



**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RESEARCH COUNCIL**

**POLARIS HOUSE  
NORTH STAR AVENUE  
SWINDON SN2 1UJ  
Tel: 01793 413000  
Fax: 01793 413001  
GTN 1434**

<b>REFERENCE NUMBER</b>
<b>RES - 000 - 23 - 0410</b>
<b>TITLE</b>
<b>'Pragmatics and Intercultural Communication'</b>
<b>INVESTIGATORS</b>
<b>Dr. Robert CRAWSHAW (Principal Investigator) Dr. Jonathan CULPEPER Professor Geoffrey LEECH Mr. Barry JONES (University of Cambridge) Dr. Julia HARRISON (Research Assistant)</b>
<b>INSTITUTION</b>
<b>Lancaster University</b>

## DECLARATION ONE: CONDUCT OF THE RESEARCH

This Report is an accurate statement of the objectives, conduct, results and outputs (to date) of the research project funded by the ESRC.

### 1. Award Holder(s) Signature

NB. This must include anyone named as a co-applicant in the research proposal.

TITLE	INITIALS	SURNAME	SIGNATURE
Dr	R.H.	CRAWSHAW	
Dr	J.	CULPEPER	
Prof	G.N.	LEECH	
Mr	B.L.	JONES	

### 2. Administrative Authority Signature

DATE:
-------

### 3. Head of Department, School or Faculty Signature

DATE:
-------

Photocopies of this page are acceptable in the seven additional printed copies of the report. This page should be left blank in the email copy.

## DECLARATION TWO: ESRC "SOCIETY TODAY"

"Society Today" is the ESRC's publicly available research database on the WWW, containing summary details of all ESRC research projects and their associated publications and outputs. From Feb 2005, the texts of Summary and Full reports from End of Award Reports will also be available. Society Today will provide an excellent opportunity for researchers to publicise their work; the database will potentially have a large user base, drawn not only from Higher Education, but increasingly from government, voluntary agencies, business and the media.

Summary details of publications and/or other outputs of research conducted under ESRC funded awards must be submitted to the Society Today database.

Please contact: ESRC Communications (Info Centre), Economic and Social Research Council, Polaris House, North Star Avenue, Swindon, SN2 1UJ.

Tel: 01793 413122; e-mail: [infocentre@esrc.ac.uk](mailto:infocentre@esrc.ac.uk) (general queries)

Tel: 0870 609 1748; e-mail: [infocentresupport@esrc.ac.uk](mailto:infocentresupport@esrc.ac.uk) (technical queries, e.g. uploading outputs)

Please sign at either A or B below.

- A. Details of relevant outputs of this award have been submitted to Society Today and details of any ensuing outputs will be submitted in due course.

Signature of Principal Award Holder

	DATE:
--	-------

- B. This award has not yet produced any relevant outputs, but details of any future publications will be submitted to Society Today as soon as they become available?

Signature of Principal Award Holder

	DATE:
--	-------

Award holders should note that the end of award report cannot be accepted, and the final claim cannot be paid, until either ESRC has received confirmation that details of relevant outputs have been submitted to Society Today or the award holder has declared that the award has not so far produced any relevant outputs

Photocopies of this page are acceptable in the seven additional printed copies of the report. This page should be left blank in the email copy.

## DECLARATION THREE: DATA ARCHIVE

A machine-readable copy of any dataset arising from the research must be offered for deposit with the ESRC Data Archive within three months of the end of the award. All enquiries should be addressed to: The Director, ESRC Data Archive, University of Essex, Wivenhoe Park, Colchester CO4 3SQ. The Data Archive maintains an informative website at:

<http://www.data-archive.ac.uk/>

Award Holders submitting qualitative data should refer to the Qualidata website at [www.essex.ac.uk/qualidata](http://www.essex.ac.uk/qualidata)

Please sign at either A or B below.

A. Machine-readable copies of datasets arising from this award have been, or are in the process of being, offered for deposit with the ESRC Data Archive.

