# PARTICIPOLOGY Case study

| IN-DEPTH PROFILE | Description |
|---|---|
| 1. Project Title | Geogopoly |
| 2. Organisation | University of Salford |
| 3. Contact name | Dr Mike Hardman |
| 4. Email address of contact | **m.hardman@salford.ac.uk** |
| 5. Website (*if available*) | |
| 6. What was the aim of the project? | To engage geography students, both in higher education and secondary education, with the board game concept |
| 7. Start date (and end date if applicable) | July 2015 |
| 8. Location and geographical coverage of the project | Various – mainly at the University of Salford and in the Greater Manchester area. |
| 9. How and why did the project come about? | Need to engage with key concepts in a more 'hands-on' manner. Adapt RUFopoly for a geographical audience. |
| 10. Participants. Who played the game? | Higher education and secondary education students (also primary school children on one occasion). |
| 11. Long-term aspiration for the project / What next? | Develop a more robust prototype and variations of geogopoly i.e. both physical and human boards |
| 12. Funding, cost | £2,000 (internal funding from the University of Salford) |
| 13. Key documents, Publications and further resources (Please provide weblink where available) | Tbc – would like to write something for 'Geographical' |
| 14. Photos, videos or podcasts (Please provide web addresses for these) | |
| IN-DEPTH EVALUATION | |
| Evaluation of the DESIGN process | |
| 15. Who developed the game? Project lead and partners (organisations) – How well did that process work? (e.g. in terms of time, costs, logistics, skills) | The game was developed through experience with RUFopoly and feedback from students over time. Funding was acquired through the University of Salford's outreach fund in order to develop the concept to the next level; further funding exists to create a more substantial prototype going forward. Mike Hardman, who previously worked on RUFopoly in his post at BCU and the Richard Armitage, GIS expert at the University of Salford, led the project. |
| 16. What PARTICIPOLOGY Resources did you use/not use in the design and play of your game? (board, questions, rules, facilitation etc.) | A PARTICIPOLOGY board was used but questions were generated through our own knowledge for each of the squares. The rules were mostly adopted, although facilitation was left to the students due to the sheer class size. |
| 17. Did you vary the game (e.g. board, rules, entry/exit question) or always use the same | The game was adapted for the various audiences: with the students in higher education the questions were closely aligned to concepts explored in the lecture series. With the secondary students questions were simplified and mostly |

| | |
|---|---|
| format? Please outline the version(s) of boards, cards, rules etc. chosen and explain the reasons for your adaptations. | followed the original RUFopoly format. Finally, with primary school children, questions were changed radically to enable them to grasp the idea of the game – a competition element was added with the latter group to make it more exciting/engaging. |
| 18. What would you say were the principal problems with the available PARTICIPOLOGY resources? (in order of significance, starting with the most significant) | 1. Basic boards – more imaginative examples needed<br>2.<br>3 |
| 19. Do you have any comments on the value of the guidance in helping you design, play and evaluate the game? | The guidance was excellent and enabled us to clearly instruct the various users of geogopoly. |
| 20. Are there any parts / pages in the PARTICIPOLOGY that would benefit from clarification or expansion? (Please list the specific weblinks and detail your suggestions) | 1.<br>2.<br>3 |
| 21. What would you say was the percentage ratio of PARTICIPOLOGY resources used to your own tailor-made input? | 50/50 – we anticipate this gap growing as we develop a more advanced prototype through using different board systems (GIS data as a backdrop). |
| 22. How cost-effective would you say was producing this resource? | Very cost effective in the sense of quickly being able to generate multiple games for different audiences. |
| Any other evaluation comments on the DESIGN | Overall, a very easy to use and clear toolkit. |
| Evaluation of the PLAY | |
| 23. How did you play the game? (rules, entry/exit questions) | The general rules of RUFopoly were used, although the entrance question was not present. |
| 24. Overview of the events at which you trialled the game(s). Did the game sessions go as planned? What, if anything, unexpected issues did you encounter? | The game sessions went as planned although more support was needed. For example, in one session I administered a class of 60 alone – explaining the concept and then facilitating all of the various boards. It was a challenge finding an adaptable room big enough for all of the students. |
| 25. Did you ask participants to provide feedback? If so, what were the key positive/negative points raised? | The students provided feedback and felt that it was an extremely useful tool. Questions were raised about the lack of a competitive edge – some thinking is required around this perhaps. |
| 26. Which key issues emerged from the debrief session(s) with the facilitator(s) / organiser(s)? Summarise any strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, challenges. | Strengths:<br><br>• Engaging concept<br>• Enables complex concepts to be explore in a more 'hands on' environment<br><br>Weaknesses:<br><br>• Instructions somewhat complex for first-time user<br>• Lack of facilitators caused difficulty in large groups |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Opportunities:<br>• A more tailored game to geography could be developed to engage audiences at more advanced levels |
| 27. Retrospectively, would change anything to how you designed or played the game based on your testing experience? | More facilitators were needed. |
| Any other evaluation comments on the PLAY | |
| | |
| **Evaluation of the OUTCOMES** | |
| 28. On a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 is not at all and 10 is completely, how successful would you say PARTICIPOLOGY guidance was for your project ? | 7 |
| 29. In terms of meeting your project aims, what would you say were the main strengths of using the PARTICIPOLOGY / game approach? | 1 Enabled complex concepts to be understood<br>2 Created a more engaging session for the students<br>3 Acted as a springboard for wider discussions |
| 30. In terms of meeting your project aims, what would you say were the main weaknesses of using the PARTICIPOLOGY / game approach? | 1 Need for more tailored boards – still focussed around planning/human geography. Physical geographers left out.<br>2<br>3 |
| 31. What lessons did you learn from developing / using the Resource Kit / playing the game? | More support is required to make it a real success. |
| 32. What, if anything, was the 'added value' of the game? (e.g. in terms of engagement, process or outcomes) | As with the above comments, it enabled the students to get hands on and explore some of the debates from the lecture series. |
| Any other evaluation comments on the OUTCOMES | |
| | |

