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What is Go Deep?

Go Deep is a game that is played by any group that is interested in the future of a community. It is like a journey, where groups of people travel through the cards along imaginary metro lines to deepen their leadership and facilitation skills and impulse actions and community transformations for everyone!

Go Deep is a game where participants learn about themselves, about their communities and get new skills about the facilitation of human relations and communities, communication, and different perspectives and resources that, after the game can be applied in their daily life. Go deep is also a game that supports communities to learn about themselves and help us all to achieve an appreciative gaze that focus on the inherent resources of the communities and the people who are part of them.

Workpackage 4 - Research and stories [Months: 1-18]

The Evaluation of the Go Deep Together in Diversity project will take into consideration both outputs and outcomes generated. While the first can and will be assessed quantitatively meeting our set goals and objectives, the outcomes will be assessed through the implementation of a social impact assessment methodology in our primary beneficiaries, i.e., the participants directly involved in the Go Deep game.

Main objectives:

1. Setting the research agenda and methodology: coaching and training all partners in order to assure consistence and coherence in the data collection and analysis;
2. Hosting 50 in-depth interviews with participants and community members;
3. Co-development of the Go Deep Theory of Change, indicators and proxy’s:
4. Data collection through online surveys and in loco observations leading to the Impact Assessment Final report;
5. Development of scientific paper based on results and methodology

Deliverable 4.4

Within Workpackage 4, deliverable 4.4 aims at presenting the key findings and the main conclusions of the overall impact assessment, taking into consideration the surveys on participants and trainees, the interviews conducted as well as the observations and comments from trainers, facilitators and organizers of the three Go Deep regional workshops that took place in Athens, Madrid, Edinburgh and Grottaglie.

The following report is divided into three sections: research methodology; results and data; conclusions.

For an intro into Impact Assessment and more methodological information please consult our Deliverable 4.1.
Glossary of key terms and abbreviations

Social Impact Assessment (SIA) - Social Impact Assessment is “analysing, monitoring and managing the intended and unintended economic and social consequences, both positive and negative, of business intervention and any social change process invoked by those interventions” (Vanclay, 2003). However, beyond such narrow definitions, SIA has also become a transdisciplinary social science that incorporates many fields “including sociology, anthropology, demography, development studies, gender studies, social and cultural geography, economics, political science and human rights, community and environmental psychology, social research methods and environmental law, among others”, transcending the mere method and rise as a distinct discipline of research (Esteves et al, 2012).

Theory of Change (ToC) - Theory of Change is essentially a comprehensive description and illustration of how and why a desired change is expected to happen in a context. It is focused on mapping out or “filling in” what has been described as the “missing middle” between what a programme or change initiative does (its activities or interventions) and how these lead to desired goals being achieved. It does this by first identifying the desired long-term goals and then works back from these to identify all the conditions (outcomes) that must be in place (and how these related to one another causally) for the goals to occur. These are all mapped out in an Outcomes Framework.

Activities – Activities are all the concrete actions implemented, developed or taken during the game, normally associated with action cards in each line. They can be done individually or in group and do not necessarily have to result in outputs but have to be connected with the ToC and the overall outcomes and impacts of the game. A group meditation can be considered an activity of the game for example.

Outputs – These are the first level of results directly associated with an activity, a line or a specific project develop through and/or during the game. Often confused with “activities”, outputs are the direct immediate term results associated with the latter. In other words, they are usually what the game and/or the line has achieved in the short term. An easy way to think about outputs is to quantify the game activities that have a direct link on the Go Deep goal.

Outcomes – This is the second level of results associated with the Go Deep game and refers to the medium term consequences of the project. Outcomes usually relate to the game overall goal or aim. For example, in a safe water project, an outcome would be “the percentage of households that are using chlorinated drinking water”. For the Go Deep it can be related with such things as the number of community members engaged in community building activities post-game or the materialization of a community dream, such as a garden or a new cultural center.