Signature of Principal Award Holder

DATE:

B. There are no relevant datasets arising from this award to date.

Signature of Principal Award Holder

DATE:

Award holders should note that the ESRC will withhold the final payment of an award if a dataset has not been deposited to the required standard within three months of the end of award, except where a modification or waiver of deposit requirements has been agreed in advance.

Photocopies of this page are acceptable in the seven additional printed copies of the report. This page should be left blank in the email copy

## PROJECT DETAILS

## ESRC END OF AWARD REPORT: PROJECT DETAILS

AWARD NUMBER:	RES - 000 - 23 - 0410		
AWARD TITLE: (the box will accommodate up to 4 lines of text)	'Pragmatics and Intercultural Communication – (The PIC project)'  Pragmatic and Sociopragmatic factors in communication between language assistants and teachers in France and England.		
AWARD START DATE	September 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2003	TOTAL AMOUNT EXPENDED:	£
AWARD END DATE	September 30 <sup>th</sup> , 2006		

## AWARD HOLDER(S):

NB. This must include anyone named as a co-applicant, as originally listed in the research proposal.

TITLE	INITIALS	SURNAME	DATE OF BIRTH	No HOURS PER WEEK/ % TIME ON PROJECT
Dr	R.H.	CRAWSHAW	16.05.47	8
Dr	J.	CULPEPER	09.06.66	5
Prof	G.N.	LEECH	16.01.36	.5
Mr	B.L.	JONES	25.12.38	.5

PRINCIPAL AWARD HOLDER'S FULL OFFICIAL ADDRESS (please list other addresses on a separate sheet if necessary)	E-MAIL
	r.crawshaw@lancs.ac.uk
Dr. R.H.CRAWSHAW Department of European Languages and Cultures Lancaster University LANCS LA1 4YN	FAX NUMBER
	(01524) 593942
	TELEPHONE NUMBER
	(01524) 582663 Mobile 07855 388 202

## ACTIVITIES AND ACHIEVEMENTS QUESTIONNAIRE

### 1. Non-Technical Summary

A 1000 word (maximum) summary of the main research results, in non-technical language, should be provided below. The summary might be used by ESRC to publicise the research. It should cover the aims and objectives of the project, main research results and significant academic achievements, dissemination activities and potential or actual impacts on policy and practice.

The main objective of the 'PIC project' was to carry out a critical analysis of communication between foreign language teaching assistants and the 'teacher/mentors' responsible for their professional welfare in French and English Schools. Its aim was to investigate and to differentiate between the various factors (psychological, linguistic, political and cultural) which determined the success or failure of their professional relationships. Students from five British and three French Universities volunteered to participate. With the full support of The British Council, the Centre International des Etudes Pédagogiques, the French Ministry of Education, Local Education Authorities and Académies, 57 students (24 French and 33 English) were placed in a cross-section of schools in different regions of France and in the South-East Midlands and East Anglia areas of England.

Both students and prospective teacher/mentors were prepared for the project in a series of workshops in both countries. The students were tested psychologically, responded to questionnaires and took part in focus groups relating to their preparation for the period of residence abroad and to their expectations. They also rehearsed 'critical intercultural incidents' derived from previous research which 'trained' them in techniques of observation and recording of their experiences, orally and in writing.

Data was subsequently collected in four formats: 'live recordings' of face to face exchanges, oral records of their reactions to these, written journals on the development of their relationships with their 'teacher/mentors' and 'retrospective reflections' gathered at final workshops. It was thereby possible to compare 'live' data with 'metapragmatic' reactions on the part of the interlocutors towards the exchanges. The data was transcribed in its entirety, codified and stored on computer for subsequent analysis using Atlas Ti5. A project website <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/fass/projects/pic/> (also accessible by googling 'Pragmatics and Intercultural Communication') was set up. It contains the full set of data, a progressively updated summary of the project's findings and outlines of the published papers emanating from the research.

