EduMAP empirical research, WPs 3 & 4

Research design documents:
Strand #1. Context Analysis

Glossary:

GP – Good practice
CE – Communicative ecologies
AE – Adult education
AC/APC – Active citizenship/Active participatory citizenship

Introductory note on public version

This is the second of a series of five documents that describe the research design and guidelines used for the multi-partner and multi-sited empirical research carried out in the EU project EduMAP (Adult Education as a Means to Active Participatory Citizenship). Empirical research work has been carried out for the Work Packages (WPs) 3 and 4, focused respectively on *Targeted research on best practices among vulnerable groups* and *Communicative ecologies in the field of adult education*. The research design included data collection and analysis protocols aligned to both WP3 and WP4 objectives, tested through a pilot conducted between December 2016 and March 2017 in Bucharest, Romania.

These guidelines have been used to ensure consistency across the Consortium for the data collection and interpretation. Overall, based on these guidelines, EduMAP partners collected data in 19 EU countries and Turkey, covering a total of 40 adult education (AE) programmes. In addition, eight groups of young people at risk of social exclusion (91 respondents) from seven EU countries and Turkey have been involved in the study to investigate their communicative practices and identify leverages that can be used to improve access to adult education.

The aim of publishing the research design is to offer an exemplar of research guidance used to plan and implement effectively multi-sited and multi-partner research for an interdisciplinary project.

(for more details on datasets and sampling, please consult the EduMAP Deliverables *D3.1. Targeted research on best practices among vulnerable groups*; and *D4.1 Communicative ecologies in the field of adult education*).

Strand #1 – Context Analysis

1. INTRODUCTION

This document outlines sampling and data collection methods for the first of three strands in the research design for EduMAP empirical research for WPs 3 and 4.

1. **Context analysis [WP3,4]**
2. Targeted research on good practice [WP3,4]
3. Targeted research on vulnerable groups: Communicative ecologies mapping [WP4]

This strand follows earlier work on the identification of good practices to be studied in-depth for a given country, and **aims** to:

- Map the local socio-economic, political and legal context as a pre-requisite to the in-depth study of good practices[1]
- Validate previously selected good practices and confirm access to study them is agreed by coordinating organisations
- (if relevant) Identify good practices to study which were not selected beforehand, if there is a need to identify new ones and there is strong indication of their suitability confirmed through interviews[2]
- Identify/confirm a vulnerable group that is particularly disadvantaged, present in high numbers, or of particular concern in the country of focus. This vulnerable group will then be the focus of #Strand 3 on Communicative Ecologies mapping.

Data collection will involve interviews and desk research.

Interviews will be designed to enable validation of good practices, their contextualisation in the local AE field, and to confirm access to studying them in-depth. Main actors involved in the AE field and social inclusion (particularly AE educators and NGO representatives) will be interviewed to:

- Identify elements of good practice against context-specific features
- Probe/assess previously identified good practices and confirm access to studying them.

Desk research will complement context mapping covered already in WP2 and cover policy, educational documents, studies and reports on 3 areas and their intersection:

- Adult education (regulatory framework, range of programmes offered, key approaches and standards)
- Specific adult education provisions for vulnerable groups
- Specific policies, strategies and programmes targeting inclusion of vulnerable groups.

---

[1] The contextual research does *not* overlap with WP2 project findings, but build on it to provide a deeper understanding of the local context through qualitative analysis. Thus, country-based reports from WP2 will be used as starting points for mapping the local context, and further information sought as relevant through interviews and desk research.

[2] Good practices will have been identified before starting qualitative research, and where access is granted to study those pre-selected, there is no need to identify new candidate GPs. However, there may be cases when 1) the candidate good practices documented through publically available documents are not confirmed as good practices through qualitative research; and/or 2) access for research is not granted by organisations coordinating the pre-selected GPs. In either case, interviews conducted in this strand can be used to identify new good practices.

To inform WP4, desk research will collect:

- Statistics and studies on the vulnerable group on which the strand #3 research in a given country is focused, data disaggregated according to gender if available
- Statistics and studies on media access for vulnerable groups (e.g. broadband uptake, mobile phone ownership and usage, media channels and availability), wherever available disaggregated according to gender, vulnerability status, and the type of vulnerability covered.