Impacts - It is the third level of results that can be attributed and/or connected with the game and are the more long -term consequences of the game. Direct attribution is the hardest difficulty of measuring impacts therefore clear causalities and impact pathways from activities to outputs, to outcomes to impacts must be ascertain.
Research methodology

The research methodology for the Gotodivers Impact Assessment – Deliverable 4.2 - was co-developed within a three-stage process that unfolded over the period of 12 months with the contributions of all partners and lead by Fciências.ID. During this period [M1 to M18] Fciências.ID held participatory workshops, expert consultation and several iterations of the proposed Theory of Change as well as the specific research methods specifically developed for the Go Deep Regional workshops, as summarized in figure 1.

In this section of our Final Report a detailed description of this development is offered together with a justification for the decisions made throughout the process regarding the research methodology.

![Figure 1 - Three-stage development process for the Impact Assessment](image)

In the first-stage of our methodological development, the key pillar was to develop, test and fine-tune the Go Deep Theory of Change (ToC). With this we aimed at crystalizing the objectives, outcomes, activities and the Go Deep vision in a unified theory with a coherent and comprehensive description of the path of change that could be measured, monitored and scientifically validated. Following the guidelines provided by the Center for Theory of Change\(^1\) and the New Economics Foundation (Nef\(^2\)) we’ve started this process with two key sources of inspiration and information, which later became the holding anchors for the theory: in one hand the consultation of Go Deep existing materials, such as the Facilitation Guide, the website texts and videos from previous Go Deep Games and events; and on another hand a participatory workshop held in Athens where Go Deep creators and facilitators were asked to present, discuss and pin-point the main outcomes and impacts.

\(^1\) https://www.theoryofchange.org/
\(^2\) https://neweconomics.org/
they’ve witness during their Go Deep experiences. From these two key sources of input the first Go Deep ToC was developed with the contribution of IA expert Constança Morais.

Figure 2 demonstrates the first ‘ToC house’ constructed with the participatory workshop contributions with a distinction between short, medium and long-term impacts for three different relevant stakeholders – local participants; migrants and/or refugees; and organizations. Also considered here is the transversal nature of the playing ‘cards’ – the cards belonging to each line as well as the emergency cards – working at the individual, group and community level - that give the foundations for the outcomes generated during the play of the game. With the arrangement displayed in figure 2 an important step was taken in the ToC development: the research would focus on the overall transversal impacts generated by the game, independent of the lines and specific cards played, in order to reduce complexity and increase impact attribution.

Figure 2 - Macro ToC Version 1 Go Deep Game

The choice made by the research team allowed to reach a clear structure for the ToC while bearing in mind the wide variety of social impacts identified by the facilitators, the complexity of the game itself and the complex interactions that take place in different contexts and also the diversity of experiences people have with the game depending on the line they’ve played, the format of the game they’ve played, the cultural background in which the game was played, among other significant variables. This also permitted the reduction of the scope of analysis and a clearer selection from all of Go Deep’s objectives those that are more central to this project and the impact assessment being conducted.

According to the Go Deep Facilitators Guide book, they key objectives/aims of the Go Deep Game are to:
Make actions in communities to promote change and empowerment through playing;

Learn **new skills** to work with people and communities;

Help the participants, and the communities **become more aware of their own talents, skills, resources and strengths.**

Work as a group to **bring transformation** in communities through actions

Get practical experience in transforming communities

**Cultivate and promote the inherent leader and facilitator** that each of us have within us.

**Experience the potential of diversity** and understand why we need to promote interactions between us and learn to see ourselves in the other.

Encourage and support communities, facilitators and participants to go beyond what they think is possible, either individually or collectively.

**Gain confidence** by meeting and overcoming challenges individually and as a group

Use learning to help towards building **more sustainable communities**

Out of all of these identified objectives we’ve clustered and defined three that are central to our investigation and to the Theory of Change and that are transversal to all the game lines:

- More community engagement and civic participation
- Increased feeling of belonging to the community
- Increased recognition and valuation of diversity (cultural, ethnic, religious, other)

The participatory workshop held in Athens also contributed to the identification of the relevant stakeholders for the impact assessment – Participants, Trainees, Organizations and the Community – and from these those that are more important: local participants and migrants/refugees participants. The primary reason for excluding from our IA other relevant stakeholders is time and budget constraints.

