-8)”

Further the elderly woman were frustrated with the absence of money and subsidies (SB), of new employment (SB, CA), not being concerned with the reserve (2xCA), the reserve not offering anything for them (nevertheless the farm is located within BR) instead the business and tourism do (CA) and are about individual benefits (CA) (*Lack of benefits and incentives I.a. for change*) (Table 22)

Es wird kein Geld zur Verfügung gestellt. Es herrscht Unzufriedenheit (SB-L-4)

„Was der Nutzen sein soll, ich meine auf persönlicher Ebene...das ist mir noch nicht klar“ (CA-L-8)



**Table 22: Collective obstacles of participation (on the level of generations)**

<b>Comparison on level of generations</b>	
<b>Youth</b>	<p>D: <i>Disinterest and desensibility</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>disinterest (SB+ CA), no association with a certain issue (SB), indifference (SB) and boredom (SB)</i></li> </ul> <p>I: <i>Missing respect</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>non-acceptance of ideas of teenagers (CA), the need to work hard for respect (SB)</i></li> </ul> <p>I: <i>No addressing of youth</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>being not addressed (2x CA, SB), instead the older generation is (SB), the youth not being present (SB)</i></li> </ul>
<b>Elderly Women</b>	<p>I: <i>Age-related non-participation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SB: <i>disability of contributing something</i></li> <li>• CA: <i>no will for participation in events (for longer than one hour) (4x), limited hearing-capacity, illness or lacking activity</i></li> </ul> <p>D: <i>Lack of mobility</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>most people walking (CA), using the bus or local taxis (CA), some woman not having a driving license (CA) and not all woman owning a car (SB) or not being able to still drive it (CA)</i></li> </ul> <p>I: <i>Occupation and other responsibilities (Illness + care mit dazu)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>got enough to do (SB), get appointments (CA), have to visit the doctor or to care for someone(CA), look after (grand-)children (2x) and family(CA), have to work (4xCA) and are generally on the move (CA)</i></li> </ul> <p>I: <i>Surplus of events</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>abundance of events is already sufficient; excess supply (CA, SB) too many possibilities and too much to do (CA)</i></li> </ul> <p>I: <i>Frustration, negative perception and doubts about reserve</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>non-importance and frustration about the reserve (SB+CA) as well as the lack of permission to build tracks (CA) and mentioned a stakeholder conflict (CA)</i></li> </ul> <p>I: <i>Lack of benefits and incentives</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>the absence of money and subsidies (SB), of new employment (SB, CA), not being concerned with the reserve (2xCA), the reserve not offering anything for them (nevertheless the farm is located within BR) instead the economy and tourism do (CA) and are unclear if the individual is going to perceive something (CA)</i></li> </ul>

#### 4.3.3.4 Obstacles of single respondent groups

Merely one interviewee of the Salzburg Youth stated the *lack of absorbability* of new information,

*Ja, weil ich in der Woche eh immer in der Schule sitze und da eigentlich schon ziemlich viel lerne und dann ist das einfach für mich nachher daheim einfach nicht mehr so das Thema dass ich mich dann auch noch weiterbilden möchte. Wenn ich dann noch einmal Informationen reingedrückt bekomme (SB-Y-2)*

The SB Elderly Women expressed fear that the BR would only taking up old traditions instead of following up new ideas (*withdrawal of old traditions*), representation of existing organizations or activities as BR-created (2x) and the losing of individuality (*mislabeled and standardization*)

Es ist alles schon da, es gibt alles schon, und das kommt nicht von dem Park (SB-L-4)  
Gruppen des Biosphärenpark müssen unter einen Hut und trotzdem individuell bleiben können (SB-L-4)

The reserves' aimlessness is described through the "Bermuda-triangle where different ships move without a common direction", divergence and a lack of concreteness and teamwork (*aimlessness*),

Das (Bezug auf vergangenes Projekt) ist ganz konkret gewesen und dann hat es geheißen, wenn du es durchführst, dann bekommst du die Summe vom Geld. Dann wird es was und das geht mir eben beim Biosphärenpark ab. Das x Besprechungen rum umadum sind (SB-L-1)

The Carinthian Youth stated the lack of identification with the region,

Viele arbeiten, die meisten gehen Schule und gehen dann studieren und interessieren sich nicht für da, für unser Gebiet, die sind einfach mit den Gedanken schon komplett wo anders, auch schon viel weltoffener. Die wollen oft die Welt sehen und interessieren sich für das einfach einen Scheiß (CA-Y-1)

while the results of Carinthian elderly woman suggest disinterest (4x), non-appealing issues, phlegmatic persons (*Different, no interest, indifference*),

Es kommt keiner zu Veranstaltungen, das Wichtigste ist Freizeit und Sport (CA-L-6)  
as well as their generations' closeness, isolation from the society, peculiarity ("Eigenheit"), uncertainty, fear of new things and lack of self-dependence and self-

confidence for socialization (*reservation, wariness, closeness, lack of self-confidence*)

Die haben auch so ein geringes Selbstbewußtsein, weil sie oft total schüchtern sind, unter Leute zu gehen. Das ist dann das nächste Problem. Die haben selber kein Selbstwertgefühl ... das haben die ... vom Mann oder so kriegen sie das nicht oder von daheim und das geht ihnen natürlich dann ab. Dann trauen sie sich ja nicht, so aus sich rauszugehen...(CA-L-3)

Further they considered comprehension problems e.g. formal German and technical language, lack of comfort (convenience), everlasting participation of the same persons (one-sided representation or perception of stakeholder) and disagreements (differences of opinion among stakeholder) as further obstacles for participation (table 23).

...dadurch, dass da jetzt so viele Reibereien waren, denke ich mir, dass da ein bissl Abstand gehalten wird ...(CA-L-2)

**Table 23: Obstacles of participation of single respondent groups**

<b>Comparison on case study level</b>	
<b>SB Youth</b>	<p>I: <b><i>Lack of absorbability of new information</i></b></p>
<b>SB Elderly Women</b>	<p>I: <b><i>Withdrawal of old traditions</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ taking up of old traditions instead of following up new ideas,</li> </ul> <p>I: <b><i>Mislabeling and standarization</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ representation of existing organizations or activities as BR-created (2x)</li> <li>▪ the losing of individuality</li> </ul> <p>I: <b><i>Aimlessness</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Bermuda-triangle where different ships move without a common direction”, divergence and a lack of concreteness and teamwork</li> </ul>
<b>CA Youth</b>	<p>I: <b><i>Lack of identification with region</i></b></p>
<b>CA Elderly Women</b>	<p>I: <b><i>Disinterest and desensibility</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• disinterest (4x), non-appealing issues, phlegmatic persons</li> </ul> <p>D: <b><i>Reservation, wariness, closeness, lack of self-confidence</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• closeness, isolation from the society, peculiarity (“Eigenheit”), uncertainty, fear of new things and lack of self-dependence and self-confidence for socialization</li> </ul> <p>I: <b><i>Comprehension problems:</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• e.g. formal German and technical language,</li> </ul> <p>D: <b><i>One-sided representation or perception of stakeholder</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• everlasting participation of the same persons</li> </ul> <p>D: <b><i>Differences of opinion among stakeholder:</i></b> disagreements</p>

#### 4.3.4 Format promoting participation

##### 4.3.4.1 Youth

The Youth would like to be invited or informed via facebook (SB+ CA), the internet (SB+ CA), regional newspapers (SB+ CA) and at places where they need to wait e.g. posters at bus stations (SB).

They numbered appreciated events, some only existing in their region. In Salzburg: Kirtag, Martinifest, Samson-Umzug, "Zamsitz" (Vereinten), Auftritt der Querschläger, Feuer und Stimme (SB) as well as in Carinthia: Kirtag, Pfarrfest, Sonnwendfeuer, Maifest (CA).

Events or activities could be organized in a diversified manner (2x) (SB), e.g. as project days relating to different topics (CA) or workshops (SB) including discussion rounds (SB), stations with different tasks or topics (SB) as well as good music (3x) (SB).

The presence of a lot of persons (SB) is appreciated, whereby conversations should take place in small groups (SB+CA). The Youth wants to refer to the issues (CA) and work on them concretely (CA) as well as practically (SB) in a casual and relaxed atmosphere (SB).

The Youth showed a negative attitude concerning political (SB), too long (SB) or too big (CA) events or activities and poor music (SB +CA); furthermore, one-sided or extreme events organized for special interest groups (SB) are negated e.g. „nur so ist gut“, „alles andere ist falsch“ (SB-Y-4), "Zu spezifisch, es kennt sich keiner mehr aus" (SB-Y-4).

The atmosphere should not be too strict or official (CA), the topics not irrelevant to young people.

Aber das Thema dann richtig gut machen, das wäre gut und nicht nur so überflüssige Sachen erzählen (CA-Y-1)

The event should be reachable within half an hour (CA) by good infrastructure e.g. in central Tamsweg, Sankt Michael, Mauterndorf (SB) or located in the neighborhood

(CB) (*Distance* cp. *Elderly Women* 4.3.4.2.) as well as happen in summer (SB) or autumn (SB) at Saturday (SB) afternoons (SB) of evenings (SB + CA).

