

What if evaluation takes place seated around the table whilst enjoying a drink?

Joana Zozimo, Lancaster University
Centre for Higher Education, Research and Evaluation
Researching Equity, Access and Participation (REAP)

Institute of Education, UCL
10th May 2017

Structure of the presentation

1. Unpack the title
2. Background
3. Overview of the research
4. Why social practice theory
5. Why social practice theory
6. Typology of participant's engagement in evaluation
7. Conclusions

Dare to enjoy evaluation!

Yah! So who else is excited about this program!



Dare to enjoy evaluation!

Ownership



Meaning



Enjoyment

“What if evaluation takes place seated around the table with a glass of wine?” (Jesse)

- Who are the players?
 - What do they do?
- Where do they do it?
- How do they do it?

Literature says that....

- Today evaluation theory and practice **“interact insufficiently”** (Chelimsky, 2013, p.91).
- There are **conflicting relationships** between stakeholders in evaluation (Abma, 2000)
- Evaluation practice has to respond to **stakeholders’ concerns** (Stake, 2004)
- Practitioners and line managers have **sufficient knowledge to meet funders’ requests of evaluation** (Garcia-Iriarte et al., 2011)

Background

- **Practitioner's** experience in 4 countries
- This paper one part of a **larger qualitative research study** (Zozimo, 2016)

Policy context

- **Development Education** is a discipline in the interdependent and globalised world, aiming to raise awareness and understanding of how global issues affect the everyday lives of individuals' communities and how each one of us can and do influence the global (DARE Forum, 2004).
- Coalition Government's decision to review the development education policy on funding, which initiated a cycle of change (O'Brien, 2011).

Main Study

Research



Evaluation Practice



Development Education

OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

1. Research Focus

Evaluation Practice → NPO, DE research context

How DE organisations evaluate their social interventions?

Qualitative, inductive in-depth case study,
Social Practice theoretical lenses
(Reckwitz, 2002; Saunders et al, 2011)

2. Method

Longitudinal in-depth single case study
(Simons, 2009)

Participants: 12 diff stakeholders, diff external bodies (coordinators; practitioners and funders)

Data ethnographically collected in two stages. 16 interviews; 126 hr observational sessions and 14 documents thematically analysed using Atlas ti. from a dynamics of SP framework (Shove et al., 2012)

3. Main Findings

- Participation
 - I. Disconnect of project's design and evaluation
 - II. Towards a forced participation in evaluation**
 - III. Four novel boundaries of participation
- Power relationships
 - I. Competence in a DE working environment
 - II. Influence of power in the perception of evaluation
 - III. Consequences of PR in a DE context
- Co-occurrence of practices (eval practice and other WA)
 - I. Evaluation practice is a collective endeavour
 - II. Episodes of coop of eval practice and WA

Why social practice theory?

1) People

2) Routines (Reckwitz, 2002)

3) Practitioners as carriers of practice

4) Unintentionality (Shove et al., 2012)

Multiple sources of data and evaluation stages covered

Designing*

- Staff interviews (SI)
- Coordinator interviews (CI)
- Funder interviews (FI)
- Documentary correspondence with funders (DCF)
- Informal conversations coordinator (ICC)
- Informal conversation staff (ICS)
- Informal conversation wider non-profit (ICNP)
- Documentary application forms (DAF)
- Researcher diary (RD)

Planning*

- Staff interviews (SI)
- Coordinator interviews (CI)
- Funder interviews (FI)
- Documentary correspondence with funders (DCF)
- Documentary public media (DPM)
- Documentary funders' reports (DFR)
- Documentary M&E plan (DM&E)
- Informal conversations coordinator (ICC)
- Informal conversation staff (ICS)
- Informal conversation wider non-profit (ICNP)
- Researcher diary (RD)

Implementing

- Staff interviews (SI)
- Coordinator interviews (CI)
- Funder interviews (FI)
- Documentary correspondence funders (DCF)
- Field notes from participant observation (FNPO)
- Field notes from site visit (FNV)
- Field notes from non-participant observation (FNNPO)
- Documentary application forms (DAF)
- Documentary evaluation activities sheets (DEAS)
- Documentary outcomes evaluation matrix (DOEM)
- Researcher diary (RD)

Reporting

- Staff interviews (SI)
- Coordinator interviews (CI)
- Funder interviews (FI)
- Documentary correspondence with funders (DCF)
- Field notes from participant observation (FNPO)
- Field notes from site visit (FNV)
- Documentary project completion report (DPCR)
- Documentary external evaluation report (DEER)
- Researcher diary (RD)

*Data covering the design and planning stage was retrospectively collected during the implementation stage.

