

## CHAPTER 3: IMPLICIT VALUES: UNCOUNTED LEGACIES

Julian Brigstocke, Elona Hoover, Marie Harder, Paula Graham, Sophia de Sousa, Andy Dearden, Ann Light, Theodore Zamenopoulos, Katerina Alexiou, Gemma Burford, Justine Gaubert, Colin Fosket

### Abstract

When we say ‘what is the legacy of a project’, the response necessarily implies a values judgement, but such values are often implicit. In this work, we explore ways of conceptualizing and evaluating legacies of community-university collaborations by starting from values: specifically the human values of those individuals and organisations involved in each collaborative project. Through a carefully developed process of making the values present in collaborative project teams explicit, we have identified multiple legacies, as seen through the new values lens. Repeating this process with project partners separately revealed further legacies of the project, linked but defined by different values perspectives. ‘Intangible

### INTRODUCTION

University-community collaborations are often complex, fraught, emotional affairs. Participants devote a lot of time, energy and emotion into bridging differences, improvising solutions, and making things work. This can be difficult and sometimes frustrating, but can also have a transformative legacy for the participants and the wider communities they are part of. These legacies, however, are not always easy to observe, identify, and authorize. As we will explore in this chapter, some of the most important legacies of community-university partnerships are intangible and refer to emotions, affects, ongoing processes and emerging potentials: for example, inspiration, confidence, friendship, as well as knowledge, ideas, and networks. These legacies are at least as important as projects’ harder, more tangible and easily measurable legacies.

Our exploration of legacies started with a shared interest in the role that values play in collaborative research, and in the way in which we understand related outcomes. Exploring this through the concept of legacy was particularly relevant as it allows for a more fluid understanding, and one that can be shaped by the local project context. Thus, the theoretical starting point for this work was that making the values within collaborative projects explicit would allow for the identification and evaluation of those, ‘less tangible’, legacies. Our University of Brighton authors Harder, Burford and Hoover previously established that a values-based approach could be very successful for evaluating ‘intangible’ outcomes and achievements projects led by Civil Society Organisations (Burford et al, 2013). They brought the approach, named WeValue, as a raw starting point to the members of two complex partnerships called Scaling Up Co-Design and the Authority Research Network (ARN), and then collectively as a consortium we co-explored, co-developed and co-generated a localisable, values-based approach for a new purpose: to identify and legitimise legacies (not only outcomes) from partnership projects (not projects from a single group or organisation).

By ‘starting from values’, we mean starting with what participants consider *valuable, meaningful and worthwhile* in the context of their group or partnership. An explicit

values lens is first locally constructed, and then used to view, identify and evaluate legacies. The WeValue approach was previously developed to allow a formal, rigorous evaluation of 'soft' or 'intangible' achievements. It uses a 'menu' of values statements that are intended to be modified into, or to trigger, novel local values statements by participants, which become their bespoke values-based indicators. The *legacies* work reported here built on and significantly adapted the WeValue approach for *partnerships*.

The approach of starting from values, we will suggest, did indeed help to identify new, less 'tangible' outcomes, as well as to articulate deeper dimensions of already known ones. In addition, by further developing that approach for partnerships and legacies, we moved well beyond specific outcomes to identifying culturally situated legacies which had *values* as an explicit starting point, with unexpectedly clear articulation and detail. By acknowledging and seeking out different values perspectives, we also revealed multiple definitions of legacy for each single collaborative research project, leading to large numbers of identified legacies for each. In addition, we later found that explicitly linking legacies to values led us to understand much more clearly the conditions necessary for achieving these legacies – which could not help but immediately feed into future strategic planning of the groups.

The chapter is divided into four sections. First, we offer a theoretical account of our approach to legacy and its relation to values and co-produced knowledge. Second, we describe how we elicited values from groups, and facilitated them to identify and evaluate their values-based legacies. Third, we introduce the two main case study projects, with descriptions and analyses of some of the most important legacies, such as new types of knowledge, inspiration from project partners, and deep friendships. Finally, we conclude by proposing that a values-based approach to investigating legacy can provide a rigorous approach to critically assessing a broader spectrum of outcomes from collaborative research projects, moving beyond the punctual concept of impacts to multiple culturally situated legacies.