Moreover the Youth spoke out against boozed (SB), critical (SB), alternative (SB), arrogant (SB), egoistic (SB), stubborn (SB+ CA), unknown (CA) persons with an extreme attitude towards life (CA) or are not open towards teenagers (CA).

Es gibt einfach Leute die haben kein Verständnis für irgendetwas und dann will man seine Meinung gar nicht sagen, weil man eh weiß, wenn ich das jetzt sage, werde ich eh angeschnauzt oder jemand fährt mich an (SB-Y-2)

#### **4.3.4.2 Elderly Women**

Elderly Women appreciate being invited personally (2x), by newspaper or via their municipality, associations and networks (CA).

They numbered appreciated events as churchy (SB+ CA), natural scientific and outdoor (CA) events as well as cultural events in general (CA) e.g. „Kultur rund um den Bauertisch“.

Events and activities should include projects, inspections, information events (CA) being repeated two to three times per year to prevent the people forgetting about the topic (SB). The issue should be worked out in small groups (SB), managed by a moderator (SB) and displayed in a concrete (SB+CA), active (CA), brief and logic (CA) way, not lasting longer than one hour (SB). Listening and anonymity (SB) are of importance as also a funny (SB + 2xCA), lively (CA) atmosphere with some entertainment through dialect (SB) music (CA+SB) and cabaret (SB). Location should be development for the public and events organized by themes (SB) e.g. about game (CA), health and environment (SB).

Frontal, scientific as well as too specific or excessive events are rather rejected (SB).

The event should be close (SB+ CA), especially in winter (SB), whereby carpools are very helpful; spring to autumn was seen as appropriate timing within the year, whereby good weather is a precondition (SB+ CA). Regarding week- or daytime the woman appreciate events on sundays (SB), at the end of the week or weekend (CA) and during the day (SB+CA).

Moreover the Elderly Women value the presence of neutral (CA), competent (CA) recognized (CA) persons, of the mayor (CA) as well as people known in the region (3xSB + 2xCA) and volunteers having a good connection to the population (CA).

#### **4.4 Potential of Intergenerational Learning on biosphere reserves' development**

##### **4.4.1 Perspective of the biosphere reserves' managers**

Managers in both parts of the protected area were not familiar with the concept of Intergenerational Learning. After its clarification, the Salzburg manager stated the importance of knowledge exchange.

SB: Die (Bezug jüngere Generation) haben bestimmt extrem viele Fähigkeiten und die ältere Generation hat auch extrem viele Fähigkeiten und Wissen, vor allem was Traditionen und altes Heilwissen oder traditionelle Wirtschaftsweisen oder sonst irgendwas besitzt, wo wir auf jedenfalls schauen wollen das man das irgendwie erhält (SB-M2)

She referred to an activity in their field of *nature conservation, cultural landscapes and agriculture* with potential for IL:

Also ganz konkret das Projekt das wir jetzt mit der Landjugend machen, da geht's um das da werden Erstling-Pyramiden aufgebaut (...) also heuer werden Bienenweiden gesät, dann als nächstes die Kartoffeln und so weiter (...) und anhand vom dem den Schülern näher gebracht warum ist Vielfalt wichtig, (...) und da haben wir auch mal angedacht dass wir Seniorenheime mit einbeziehen. Aber das haben wir jetzt in der Startphase nicht geschafft (SB-M)

The Carinthian leadership pointed to the regions' ongoing cultural exchange between the generations relating to their field of *Men and culture*.

(...) was Volkslieder anbelangt, was Singen anbelangt, Musizieren, bodenständige Musik, da glaub ich funktioniert diesen tradieren des Wissens, also das mündliche Überliefern, viel viel besser und wird auch bewusster wahrgenommen. Also es gibt heute relativ viele Junge die sagen „Mah, bitte, schreib mit das Lied auf, das kann keiner mehr, schreib mir das Lied auf, damit das Bestand hat“ oder, also da in dem Bereich gibt's einiges und da funktioniert glaub ich auch die Kommunikation sehr gut (CA-M)

He sees the BR's task in supporting but not developing intergenerational activities, the latter being task of the region itself.

ch glaube der Biosphärenpark kann es nicht aufnehmen und weiterentwickeln. Ich glaub, dass der Biosphärenpark das fördern kann, in eine gewisse Richtung lenken aber nicht wirklich nachhaltig beeinflussen. Und ich glaube auch, dass er es gar nicht braucht. Der Biosphärenpark kann eine Institution sein, die eine derartige Initialzündung gibt, aber das entwickelt sich dann von selbst (CA-M)

Tun musst du es selbst, tun müssen sie es selbst. Der Biosphärenpark ist ja nicht das, was das Management macht, sondern dass, was die Region aus dem Biosphärenpark macht. (CA-M))

Relating to the format of an event promoting Intergenerational Learning, the Salzburg manager proposed several ideas e.g. “Leihomas” where unmated elderly woman care for children, intergenerational cooking and gardening as well as school projects including the older generation.

ja zum Beispiel ein Schulprojekt und die Schüler gehen dann zu ihren Omas, ihren Nachbarn der älteren Generation und befragen die, (...) und dann halten sie die z.B. über Video fest und machen gemeinsam ein Herbarium und dann gibt's ein Youtube-Video (SB-M)

The Carinthian manager sees little need for the BR to actively bring together older and younger groups.

Und was ich auch meine, dass man nicht krampfhaft Alt und Jung zusammenführen muss. Wenns passt finden die sich schon und ich meine auch, dass man auch alte Menschen alt sein lassen darf(CA-M)

#### **4.4.2 Perspective of Youth and Elderly Women**

##### **4.4.2.1 Offering of knowledge and skills across generations**

Regarding the potential of Intergenerational Learning for the younger and older generation, they appreciate exchanging cultural knowledge and skills in both regions. Further the Youth likes to offer their ability in technology and sport to the older generation, who proposed to learn the before mentioned themes from their younger counterpart.

The other way around elderly woman would like to hand their capabilities of nature conservation, cultural landscapes and agriculture to teenagers, who are also keen on learning them.

Thus the analysis shows three fields of IL: culture, agricultural landscapes and technologies.



#### **4.4.2.2 Motives for Intergenerational Learning**

The motives for Intergenerational Learning are displayed collectively for all respondent groups (codes existing for the Elderly Women and Youth in SB and CA) and for the single respondent groups (codes merely existing for the Elderly Women in SB or CA or for the Youth in SB or CA); For the level of the case study (similar codes for Youth and Elderly Women in CA or SB) and the level of the generation (similar codes of the SB and CA Youth (or respectively Elderly Women in SB and CA)) no codes exist.

#### 4.4.2.2.1 Motives of all respondent groups

All four respondent groups *enjoy the interaction with the other generation at event or public meeting places*. More specific, the youth joined events (SB) and huts (CA).

SB: Nein also unsere Dorfgemeinschaft, auch die ganze Dorfgemeinschaft schätze ich ziemlich gut ein. (...) Es sitzen auch bei Veranstaltungen Jung und Alt, also es ist nicht so da sind die Jungen da sind die Alten, sondern so alle zusammen. Bei so Sachen kommen Jung und Alt eigentlich schon zusammen (SB-Y-2)

CA: Auf einer Hütt'n, da ist jung und alt und auf einer Almhütten, da trinken sie einen Wein und da sitzen Jung und Alt zusammen (CA-Y-3)

The Elderly Women mentioned sport- and outside activities for example going for a mushroom foray (CA) and generation reunions (SB)

Das machen wir da. Generationentreffen, das haben wir schon, aber das ist mehr so ein Festel, wo sich alt und jung eigentlich so einmal austauscht (SB-L-3)

Both generations appreciated the intergenerational cooperation and the competencies of the other generation. The Youth perceived the older generations' experience of life positively (SB) and declared that one gets taught a lot (2xCA) and that special knowledge and skills, e.g. choir, are useful.

SB: Also erstens einmal weil die schon über 70 Jahre Lebenserfahrung haben, weil die genau wissen wie man bestimmte Sachen macht, weil die genau wissen wie schwer das Leben sein kann (...) Also wenn ich irgendjemanden frage, zum Beispiel das mit dem Handwerklichen, ich würde das nie meinen Papa fragen, weil ich einfach weiß, dass das mein Opa viel besser kann, wie mein Papa (SB-Y-3)

"CA: will auch nicht, dass das zugrunde geht. Ich will trotzdem irgendwann einmal was machen draus und wenn jetzt keine sagen würde er geht jetzt hin, dann würde sich alles auflösen, dann würde es gar nichts mehr geben. Dann gibt's keine Möglichkeit mehr, was zu ändern" (Bezug: Jüngere lernt von älteren Generation, e.g. Chor) (CA-Y-1)

The Elderly Women state the need of the younger counterpart "for all matters and everywhere" (CA), value learning from the younger generation (CA) and asking them for help (CA, SB) (table 24).