Typology of participant's engagement in evaluation

- Disengagement
- **Forcing**
- Resistance
- Coping
- Collaboration

Forcing (Evidence)

- *“We have only been evaluating as **it is forced upon us**”. (Glenn)*
- *“Evaluation is not a practice that anyone could do and certainly is an impossibility **to do all that evaluation entails, and to do it well**” (Jesse).*
- *“We only do it [evaluation] **to please the funders** “(Addison)*

Forcing (Research)

- 1) Forced engagement
- 2) Lack of ownership (Stake, 2004; McCluskey, 2011)
- 3) Disengaged move (Zozimo, 2016)

Forcing (Policy learning)

- 1) Participation of practitioners (Greene, 1988) across all stages of the project cycle is taken for granted.
- 2) Need for reflective space (Saunders et al., 2011)
- 3) Increased understanding of how the meaning of evaluation is attributed (Shove et al., 2012).

Dare to enjoy evaluation!

Ownership



Meaning



Enjoyment

Resistance (Evidence)

- *The project started in April, so I was in the deep end with the new funded project with some really heavy evaluation tools that funders wanted and I did not have that much experience in evaluation and monitoring. (Sam)*
- *So if the evaluation relates to performance in any way it won't do, it will not be reflective, people will tell you just what they think you want to know. (Jesse)*
- *While film and photos were very useful I am not sure how much the funders[pause] want to replace written reports for a film evaluation; so it is only in addition to, rather than, certainly not substituting. (Dale)*

Resistance (Research)

- Need for guidance was visible. Practitioners felt lost. They resist.
- Preoccupation with performance; reinforcing the need for alternative approaches to practice evaluation (Bourn, 2014).
- Evaluation as social practice depicted through daily based conversations.

Resistance (Policy learning)

- 1) Bi-directional resistance from funders towards practitioners
- 2) New interpretations of evidence when reporting evaluation such as arts-based methods

What the evaluation outputs would look like if a social practice approach is taken?

- A drama performance (Project Oracle)
- Young people's film (The Dukes, Lancaster)
- A film evaluation (Wolverhampton City Council)
- A poem (Simons, 2009)
- A reflective set of questions (Saunders, 2005)
- A conversation (McCloskey, 2011)
- A drink/ meal around the table (Zozimo, 2016)
- **What else? What you would add?**

This paper adds....

- **Seat more often around the table.** Today evaluation theory and practice “interact insufficiently” (Chelimsky, 2013, p.91).
- **Agree that we disagree.** There are conflicting relationships between stakeholders in evaluation (Abma, 2000)
- **Share everybody’s concerns around the table.** Evaluation practice has to respond to stakeholders’ concerns (Stake, 2004)
- **Learn from each other whilst enjoying a drink.** Practitioners and line managers had sufficient knowledge to meet funders’ requests of evaluation (Garcia-Iriarte et al., 2011)

Further reading

- **Zozimo, J. (2016). Exploring evaluation using social practice theory in development education: a longitudinal in-depth case study.** PhD, Lancaster University, 376 p.
- **Passey, D., & Zozimo, J. (2016). Developing mobile learning practices through teacher education: outcomes of the MLEARN pilot.** *Interactive Technology and Smart Education*, 13(1), 36-51. DOI: [10.1108/ITSE-01-2016-0002](https://doi.org/10.1108/ITSE-01-2016-0002)

Further reading

- **Passey, D., & Zozimo, J. (2015). Mobile learning and teacher training: researching MLEARN pilot development.** In I. A. Sanchez, & P. Isais (Eds.), 11th International Conference Mobile Learning 2015, Madeira, Portugal, 14-16 March: Proceedings. (pp. 62-69). IADIS.
- **Zozimo, J. (2013) Avaliação de Projectos de Educaçao para Desenvolvimento, E a ED avaliavel? E-FEC**