2. SAMPLING

Sampling follows two routes:

2.1. Context-mapping and identification of elements of good practice

Interviewees will be identified from professionals involved in designing and running AE and social inclusion programmes:
- Experts in lifelong learning and AE targeting vulnerable groups
- Social inclusion experts involved in AE programmes for vulnerable groups
- Professionals involved in AE and social inclusion programmes targeting the selected country vulnerable group

We advise a snowball sampling approach, where each interviewee is asked to provide contacts to experts in the area of study. **The pilot research demonstrates the importance of local contacts and access to networks, as well as language skills on the part of the researcher.**

2.2. Implementing agencies of pre-selected GPs

Implementing agencies of previously selected candidate GPs will be contacted and one probing interview will be arranged, to ask more in depth information about the potential GP and to confirm access to studying it in depth. The interviewee should be selected based on its role in the organisation and knowledge of/involvement in the GP. Based on each case, confirming access to studying a GP may require further contact with persons in managerial positions in the organisation.

3. INTERVIEW DESIGNS/PROTOCOLS

3.1. Interviews with educators and socio-economic inclusion experts involved in AE programmes.

(not specific here to identified GPs, but more general. These interviews are about helping us to understand contextual factors, and if necessary through these local experts, identify new GPs)

The main goals of the interview are to:

1. Collect expert views on achievements, impacts, and shortcomings of local AE policies and practices in terms of their potential to contribute to socio-economic and professional inclusion of vulnerable groups
2. Identify elements of good practice in AE programmes and policies, in relation to their potential to cultivate APC competences for local vulnerable groups
3. Identify what qualifications and trainings are needed for educators in AE programmes addressing vulnerable groups
4. (if relevant) Collect new GP examples
5. Identify the accessibility of the case/s at all levels (institutional, educators, learners)
6. Identifying possible diverging implementation from the official documentation

Some notes on the questions and their administration:

In the following sets of interview questions (protocols), there are a **small number of questions** which can be further probed where appropriate. **Some of these questions are followed by suggested** *prompts*, which can help you to guide discussions, to generate more discussion, delve more deeply in the case of an interesting response, or help move the interview along.

All questions can be adapted according to the context and interviewees' profile.

The order in which the questions are asked can be changed, depending on the flow of the interview.

Consideration of the time that an interviewee has set aside for the interview may mean you have to be selective in which questions you probe further through the prompts.

Where translation/interpretation is required, we will develop specific guidance, and will work on this with those of you who intend to use such services.

ORGANISATION PROFILE

1. Could you tell me a bit about your organization and your work in the organization?
2. In the project EduMAP we work with the concept of 'active participatory citizenship', and we are interested to understand how it is defined and used in other organisations. Do you have a concept of active participatory citizenship and have you addressed this in any of your programmes?
   Prompts:
   a. What does it mean according to your organisation to be an active citizen?
   b. What are the main issues faced by the vulnerable groups you address in becoming actively involved socially, economically, politically?
   c. How do the programmes/courses offered by your organisation contribute to stimulating active citizenship amongst vulnerable groups?

A. IDENTIFY ELEMENTS OF GOOD PRACTICE AGAINST SPECIFIC LOCAL CONTEXT

1. What are the most important **issues** faced by the vulnerable groups you address in enabling them to become more socially, politically and economically included?
2. Do you think the current **regulatory framework** for education and social inclusion (policy, policy implementation instruments, regulations, etc.) is addressing these issues?

Prompts:
    a. Why/why not?
    b. What is needed to better address them?

3. How do you think **current adult education programmes** are addressing these issues?
Prompts:
    a. How successful are they?
    b. What are the limits of these programmes in addressing vulnerable groups?
    c. What should change in their approach, so they address more efficiently the needs of vulnerable groups?
    d. To what extent and how are supportive services for vulnerable groups integrated in the provision of adult education programmes?

4. What, in your opinion, are the most important factors to be taken into account for an adult education programme to be **successful** in addressing the needs of vulnerable groups?
Prompts:
    a. What kind of competences and qualifications do educators need to successfully train vulnerable groups to be active citizens?
    b. What training and support do educators need that can enable them to be more successful in engaging with vulnerable groups?

5. What in your opinion would make a **good practice** in AE for inclusion of vulnerable groups?
Prompts:
    a. Are there elements of success you can identify, based on your experience?
    b. How important it is for a programme to have lasting impacts?