Having identified the relevant stakeholders and the relevant objectives of the game, we were able to start constructing the path of change. Figure 3 demonstrates the fundamental logic of our ToC where the different cards played during each game build up to reduce stereotyping, increase trust in the community and ultimately contributed to the desired goal of increasing civic participation in the community activities.
Regarding our second relevant stakeholder group – migrants or refugees participants – the increased awareness of own talents and powers together with increased confidence and group recognition generates a sense of empowerment and integration that compounds with the effects of community cards to generate a sense of belonging, itself a primary objective, and finally an increased participation of this group in their community (figure 4).

Regarding our second-stage of methodological development – Appropriate methods for data collection - several different possibilities were weighted and considered by the research team and placed against the resources available. Although an in-depth impact assessment that truly considers different aspects of individual and societal transformation -
behavioural change, skills and competences change, new perceptions and beliefs - takes time and requires a deep immersion within the social context where the activities are taking place, within the Go To Diversity project other routes had to be taken. Due to the limited timescale for implementation and analysis off the research (4 months) and the limited budget available, two key decisions were made regarding data collection: 1) Focus on skills development and perception changes, opting out of identifying behavioural change; 2) Focus on Individual change, opting out community and relational change (processes that take much longer).

With this research choice we moved away from a more ethnography or participant observation type of field methods and towards simpler and more distant methods, such as interviews and questionnaires. Drawing experience from previous research and trials of Impact Assessments of similar games (Alves, 2017) we assumed that collecting useful and timely information from the stakeholders identified previously is a key component for the scientific and methodological coherence and consistency of the Impact Assessment for the Go Deep Game and a big challenge in itself. Participants delay, forget or simply do not fill in the necessary data in the right timing. Others join later or quit before the game process making it extremely hard to account for significant and measurable changes and impacts of the game. In the Go Deep game specially, the high freedom of mobility of participants into and out of the game, presents additional challenges for the traditional SIA methodologies requiring novel approaches and more dynamic data collection tools. Therefore, and taking into account the wide diversity of socio-economic contexts where the game will be played we proposed two parallel and complementary strategies for data collection:

a) **S1: Questionnaires.** Following traditional approaches to SIA we’ve developed online questionnaires that can be applied to all participants that will commit to play at least 75% of the game. Questionnaires will be filled before, immediately after the game and 1-month after the game was played. This strategy is particularly relevant (and compulsory) for those interested in becoming facilitators of the game in the future;

b) **S2: Video interviews.** During and immediately after the game video recordings of game participants will be collected based on the semi-structured script presented in a later section of this manual.
Regarding the Questionnaires to be sent to and filled by the key stakeholders identified before it is of paramount importance that the timings shown in the figure under are correctly followed as it may influence the overall results and bias our analysis. We also propose that the Questionnaires shall be online in order to facilitate the process. However, physical Questionnaires can be provided for participants with low or no IT literacy, assuming that the facilitator will later provide the answers in the online platform.

The online questionnaires developed for the Regional workshops of the Gotodivers project used the online platform ‘Typeform’ and were translated into three languages: English, Spanish and Italian. After a first trial phase in the Regional workshop that took place in Athens, the questionnaires were divided into two separate groups: one questionnaire specifically designed for local participants from the community and another for other game participants but that don’t recognize themselves as an integral part of the community. In this second group we include participant trainees, participants from local organizations but that don’t live in the community, participants from nearby communities that don’t inhabit the particular venue where the game is taking place. For example, in Madrid, the game was played in the Barrio de San Cristóbal (8km south from Madrid centre) and participants coming from Madrid were not considered as community members. This separation was key for our understanding of the impact of the game as these two stakeholder groups have different Theories of Change and more importantly different paths of change. Concretely,
the most relevant distinction between both questionnaires is regarding the skills and competences assessment. While in the community members our focus was on assessing their level of community empowerment, engagement and their level of community belonging, for the rest of the game participants we choose to focus more on the specific skills and competences directly connected with the game, such as conflict management or capacity to lead diverse teams.

Our questionnaires were divided into four dimensions: 1) participant profile; 2) motivation, knowledge of the game; 3) skills and competences self-assessment; 4) expectations and comments. Before starting the questionnaire it was made clear the intention and purpose of the questionnaire – see figure 8 – and according to the new European law on data use it was asked permission to analyse and use the data provided for research objectives.

