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KEY QUESTIONS

• Research – who for, what for, how, why, whose knowledge?
• Participation – who participates, how, why, who gets to decide, what do they participate in?
• Quality – process, engagement, power distribution, findings, dissemination.

• OPEN THIS LINK AND SIGN UP TO ‘PADLET’
  https://padlet.com/kazstuart480/d6c10eq7y0e0
I. BIG PICTURE – PARTICIPATORY PHILOSOPHY

- Social justice – equality and equity (Stuart et al., 2019)
- Self-determination, emancipation, empowerment (Maynard and Stuart, 2018)
- Value each person as a being and political self (Kallio, 2008)
- Rehumanising (Foster, 2016)
- Not seeing the truth, but seeing different perspectives (Cotton, 2007)
- Questioning the everyday (Perec, 2008)
- Knowledge democracy (Smith, 2012) rather than epistemological exclusion (Stuart and Shay, 2018)
- Addressing meta narratives at local level (Foster, 2016)
- Criticality, disruption, transformation (Fine, 2008)
2. WHY? THE OVERARCHING AIMS

- Development of a critical consciousness of both researcher and participant
- Improvement of the lives of those involved in the research process
- Transformation of fundamental social structures and relationships

(Maguire, 2014: 418).
3. HOW? THE META PROCESSES

Investigate

Act

Educate
4. WHO? EVERYONE... ESPECIALLY THOSE:

- Excluded on gender, race, sexuality, class, belief, age, ability.
- Where people live – homeless, in prison, refugees, institutionalised.
- People who communicate differently – different language, deaf, learning difficulties, non-verbal.
- Impairments – aging, cognitive, physical – meaning they would not want to or could not meaningfully contribute.
- Where people are seen as unwanted voices – say what people do not want to hear, or when seen as problematic or disruptive (Beresford, 2019).
5. METHODOLOGY

• Participatory action research (Rowell et al., 2017)
• Ethnomethodology (Garfinkel, 1974)
• Phenomenology (Moustakas, 1994)
• Case study (Yin, 2009)
• Evaluation (Stuart, Maynard and Rouncefield, 2015)
• Reflexivity (Pink, 2001)
REVIEW OF THE OCC ADVICE, ADVOCACY AND REPRESENTATION SERVICE FOR YOUNG PEOPLE IN CARE

136 children, young people, practitioners, policy makers.

Youth steering group to co-design

Creative knowledge building

Researcher analysed

OCC disseminated
6. DATA COLLECTION TOOLS

• Image and metaphor work (Foster, 2016)
• Drawing and art (Theron et al, 2011; Mcpherson, 2019)
• Mapping (community, assets, network, actor, GIS) (Edizel and Evans, 2017)
• Performance (Jones, 2006)
• Walking (Heddon and Turner, 2010)
• Focus Groups (Wilkinson, 2017; Ayrton, 2019)
• Future search (Weisbord and Janoff, 2010)
• Ecosystem maps (Edizel and Evans, 2017)
• Photovoice (Wang, 1999)
• Video (Molestane, 2009)
• Digital tools (Gubrium and Harper, 2013, Berriman, 2019)
• Walking (O’Neill and Reynolds, 2019)
• Multimodal ethnographies (Cowan and Potter, 2019)
• Merging Knowledge Method (ATD, 2019)
THE MARGINALIZATION AND CO-CREATED EDUCATION RESEARCH PROJECT

Erasmus+
3 years
Norway, Denmark, UK

10 academics
30 students
200 young people

4 ½ days online
1 week Norway
1 week UK
Research meets

An Indirect Approach (Bunting and Moshuus, 2017)

Individual research, collective findings, collective dissemination

Journal of Youth Voices in Education: Methods, Theory, Practice
7. LEVELS OF PARTICIPATION – ARNSTEIN (1971)

- **ACTIVE**
  - Increased levels of decision-making power

- **RESPONSIVE**
  - The ‘powerful’ have continued right to decide, but ‘powerless’ can advise
  - ‘Powerless’ can hear and be heard, but have no assurance of being heeded by ‘powerful’

- **PASSIVE**
  - ‘Educate’ or ‘cure’ the ‘powerless’

**Degrees of Citizen Power**:

1. MANIPULATION
2. THERAPY
3. INFORMING
4. CONSULTATION
5. PLACATION
6. PARTNERSHIP
7. DELEGATED POWER
8. CITIZEN CONTROL

**Degrees of Tokenism**:

- Non-participation
- Deception
- Placation
- Consultation
- Ignorance
- Inclusion
- Participation
- Control
LEVELS OF PARTICIPATION – HART (1992)
LEVELS OF PARTICIPATION – KANJI AND GREENWOOD (2001)
DEGREES OF PARTICIPATION – TRESEDER, 1997

1 Assigned but informed
Adults decide on the project and children volunteer for it. The children understand the project, they know who decided to involve them and why. Adults respect young people’s views.

