3.1 The engagement project

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____ **Total: 27 marks**

KEY WORDS engagement • ethics

The engagement project

Objective

Frame a political issue with key concepts, plan purposeful first-hand engagement, weigh perspectives against the published record, and write the analysis-and-reflection report (the internal assessment).

1 Key knowledge and worked examples

Engagement toolkit. The issue: political (power, decisions), debatable, globally connected, engageable – framed as a question with two core concepts. The plan: sources mapped, perspectives identified, a realistic route. Engagement: first-hand, purposeful, documented, ethical (consent, anonymity, owned positionality). Research: the published record weighed against the experience; perspectives evaluated, silences named. The report (2 000 words): issue and context, research findings, the engagement, analysis with concepts, reflection owning limits. Worked example: street homelessness and encampment clearance.

2 Practice

2.1 State the four tests a project issue must pass. [3]

2.2 Improve this issue into a framed question: "Is immigration good?" [2]

2.3 State three things the engagement must be (beyond merely happening). [3]

2.4 Name the two ethics obligations an interview-based project carries. [2]

2.5 What does the reflection component ask that the analysis component does not? [2]

3 Exam-style questions

3.1 *(Framing style.)* Frame the homelessness issue as a project: write the question, name the two key concepts it applies, and draft the research plan (sources and perspectives) in brief. [6]

3.2 *(Analysis style.)* Using the worked example, explain how the clearance policy shows second-face power and a legitimacy contest, with evidence from the engagement. [5]

3.3 *(Reflection style.)* Write the reflection paragraph the worked project needs: the document-record gap, the limits, and one thing the engagement taught that research alone could not. [4]

Solutions

2.1 Political (about power, decisions, who gets what); debatable (real competing perspectives); globally connected (a local manifestation of a global issue or the reverse); engageable (something a student can genuinely act on) (3 for any three).

2.2 Any defensible framing naming issue, level and concepts – e.g. "How does [city]'s sanctuary policy exercise power and construct legitimacy, and whose rights does it serve?" (2 for question + two concepts + a level).

2.3 First-hand (beyond the classroom), purposeful (chosen to answer the framed question) and documented (notes, transcripts, photographs – the evidence the report cites) (3).

2.4 Informed consent from interviewees; anonymity where requested (accept: owning the researcher's position in the reflection) (2).

2.5 The reflection asks what the engagement taught that research alone could not, and owns the project's limits and the researcher's positionality (1); the analysis applies the concepts to the evidence (1).

3.1 Question: "How does [city]'s encampment-clearance policy exercise power over the unhoused, and on what legitimacy does it rest?" (2). Concepts: power (its faces) and legitimacy (its types and test) (1). Plan – sources: the council's policy documents, national homelessness statistics, a housing charity's reports, one academic study of clearance effects (2); perspectives: the housing officer (official), the outreach organiser (advocate), site residents (affected), the study's authors (academic) (1).

3.2 Second-face power: the agenda is set before the unhoused are heard – clearance is scheduled and announced, and consultation follows, so the decision space itself excludes them (2); the engagement's evidence: the residents' accounts of the notice period and the housing officer's account of the mandate together show the agenda working (1). Legitimacy contest: procedural legitimacy (the mandate, the consultation) against performance legitimacy (the cleared return, the support-first promise unmet in residents' experience) (2).

3.3 Model reflection: "The engagement revealed a document-record gap the sources could not: the policy's 'support-first' account bore no relation to the residents' experience of the clearance mornings (1). The project's limits are real – two residents, one city, twelve shifts – and my position as a volunteer may have shaped what participants chose to tell me (2). What only engagement taught: power here is not the officer's intention but the residents' learned expectation of not being consulted – a preference-shaping the documents record nowhere (1)."

Local review guidance: the question must carry concepts, not just a topic; (R1 3.2) the power claim rests on BOTH sides' accounts; (R1 3.3) reflection is specific, not confessional. Authored guidance.