As a part of our Gotodivers project that makes possible this unique event, all partners have committed to develop and perform an Impact Assessment in order to better understand and evaluated the outcomes of the game. This is the first of three online questionnaires that we ask you to contribute to.

Let’s Go! press ENTER

The questionnaires started with a sequence of profile questions in order to better understand our group of stakeholders as well as to give the possibility of running future deeper social studies on potential relevant correlations. Employment status, education level, belonging to minority groups and age were among the questions asked.

While some questions differ according to each stakeholder group, others were precisely the same, namely one of our key questions within this project:

10 How much do you agree with the sentence: "With diversity we win rather than loose?"

[Scale of 0 to 5]

Figure 8 - Intro statement for the questionnaire

Our Go Deep slogan “With diversity we win rather than loose” turned into a scale question in order to better understand the views and perceptions with the wide topic of diversity and identify changes occurring during and after the game. As you will see in the next section of this report – Results -, not only we asked the level of agreement but also asked participants
to explain or justify their answers so that we can have a more qualitative perspective into the answers given. This complementary approach between quantitative data and more qualitative information which allows us to go deeper in the research is an embedded character of our analysis in these questionnaires.

We’ve also blended scale questions, with open-ended questions, drop-down menus and multiple-choice to foster a dynamic and simple approach to the questionnaire, facilitating as much as possible its filling while making it relevant, interesting and user-friendly.

12. What is your main motivation to play the Go Deep game?
(Please choose just one)

- A. To get to know more people in my community;
- B. To connect with other community members and address common issues;
- C. To foster community cohesion, integration and inclusion;
- D. To learn more about the Go Deep game and bring it to other communities;
- E. To have fun while doing the change I want to see in the world;
- F. Other

The pursuit of a user-friendly and efficient-filling questionnaire was also very much enriched after the first Regional workshop in Athens were the questionnaire was first trialled and participants feedback was given regarding the clarity of the questions, the understanding of the scales, the usability of the platform and the language used. From this feedback, many corrections were made and improvements introduced, for example with adding up descriptions and examples under the questions or using highly recognized symbols for the scales. Figure 11 under provides an example of this where we’ve introduced heart-shaped symbols and a deconstruction of ‘belonging’ to facilitate participants’ clarity while answering.

8. How would you rate your sense of belonging in this community after playing the Go Deep Game?
(Sense of being seen, valued, accepted)

Figure 11 - Scale question example for community members
S2: Script for semi structured interviews

The key objective of these interviews is to collect personal stories around the theme of cultural diversity / inclusion / integration while at the same time reflecting on the Go Deep Game and its impacts.

Semi-structured interviews based on a given script with audio recording and possibly video recording for later editing. The interviews should be relatively short while allowing time and space to go deep (5 to 25 minutes); personal and individual; and if possible on a one-to-one setting within a quiet and safe context. Ideally in English with the possibility of being done in mother language by a local facilitator and later translated and/or subtitled. The script is not to be followed linearly but intuitively according to the flow of the conversation and can be adapted to better fit the situation.

Draft proposal for interviews:

1. A short presentation (who are you? What brings you here to the Go Deep game? What are your expectations? Or What do you think about the game?)
2. “With Diversity we win rather than loose.” What are your thoughts and feelings regarding this claim/affirmation?
3. Do you think playing the Go Deep game has/will improve your connection and relation with your community? How? Why so?
   a. Group
   b. yourself
4. Do you think playing the Go Deep game has/will change your perception/beliefs regarding diversity and inclusion within your community? How?
5. Do you feel more included and integrate within your community after playing the game? What changed? What could make it better?
6. Do you think playing the Go Deep game has/will improve community cohesion and inclusion of diversity? How? Why so?
7. Recall a special moment of the game for you. What was it that made it special? What has changed inside of you?
8. Was there any insight/learning that you’ve gained through playing the game? Did this game brought awareness to you?
9. How, according to you, this game can help in the process of “growing communities”?
Results