CA: Weißt so, schön wäre, dass man den Jungen um Hilfe bittet. Nicht immer umgekehrt...die Jungen, wir brauchen sie einfach in allen Bereichen. Ich bin ja hilflos ohne den jungen Menschen, in jeder Beziehung (CA-L-1)

SB: (...) wenn ich heute 60 oder 70 Jahre bin, dann muss ich auf den jungen Menschen zugehen und ihn um Hilfe bitten, dann brauche ich den (SB-L-1)

SB: Ich kriege ja eine Information von den Jungen, ich persönlich tu mir ja da leichter, wenn der Jugendliche mit mir redet drüber und mir das erklärt, dass ich ... muss mir das irgendwo im Radio oder im Fernsehen anhorchen. Also wenn ich da praktisch teilhaben kann (SB-L-3)

**Table 24: Collective motives of Intergenerational Learning (all respondent groups)**

Motives of all respondent groups
<p>D: <i>Enjoying interaction with other generation at event or public meeting places</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Youth: joined events (SB) and huts (CA)</li> <li>• Elderly Women: sport- and outside (CA), generation reunions (SB)</li> </ul> <p>D: <i>A Intergenerational cooperation and appreciation of competencies of the other generation</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Youth: older generations´ experience of life (SB), getting taught a lot (2xCA) usefulness of special knowledge</li> <li>• <i>Elderly Women</i>: need of younger generation “for all matters and everywhere” (CA), learning from the younger generation (CA) and asking them for help (CA, SB)</li> </ul>

#### 4.4.2.2 Motives of single respondent groups

The Salzburg Youth stated the mutual understanding of the generations  
(*Communication channel based on understanding and mutual respect*),

Nein aber es gehört schon verbunden, dass Jung und Alt zusammenkommt, damit die alten Leute wissen so denkt die Jugend über das Thema und dass auch die jungen Leute wissen, so denken die Leute über das Thema, dass sich die älteren Leute besser in die jungen Leute einfühlen können, das besser verstehen können, und dass auch die jungen Leute verstehen wie haben die älteren Leute früher gedacht. Oder wie war es in der Jugend von den älteren Leuten, vielleicht haben die genau gleich gedacht? (SB-Y-2)

while for the Salzburg Elderly Women no further statements exist.

The Carinthian Youth values increasing *self-esteem* by successfully learning traditional skills.

Das Mähen mit der Sense, da bin ich schon sehr stolz drauf, das können nur sehr wenige (CA-Y-2)

while their older counterpart (Carinthian Elderly Women) stated a positive perception of the younger generation and contacts to young people (Existing contacts to the younger generation as via grandchildren)

*Aber die Frau war zum Großteil daheim und das ist noch fest verwurzelt in denen drinnen. Die da zu ... obwohl es eh, ja es ist teils so, dass so ... es ist so ganz unterschiedlich, wenn junge Leute daheim sind, ist das wieder anders. Die sind ein bissl offener, weil sie einfach zu tun haben mit den jungen Leuten und sehen, nein, die sind ja doch nicht so schlimm (CA-L-3).*

as well as the interaction with the Youth to decrease isolation and helplessness (*Reduction of isolation*) (table 25).

Da sitze ich einsam da, das ist ja eine Katastrophe (CA-L-1)

Ich bin ja hilflos ohne den jungen Menschen, in jeder Beziehung (CA-L-1)

**Table 25: Motives of Intergenerational Learning of single respondent groups**

Comparison on case study level	
Salzburg Youth	D: <i>Communication channel based on understanding and mutual respect</i>
Salzburg Elderly Women	/
Carinthian Youth	D: <i>Self-esteem by successfully learning traditional skills</i>
Carinthian Elderly Women	I: <i>Positive perception of the younger generation</i> D: <i>Existing contacts to the younger generation as via grandchildren</i> D: <i>Reduction of isolation: decrease of isolation and helplessness through the interaction with the Youth</i>

#### 4.4.2.3 Obstacles of Intergenerational Learning

The obstacles of Intergenerational Learning are displayed collectively for all respondent groups (codes existing for the Elderly Women and Youth in SB and CA), for the level of the case study (similar codes for Youth and Elderly Women in CA or SB), for the level of the generation (similar codes of the SB and CA Youth (or respectively Elderly Women in SB and CA)) and for the single respondent groups (codes merely existing for the Elderly Women in SB or CA or for the Youth in SB or CA).

#### 4.4.2.3.1 Obstacles of all respondent groups

All four respondent groups confirm the existence of a *generation gap* due to various reasons, which is *enforced by prejudice, stereotype and ageism* towards the other generation as well as the assumption that the other generation is biased regarding the own generation.

The Youth regrets that the older generation does not keep up with new trends and have a stronger focus on work,

SB: Ja weil die Leute, weil sich einfach alles so schnell entwickelt, dass die alten Leute mit der ganzen Entwicklung irgendwann nicht mehr nachkommen, weil sich alles so schnell entwickelt (SB-Y-2)

CA: Die ältere Bevölkerung ist immer nur aufs Arbeiten und wenn ich in die Natur bin, ich setze mich einfach mal irgendwo hin und genieße einfach mal. Das können die Älteren einfach nicht. Sie sehen immer nur arbeiten, das ist ein sehr großer Punkt (CA-Y-1)

An interviewee from the Salzburg younger generation feels the older generations' mistrust towards younger persons and tries to explain this with their longer life experience.

Es gibt ja oft so Vorurteile „Die Jugend heutzutage“. Es ist ja auch nicht immer so, es sind ja auch viele alte misstrauische Leute, is es klar die haben viel erlebt, dass eben Leute misstrauisch sind (SB-Y-2)

The Carinthian Youth assumes that the older generation regards them as planless.

Wenn ich mal 70 bin und die Jugend sehe, würde ich auch denken, die haben keinen Plan, die ham nichts, die tun nur groß reden. Ich glaub dass die Alten sich da nicht mehr so reinversetzen können. Es gibt auch noch gute Jugendliche, aber es gibt auch nicht mehr so gute Jugendliche, die nur daheim rumhängen, und da gibt's glaub ich mehr, die so denken als wie so (CA-Y-1)

The Elderly Women in the Salzburg part of the reserve explain the missing intergenerational interaction with young people' attention being centered to computers and televisions. The Elderly Women in the Carinthian sub-area state that dialogs with younger persons are short or do not even happen as mobile phones are more important and, in general, contact to the other generation is insufficient.

Naja, da habe ich jetzt zu wenig, muss ich ehrlich sagen, zu wenig Kontakt mit der jetzigen heutigen Jugend, dass ich da jetzt wirklich ...(CA-L-4)

Die Jungen reden schon mit den Alten, aber nur kurz (CA-L-6)

Furthermore the results express frustration about the younger generation instantly grabbing for laptops instead of spending time in nature, not being interested in the

knowledge of the other generation (e.g. for the take-over of the farm), behaving differently (e.g. do not greet anymore) and not daring to approach older persons.

The generations divide is further aggravated by both generations being excessively attached to media, having different interests (2x) as for example the Youth´ disinterest in traditional songs.

The generation conflict between the younger and older generations was mentioned by one interviewee as a reason to rather stay apart.

Aber es ist genauso das Zusammenleben jetzt auf engstem Raum ist auch nicht immer einfach ... Was wir eigentlich so mitgekriegt haben, also zwischen alt und jung ist genauso der Generationenkonflikt und ... es ist immer besser getrennt (CA-L-2)

The Salzburg Elderly Women claim that the younger generation can not resign, handle money, help themselves and do not talk to each other sufficiently,

Die Jungen sollen miteinander mehr reden“ (SB-L-2)

The Carinthian Elderly Women argue that Youth only wants to earn money resulting in a lose of values. Further the own generation holds a lot prejudice against the youth pushed by media (table 26).

Ich glaube, dass die ältere Generation schon so viele Vorurteile hat, was die Jugend anbelangt, weil man natürlich soviel hört aus den Medien und das wird natürlich projiziert auf jeden Jugendlichen,

**Table 26: Collective obstacles of Intergenerational Learning (all respondent groups)**

Comparison of both generations in both case study regions
<p><b>I: Generation gap enforced by prejudice, stereotype and ageism</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Youth:</i> Older generations only focusing on work, not keeping up with trends</li> <li>• <i>Older generations´ bias towards youth:</i> Aimlessness of younger generation</li> <li>• <i>Elderly Women:</i> Generation conflict / Younger generations´ attention on media (in general)</li> <li>• <i>Younger generations´ bias towards older generation:</i> No interest on the knowledge of the other generation / Different behaviour</li> </ul>

#### 4.4.2.3.2 Obstacles on case study level

Regarding the reserves' sub-areas common obstacles of the younger and older generation exist in the Carinthian region.

A youth interviewee explained the disinterest of the own generation in knowledge of the older generation e.g. tradition and culture.