Physical dissemination of the findings has taken place through specially organised national and international workshops and presentations by members of the research team at international conferences (see website and below).

At the institutional level, the Project's principal finding has been that despite the high quality of available preparatory material offered by government agencies, lacunae persist in students' preparation for the programme. This applies particularly in the field of pedagogy, given the increasing demands placed on assistants in schools. In addition, educational policies in the two countries (such as GCSE examination syllabi or the compulsory inclusion of English in French primary schools), themselves the expression of national cultures, are key determinants of the topics of exchange and their likely outcomes. These policies also to a large extent determine the nature of the teaching undertaken by the assistant.

At a theoretical level, the Project demonstrates that intercultural verbal communication cannot satisfactorily be understood in terms of universal politeness principles. Specific cultural codes regulate what is considered appropriate in given situations, for instance those dominated by such functions such as 'giving information', 'seeking advice', 'complaining', 'praising', 'criticising' and 'apologising'. These codes are likely to be as much the product of particular contexts as of nationally determined linguistic patterns of behaviour. Not surprisingly, students need to be aware in advance of the codes appropriate to the contexts concerned if they are to manage their professional relationships successfully in the foreign school environment. For example, in 'giving information' and 'seeking advice', a major institutional difference between the French and English contexts is that the post of 'head of department', standard within English schools, does not exist in the French education system. Inevitably, what is deemed to be 'reasonable' in requesting guidance differs between the two countries. In England, the Head of the French department can be expected to know the timetable of the assistant and would normally take responsibility for her (his) teaching programme; in France this is not the case. If English assistants require this type of advice, they need to be more circumspect in requesting it and require more diverse negotiating skills. This knowledge and the type of expression appropriate to the occasion, together with the role and status of the interlocutor, define the nature of an 'activity type' – or the bundle of culturally determined conventions governing professional interchanges. Contrary to popular stereotype, the French students exercised more reticence than the English in seeking advice and complained less when things went wrong. In general, the French suffered fewer breakdowns in communication due to language difficulties than did the English. Analogous, culturally determined, 'rules of conduct' were at play in interpreting 'praise' or the giving of 'compliments'. While the English teachers were more liberal in expressing personal approval of the assistants than their French equivalents, these attitudes were readily interpreted by the French students as 'false' if they were not sustained. As might be expected, the French teachers were viewed as being more 'formal' than the English. Again, such cultural criteria needed to be understood prior to departure, and appropriate linguistic instruments developed, if a successful cross-cultural 'rapport' was to be established with colleagues in the place of work.

The originality of the project and the quality of its contribution to the field of intercultural pragmatics lies in having provided empirical evidence of cultural differences in attitude and speech behaviour between two directly comparable experimental groups, fulfilling similar roles and undertaking analogous communicative tasks in professionally equivalent situations. The data is original in that it combines live interchange with retrospective analysis by the participants of the factors conditioning its outcomes. Its analysis has exposed the mechanics of communication between language assistants and teachers in French and English schools. It has tested the validity of stereotypes of English-French cross-cultural communication by closely examining patterns of communication in a number of selected domains. It has provisionally concluded that the rules governing given types of exchange (or 'activity types') are culturally determined and specific to particular contexts. Their make up can only satisfactorily be explained by an approach which combines the quantitative analysis of specific 'moves' with a qualitative insight into their symbolic connotations, sequential structure, style and impact and a knowledge of the environment in which they occur.

## 2. Dissemination

A. Please outline any specific plans you have for further publication and/or other means of dissemination of the outcomes and results of the research.

Information about the project's outcomes including links to the website have been circulated electronically to the departments of Modern Languages (French) in every HE institution in the UK, as well as to associations and agencies responsible for the teaching of French in secondary and HE and for residence abroad in England and France. The latter have included The Subject Centre for Modern Languages, the National Centre for Languages (CILT), The British Council and the Centre International des Etudes Pédagogiques. The letter accompanying the message has invited critical feedback on the website which continues to be maintained in the light of comments received (see Appendix 1).

