To cite these figures: Richardson, L. (2017) 'Participatory evaluation', in B. Greve (ed) *Handbook of social policy evaluation*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing,119-139.

Find out more here: https://www.e-elgar.com/shop/gbp/handbook-of-social-policy-evaluation-9781785363238.html

---

Figure 1. Stages of policy evaluation research

1. Governance and oversight of evaluation, including commissioning and specifying the evaluation where applicable.

2. Identifying research problem, developing questions.

3. Designing research methodology, including theory & literature, research design, sampling, instruments, details of fieldwork, analysis, write up and dissemination plans.

4. Identifying respondents.

5. Co-designing research tools.

6. Data gathering/collection.

7. Data analysis.

8. Writing up and co-authorship.

9. Dissemination, lobbying, policy impact/implications.

10. Policy re-design.

Figure 2. Stages of evaluation by levels of challenge and skill

Lower

6. Data gathering/collection.

4. Identifying respondents.

Medium

5. Co-designing research tools.

9. Dissemination, lobbying, policy impact/implications.

7. Data analysis.

10. Policy re-design.

Higher

1. Governance and oversight of evaluation.

2. Identifying research problem, developing questions.

3. Designing research methodology.

8. Writing up and co-authorship.

Figure 3. Summary of rationales and benefits of participation

Type of argument	Rationale/benefit
Value-based	Right to be involved/have voice; empowering
	Respect different expertise
	Opens up science – democratises
Ends-based	Better research through lay knowledge
	Builds trust and traction in science & policy
	Way of getting mass data collection
	Access hard to research groups and topics

Figure 4. Practical implications of rationales for participation

Type of argument	Rationale/benefit	Stage of research	Other considerations	Challenge & skill levels
Value-based	Right to be involved/have voice Empowering	1. Governance and oversight of evaluation 2. Identifying research problem 3. Designing research methodology 8. Writing up and co-authorship	History of negative relationships Sample includes 'marginalised' groups	High
	Respect different expertise	2. Identifying research problem (framing the issue) 4. Identifying respondents 5. Co-designing research tools 7. Data analysis 9. Dissemination, lobbying, policy impact/implications 10. Policy re-design	Intractable issues Lack of intelligence & evidence	Medium
	Opens up science - democratises	6. Data gathering/collection, a*nd/or* 1. Governance and oversight of evaluation 2. Identifying research problem (framing the issue) 3. Designing research methodology 5. Co-designing research tools 8. Writing up and co-authorship 9. Dissemination, lobbying, policy impact/implications	Intractable issues Controversial and/or highly specialised technical debates	Low Medium, to high
Ends-based	Better research through lay knowledge	2. Identifying research problem (framing the issue) 3. Designing research methodology 4. Identifying respondents 5. Co-designing research tools 7. Data analysis	Lack of intelligence & evidence	Medium to high
	Builds trust and traction in science & policy	1. Governance and oversight of evaluation 2. Identifying research problem (framing the issue) 7. Data analysis 8. Writing up and co-authorship 9. Dissemination, lobbying, policy impact/implications 10. Policy re-design	Weak integration of research into policy Intractable debates Controversial and/or specialised technical debates	Medium to high
	Way of getting mass data collection	6. Data gathering/collection *And possibly also:* 4. Identifying respondents	Data hard to access in conventional ways Accessible data protocols	Low Low to

		5. Co-designing research tools 7. Data analysis	allow standardised data collection	medium
	Access hard to research groups and topics	4. Identifying respondents 5. Co-designing research tools 6. Data gathering/collection	Sample includes 'marginalised' groups Topic is less visible Presence of networks.	Low to medium

Type of argument	Rationale/benefit	Other considerations
Value-based	Right to be involved/have voice Empowering	History of negative relationships Target 'marginalised' groups
	Respect different expertise	Intractable issues Lack of intelligence & evidence
	Opens up policy - democratises	Intractable issues Controversial and/or highly specialised technical debates
Ends-based	Better policy through lay knowledge	Lack of intelligence & evidence
	Builds trust and traction in policy	Weak integration of citizens into policy Intractable debates Controversial and/or specialised technical debates
	Access difficult policy topics	Target 'marginalised' groups Topic is less visible Presence of networks.