Es ist schon wichtig, dass die Kultur bleibt und der Brauchtum. Es wird ja immer so weitergegeben, aber ich glaube, aber es immer schwerer, jetzt den Jugendlichen oder überhaupt der nächsten Generation jetzt Brauchtum zu vermitteln, weil sich einfach die jüngere Bevölkerung auch überhaupt noch dafür interessiert, durch solche äußeren Einflüsse wie die Medien einfach immer mehr werden und dadurch „das da draußen“ immer interessanter wird oder interessanter scheint (CA-Y-1)

Similarly as the older generation, claiming insufficient interest in earlier economic activities by the Youth in general as in farming (*Lack of interest*)

So viele Bauernhöfe schließen zu, weil ja niemand mehr da ist, keine Nachfolge oder zu wenig Interesse ist einfach für die Jungen....(CA-L-1)

One interviewee of the older generation also mentioned a general lack of interest in the younger generation by the older generation.

The Carinthian Youth described a *lack of openness* of the older generation, bridling at a lot things, not being open but strict, keeping old ways of thinking, opinion and ways of doing things.

Sie sind in so einen Dings drinnen, das geht Jahr für Jahr und es muss einfach jeden Tag was gemacht werden. Ich glaube, die Jugend ist da sehr viel offener. Es darf sich nichts geändert werden, keine neuen Geräte, nichts, es muss immer alles so bleiben oder keine neuen Ideen. Will ich zum Beispiel neue Ideen einbringen, sagen sie nein. Bei verschiedensten Arbeiten, wie man es leichter machen kann, aber man kann es eben nicht, weil sie eben in dem alten Strom drin sind und nicht raus wollen (CA-Y-1)

This was confirmed by the Elderly Women stating that some are thumping on what used to be (2x), live the old way leading to a deterrence of the younger generation as well as lack of acceptance of new approaches.

Also das Schlagzeug mögen die Alten nicht, aber ja (...) also das ist auch wichtig und das sollten die Alten genauso lernen, das anzunehmen von der Jugend wie umgekehrt (CA-L-1)

A *Lack of self-confidence* was identified by the older generation, i.e. older people not daring to address the younger generation, who consequently has to ask for support. One youth interviewee reinforced the older generations insufficient confidence fearing to disgrace oneself.

Weißt sie trauen sich auch nicht zu sagen „Zeigt mir das“, weil das ist ja auch irgendwie sie blamieren sich dann auch, das ist auch peinlich für sie. Wenn sie jetzt sagen „Zeig mir das“, das

stellt sie auch wieder als dumm dar, obwohl sie nichts dafür können. Einfach weil es das in ihrer Zeit nicht gegeben hat, aber die junge Bevölkerung versteht das auch wieder nicht so richtig (CA-Y-1)

Further, both generations confirm that many old people are not interested or do not see benefit in technical knowledge of the younger generation (*Lack of benefits and incentives*).

Youth: (...) man wird die gesamte ältere schicht sicher nicht von technik überzeugen können (CA-Y-1)

Elderly Women: Ja und ein paar Alte wird es ja geben, die sich interessieren, aber die meisten halt wahrscheinlich nicht, weil sie es nie brauchen. Und den Apparat auch nicht und du brauchst ja was (CA-L-4)

They agree that listening and mutual respect being a basic requirement for intergenerational activities (*Missing respect*) (table 27)

Youth: Also ich glaube gegenseitiger Respekt ist eine Grundvoraussetzung, wenn man so was starten sollte mit Jung und Alt. Das man sich gegenseitige zuhören, bevor man kritisiert (KN-Y-2)

**Table 27: Collective obstacles of Intergenerational Learning (on the case study level)**

Comparison on case study level	
<b>Salzburg</b>	<i>No further collective obstacles</i>
<b>Carinthia</b>	<i>I: Lack of interest</i> <i>I: Lack of openness</i> <i>I: Lack of self-confidence</i> <i>I: Lack of benefits and incentives</i> <i>I: Missing respect</i>

#### 4.4.2.3.3 Obstacles on level of generations

The older generation points at the Youth common disinterest (SB), more specific on older generation knowledge in tradition and culture (CA) (*Lack of interest*)

SB: Es gibt sicher ein paar die interessiert das einfach nicht, ich weiß nicht was die immer machen...(SB -Y-2)

CA: Jugend interessiert sich nicht für Brauchtum und Kultur da Medien interessanter scheinen

The older generation is reserved, not willing and kept quiet (SB), closed (2x CA) (*Reservation, wariness and closeness*)



CA: "...der Ältere muss von den Jungen auch immer was annehmen" (CA-L-1)  
as well as misses places to meet the other generation (SB, CA), places for  
discussion (SB) (*Lack of meeting spaces*) as for example music – and choir  
associations are closing (CA) (table 28).

SB: Ort für Begegnungen, Platz für Diskussionen (SB-L-4)

**Table 28: Collective obstacles of Intergenerational Learning (on the level of generations)**

<b>Comparison on level of generations</b>	
<b>Youth</b>	<b>I:</b> Lack of interest
<b>Elderly Women</b>	<b>I:</b> <i>Reservation, wariness and closeness (Table x: Other obstacles (case study level))</i> <b>I:</b> <i>Lack of meeting space (Table x: Other obstacles (case study level))</i>

#### **4.4.2.3.4 Obstacles of single respondent groups**

No further statements (respectively codes) exist for both Salzburg generations as well as for the Carinthian Youth; the Carinthian Elderly Women express constraints on *comprehension problems* due to the Youth using different vocabulary, not seeing the Youth interests and hobbies as their responsibility (*Lack of feeling of responsibility*), the difficulty of transferring traditional medical knowledge legally e.g. herbology (*Illegality of knowledge*) and the Youth´ *Wish for autonomy*, wanting to explore things by themselves without the older generation (table 29).

Das ist ... ich denke mir, so zwischen 20 und 30 oder 15 und 30 so ungefähr, wo du selber starten willst, du willst selber was machen, ich merke das ... auf dem Bauernhof ist es halt denke ich mir so, du hast übernommen und dann willst du selber, du willst zeigen, dass du was machen kannst oder was...(CA-L-2)

**Table 29: Obstacles of Intergenerational Learning of single respondent groups**

Comparison on case study level	
<b>Salzburg Youth</b>	No further obstacles
<b>Salzburg Elderly Women</b>	No further obstacles
<b>Carinthia Youth</b>	No further obstacles
<b>Carinthia Elderly Women</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I: Comprehension problems</li> <li>I: Lack of feeling of responsibility</li> <li>I: Illegality of knowledge</li> <li>I: Wish for autonomy (Elderly Women about Youth)</li> </ul>

## 5 Discussion and conclusion

### 5.1 Discussion of methodology

#### 5.1.1 Mixed methods approach

The mixed methodological results of single and group interviews and World Café with a total of 74 interviewees in two independent case studies can be considered as more powerful and substantial than results coming from a single case or a single method alone (YIN, R.K., 2009) and as adequate for this research on participation. Nevertheless some limitations have to be taken into account:

The recruiting- and interviewing process can be very travel- and time-intense (lasting seven month for the present thesis). The interviews were conducted by one female researcher and helped by two other female students; one fourth of the interviews was transcribed by another person than the researcher. During the study's realization, it became obvious that the answering of the complex questions was especially challenging within the school class workshops. Due to time limitations, the high number of participants (16-18 pupils), the age-groups' readiness of understanding and communicating answers led to rather factual answers, while smaller groups sizes and more average time, as applied with elderly woman in focus groups, allowed more extensive responses. In this respect, it was very helpful to have also single interviews, giving deep insights, which were conducted with both respondent groups in addition to the group interviews.

Within school classes most various opinions were provided and reflected with other participants, while the process of sharing and comparing gets fewer in focus groups and does not exist at all in single interviews. Therefore, the group interview had also advantages. .

There also exist other methodological approaches for the getting insights into topics which are related to the present thesis. By means of (mainly) quantitative research designs, ENENGEL et al. (2010) addressed the issue of landscape co-management and SCHMIDT and TIPPLET (2009) investigated the education of elderly persons in the context of Intergenerational Learning:

With reference to long term cooperative planning ENENGEL et al. (2010) investigated the time efforts, benefits and risks of participation of in two Austrian case

studies, namely the EU Life-Nature Project (CS1) and the Cultural Landscape Project (CS2). Both projects based on initial explorative expert interviews, document analysis and standardized questionnaires including 60% of closed questions answered by participants chosen by project managers (Nr. of participants n = 37 / n= 50 at the average age of 47 and 50 years), standardized questionnaires displayed the core of the analysis (ENENGEL et al., 2010).

Comparing to the present thesis the recruiting process differs as the majority of interviewees were chosen by key informant and snowball sampling technique (All Salzburg respondents and all despite 16 out of 35 respondents in the Carinthian case study). The methodological approach applied to the target groups Youth and Elderly Women also differed; qualitative methods were applied based on a semi-structured manual. Furthermore the representative groups composition in terms of demography are unlike, because the parameters e.g. Families, youth, retirees or more woman was not an objective of the projects (ENENGEL et al., 2010). The choice of the mid-aged respondents of the EU Life-Nature Project (CS1) and the Cultural Landscape Project (CS2) rather aimed on professionally involved persons (CS 1) and the environmental committee of the municipality (CS2) as well as on volunteers, half of the respondents having a university degree (ENENGEL et al., 2010).