S1 – Questionnaires

The results presented in this report are from three regional workshops – Madrid, Grottaglie and Edinburgh – that took place in September and October of 2018, respectively. We did not consider the data extracted from the first regional workshop in Athens (March 2018) as several changes were made to the questionnaires and to the ToC after the trials in Athens and the fact that in Athens we only had one questionnaire, and it was mostly applied on non-community participants. It is also important to mention that during the research period we’ve used other Go Deep events to fine-tune and trial the data collection methods but as they were not run under this project and they had different formats and target groups, we did not consider them within this analysis. Therefore, our sample of analysis is the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location \ Nº of valid answers</th>
<th>Getting ready (T0)</th>
<th>Arriving (T1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Community members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Cristobal – Spain</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh - Scotland</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grottaglie - Italy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As one can read from the table above the data is not complete nor there is a perfect match between answers in both periods of analysis, meaning that not all individual paths of change could be assessed. Whenever relevant for this report we will refer to individuals (anonymously) but more often we will only communicate and reflect upon overall sample or per country conclusions. It is also of particular scientific relevance to mention the reduced size of the sample which requires caution and containment in establishing grand conclusions, correlations or even impact-related considerations. All comments and conclusions made in this section, although insightful and inspiring, can only be valid for this very limited sample and not for the Go Deep game as a whole.
Regarding the socio-economic characterization of the sample and as you can see in figure 13, we have a majority of female participants, where 37.5% self-identify as part of a minority group\(^3\) and where the vast majority did not play the Go Deep game before. The average age of the participants in Madrid and Edinburgh was 42 years and a significant proportion self-identified as self-employed or unemployed (54%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender (M / F / NA)</th>
<th>Minority group</th>
<th>Played the game?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Cristobal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grottaglie</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13 - Social characterization of the sample

Although the vast majority of respondents did not play the Go Deep game, 70% mentioned previous experience and participation in community development activities and knowledge of other methodologies for community engagement and participatory planning such as: Oasis Game; Dragon Dreaming; Open Space; and World Café.

Regarding the motivation for participating in the Go Deep game – see figure 10 – three answers clearly stick out and dominate regarding the overall sample: To foster community cohesion, integration and inclusion (25%); to learn more about Go Deep game and bring it to other communities (35%); and, finally, to become a Go deep facilitator (25%). However, once we single-out only community members’ responses, the intention to ‘Foster community cohesion’ rises to more than 45% of all answers signalling a clear commitment with community development and using the Go Deep game as an active means for promoting social inclusion and community integration.

Following up on community members specific answers, the next three questions were directly related with the theory and path of change and aimed at any self-identified change regarding the participants’ sense of belonging, engagement and support within their local community prior and after the Go Deep game. As one can see from figures 14, 15 and 16, the trendline of change is remarkably clear: in all three questions there is a movement towards the right, and higher values on each of the charts portraying a higher sense of belonging, a higher feeling of engagement in community activities and a higher feeling of supported to act after the completion of the Go Deep game. The bigger changes took place in the sense of belonging and feeling of engagement, however the later does not surprise us as the Go Deep game has a significant component of group and community activities in its

\(^3\) Participants were asked to name the minority group when answering YES. We have collected a wide variety of answers that range from ethnic or cultural minorities, to political or even to gender and (dis)ability-related.
layout, specifically designed to foster engagement, active participation and conscious listening of all voices. More interesting for our report is the stated change regarding the sense of belonging to the community.

Within our ToC a greater sense of belonging came with a better integration, increased awareness and social recognition as much as the development of deeper bonds with other community members. Such an increase in such a short period of time may raise hearts and smiles but also eyebrows and interesting questions. Are these changes just short-term hypes created by the intensity of group work in a week or significant and sustained transformations in with longer-term impacts? What follow-up is needed to sustain and continue these trends towards greater integration and bonding? Although some of these
reflections will be presented and discussed in the next section, a participant quote might enable us to set the mood and explore deeper some ideas: “il lavoro personale, la condivisione, la stanchezza, la felicità, il mettersi in gioco, la paura, la collaborazione...tante cose che hanno permesso alla nostra comunità di crescere insieme e a ciascuno di noi di sentirsi singoli importanti e diversi che hanno fatto un pezzo di strada insieme.”