### **Key resources for thinking about Legacy**

Alexiou, K, Zamenopoulos, T, and Alevizou, G, 2013, Valuing Community-Led Design. AHRC Discussion Paper

Podger, D, Velasco, I, Amezcua Luna, C, Burford, G, and Harder, MK, 2013, Can values be measured? Significant contributions from a small civil society organisation through action research evaluation. *Action Research*, 11, 1, 8-30

For more detail on the WeValue approach, visit the WeValue website at: <http://blogs.brighton.ac.uk/wevalue/>. Short films from the Starting from Values project also provide additional detail for some of the steps described: <http://arts.brighton.ac.uk/projects/starting-from-values-evaluating-intangible-legacies/project-videos>.

The project discussed in this chapter starts from the assertion that the community partners and academic researchers who carry out research should have the space to articulate the impact and legacy of their work through frameworks that derive from their own value structures, and that this can ultimately help create new, more participatory, forms of accountability. We argue that it is precisely a shift to making the values underpinning such decisions explicit that makes this type of investigation of legacy particularly fruitful. We are proposing an unapologetically multiple, heterogeneous, and 'inside-out' approach which accepts the culturally situated nature of project impacts and focuses on 'legacy' as something that implies an inherent values judgement. As we will see, different legacies are revealed when projects are viewed through different lenses and from different standpoints. Our method for capturing legacies aims to be as faithful to this variety as possible, by taking as a starting point the premise that the research partners and participants should themselves define what potential legacies are most important. This means that the project can be evaluated according to criteria that are immanent to the project's own multiple value structures such as those of the academics, separate partner groups, and wider community members. Achieving this would make it possible for legacies to be evaluated according to a very broad set of social and political values, including values that do not necessarily sit entirely comfortably with those of the funders. This is not to say that public funding does not need to be accountable to the public, but to recognise that additional forms of accountability are needed that engage with community organisations as equal partners.

Our approach does not offer a pre-defined notion of what legacy is, but reflects that the many different senses of what legacy is can be captured by grounding it in the values of the people involved in co-producing the project. Starting from values, therefore, is a way of uncovering legacies that may otherwise remain hidden, marginalized, or denigrated. We are not claiming to come from a position that escapes theoretical or normative assumptions. Indeed, the approach is explicitly aimed at contributing to a wider social goal, shared across much co-design and participatory research, of redistributing the authority relations in academic research, and recognising, to the greatest extent possible, the authority and expertise of the communities, often silenced or under-represented, who participate in research activities.

The aim of the project is not to replace overly objectivist, rationalized approaches to evaluation with purely subjective definitions of legacy. Rather, the aim is to redistribute the authority to define the nature of desirable legacy to project participants, by grounding part of the definition of legacy within their own values. Values, far from being merely subjective, are complex socio-cultural constructs that are rooted in social power relations (Hitlin & Piliavin, 2004). Grounding legacies in the authenticity, coherence, and persuasiveness of a locally shared set of values is a way of redistributing the authority to define what legacy is in a particular context. Thus we are contributing to an effort to demonstrate that co-produced research, far from flattening out standards of knowledge and objectivity, has the potential to create stronger, richer, more authoritative knowledge that challenges conventional, historically specific, divisions between subjective and objective knowledge (see Blencowe, Brigstocke & Noorani, 2015), and enables knowledge to be used in more effective ways in novel contexts and across new community networks.

A key theoretical challenge, however, lies in developing a clear theory of the nature of values and their link to legacies (or in more general terms, the link between values and action). The use of the concept of 'values' in social-scientific analysis has proved controversial in recent debates, due to the great difficulty of clearly defining what

'values' actually are. As Hechter (1993) observes, studying values presents many problems. For example: values are not visible; the link between values and behaviour is unclear and hard to determine; the formation of values is poorly understood; and, it is very hard to measure values.

Whereas much social-scientific research has assumed values to function at a largely cognitive level, existing as abstract ideals that are (perceived to be) outcomes of individual choice, we would emphasize the affective and emotional aspects of values and valuing. Values are not necessarily abstract or philosophical principles; they are outcomes of social processes of valuing, which occur routinely as we encounter the world through our embodied practices. Valuing is done through the senses and emotions as much as it is done through reason. Valuing occurs when the world puts something into question, when it invites people to consider or reconsider their orientations, perspectives and approaches to (particular aspects of) the world. Values are 'evaluative beliefs that synthesize affective and cognitive elements to orient people to the world in which they live' (Marini, cited in Hitlin & Piliavin, 2004).