In a study representative for the Federal Republic of Germany, SCHMIDT and TIPPLET (2009) investigated on the education of elderly persons and intergenerational learning. They implemented a survey representative for 45-80 year old German population including 4909 personal computer-based interviews.

The methodological approach applied in the present thesis proved to be true for the two case study regions, as in semi-structured single and group interviews a trustful atmosphere developed, enabling a situation where the interviewees could inquire and the interviewees' most important aspects, the personal wants and fears as well as the own social reality stand in the foreground (LAMNEK, 2010). In this respect the new inductive insights could be seen as an advantage.

### **5.1.2 Interviewee characteristics**

The present thesis was not implemented without limitations. The limited number of 30 elderly women and 40 teenagers was recruited through snowball sampling, consequently not randomly selected, in some cases potentially leading to a biased sample of self-selection including (primarily not intended purposeful selection of younger women, see below).

Further, finding respondents in the Carinthian case study area in general and elderly woman in particular was very challenging :

About one fourth of the respondents of elderly woman (four of 14) were aged between 40 and 50 (instead of 65 years and older) explaining their perception about the older generations towards the respective topics (chapter 3.3.). Respectively this data might differ from the actual Elderly Women´ attitudes. Thirteen Carinthian interview partners resided in municipalities close but outside the reserves´ area, including two informant of the Elderly Women (14 total) and eleven Youth respondents out of which nine were pupils of the “Biosphärenpark-Schule” (19 total). The fact of living outside the reserves´ area questions the interviewees´ state of information, previous participation as well as their place-attachment. All interviewees of both generations expect one Youth interviewee had heard about the reserve before but only the pupils had participated (excursion of “Biosphärenpark-Schule”).

## **5.2 Discussion of results in comparison to the participatory process in the biosphere reserve Großes Walsertal**

In this section I compare the the participatory process of the biosphere reserve Salzburger Lungau and Kärntner Nockberge with another Austrian biosphere reserve, Großes Walsertal (GW). In the study of JUNGMEIER et al. (2009), based on 21 interviews, however not specifically targeted at Youth and Elderly Women, it was found out that the population received the reserves´ implementation positively. My age-specific interviews also showed a rather positive attitude to the BR despite some concerns (e.g. lack of jobs (SB) and subsidies (CA), land owner conflicts (CA)).

While the populations in GW felt that it was their own decision individual Youth interviewees claimed people “up there” having the say (SB) and not to be

approached and listened (CA) as well as their older counterpart seeing the BR-management (SB) and the federal politicians (CA) “standing above” the population. Nevertheless co-deciding was noticed as motive for both generations in the two case study areas of the respective thesis, e.g. the acceptance of ideas (CA Youth) and bottom up reformation (SB), the same going for the GW reserve.

In the GW reserve, the awareness of “standing in a common boat” and the need for working with a collective brand were missing. In the same line was a statement of a SB Elderly Woman Elderly Women talking about a “Bermuda-triangle where different ships move without a common direction”. The BR-reserves’ incorporation of the tourism marketing, negatively considered in Großes Walsertal, can be related to the perception of the BR-management in SB relabeling existing institutions or activities as BR-created (SB Elderly Women).

Active co-deciding did not exist in the GW protected area implementation. The participatory process mainly focused on the level of information and consultation (numbers of participating persons are not known). Regarding the Youth the school class (CA) and one Salzburg interviewee had participated in a project before; regarding Elderly Women eight took part in an event (2x SB, 6x CA). The communication means, ranging from BR-information folder, regional newspaper to events, are similar in both reserves, both interview groups further appreciated being invited personally (cf. Ravindra, (2004))

Regarding the size of the reserve Großes Walsertal, it is negatively impacting the efforts of mobilizing participants, a fact that also needs to be regarded in the SB and CA reserve, further challenged by the reserves being led by two administrations.

### **5.3 Comparison of results with underlying literature and analytical framework**

The two generations in both case study areas associated the BR with nature conservation, cultural landscapes or agriculture a mayor part of informants with sustainability Elderly Women as well as economy and regional development; only the young interviewees in both case study areas related the protected area to forestry.

The major part of the results of the present thesis is in line with the studies of the analytical frameworks of participation (GAGIL and others, 1993, BERKES and FOLKE, 1998, BERKE and others, 2003 cited in PICKERING SHERMAN, 2010; ARBTER, 2008 cited in HUBER; TIPPETT et al., 2007; ENENGEL et al., 2010;

GREENWOOD et al., 1993; OKALI et al., 1994; MACNAUGHTEN and JACOBS, 1997; WALLERSTEIN, 1999; REED, 2008; THOMAS and MEDDLETON, 2003; RAVINDRA, 2004; DAVIS et al. 2012; BUFFEL et al., 2003; LARSON and LACH, 2008; HUBER, 2011; BALAND and PLATTEAU, 1996; SCHEFFER and others, 2002; MANNETTI, 2004; WEISS, 1998; SCHENK, 2000; LUPOU, 2010; 2011; MARTINEZ and MCMULLIN, 2004; MOSLER and TOBIAS, 2000; ENENGEL, 2009; KRUKER, 1984; IANNI et al., 2009) as well as with Intergenerational Learning (SCHMIDT and TIPPLET, 2009; BUFFEL, 2013; FRANZ, 2010; PIERI and DIAMANTINIR, 2010; FRANZ and SCHEUNPFLUG, 2009; ROSENMAYER and BÖHMER, 2003; ARMITAGE et al., 2007).

Some motives of participation identified in literature were not at all raised during the interviews:

- Building connections to social networks (HUBER, 2011; SCHEFFER and others, 2002).; REED, 2008; ENENGEL et al., 2010) Elderly Women
- Familiarity with and trust in public authorities (KRUKER, 1984; HUBER, 2011) Elderly Women
- Sufficient level of knowledge and comprehensive media (HUBER, 2011; SCHEFFER and others, 2002 Elderly Women

Some obstacles mentioned in literature were not important for interviewees:

- Unsuitability of the governance model and the reluctant or incomplete government support (RAVINDRA, 2004; ENENGEL et al., 2010)
- Lack of finance (HUBER, 2011; RAVINDRA, 2004; ENENGEL et al., 2010; ENENGEL et al., 2009) Elderly WomenElderly WomenElderly Women
- Lack of material, technical and infrastructural resources (ENENGEL et al. 2009; ENENGEL et al. 2010) Elderly Women

Elderly WomenIn literature there exist some motives and obstacles of Intergenerational Learning which were not which were not of importance forinterviewees of the present thesis:

- Contributions of one´s competencies into educational institutions (BUFFEL et al. (2013))

- Learning of experiences from persons of same age-group (ROSENMAYER and BÖHMER (2003))
- Little positive experience of learning something new (SCHMIDT and TIPPLET, (2009)).

## 5.4 New insights from the interviews

The results introduced new aspects, which were not regarded in literature before. With regard to future research it is recommended to explore the impact of these additional factors of participation and Intergenerational Learning:

### 5.4.1 Participation

There exists several motives of participation which were not regarded in literature before. These open up new research aspects:

The importance of appealing topics serving one's own interest was mentioned by the young and the older generation in both case study areas e.g. the Youth being interested in the marketing of organic food (CA) and nature and hiking in the region (SB) and the Elderly Women in up-to-date topics (CA) as well as culture and health (SB).

The Youth wishes the possibility of meeting friends (CA + SB), being taken along to BR-events by someone knowing about the BR or the respective topic (SB) and their representation by a political youth party (CA). The Elderly Women appreciate the sense of belonging ("Zugehörigkeitsgefühl") (SA) and their opening for new things (CA).

The obstacles of participation, previously not investigated by other researchers, comprise the Elderly Women age-related disability of contributing something (SB) and the age-related absent will for participation (CA) their lack of time due to their occupation, responsibilities and the surplus of events as well as their frustration about the reserve e.g. about the lack of employment (SB + CA), permissions for forest roads (CA) and the BR reserves' focus on tourism and business (CA). Further obstacles hindering participation of the Carinthian Elderly Women are the lack of comfort, their disinterest, comprehension problems of formal German and technical language as well as their closeness and peculiarity ("Eigenheit"), isolation from the



society, uncertainty, fear of new things and lack of self-dependence and self-confidence for socialization; The Salzburg Elderly Women fear the reserves' uptake of old traditions instead of follow-up of new ideas, the uniform labeling and mislabeling of existing organizations or activities as BR-created. Furthermore they mentioned the BRs' aimlessness and lack of concreteness, exemplified by a "Bermuda-triangle where different ships move without a common direction".

The Youth' issues challenging participation are the feeling of not being addressed and respected, in detail the non-acceptance of their ideas (CA) and the need to work hard for respect (SB). The Carinthian Youth further mentioned the lacks the identification with the region, while the Salzburg Youth states the limited capacity of taking up new information as they already learn a lot in school.