References

- Abma, T.A.** (2000) Stakeholder conflict: a case study. *Evaluation and Program Planning*. 23(2), 199–210.
- Bourn, D.** (2014) *The Theory and Practice of Global Learning*. Development Education Research Centre.
- Carman, J.G.** (2007) Evaluation Practice Among Community-Based Organizations: Research Into the Reality. *American Journal of Evaluation*. 28(1), 60–75.
- Chelimsky, E.** (2013) Balancing Evaluation Theory and Practice in the Real World. *American Journal of Evaluation*. 34(1), 91–98.
- García-Iriarte, E., Suarez-Balcazar, Y., Taylor-Ritzler, T., Luna, M.** (2011) A Catalyst-for-Change Approach to Evaluation Capacity Building. *American Journal of Evaluation*. 32(2), 168 –182.
- Greene, J.C.** (1999) The Inequality of Performance Measurements. *Evaluation*. 5(2), 160–172.
- Henry, G.T., Mark, M.M.** (2003a) Toward an agenda for research on evaluation. *New directions for evaluation*. 2003(97), 69–80.

References

- Henry, G.T., Mark, M.M.** (2003a) Toward an agenda for research on evaluation. *New directions for evaluation*. 2003(97), 69–80.
- Kusek, J.Z., Rist, R.C.** (2004) *Ten Steps to a Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System: A Handbook for Development Practitioners*. World Bank Publications.
- McCluskey, A.** (2011) Evaluation as deep learning: a holistic perspective on evaluation in the Pallete project. In M. Saunders, ed. *Reconceptualising evaluative practices in HE*. Open University Press.
- Reckwitz, A.** (2002) Toward a Theory of Social Practices: A Development in Culturalist Theorizing. *European Journal of Social Theory*. 5(2), 243–263.
- Saunders, M., Charlier, B., Bonamy, J.** (2005) Using Evaluation to Create ‘Provisional Stabilities’. *Evaluation*. 11(1), 37–54.
- Saunders, M., Trowler, P., Bamber, V.** (2011) *Reconceptualising Evaluative Practices in HE*. 1st ed. Open University Press.
- Shove, E.** (2003) *Comfort, cleanliness and convenience the social organization of normality*. Oxford, England; New York: Berg.

References

Shove, E. ed. (2007) The design of everyday life. New York, NY: Berg.

Shove, E., Trentmann, F., Wilk, R.R. eds. (2009) Time, consumption and everyday life: practice, materiality and culture. Oxford ; New York: Berg.

Shove, E., Pantzar, M., Watson, M. (2012) The dynamics of social practice: everyday life and how it changes. Los Angeles: SAGE.

Simons, H. (2009) Case study research in practice. Los Angeles ; London: SAGE.

Stake, R.E. (2004) Standards-based & responsive evaluation. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage

Trowler, P., Ashwin, P., Saunders, M. (2014) The role of HEFCE in TL Enhancement.

Remember to dare to enjoy evaluation!

Thank you!

What has resonated with you?

j.zozimo@lancaster.ac.uk

Disengagement (Evidence)

- *“The project had been designed by our coordinator, so I wasn’t involved in the design of it at that stage. It had been informal conversations but not any formal conversation in the sense, let’s think this out”. (Jesse)*
- *“from my point of view it would had been better for our coordinator, to have communicated about how are we going to achieve the outcomes that we laid down [pause] because they were self” (Dale)*

Disengagement (Research)

- A disconnect, lack of flow between the stage of design and the evaluation of the project
- Evaluative thinking from the outset of the project (Saunders et al., 2011)
- Engagement as a form of belonging and identification with a community of practice (Wenger et al., 2015)
- This paper sheds light on a disengaged moved that emerged from practitioners' perception of design and evaluation as dissociated stages.

Disengagement (policy learning)

- Other reflective tools are important for practitioners to attribute meaning to evaluation (e.g research process)
- Space for creative talented practitioners and evaluators who let policy makers know what works and what does not (Simons, 2015);
- Otherwise practitioners and funders' expectations would not easily match