For some other questions in our questionnaire, the change pre and post regional workshop game is not so significant and mostly because the starting level is already very high. In the case of our key question ‘How much do you agree with the sentence “With diversity we win rather than loose”’ – see figure 9 – the average (and median) answer was 5 out of 5 in both moments. Therefore, the interesting and richer component to analyse were the individual answers before and after to justify the answer given in the scale. As one participant from the UK summarized: “Diversity needs energy and work to bring it together, When it comes together it is a beautiful and magical thing but this takes energy and effort, sometimes it can be too much which can lead to fracturing and isolation. It must grow at a manageable pace”. From our analysis, the results show a deeper understanding of diversity, what it means and how it can be used to foster creativity and collaboration, namely for the participants that played the Diversity line in the regional workshop in Spain. Therefore, we can assume a qualitative increase in awareness and understanding of diversity although the quantitative proxy does not fully reflect that increase. As for the development of competences during the regional workshops there was a distinction between the two stakeholder groups, whereby ‘other participants’ which often included trainees and community workers, were also assessed in their capacity to facilitate the Go Deep game and lead diverse teams. See figure 17 for a list of competences analysed for both stakeholder groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competences</th>
<th>Community members</th>
<th>Other participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to connect with others from different cultures/ backgrounds / beliefs</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to cooperate and work together with people from different cultures / backgrounds / beliefs</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to trust in others and build trust among others</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to establish bridges among cultures and find common solutions</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to solve and / or mediate conflicts</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to express myself and my emotions in diverse groups</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to lead and facilitate diverse teams</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to facilitate the Go Deep game in</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Translate from the original: “il lavoro personale, la condivisione, la stanchezza, la felicità, il mettersi in gioco, la paura, la collaborazione...tante cose che hanno permesso alla nostra comunità di crescere insieme e a ciascuno di noi di sentirsi singoli importanti e diversi che hanno fatto un pezzo di strada insieme.”
Based on this competence list, built in coherence with the proposed ToC and Path of Change, the self-perception of participants was questioned before and after the game. The average change can be seen in figure 18, depicting two fundamental conclusions: firstly, there’s an overall progression in both countries and for the vast majority of competences; secondly, there are country differences in terms of competence development. While in the UK the highest increase was in the “Ability to connect with others from different cultures/ backgrounds / beliefs”, in Spain it happen in the “Ability to facilitate the Go Deep game in diverse communities”.

The differences between the two regional workshops mentioned are not surprising and can be attributed to many different variables – from cultural contexts, to which lines were played for example. However, the fact that a positive change in the self-assessments by all participants regarding these competences demonstrates the validity of our initial assumptions. As one can see in figure 19 for the case of the regional workshop in Scotland, there are differences even within each country between competences but the overall change is clearly visible.

---

5 The results from the competences development in Italy could not be aggregated here due to an inconsistency in the data collection phase derived from a communication mistake between the teams and translation errors.
Finally, and regarding the overall appreciation of the game and if it met the participants' expectations, the overall feedback given is extremely positive – 90.5% of all answers between 4 and 5 – as well as the comments and remarks on the specific components of the game that most contributed to their development and what they personally take from the journey. “The joy of seeing so many different people bring in their deepest dreams as strengthened my dreams and hopes” was a comment from a Scottish participant. “Reminder of the importance of creating an atmosphere for creativity and openness. I've learned new ways (and been inspired) to be inclusive in the planning stages of community development and encouraging input at all stages and according to ability. I've learned about trusting the group to co-facilitate and that there doesn't need to be one person on charge”, were valuable remarks from participants from San Cristóbal (Madrid).
Concerning the interviews collected for our impact assessment, Fciências teamed up with the video team from Punes and together we’ve captured 52 video interviews with Go Deep participants and facilitators, 26 in the first regional workshop in Athens and 26 in the other three combined. The videos were made during the game following the structure presented in the previous section of this report. The videos were filmed in informal settings, in both English and Spanish, using breaks or time-off from group activities during the game to gather some more insights and explore deeper the issues of diversity, integration, empowerment and belonging.