#### **5.4.2 Intergenerational Learning**

Several motives for Intergenerational Learning were identified, which were not regarded in literature before. These open up new research aspects:

The Carinthian Elderly Women regard the positive perception of the younger generation as a motive for participation, while the obstacles of Intergenerational Learning, previously not investigated by other researchers, comprise the following:

Both generations in the two case studies regard the generations' divide enforced through prejudice and stereotype as a factor challenging participation, while bias is expressed towards the other generation as well as enforced by the assumption that the other generation is biased regarding the own generation. For example, the Elderly Women express frustration about the younger generation instantly grabbing for laptops instead of spending time in nature, being focused on money, intergenerational dialogs being short or do not even happen and the Youth not being interested in the knowledge of the other generation; however the older generation also states their disinterest in the Youth knowledge. The generation conflict between the younger and older generations was mentioned as a reason to rather stay apart. The Youth regrets that the older generation does not keep up with new trends e.g. the Youth technical knowledge, their stronger focus on work, their consideration of the youth as planless and their mistrust in them. The younger generations' disinterest in knowledge of the older generation, e.g. tradition and culture, was explained by a Carinthian Youth interviewee.

The Elderly Women in both case study areas agree on their reservation, wariness and closeness as well as on the lack of meeting spaces as reasons hindering participation. Further topics comprise comprehension problems (due to the youth using different vocabulary), the difficulty of transferring traditional medical knowledge legally e.g. herbology, no feeling of responsibility for Youth interests and their wish for autonomy, wanting to explore things without the help of the other generation.

In the Carinthian case study area the Youth described a lack of openness of the older generation, which was confirmed by the Elderly Women e.g. lacking the acceptance of new approaches. They also lack confidence e.g. not daring to address the younger generation, which was reinforced by a youth interviewee explaining the older generations' fear to disgrace oneself. Furthermore, they agree that listening and mutual respect being a basic requirement for intergenerational activities.

## **5.5 Recommendations for the Biosphere Reserve managements**

The recommendations for the BR-managements are derived from the principal results regarding motives and obstacles of participation and Intergenerational Learning as well as the ideal format of participatory activities (cf. chapters 4.3.-4.4.).

Measures related to participation refers to the (location, type, planning, timing of br events

- Concretion of information about BR- concept and objectives related to the developments in the region (including learning activities and leisure, as well as potential for economic benefits) as well as clarification of topics leading to frustration e.g. stakeholder conflicts and the lack of new employment. Involving the local youth and the elderly women in preparing information might help to ensure their appeal to both groups.
- Planning of participatory events and activities (inter alia 4.3.4.1.) considering:
  - The promotion of co-decision and avoidance of hierarchical structures e.g. respecting and addressing the Youth

- Age-specific invitation e.g. Youth by internet, Elderly Women personally
- Tie in with existing appreciated events e.g. Youth appreciate “Kirtag”, Elderly Women events related to the church
- Procedure of event e.g. diversified manner, positive learning experience and casual, funny atmosphere (Youth), concrete display of issue, being listened and anonymity (Elderly Women)
- Distance of event
  - taking into account Elderly Women lack of mobility (e.g. not all woman having a driving license)
  - e.g. taking place in locations close to their homes(especially in winter), “taxi service” (Elderly Women) and locations serviced by public transport (Youth)
- Timing
  - the Youth and Elderly Women prefer summer or autumn, whereby good weather is a precondition (especially for Elderly Women)
  - at the end of the week or weekend (Elderly Women) and Saturdays (Youth), during the day (Elderly Women) and at afternoons or evenings (Youth)
- Address of personal interests e.g. health, organic farming, up-to-date topics, culture
- Prevention of tediousness
- Involving the local youth and the elderly women in organizing events and activities might help to ensure their appeal to both groups
- Provision of benefits in general, e.g. winnings (Youth), meeting new people (Elderly Women)

Supportive measures regarding Intergenerational Learning are related to the provision of social and physical meeting places e.g. huts (Youth) and outdoor activities (Elderly Women), which might trigger Intergenerational reunions, hopefully leading to a decrease of the generations divide enforced by prejudice and stereotypes (4.4.1.3.1.).

Both generations appreciate the knowledge and competencies of the other generations, particularly cultural skills. The Youth likes to offer their ability in technology and sport to the older generation, who proposed to learn the before mentioned themes from their younger counterpart; they further value the older generations' the experiences of life. The other way around, elderly woman would like to hand their capabilities of nature conservation, cultural landscapes and agriculture to teenagers, who also are keen on learning them; moreover the older generation needs the younger generation "in all matter". The appreciation of this mutual exchange could help to overcome age-related non-participation (obstacle of participation), which is most obvious in the Elderly Women' lacking will or capacity of contributing something. The appreciation of the mutual knowledge and skills exchange, especially in the field of nature conservation, cultural landscapes and agriculture, goes on line with the biosphere reserves' core tasks. Consequently, the topics can be seen as connecting element of Intergenerational Learning and BR-goals.

## 6 Conclusion

In the biosphere reserve Salzburger Lungau and Kärnter Nockberge the local population has been integrated into the planning of the protected area since several years. In both, the Salzburg as well as in the Carinthian region, it is especially challenging to reach and mobilize the Youth and Elderly Women for taking part in the participatory processes. However, both groups are of particular significance because they can learn from each other (“Intergenerational Learning”).

Both age-groups, comprising 70 interview partners, were interviewed by a mixed method approach in including single and group interviews and World Café; in addition four interviews with the reserves’ managers and process facilitators took place.

Proper information being a precondition for successful participation, first the communication of the BR-management and the stakeholders’ state of information were considered. In the second step, the stakeholders’ view on obstacles challenging participation and motives as well as formats of events or activities promoting participation were examined. In the third stage, the BR-managers’ as well as the stakeholders’ perspectives about Intergenerational Learning (IL) were explored, particularly regarding the exchange of knowledge and skills between the younger and the older generation, the obstacles challenging IL and motives as well as formats of events or activities promoting IL.

The present thesis aimed at contributing to literature by the following research questions:

- RQ-1: How did the participatory process look like and which age groups had been present?
- RQ-2: How do the biosphere reserve managers communicate with the stakeholder and in which way (face-to-face-communication vs. media) are they informed about the participatory process?
- RQ-3: Which motives promote and which obstacles challenge (e.g. time related issues, mobility, subjective impression of being welcome or being actually able to contribute) actual participation of potential participants?

- RQ-4: What potential does intergenerational learning (IL) have on the biosphere reserves' development? (Potential of IL on biosphere reserves' development)

All research questions could be answered, also including new inductive insight:

The first research question showed that the Carinthian participatory process which could build on the former National Park process was on the one hand characterized by conflicts between single land owners, on the one hand and public authorities and the reserve management pushed the BR. In contrast, the Salzburg process was described by a bottom up approach, driven by a local non-governmental initiative (CA-PF) (Cf. 4.3.1. direct selection of certain interview partners). In both parts of the BR, the older and the younger generation could hardly be mobilized for direct participation in BR-events.

The second research question displayed that the communication of the two biosphere reserves' managements was characterized by medial and face-to-face interaction, while the Salzburg administration puts more effort on consultation and co-decision making (Cf. 4.3.1. direct selection of certain interview partners). The 40 Youth and the 30 Elderly Women were asked by single and group interviews. Except one Youth interviewee (CA) all other young interview partners had heard about the biosphere reserve before. In contrast, about three-fourth of the 30 older interviewees did know about it. All respondents associated the BR with nature conservation, cultural landscapes or agriculture a mayor part of informants with sustainability (all except Elderly Women in CA) as well as economy and regional development (all except Salzburg Youth); only the young interviewees in both areas related the protected area to forestry.

Regarding the third research question it became obvious that participation experience strongly differs in the interview groups, with three of 37 respondents in the Salzburg (Youth: *one* of 21; Elderly Women: *two* of 16) and 24 of 33 informants (Youth: *16* (school class) of 19; Elderly Women: *six* of 14) in Carinthian sub-area of the biosphere reserve (Cf. 4.3.1. direct selection of certain interview partners). Motives for participation proposed by all groups are benefits, co-decision making and

the interest in a certain issue. Furthermore learning and being educated is a mayor incentive in the Carinthian region, while the Youth in both case study regions valued their enjoyment and meeting friends at such events.

The obstacles challenging participation shared by all four groups were related to missing or non-concrete information, the perception of power inequality, hierarchy as well as tediousness e.g. of projects and the lack of time. In the Carinthian sub-area missing trust and the lack of benefits and incentives was expressed, while the Youth in both case study areas felt frustration about not being addressed, missing respect, adversarial social relationships, however they also mentioned their disinterest and desensibility for the BR. Elderly Women are lacking mobility, benefits and incentives and are prevented from participation by their time-consuming occupation and responsibilities, as also by their doubts about the BR.

The results of the fourth research question showed that the managers in both parts of the protected area were not familiar with the concept of Intergenerational Learning. After its clarification, the Salzburg manager identified intergenerational activities in their field of nature conservation, cultural landscapes and agriculture, while the Carinthian leadership pointed to the regions´ ongoing cultural exchange between the generations, seeing the BRs´ task in supporting but not developing of such intergenerational activities.