Values, then, are not stable and static. What's more, value systems are rarely systematic or internally coherent, since different values are often brought into play in different kinds of social context and social practice. Everyday life often does not force people to develop carefully articulated and internally differentiated systems of values; rather, we actualize different values at different times in relation to different demands. The values I prioritize at home are not necessarily the same as the values I prioritize at work or in the public sphere. Conflicting or competing values may co-exist quite happily until a particular situation translates this conflict into a problem that needs resolving. Values, therefore, are relational achievements of specific practices, events and situations. In this sense, values are always shared in some way, since they emerge from shared social practices. In the context of groups and organisations, shared values are co-created (whether explicitly or implicitly) through the development of shared practices, problems, achievements and failures. Given the heterogeneous nature of such groups, however, these shared values may be very hard to make explicit and tangible.

It is no wonder, then, that efforts to define values have proved challenging, and approaches vary widely across disciplines. There is a disparate body of work on values elicitation that spans many different academic disciplines. The methods used to elicit values range from deductive approaches which use pre-established definitions of values, which people often have to rank, rate, evaluate or classify, to inductive approaches which seek to develop a context-specific understanding of values (Shilton, Koepfler & Fleischmann, 2013). Proponents of different approaches have shown their respective advantages and disadvantages. Deductive approaches can be accused of reductive rationalism, assuming values to form clear, singular, relational structures. Inductive approaches tend to be time-consuming and only applicable to a given context. In contrast, our method for eliciting values (and evaluating legacies based on these values) acknowledges both the performative aspect of eliciting values (playing an active role in forming values judgements, not neutrally measuring them) and also the affective aspects of them (acknowledging the rootedness of values in emotional and affective social life), while using an approach that can be transferred across context by noting that many locally expressed group values can be considered variations of items in a 'fuzzy framework' previously elicited from other groups. We describe our approach for achieving this in the next section.

## WHAT WE DID

Our 'starting from values' approach involves creating a space for participants to reflect on what they value in their collaborative work, and then to articulate this through a facilitated discussion, in a collective valuing process. This began with eliciting local statements of 'what is meaningful, worthwhile and valuable' to partnership members. This was done through brainstorming, storytelling, photo-elicitation, mapping, and diagramming, and produced 'values statements' - articulations of values-in-action in the partnership. See examples below.

Examples of 'values-based statements' (where the level of specificity is purposeful)

"People have a sense of power that they can effect change"

"People feel they will not compromise their personal beliefs/values by participating in the organisation's activities"

"People reflect critically on what is necessary to learn"

"Differences of opinion are acknowledged and valued through dialogue"

Second, participants were introduced to additional values statements from other groups. These were used to trigger participants to actively explore *their own* unarticulated values by collectively re-phrasing and prioritising those that represent what they collectively value most.

Third, participants were asked to loosely organise their values-based statements into a framework (including the noting of unshared values). Seeing previously 'intangible' concepts specified, and related to each other, created a new overall frame, or lens, with which to view their work.

Fourth, by using their new values lens, the partnership was assisted to identify actual or intended legacies. The values-based statements included aspects that might usually be considered awkward to articulate or evaluate; but because they were very specific - like deep friendships - ,it made it easier for these aspects to be openly considered.

Fifth, groups were asked to devise creative ways of 'measuring', capturing or expressing these legacies. We identified that the legacies could not be adequately represented with a series of bullet points or text alone. Thus, we assessed evidence for different legacies and represented these through illustrations, mind-maps including text and images, narratives and stories, and audio-visual material. Some continuing projects developed documents and objects to identify and record evidence for intended legacies, such as a 'value and legacy box'.<sup>5</sup>

Sixth, the processes above were repeated separately for groups which were members of the Scaling Up consortium, to reveal the legacies from their values viewpoint. This revealed different, but sometimes overlapping, sets of legacies - and many more than previously envisaged by looking at the first partnership perspective alone.

---

<sup>5</sup> Additional detail about legacies found and approaches used to identify and represent these can be found in the project report (see Hoover, Harder & Burford 2016).