The vast majority of the interviews collected have 4 to 5 min on average and are individual. While the transcripts will be provided in annex, some interesting insights for discussion can be here summarized:

1) On the method:

Video interviews proved to be a fun and challenging medium for most interviewees, who expressed some nervousness and uneasiness to be talking on camera about these topics and their views and emotions. Moreover, conducting them during the game exacerbated that uneasiness as well as the potential influence of context on their answers. Although our research team aimed at an informal conversation, semi-structured and only after building some trust and relationship during the game, our overall conclusion is that video interviews can be challenging and potentially not the most adequate method to harvest quality data from Go Deep participants regarding the game impact on their lives. However, for dissemination, visual impact and storytelling purposes the videos collected are powerful, insightful and very inspirational accounts of personal impactful journeys.

2) From the interviews:

The interviews provided a window into the realm of social complexity and societal transformation that the questionnaires couldn’t reach and in doing so were a very useful complement for our analysis. While in conversation, participants held a visible tension between the experience of the game, its impact in themselves and their community – feedback very congruent with their answers in the questionnaires – and at the same time the understanding that most of the issues being worked out – belonging, empowerment, integration – were complex systems, with non-linear trends, that require short, medium and long-term interventions and that at the local scale things can easily get entangled in the fabric of social relations. One of the words most commonly use was ‘people’ followed by ‘community’, clearly underlining that it’s all about people and the relationships between them that matter and make a difference. Even regarding the development of inner individual skills during the Go Deep game, the interviewees stressed the social context in which those learnings took place and the social work that those skills will contribute to.
These interviews also allowed us to better understand how time – past, present and future – and relations – personal, group and community – are constantly weaved together in a fabric that can hardly be separated or clustered. This is an important insight for the discussion under and future research.

Discussion

The Go Deep game is undoubtfully an impactful tool for community development, for the promotion of social cohesion, for integration of people in a group or in a community and for an increased civic participation. The data shown in this report as well as the interviews collected during and after the three regional workshops, confirm the claims and aims of the Go Deep game and allow for several insights on how that impact happens and to what degree it can happen. Participants that have played the game show a clear increase in confidence in their own social skills and feel more integrated and motivated for community engagement. Moreover, the data presented in section 2 supports and validates the theory and path of change designed for the relevant stakeholders. Furthermore, the results show that the game can be taught and that, when participating in a training for facilitators, participants significantly increase their confidence in facilitating the game in other communities. This result shows the potential of replication of the positive effects of the game, should the Go Deep game be made available for further use. However, the data, and more precisely the limitations and constraints imposed by a limited data collection and analysis, also demand caution in our current conclusions and they signal the need for deeper and wider research in the future.

Due to the complexity, variety and finesse of outcomes and impacts generated by the Go Deep game, is our conclusion from this impact assessment that further research conducted should take into consideration: 1) longer time periods for analysis and implementation; 2) the need for an in-depth systematic field participant observation in order to assess and quantify behavioral change and witness community change processes; 3) the need to extend the analysis to other relevant stakeholders, namely community informal groups and local organizations working inside the community; 5) the need to consider how the context variables can influence the end results (i.e. where the game is played; which organization is the host; who is invited to play; the importance of having participants external to the community; etc). For the present results, we have designed a research path that included and integrated the project consortium and facilitators of the game in the development of the Theory of Change of the Go Deep game. In the future, the research path and the development of the Theory of Change could be improved by including the participants of the impact assessment and the communities were the game has been played. This would develop its own feedback loops as an integral part of a community development process and could result in further improvements or follow ups to the Go Deep game. Despite the fact that this research showed very positive results, the direct feedback requested by facilitators on the Go Deep game have shown that there is also space for improvement. Even though this feedback is in principle integrated in the Go Deep card revision that is
taking place within the Go Deep project, a participatory-action-research could further contribute to this improvement, supporting and in-depth analysis of the perceptions of participants and communities. Our learning throughout this project leads us to believe that the social impacts of complex tools such as the Go Deep game can be better assessed and improved with the support of an on-going, long-term, participant observation ethnographic methodologies that are ultimately co-developed with the community itself.
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We have discovered that **real transformation** depends on the **attitude** we bring.

To realize the opportunities for growth that new challenges bring, we need to be willing to **immerse** ourselves in community and perceive the **abundance** that is there.