Regarding the potential of Intergenerational Learning for the younger and older generation, both groups appreciate exchanging cultural knowledge and skills in both regions. Further the Youth likes to offer their ability in technology and sport to the older generation, who proposed to learn the before mentioned themes from their younger counterparts. The other way around elderly woman would like to hand their capabilities of nature conservation, cultural landscapes and agriculture to teenagers, who also are keen on learning them.

Motives for Intergenerational Learning suggested by both generations in both areas are joint events or public meeting places and the appreciation of competencies of the other generation. In contrast they regard the generation divide as well as prejudice, stereotypes and ageism as obstacles of intergenerational interactions. Regarding collective challenges for the generations, the Youth lacks interest in the other generation, while the Elderly Women are dared by the Youth´ reservation, wariness

and closeness and see a lack of meeting spaces. In the Carinthian region, respondents of both generations lack interest, openness, self-confidence benefits and incentives and miss respect for each other.



## 7 References

ARMITAGE, D. (2007): *Adaptive co-management and the paradox of learning*. In: *Global Environmental Change* 18 (2008): P. 86-98.

ARNSTEIN, S.-R. (1969): *A ladder of citizen participation*. In: *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35 (4) (1969): P. 216-224.

BALAND, J. M. and PLATTEAU, J.P. (1996): *Halting degradation of natural resources: is there a role for rural communities?* Available at 2016.03.23: [https://dlc.dlib.indiana.edu/dlc/bitstream/handle/10535/21/Halting\\_degradation\\_of\\_natural\\_resources.pdf?sequence=1](https://dlc.dlib.indiana.edu/dlc/bitstream/handle/10535/21/Halting_degradation_of_natural_resources.pdf?sequence=1)

BROWN, J. and ISAACS, D. (2007): *Das World Cafe: Kreative Zukunftsgestaltung in Organisationen und Gesellschaft*. Carl-Auer Verlag, Heidelberg.

BUCHECKER, M., HUNZIKER, M. and KIENAST, F. (2003): *Participatory landscape development: overcoming social barriers to public involvement*. In: *Landscape and Urban Planning*, Volume 64, Issues 1–2, (2003): P. 29–46.

BUCHY, M., and HOVERMAN, S. (2000): *Understanding public participation in forest planning: A review*. In: *Forest Policy and Economics*, Volume 1, Issue 1, (2000): P. 15–25.

BUFFEL, T., DE BACKER, F., PEETERS, J., ROMERO REINA, V., KINDEKENS, A., DE DONDER, L., and LOMBAERTS, K. (2014): *Promoting Sustainable Communities Through Intergenerational Practice*. In: *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116 ( 2014 ): P. 1785 – 1791.

BUNDESZENTRALE FÜR POLITISCHE BILDUNG, (2011): *Jugend/ Jugendliche*. Available at [2015.03.13: http://www.bpb.de/nachschlagen/lexika/politiklexikon/17676/jugend-jugendliche](http://www.bpb.de/nachschlagen/lexika/politiklexikon/17676/jugend-jugendliche).

CHESS, C. and PURCELL, K. (1999): *Public participation and the environment – do we know what works*. In: Environmental Science and Technology 33 (16), (1999): P. 2685–2692.

CIPRA 1999/17, Zukunftsperspektiven und Generationendialog. Jung sein – alt werden im Alpenraum. Tagungsband zur CIPRA-Jahresfachtagung, 28. bis 30. Oktober 1999, Benediktbeuern, Deutschland. CIPRA 1999.

CORNWALL, A. (2008): *Unpacking 'Participation': Models, meanings and practices*. In: Community Development Journal, 43 (3), (2008): P.269–283.

DALE, V. H., BROWN, S., HAEUBER, R. A., HOBBS, N. T., HUNTLY, N., NAIMAN, R. J., RIEBSAME, W. E, TURNER, M. G. and VALONE, T. J. (2000): *Ecological principles and guidelines for managing the use of land*. In: Ecological Applications 10, (2000): P. 639–670.

DAVIS, S., CROTHERS, N., GRANT, J., YOUNG, S., and SMITH, K. (2012): *Being involved in the country: Productive ageing in different types of rural communities*. In: Journal of Rural Studies, Nr. 0, [Volume 28, Issue 4](#), (2012): P. 338–346.

DEUTSCHER BUNDESTAG (2008): *Senioren und Seniorinnen in Deutschland*. Available at 2015.05.04: <http://www.bmfsfj.de/RedaktionBMFSFJ/Abteilung3/Pdf-Anlagen/bt-drucksache-senioren-in-deutschland.property=pdf,bereich=bmfsfj,sprache=de,rwb=true>.

E.C.O. INSTITUT FÜR ÖKOLOGIE, (2013): *Establishing a complete Biosphere Reserve Integrated Monitoring scheme for the transboundary Biosphere Reserve Salzburger Lungau & Kärntner Nockberge*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Klagenfurt, (2013): P. 1-10

ENENGEL, B., (2009). *Partizipative Landschaftssteuerung, Kosten-Nutzen-Risiken-Relationen aus Sicht der Beteiligten*. Dissertation. Universität für Bodenkultur, Wien, (2009): P. 323

ENENGEL, B., PENKER, M., MUHAR, A., and RACHAEL, W. (2010): *Benefits, efforts and risks of participants in landscape co-management: An analytical*

*framework and results from two case studies in Austria.* In: Journal of Environmental Management 92 (2011): P. 1256 - 1267.

FANNINGER, J., (2012): *The Path towards Setting up the UNESCO Biosphere Reserve Salzburger Lungau & Kärntner Nockberge.* Eco.mont 4 (2). Available at 2016.02.14: <http://epub.oeaw.ac.at/eco.mont>.

FRANZ, J., (2010): *Intergenerationelles Lernen als Herausforderung für NGOs.* In: Gruppendynamische Organisationsberatung (2010) 41: P. 207–218.

FRANZ, J. and SCHEUNPFLUG, A. (2009): *Zwischen Seniorität und Alterität. Eine empirische Rekonstruktion intergenerationellen Lernens.* In: Zeitung für Erziehungswissenschaft (2009) 12: P.437–455.

GREENWOOD, D.J., WHYTE, W.F., and HARKAVY, I., (1993): *Participatory action research as a process and as a goal.* In: Human Relations 46 (1993): P. 175–192.

HATTON-YEO, A., (2014): *Perspectives on Intergenerational Practice.* In: Intergenerational Learning and Innovation for Sustainable Development. Proceedings of the Final Conference of the Project “Big Foot: Crossing Generations, Crossing Mountains”, edited by Tamara Mitrofanenko. Vienna, Austria: UNEP Vienna - SCC.

HECKATHORN, D.D. (1997): *Respondent-driven sampling: A New Approach to the Study of Hidden Populations.* In: Social Problems 44(2), (1997): P. 174-199.

HECKATHORN, D.D. (2011): *Comment: Snowball versus Respondent-Driven Sampling.* In: Sociological Methodology 41 (1), (2011): P. 355–66.  
doi:10.1111/j.1467-9531.2011.01244.x.

HUBER, M. (2011): *Akzeptanz und Partizipation der Bevölkerung im geplanten Biosphärenpark Lungau.* Diplomarbeit, Universität für Bodenkultur, Wien, 2011: P. 141

HUBER, M., JUNGMEIER, M., LANGE, S. and CHAUDHARY, S., (2013): *Knowledge, Parks and Cultures. Transcultural exchange of knowledge in protected areas: Case studies from Austria and Nepal.* Series : Proceedings in the

Management of Protected Areas, Vol.5 (2013), Johannes Heyn Verlag, ISBN : 978-3-7084-0497-4, Klagenfurt

IANNI, E., MATTENET, M., GENELETTI, D., and MALIZIA, M.R. (2009): Community-based forest management in the Yungas biosphere reserve, Northern Argentina. In: Environment Development and Sustainability (2010) 12: P.631-646.

JUNGMEIER, M., PAUL-HORN, I., ZOLLNER, D., BOR, F., LANGE, S., REUTZ-HORNSTEINER, B., GRASENICK, K., ROSSMANN, D., MOSER, R., & DIRY, CH. (2009): *Part\_b: Partizipationsprozesse in Biosphärenparks – Interventionstheorie, Strategieanalyse und Prozessethik am Beispiel vom Biosphärenpark Wienerwald, Großes Walsertal und Nationalpark Nockberge - Band II: Spezielle Ergebnisse und Dokumentation*. Studie im Auftrag von: Österreichisches MAB Nationalkomitee, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Klagenfurt, (2009): P. 140

KASEMIR, B., JAGER, J., JAEGER, C., and GARDNER, M. T. (2003): *Public participation in sustainability science*. Available at 2015.09.14.: <http://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/samples/cam034/2003273139.pdf>

KÖSTL, T. & JUNGMEIER, M. (2012): *BRIM Nockberge - Biosphere Reserve Kärntner Nockberge - Conception and implementation of an Integrated Monitoring System*, Auftraggeber: MAB-Programm an der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Bearbeitung: E.C.O. Institut für Ökologie (2012): P. 85

KRUKER, R., (1984). *Jugend im Berggebiet. Berufliche, soziale, kulturelle und räumliche Orientierung*. Verlag Rüegger, CH-8253 Diessenhofen, ISBN 3 7253 0221 9, (1984): p. 187ff., p.430ff., p.318ff.