This approach was further developed, modified, and extended through several iterations, in response to the experiences of the consortium members in a series of co-learning exercises (not reported on further here). A number of critiques and ideas for change were developed, summarised as follows:

- **Partnerships beyond consensus:** the original WeValue process was designed for use with organisations or groups, rather than partnerships where there typically will be less expectation of an entirely shared set of values. This led to a re-design of the WeValue approach, to allow better identification and acknowledgement of unshared and even diverging values, and the expansion of the trigger set to include some more specialised to partnership aspects.
- **Materiality matters:** The use (or non-use) of material artefacts affected the process. For example, using spatial representation and mapping tools could help guide discussions about shared or not shared values, having pre-printed examples of values statements could discourage editing for authenticity, while blank cards could create barriers to starting to write. Different fonts, cards, post-its, lists, were all found to influence voice and authenticity, as too was participants' ability to manipulate concepts. All of these raised new issues of ethics. Creative or arts-based methods were found to be key: in order to produced rich values elicitation material, on which the process depended, non-cognitive methods were key such as photo-elicitation, storytelling, and sensory recording.

**Projects Studied** The Authority Research Network (ARN) is an international, university-based research collective which engages with questions of authority, positive power, and participatory democracy through developing strong social theory and links with practice. Initiated by a group of academic researchers, the network developed as a collaborative space where deep thinking and theorising could be done through friendship and a supportive environment. Members of the network collaborate through week-long residential reading and writing 'retreats' and joint research projects. The ARN has recently participated in or led several university-community projects exploring issues including: community forestry; democracy and non-human life; law and debt; and violence in marginalized communities. It has also developed new theoretical frameworks for understanding participatory practice.

Scaling Up Co-Design (Scaling Up) is a collaborative project between academics and six UK community organisations, exploring how the impact and reach of civil society work can be scaled up through co-design practices. By sharing experiences and connecting existing knowledge and resources together, partners created new opportunities for innovation, built their capacity to address complex issues, and thus achieved more for less. Legacies were explored separately for each of the collaborating community organisations, and for the partnership.

## EVALUATING AND IDENTIFYING LEGACIES - THROUGH A VALUES LENS

The Starting from Values project yielded a rich set of data about legacies from the two projects, and these have been represented through audio-visual production,

illustrations and diagrams.<sup>6</sup> Both partnership teams had taken time to consider what their legacies were before they joined our consortium and developed their 'values' framework. This provided a new lens with which to view their project landscape of outputs, achievements and impacts to evaluate which combined to form legacies now identifiable to them. More detail can be found in learning and outcomes from the project, including non-text representations that display them more richly and appropriately (see *Starting from Values*, 2016; Hoover, Harder & Burford, 2016), but we highlight some points below.

### **Legacies for the Authority Research Network (ARN)**

Values agreed to be central to this research network, which focuses on emerging forms of power, authority and community and engages in several closely related community–university projects, included: resisting superficiality and creating deep, lasting connections and collaborations; valuing creativity; adopting an experimental attitude towards research and knowledge; and contributing to the thinking and practice of equality and the making of the commons.

Both tangible and intangible legacies were then identified that specifically linked to these values. A key legacy was that the network itself had developed very strong, close links with an expanded network of community activists, artists, and academics. The network strongly values prioritizing quality over quantity, and focused on building deep and meaningful collaborations with a relatively small number of people and groups. These close connections were productive of many new ideas, academic collaborations, projects, and forms of activism and engagement. For example, ARN projects enabled participants to set up community reading groups, new community–university networks such as the Soils, Seeds and Social Change network, and new partnerships with groups such as the Bolivia Democracy Centre, a centre for marginalized children in the Bronx in New York, the Citizens Advice Bureau in the UK, and Redes da Maré, an NGO working with deprived communities in Rio de Janeiro.

Another important legacy was the emerging skills in arts-led forms of research practice. Network members and community partners explored new forms of 'creative listening' and creative writing, and are now incorporating new arts-led methods in their research practice. One project also produced a book of accessible essays on participatory democracy, aimed at a general activist audience, which was downloaded by several thousand unique users (Noorani et al, 2013). In brief, ARN's community-engaged projects and activities led ARN to develop its more theoretical work in community-engaged ways: to move their academic work 'into the world'. That is a legacy which has transformed the network, its members, and its outputs, and is now embedded in their core research and practice.