**The following questions were used with primary school children:**

1. A developer wants to build a new skyscraper in this area for office workers. Do you:
a) Let them go ahead
b) Tell them that they are not allowed to build (explain why)
c) Other (explain)

2.  The field outlined in blue is to be turned into a football stadium. Do you think this will fit in with the area? Why/why not?

3.  A developer wants to demolish all of the building in this place and build a theme park. Do you think this is a good idea? Why/why not?

4.  A new road is to be built through the area marked in blue – you decide what happens. Do you:
a)  Let them build the road
b)  Stop it from happening (explain why)
c)  Other (explain)

5.  The Forestry Commission wants to build woodland in the area marked with the blue lines. Do you think this should go ahead? Why?

6.  An application has been submitted for 400 houses on this space. Do you think this is a good location for building that many houses? Why?

7.  The local community want to improve the lake in this area. What would you suggest they focus on?

8.  There is a disused quarry in this area, how do you think they should bring the area back to life?
a)  Watersports on the lake
b)  Create a place for wildlife
c)  A holiday village
d)  Other

9.  The blue area in this square is to become a factory. Do you think this is a good idea? Why?

10. A lot of people throw rubbish away legally in this area. How would you stop this from happening?

11. A polytunnel is like a greenhouse – the local farmer wants to build lots of these in the orange area within this square. It would allow him to grow vegetables a lot quicker but it would look horrible on the farm area. What would you allow him to do?

12. The owner of this field wants to build a skate park on the land. Would you let him do this? Why?

13. The locals want to make better use of the canal and are worried that visitors do not have access. What would you suggest is the best way forward:
a) Build  a new road to the canal
b) Build a new road and facilities for visitors
c) Build a new footpath to the canal
d) Build a new footpath and facilities for visitors
e) Leave it as it is
f) Other (explain)

14. The council want to use part of this area for a new waste dump. The waste has to go somewhere and they have narrowed it down to this area or a nearby field. Which would you choose and why?

15. The lake in this area keeps flooding and is causing the local farmer to worry. He has contacted you to see which would be the best option forward:
a) Build expensive flood defences (this would cause other projects to not go ahead)
b) Build cheaper flood defences which might not work properly
c) Fill in part of the lake
d) Do nothing
e) Other (explain)

16. The purple boundary outlines where the council want to put another waste site. Nearby residents have complained that the smell will affect them. Do you think this site should go ahead? Why?

17. The residents want to do something with the vacant land in this space. What do you propose?

18. A big company wants to use the two big warehouses in this area to start a new business which will create 200 jobs. However, local residents say that the business will have a negative impact on the area. Would you let this go ahead? Why?

19. A local businessman wants to build a new go kart track in this area. Do you let it go ahead? Why?

20. You are walking alongside a path in this area when you notice someone tipping out lots of rubbish, do you:
a) Ignore it and move on
b) Phone the police
c) Clear up the rubbish yourself
d) Other (explain)

21. A local group of mountain bikers want to create a new track in this area. Do you allow them to go ahead with their plans? Why?

22. The management of the nature area want to introduce wolves into this area, but local farmers are worried about their sheep. Do you think this is a good idea? Why?

23. The nearby village of RUFley want to build a new car park here as it gets very busy in the area on a weekend. Do you think this should go ahead? Why?

24. The train station in this area is very poor and the train companies want to expand. Local residents are not happy about the plans as the train station is beautiful and very cosy – do you think they should expand? Explain your answer.

25. How should this space look in 10 years time?
a) An extra car park for the nearby village
b) A new business park to give nearby residents more job opportunities
c) A waterpark
d) Keep the same
e) Other (explain)

26. A small community group has built a few houses without permission in this area. Do you:
a) Bend the rules so that they can keep the houses
b) Tell them to take the houses down as they didn't ask permission and have spoilt the countryside
c) Do the action in b) but give them a fine too
d) Other (explain)

27. A local developer wants to build a wind farm in this area. Residents say it will be an eyesore on the countryside and it will kill a lot of birds and bats. However, the developer says it will provide electricity for all of the houses in the area. What do you do?


28. You have now completed the game! Look over your answers and see which of the following you best fit with:
a) You want to build lots and give people jobs
b) You want to build lots but keep the countryside too
c) You don't want to build and prefer keeping the environment looking nice
d) Other (explain)