2 Consulted and informed
The project is designed and run by adults, but children are consulted. They have a full understanding of the process and their opinions are taken seriously.

3 Adult-initiated, shared decisions with children
Adults have the initial idea, but young people are involved in every step of the planning and implementation. Not only are their views considered, but also children are also involved in taking the decisions.

4 Child-initiated, shared decisions with adults
Children have the ideas, set up projects and come to adults for advice, discussion and support. The adults do not direct, but offer their expertise for young people to consider.

5 Child-initiated and directed
Young people have the initial idea and decide how the project is to be carried out. Adults are available but do not take charge.
TYPES OF RESEARCH – PAUWELLS, 2011

On  For  With
8. CO-PRODUCTION (OSTROM, 1970)

• People working together
• Co-producing services, products or research
• Disrupts the usual power domains
• Multi-actor, multi-disciplinary and intersectional (Ersoy, 2017)
• Spaces of dissent (McDermot, 2012)
• Intuitive (O’Riorden, 2001)
• An ethical commitment (Cohen et al., 2017)
RESEARCH WITH ‘GANG INVOLVED’ YOUNG PEOPLE

143 young people and 49 practitioners over a year

Access issues – hanging out at the food bank

Ethical issues – creative elicitation technique

Series of micro-participations – the yp held the power

BURIED!

9. POWER - STAGES

Design | Data collection | Analysis | Dissemination | Archiving
POWER - SOURCES

- Gender
- Age
- Race
- Religion
- Regionality
- Class
- Money
- Influence
- Position
- Charisma
- Authority
- Position
POWER-HOLDERS
10. OUTPUTS AND ACTION

What will you disseminate?
- Report, article
- Manifesto, charter
- Art work, installation
- Performance
- Digital product
- Archive

Who will it influence / where will change happen?
- Participants themselves
- Communities
- Practitioners
- Policy makers
- Governments
• “Once critical researchers chronicle the scar tissue and desires of those who have been shut out, we carry the responsibility to theorise, historicise, make visible, re-present and re-circulate their stories in the courts, in policy, in text-books, classrooms, curriculum, organising and popular media…… Critical researchers are neither tape recorders nor ventriloquists. And so what do we do with these luscious transcripts scattered around our living room floors?” (Fine, 2018:12)
II. QUALITY

**Positivistic**
- Replicable
- Reliable
- Triangulated
- Valid
- Objective / neutral
- A tidy process.

**Post positivistic –**
- Specific (Flyvberg, 2006)
- Representative (Geertz, 1973)
- Crystalised (Richardson, 1994)
- Empathetic validity (Dadds, 2008).
- Subjective and reflexive (Etherington, 2004)
- Messy (Cook, 2008).

**Participative –** participants value the process and outputs as meaningful.
11. PROBLEMATISING PARTICIPATION

- Participants may not have the skills and may need training
- Can become simplistic and patronizing (Gillies and Alldred, 2002)
- May not be experts on own lives – blind in comprehension and deaf to structures (Back, 2007)
- Participants do not have the time, they are in ‘time poverty’ (Cohen et al., 2017)
- Commissioners offer time bound projects (Haggerty, 2004)
- Participants may have different agendas
PROBLEMATISING PARTICIPATION

- Impossible to transcend power in practice (Gallagher, 2008; Mannay, 2016)
- Even inclusion is an act of power (Kothari, 2001)
- May reinforce rather than transcend power and structures (Ledwith and Springett, 2010)
- Ignores how these voices were initially oppressed (Barrera, 2011)
- Silencing may happen if outputs ignored (Delgado, 2015)
- Challenging role for the researcher (Maguire, 2016)
12. FRAMEWORK OF CRITICAL QUESTIONS
12. EXPANSIVE ‘ANTI-ASSUMPTIVE’ THINKING

- Who could the participants and stakeholders include?
- What could their motivations and agenda be?
- How might we reach and engage everyone?
- What could the overall purpose be?
- What might the research questions include?

- How will it be done, what methods and tools could be used?
- What roles and positions might there be?
- Who will the audience be?
- What could the outputs include?
- How might we know of its impact?
- How could we come to a satisfactory close?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders and participants</th>
<th>What are the possibilities for participation?</th>
<th>Where alignment and dissent is there and how will this be managed?</th>
<th>What is the process of arriving at a decision? (consensus, vote, leader decides?)</th>
<th>How will you know if that aspect was appropriate retrospectively? e.g. everyone happy?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation and agendas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach and engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose or aims</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles &amp; positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs and dissemination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End point and closure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONTACT

- kaz.stuart@cumbria.ac.uk
- Twitter: kazstuart480
- Linkedin: Kaz Stuart
- Facebook: Practitioner & Action Research and Creative Methods Hub