One of the crucial legacies identified by ARN members was previously intangible and thus not appropriately valued: the new friendships that emerged out of these close collaborations. The 'retreat' method, which involves living, cooking and cleaning together for a week in a remote rural location, is conducive to generating close bonds with project participants. Participants in these retreats were struck by the space they allowed to create new forms of thinking, novel ideas, and new friendships. This was perceived to be extremely valuable as research participants frequently felt alienated from the process and products of university research. Developing these new ways of

---

<sup>6</sup> Various representations are available on the project website, learning and outcomes section (see *Starting from Values*, 2016)

working together was a way of experimenting with new relationships between life and work, and between play and scholarship. Such close friendships enable an enabling environment for generating new ideas and impossible sounding projects, as well as generating support networks (or even 'magic circles!') to protect themselves from the sometimes poisonous atmosphere of the neoliberal university and its gruelling schedules, demands and frequent impersonal (and personal) rejections.

In that sense, the new friendships produced by working closely together can have a positive legacy on developing future community-university partnerships. However, participants were keen to insist that such legacies should not only be viewed instrumentally, in terms of new projects and partnerships they make possible, but that an *intrinsic* value of such projects is the friendships, new forms of life and new forms of joy to be found in working collaboratively, across boundaries, in new and sometimes challenging contexts. This is an important legacy in and of itself.

Projects didn't only generate new knowledge, but also created new affective relations, new practices of relating work to everyday life, and experiments with living differently. At the time of writing, project participants were beginning to imagine an ambitious, long-term project that would involve contributing large amounts of time, resources and energy to a collective, community-based project that would encompass, but far exceed, academic research. Plans such as these, whether or not they come to fruition, were possible only within a context of having generated close friendships through collaboration (including collaboration across university-community boundaries) over a number of years.

### Legacies of Scaling Up Co-Design

The Scaling Up team identified three key (shared) values that drive action for the members:

- **Collaborate:** collaboration offers opportunities and resources to test ideas and approaches.
- **Cross-pollinate:** cross-fertilization of ideas inspires new practices and ways of thinking.
- **Make a difference:** the ambition to make a clear difference for communities and broader society encourages trust and further collaboration.

Associated with these values was a set of three legacies:

- **New ways of thinking and doing:** The team found that people individually were able to do new things, or do things differently in their own organisations as a result of scaling-up.
- **Growing connections:** The project created connections or networks between organisations and individuals that otherwise would not have connected, and these last beyond the end of the project.
- **Cascading co-design:** The project's activities and messages influenced practice and behaviour beyond the project group/partners.

Although the team already held some of the data that provided evidence for these legacies, the values approach gave team members the space and processes to think more deeply about values and the importance of the resulting legacies from the different perspectives of individuals and participating organisations. It also gave the opportunity for the team (academics and project partners) to better understand and make more explicit the meaning and implications of these legacies, and to understand each other's perspectives. A characteristic moment of this process was during the first workshop of the Starting from Values project, when the term



'openness' arose as an important value and legacy of the project. This then helped the team to explore a series of interpretations for this commonly used term. It gave the opportunity to articulate various nuances and views about openness, for example regarding the boundaries of the network of people and ideas that form the project; the movement and dissemination of ideas; but also the flexibility (or incompleteness) of the ideas and infrastructures that this project created. These discussions gradually led to the legacy statements that appear above. The Scaling Up project involved community partners who separately explored their own values and created their own bespoke values lens to perceive the Scaling Up project and its legacies. A key aspect of our approach was to ensure that this multiplicity of voices had a place so that we articulated and lent authority to legacies from different partners. Using different values lenses (consortium as a whole, and partners separately) helped partners to evaluate legacies they would not have identified on their own. Below we present the identified values and legacies from the perspectives of the community partner organisations.

### **Legacies of Scaling Up Co-Design: from the perspective of community partner organisations**

Legacies of the Scaling Up project, as defined through the values lens of the community partners, both relate and differ to the legacies defined by the project partnership. In some cases, new legacies that were not identified by the project group were identified; in others, similar legacies were identified, but using different language to describe them; and in other cases, for instance for Silent Cities, some legacies were articulated by viewing them 'in reverse' through the values lens of the perspective of the Scaling Up partnership - for example, the value 'people do new things or do things differently' helped Silent Cities identify a new legacy: they now use research and have recruited research students.