B. COLLECT NEW GOOD PRACTICE EXAMPLES [optional][3]
[Background intro to GPs] '*We are seeking to identify good practices in adult education for socio-economic and professional inclusion of vulnerable groups, targeting vulnerable young adults aged 18 to 30 y.o. We are interested to hear about examples of good practices from your own organisation, or others you know of*'.

1. Could you mention some examples of adult education projects and programmes from your organisation or run by other parties, which have been successful in improving the socio-economic and political participation of vulnerable groups?
Prompts:
    a. Probe specify criteria: 16-30 y.o; specific programme for addressing disadvantages; clear AE component and type of AE programme; integration of supportive services for vulnerable groups in the AE programme.

2. [if not run by same organisation] How did you come to hear about this programme?

3. Why do you judge this programme to be successful?
Prompts:
    a. Do you know more about the **impacts** it had on target groups? Can you name some impacts?
    b. Are you aware of how target groups developed or improved their life conditions because of attending this course?

4. To what aspects do you think this initiative owes these successful outcomes?
Prompts:
    a. [Probing] The learning process, particular approach in engaging with students, particular needs addressed, the teaching process and qualifications of personnel
    b. Do teachers and educators have (or need) any specific qualifications to master the challenges in the learning situation?

5. Are there shortcomings or limits to this programme? Which ones?
Prompts:
    a. How can they be better addressed in future editions or similar initiatives?

---

[3] This part of the interview is necessary when pre-selected GPs cannot be studied for a specific country, and thereafter new ones can be identified.

3.2. Interviews with GP managers/implementing agency[4] (from the pool of candidate GPs)

The main goal of the interview is to assess the GP in terms of its contribution to supporting APC competence development for students. Information for the GP will be already available, and where covered some questions from the below guide can be skipped.

A. ORGANISATION BACKGROUND
1. Could you tell me a bit about your organization and your work in the organization?
2. In the project EduMAP we work with the concept of 'active participatory citizenship', and we are interested to understand how it is defined and used in other organisations. Do you have a concept of active participatory citizenship and have you addressed this in any of your programmes?
    Prompts:
    a. What does it mean according to your organisation to be an active citizen?
    b. What are the main issues faced by the vulnerable groups you address in becoming actively involved socially, economically, politically?
    c. How do the programmes/courses offered by your organisation contribute to stimulating active citizenship amongst vulnerable groups?

B. GP INFO AND ACHIEVEMENTS [WP3]
Introduction: We would like to talk more about [specific programme name].

1. Could you tell me more about the **story and evolution** of [GP-programme name],
    Prompts:
    In particular:
    a. How did the [GP] start and how it evolved?
    b. What are its objectives? Have they evolved in time?
    c. How is the programme structured? [length, one-off or repeated, modules]
    d. What specific vulnerable groups are addressed through this programme?
    e. How are participants recruited?
2. What distinguishes the **pedagogical approach** of [GP]?
    Prompts:
    a. What kinds of pedagogical methods and techniques are used?
    b. Which methods had the best results with vulnerable groups?
    c. What competences and qualifications are held by the instructors/educators?
3. How would you describe the **impact and achievements** of this programme?
    Prompts:
    a. What are the main competences developed by students through attending this course?
    b. How do these competences enable vulnerable groups to participate more actively socially, economically, politically?
    Socio-economic focus:
    a. Would you say that the programme has contributed to improving the life conditions/economic standing of students? How?
    Socio-cultural focus:
    b. Do you think that the participation in the present educational initiative is increasing learners'

---

[4] This interview guide is a light version of the interview guide for the GP-focused research in Strand #2. It is designed to probe key aspects without insisting too much on them, remembering that this is about context and gathering details on the main criteria of GP selection - the in-depth study of the GP examples follow in strand *#2. Targeted research on good practice*

willingness and capabilities to interact with people/groups outside their immediate environment and in more formal settings? In what ways?

Legal-political focus:

    c.   Do you think that the participation in the present educational initiative is increasing learners' knowledge/awareness of their rights and responsibilities as citizens? Or enhance knowledge about how the socio-political system is functioning? In what ways?

    d.   Do you think it will foster learners' interaction in the civic/institutional context, for instance to access their entitlements, and to perform their responsibilities as citizens? In what ways?

4.   What are the main elements/aspects that contributed to the **success** of this programme?

    Prompts:

    a.   What elements are transferable, could be adapted or inspire educational initiatives in other contexts?

5.   Have you encountered particular **challenges or impediments** while running the programme? What would you do differently?