KUCKARTZ, U. (2014). *Mixed Methods. Methodologie, Forschungsdesign und Analyseverfahren*. Verlag Springer VS Wiesbaden, ISBN 978-3-531-93267-5.

LAMNEK, S. (2010). *Qualitative Sozialforschung*. Verlag Beltz, Weinheim, Basel, 5. überarbeitete Auflage, ISBN 978-3-621-27770-9, (2010): P.302

LARSON, K.L. and LACH, D. (2008): *Participants and non-participants of place based groups: An assessment of attitudes and implications for public participation in*

*water resource management*. In: *Journal of Environmental Management*, 88 (2008): P. 817-830.

LUPOU, R. (2010). *A new lifelong learning model based on intergenerational exchange: Premises and foreseen benefits*. In: *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 2 (2010): P. 2761–2765.

LYNAM, T., DE JONG, W., SHEIL, D., KUSUMANTO, T., and EVANS, K. (2007): *A review of tools for incorporating community knowledge, preferences and values into decision-making in natural resources management*. In: *Ecology & Society* 12(1), 5, available at 2014.08.12.: <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol12/iss1/art5/>.

MICHENER, V., (1998): *The participatory approach: contradiction and co-option in Burkina Faso*. In: *World Development* 26 (12) (1998): 2105–2118.

MacNAUGHTEN, P. and JACOBS, M. (1997): *Public identification with sustainable development - investigating cultural barriers to participation*. In: *Global Environmental Change: Human and Policy Dimensions* 7 (1997): pp. 5–24.

MANNETTI, L., PIERRO, A. and LIVI, S. (2004): *Recycling: Planned and self-expressive behavior*. In: *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 24 (2), (2004): P. 227-236.

MARTINEZ, T.A. and MCMULLIN, S.L. (2004): *Factors affecting decisions to volunteer in non-governmental organizations*. In: *Environment and Behavior*, 36 (2004): P.112-126.

MORGAN, D.L. (1997). *The Focus Group Guidebook, Focus Group Kit 1*. Sage Publications, London (1997): P.120

MOSLER, H.J., and TOBIAS, R. (2000): *Die Organisation kollektiver Aktionen durch Beeinflussung der individuellen Teilnahmeentscheidung: Eine Simulationsstudie*. In: *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 52 (2) (2000): P.264-290.

OAKLEY P. et al. (1991): *Projects with People: The Practice of Participation in Rural Development*. In: [The Journal of Agricultural Science](#) 117 (03) (1991): pp 385-385

- OKALI, C., SUMBERG, J., and FARRINGTON, J., (1994): *Farmer Participatory Research*. In: Overseas Development Institute available through Intermediate Technology Publications, London 51 (3) (1996): P. 364–367
- OLSSON, P., and FOLKE, C. (2004): *Adaptive Co-management for Building Resilience in Social–Ecological Systems*. In: Environmental Management 34 (1) (2004): pp. 75-90.
- PAIN, R. (2005): *Intergenerational Relations and Practice in the Development of Sustainable Communities*. Durham University, Intergenerational Centre for Regional Regeneration and Development Studies. Available at 2015.09.13: <http://www.centreforip.org.uk/res/documents/publication/ODPM%20intergenerational%20report.pdf>.
- PFEFFERKORN, W. (2006): *Vielfalt statt Zwiespalt. Begleitfaden zum Mitgestalten von Lebensräumen - ein Beitrag zur Umsetzung der Biodiversitätskonvention*. Berlin, Logos-Verlag.
- PICKERING SHERMAN, K. (2010): *Practical Environmentalism on the Pine Ridge Reservation: Confronting Structural Constraints to Indigenous Stewardship*. In: Human Ecology 38 (4) (2010); pp 507-520.
- PICKL, J. (2014): Mündliche Auskunft 2014.02.05.
- PIERI, M. & DIAMANTINIR, D. (2010): *Young people, elderly and ICT*. In: Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences 2 (2010): P. 2422–2426.
- PRETTY, J. N. (1995): *Participatory learning for sustainable agriculture*. In: World Development 23(8) (1995): P. 1247-1263.
- RAVINDRA, M. (2004): *A Road to Tomorrow: Local organizing for a biosphere reserve*. In: Environments a journal of interdisciplinary studies 32(3) (2004): P. 43-59.
- REED, M.S. (2008): *Stakeholder Participation for Environmental Management: A Literature Review*. In: Biological Conservation 141 (10) (2008): P. 2417–2431

- REED, M.G., and EGUNYU, F. (2013): *Management effectiveness in UNESCO biosphere reserves: Learning from Canadian periodic reviews*. In: *Environmental Science & Policy* 25 (2013): P.107-117.
- ROSENMAYER L. and BÖHMNER, F. (2003): *Hoffnung Alter*. Facultas Verlags- und Buchhandels, Wien, ISBN 3-85114-708-1, P. 168.
- ROWE, G., and FREWER, L., (2000): *Public participation methods: a framework for evaluation in science*. In: *Technology and Human Values* 25 (2000): P. 3–29.
- SCHAUPPENLEHNER-KLOYBER, E. & PENKER, M. (2014): *Biosphere Reserve Integrated Monitoring Salzburger Lungau & Kärntner Nockberge. Yearly Indicator Screenshot: Partizipation und Diversität. Endbericht*. In: Universität für Bodenkultur, Wien, P. 47.
- SCHEFFER, M., WESTLEY, F., BROCK, W.A. and HOLMGREN, M. (2002): *Dynamic interactions of societies and ecosystems: linking theories from ecology, economy, and sociology*. In: *Panarchy: Understanding transformations in human and natural systems* (2002): p. 195 – 239.
- SCHENK, A. (2000): *Relevante Faktoren der Akzeptanz von Natur- und Landschaftsschutzmassnahmen – Ergebnisse qualitativer Fallstudien*. Neue Folge, Heft 5 (2000). Publikation der Ostschweizerischen Geographischen Gesellschaft.
- SCHLIEP, R. & STOLL-KLEEMANN, S. (2009): *Assessing governance of biosphere reserves in Central Europe*. In: *Land Use Policy* 27 (2010): P. 917–927.
- SCHMIDT, B. & TIPPLET, R. (2009): *Bildung Älterer und intergeneratives Lernen*. In: *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik* 55 (1) (2009): P. 73-90.
- SCHMITT, M. (2014): *Gender Awareness in European Alpine Protected-Area Management: Achievements, Shortcomings, and the Way Forward*. In: *Mountain Research and Development* 34 (3) (2014): P. 291–96.
- SCHUSLER, T.M., DECKER, D.J. and PFEFFER, M.J. (2003): *Social Learning for Collaborative Natural Resource Management*. In: *Society and Natural Resources*, 15 (2003): P. 309–326.

SPRINGATE, I., ATKISON, M., and KERRY M., (2008): *Intergenerational Practice: A Review of the Literature*. LGA Research Report F/SR262. Slough, Berkshire, England: National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER). Available at 2016.01.20: <http://www.nfer.ac.uk/publications/LIG01/LIG01.pdf>.

TACCONI, L. (1997): *An Ecological Economic Approach to Forest and Biodiversity Conservation: The Case of Vanuatu*. In: *World Development* 25 (12) (1997): pp. 1995-2008.

THOMAS, L. and MEDDLETON, J. (2003): IUCN Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK. ix + 79pp. Available at 2014.10.13: <https://portals.iucn.org/library/efiles/documents/PAG-010.pdf>

TIPPET, J., HANDLEY, J.F., and RAVETZ, J., (2007): *Meeting the challenges of sustainable development – A conceptual appraisal of a new methodology for participatory ecological planning*. In: *Progress in Planning* 67 (2007): P. 9–98.

UNESCO (1996): *Biosphere Reserves: The Seville Strategy and the Statutory Framework for the World Network*. UNESCO Paris, available at 2016.03.12: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0010/001038/103849eb.pdf>.

van NOORDWIJK, M., TOMICH, T. P., and VERBIST, B. (2001): *Negotiation support models for integrated natural resource management in tropical forest margins*. *Conservation Ecology* 5 (2001): P.2–21.

WALLERSTEIN, N. (1999): *Power between the evaluator and the community: research relationships within New Mexico's healthier communities*. In: *Social Science & Medicine* 49 (1999): pp. 39–53.

WEISS, D. (1998): *Partizipative Verfahren in der dörflichen Entwicklung - erarbeitet an einem Verfahren der Agrarstrukturellen Vorplanung*, Shaker Verlag, Aachen.

YIN, R.K. (2009): *Case study research, Design and Methods*. Fourth edition, Thousand Oaks, SAGE Publications, London.

ZACHRISSON, A. (2004): *Co-managment of Natural Resources. Paradigm Shifts, Key Concepts and Cases*. Verlag Mountain Mistra 2004, FjällMistra, P.30.