### **The Glass-House Community Led Design**

The Glass-House, a UK organisation which seeks to involve tenants and low-income communities in building design, had already done significant analysis and capture of legacies and impact of their action research within the communities in which they worked. However, starting from a values perspective helped them make sense of a very long list of outcomes by identifying how each contributed to their mission and values, and what they should focus on for further work. Their new bespoke values framework helped to identify a number of strategic organisational legacies as well as shifts in actual project delivery and professional practice which included: a more complex and richer set of definitions and approaches around scale, impact and reach; greater clarity around what The Glass-House seeks from and can contribute to partnership working, with a stronger emphasis on co-designed collaborative projects; cross pollination across areas of work and disciplines as a key organisational aspiration and approach, both across The Glass-House programmes and with partners. Staff also noted individual-level legacies of new confidence and inspiration, aligned both with organisational values and their own personal values.

The Glass-House further identified three main practice-based legacies: refocusing on and developing new tools for the use of sensory and emotional connection with place as a tool to support placemaking; the building in of research approaches and tools developed in the Scaling-Up project (such as a workshop resource book that helps

gather data as well as being a facilitation tool), and bringing artistic production into their placemaking work with communities in new ways. This last legacy includes new layers and deeper personal aspects, such as shifts in personal perceptions of the inherent worth of these kinds of outputs: valuing them as artistic productions in their own right (and not only as a useful tools for placemaking processes). The bespoke values framework developed within the Scaling Up partnership has become a legacy, in its own right, and is now used by The Glass-House a valuable strategic tool by the organisation.

### **Silent Cities**

Silent Cities works with communities suffering from economic disadvantage to provide mentoring and access to digital technologies, offering opportunities to participate in citizen journalism, video and music creation, social media and online content. A very significant, and already identified, impact of the Scaling Up project was the winning of a city-wide Age Better Big Lottery bid for £6m to reduce isolation and loneliness amongst 12,000 of the most isolated older people of Sheffield, UK, which Silent Cities played a key role in (see also Light and Akama 2014). Starting from values highlighted the importance of the bid's integration of co-design principles – a key value of the partnership. But from the perspective of Silent Cities' values, further legacies were identified: the director acquired energy and confidence to speak about co-design in an authoritative way, inspiring her to integrate newly cross-fertilized methods, strategies and approaches. These legacies allowed for potentially much broader and longer term impacts, e.g. not just integrating co-design into the bid, but also facilitating its permeation into other organisations in Sheffield involved in the development and future delivery of the project.

Other values-based legacies for Silent Cities were: a renewed strategic focus for the organisation; expanding networks; developing a lasting partnership with one of the other community partners; building capacity in community media through their community journalists' programme, and the personal and professional transformation this led to for those involved. To explore third-order perspectives of the latter legacy, two community journalists were asked to consider their values-based legacies: they reported that it developed and enhanced their confidence and skills in community media practice (e.g. vox popping, editing) and education; it enhanced their employability and professional experience; it gave them the courage to do things that were personally important to them; and it led to new friendships.

### **Blackwood Foundation**

The Blackwood Foundation is a housing and care provider based in Scotland, UK, specializing in homes and care services for people with disabilities. Previously, legacies of new partnerships and the transfer of co-design principles into Blackwood Foundation had been identified. The process of starting from values led the Blackwood Foundation to better articulate its legacies in its own terms, and, perhaps crucially, to legitimise and strengthen them. For instance, a key legacy was that through the embedding of co-design principles within their organisation, the project helped them to reconnect with the spirit of their founder, and to go on to advocate for co-design practices within regional health and social care policy reforms. Other legacies included transforming the work of several community partners by raising awareness of accessibility and disability issues in their practice, as well as integrating these issues in the product design curricula at Brunel University; and

new practices and enhancing activities on the foundation's in-house community network through integrating multi-media approaches (digital stories, video conferencing).

FIGURE 1: VISUALISATION OF LEGACY FROM SCALING-UP CO-DESIGN PROJECT FOR THE BLACKWOOD FOUNDATION.

### **Fossbox and Flossie**

Prior to the values approach, the director at Fossbox (a digital consultancy specializing in design through research and building interactive digital platforms) had identified that the most important outcomes of the project were increased social capital and networks. The process of starting from values provided new insights on legacies: Fossbox had contributed to empowering women to use technology; inspired individual women to integrate co-design into their practices; allowed their network of women in technology to gain profile and participate in workshops focused on international issues. These contributed to building confidence in the organisation as a female technology trainer, expanded contacts and enhanced their profile in this area. Finally, while the Scaling Up partnership project led to reflection on strategic direction generally, the values based approach greatly enhanced this process by clarifying the importance of co-design in Fossbox's strategic direction, and triggering thinking about a lack of consistency between their service delivery and advocacy work: they had previously used co-design with community partners but did not use design in their advocacy work. They realised that advocacy should be 'designed' by and for all stakeholders as much – perhaps more – than service delivery. As a result, Fossbox collaborated with Common House and Furtherfield to develop a series of free critical design workshops to explore what many see as a 'democratic deficit' around new technologies such as 'quantified self' and 'future cities' which has since opened out new avenues of research to explore.

## **INSIGHTS FROM VALUES TO LEGACIES IN COLLABORATIVE AND INTERDISCIPLINARY WORK**

In this section we briefly outline learning from the 'starting from values' approach, in particular relating to the context of collaborative and interdisciplinary work, and discuss possible limitations of the approach.

The project team spent time reflecting on the benefits and added value of the values-based approach. This was conducted by referring back to discussions prior to the first reflection meeting and questioning the insights each partner gained from the process. This reflection was captured by a visual artist at the last iteration of our reflective meetings. Some of the key insights were that our co-evolved approach:

- (i) leads to identifying previously unarticulated outcomes or impacts;
- (ii) helps partners gain a deeper understanding, identify new layers of meaning and articulate deeply personal (for individuals and/or organisations) aspects of project legacies – though not all projects found 'new' legacies, all developed deeper understandings of existing ones. Making multiple values perspectives explicit was important to achieve

this, for instance, community partners revisited the impacts of the project in a new way, linking to their values;

- (iii) provides an explicit values lens through which to analyse project outcomes, thus moving from a mere collection of outcomes or impacts towards a culturally situated understanding of legacies;
- (iv) through a rigorous articulation of legacies through locally relevant values frameworks, legitimizes and authorises legacies that partners had previously not considered valid. In many cases, these were less 'tangible' legacies such as energy, friendship or new ways of thinking, which were now perceived to be significant and valid;
- (v) incorporates creative and critical approaches central to arts and humanities research as an acknowledged key component to articulate shared and conflicting values in collaborative and interdisciplinary work, as well as to effectively identify and articulate new, deeper and 'less tangible' types of legacies.

In addition to the insights above, we looked across all of the legacies identified during the course of the project and identified two themes that we suggest are of interest in the context of collaborative and interdisciplinary work: (a) new knowledge, ideas and inspiration linked to the nature of the cross-boundary, interdisciplinary work and, (b) friendships, networks and connections that are qualitatively deep and lasting. The ubiquitous evidence of legacies relating to these themes is perhaps important. Finding shared ground in collaborative and cross-context research is challenging, and when this happens successfully it is probably because a lot of effort, work and carefully allocated time and space has been put into building such relationships. Thus, depth of connections between collaborators is an important kind of legacy from this kind of work, and we need to find appropriate ways of expressing and presenting them. Relationships and networks were not formed in all cases, and projects usefully attended to conflict in their values systems and relations between members, or ignored them at their peril. But, when it was there, the depth and endurance of these relationships, often characterised by the term 'friendship', was a crucial dimension.

Last, the consortium identified several design principles needed in order to use a values-based approach in a way that is appropriate to collaborative research. We are still refining these ways of building capacity within community and academic partners for facilitating this process. Some of our remaining questions include whether the process should (or can) take into account wider social contexts which may influence or bring particular challenges to organisations or individuals with certain types of values. We also would like to explore the potential for this approach to hold differences in values perspectives open, and to what extent condensing around shared values is important for the process. In doing so, we recognise that an openness to the development of values is a value in itself (see Light's concept of metavalues, Light 2011).

## CONCLUSION

Using the values-based approach described in this chapter, the projects evaluated in this project identified intangible legacies including new knowledge, ideas and inspiration, as well as new friendships, networks and connections. The research

found that these softer, intangible legacies are an extremely important dimension of community–university collaborations.

The values-based approach used in this project opened up deeper and more personal legacies for the partnerships we worked with. This led to a deeper understanding of traditional output-related legacies and identification of new legacies, as well as reflections on the specific value of the projects to multiple parties. In this sense, by reaching to deeply personal realms through values discourse, partners could re-evaluate their own involvement in the collaborative research projects and make new sense of them in terms of their own organisational and personal values. In most cases, this brought new depth, breadth and multiplicity to the legacies of the projects. En route, the approach made different values perspectives explicit, providing a rigorous mechanism for articulating multiple perspectives and recognising their situated validity.

We propose that these findings are particularly important for the context of collaborative research for a number of reasons. Firstly, only one of a few values perspectives (e.g. funders, academic investigators) is commonly the basis for evaluating the outcomes or impacts of such projects. By starting from values we set a new balance, allowing diverse values perspectives (academics, community partners, institutions, collectives, individuals) to share authority. Secondly, in doing so and creating a space for reflection through values, we have identified dimensions of legacies that had not previously been considered legitimate or even seen to exist as valid impacts from collaborative research. Our legacy project gave authority to new ways of articulating legacies that we propose are inextricably linked to the nature of collaborative and interdisciplinary research, and which warrant acknowledgement as such, despite their unfamiliar typology. Collaborative partnership projects involve connecting ideas, knowledge and/or practice from often ‘distant’ domains – this connection and collaboration takes time, effort, safe space and careful attention. It is thus not surprising that an important legacy of these projects should be new ways of thinking and knowing through deep connections (or friendship) that are qualitatively different from other types of collaborations.

#### **Key messages for others interested in understanding legacy**

- When we think about the legacies of a project, we are defining those by what we value. Thus, legacies will be different if we identify them from different values perspectives
- Try *starting from values*: first clarifying the locally defined values a group, and then using them as a lens through which to investigate legacy.
- Using carefully developed values statements from other groups (used in the WeValue approach) can help to rapidly identify where values are shared, not shared or even contested
- Use carefully developed values statements to challenge how values are defined, through slight disruption and reconsideration
- Consider the multiple viewpoints for legacy, and acknowledge plural views.
- Do not limit expressions of legacy to words: explore different ways of representing them.

#### **REFERENCES**

Blencowe, C, Brigstocke, J, and Noorani, T, 2015, Engines of alternative objectivity: Re-articulating the nature and value of participatory mental health organisations

with the Hearing Voices Movement and Stepping Out Theatre Company, Health, early online.

Burford, G, Velasco, I, Janoušková, S, Zahradnik, M, Hak, T, Podger, D, Piggott, G, and Harder, MK, 2013, Field trials of a novel toolkit for evaluating 'intangible' values-related dimensions of projects, *Evaluation and program planning*, 36, 1, 1-14

Hechter, M, 1993, Values research in the social and behavioral sciences, in M, Hechter, L, Nadel, & RE, Michod (eds.) *The origin of values*, AldineTransaction, 28

Hitlin, S, and Piliavin, J, 2004, Values: Reviving a Dormant Concept, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30, 359-393

Hoover, E and Harder, M, (eds) 2016, *Starting from Values: Evaluating Intangible Legacies*, project report, Available from:

<http://arts.brighton.ac.uk/projects/starting-from-values-evaluating-intangible-legacies/learning-and-outcomes> [24 March 2016]

Light, A, 2011, HCI as heterodoxy: Technologies of identity and the queering of interaction with computers, *Interacting with Computers*, 23, 5, 430-438

Light, A, and Akama, Y, 2014, Structuring Future Social Relations: The Politics of Care in Participatory Practice, *Proceedings of the 13th Participatory Design Conference: Research Papers-Volume 1*, ACM, 151-160

Noorani, T., Blencowe, C., and Brigstocke, J (eds), 2013, *Problems of Participation: Reflections on Democracy, Authority and the Struggle for Common Life*, Lewes: ARN Press.

Shilton, K, Koepfler, JA, and Fleischmann, KR, 2013, Charting Sociotechnical Dimensions of Values for Design Research, *The Information Society*, 29, 259-271

Slater, T, 2012, Impacted Geographers: A Response to Pain, *Kesby & Askins, Area*, 44, 1, 117-119

Starting from Values, 2016, *Starting from Values - Evaluating intangible legacies*, University of Brighton, Available from: <http://arts.brighton.ac.uk/projects/starting-from-values-evaluating-intangible-legacies> [24 March 2016]