As indicated above, progress reports and/or summaries of the project's findings and original research papers have been presented at specially invited lectures, conferences and workshops at the following locations:

The Open University, Milton Keynes June 2004; Dublin City University, December 2004; Lancaster University January 2005; The British Council Paris December 2005; The British Council London, March 2006; University of Koblenz, Landau, March 2006; Nottingham University, April 2006; University of Cardiff, June 2006; University of Limerick, June 2006; University of Cork, September 2006; Lancaster University, October 2006; Norwich UEA, November 2006; Bristol University February 2007.

Abstracts of the above presentations feature on the project website and are attached in hard copy. Together, the presentations have formed the basis for five, jointly authored, academic research papers. One of these has already been accepted for publication and will be appearing in the journal *Language and Intercultural Communication* in August 2007. The four others either have been or are about to be submitted to the following journals: *Text and Talk*, *Multilingua*, *The Journal of Pragmatics*, *The Journal of Politeness Research*, *Sociolinguistics*.

A proposal for a jointly authored book, entitled *Pragmatics and Intercultural Communication*, has been derived in part from the papers outlined above but places the outcomes of the project in the global context of research in pragmatics and intercultural communication. The proposal has been accepted by Cambridge University Press following strong support from referees in the UK and USA. and a contract has been drawn up. Work on the book is already under way towards a submission deadline of December 2007. It is anticipated that the book will give the project and its outcomes a global profile, enabling comparisons to be drawn between an intra-European case study and analogous studies involving other countries in Europe and elsewhere in the world.



REFERENCE No.

B. Please provide names and contact details of any non-academic research users with whom the research has been discussed and/or to whom results have been disseminated.

The British Council, Assistants' Department, 10 Spring Gardens, London SW1A 2BN.

The British Council in Paris, 9, rue Constantine, 75007 Paris.

Le Centre International des Etudes Pédagogiques, 1 Avenue Léon Journault, 92310, Sèvres, France.

Subject Centre for Languages, Linguistics and Area Studies, University of Southampton, Highfield, Southampton, SO17 1BJ.

CILT, the National Centre for Languages, 20 Bedfordbury, London WC2N 4LB.

### 3. Nominated Outputs (see Guidelines 1.4)

Please give full details of the two nominated outputs which should be assessed along with this report. Please provide one printed copy of publicly available web-based resources, eight copies of any nominated outputs must be submitted with the End of Award Report.

‘Politics and Pragmatics in the cross-cultural management of rapport. Two exchanges between English Language Assistants and mentors in French schools’ refereed and approved for publication - to appear in *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 7:3 August, 2007.

“‘Activity Types’ as a bridge for micro and macro research: the case of ‘advice’ in interactions between language assistants and their supervisors in schools in France and England”. Paper presented at 31<sup>st</sup> International LAUD Symposium, Landau, Germany, 28<sup>th</sup> March, 2006. Subsequently revised and submitted to Text and Talk.

### 4. Staffing

Please detail appointments and departures below for ALL staff recruited for this award. Where possible, please note each person's name, age, grade; and for departing staff, destination type on leaving.

(Destination types: Academic post, Commercial, Public Sector, Personal, Other).

NB. This section must not include anyone who is an award holder.

Title	Initials	Surname	Date Of Birth	Grade	Appointment Date	Departure Date	Destination Type & Post
Dr	J.M.	Harrison	15.7.70	Research 1A	27.10.03	26.8.06	Continued part-time appointment as RA, Lancaster University
Ms	J.	McVicker	20.8.52	Clerical CS3	1.12.03	30.9.06	Appointed to clerical post on new AHRC project, Lancaster University

## 5. Virements

Since 1st April 1996 investigators may vire between grant headings without reference to Council, except where major capital items are being provided for. Please detail below any changed use of resources and the benefits or problems this brought.

The main financial issue was our underestimate of the costs of the workshops in Cambridge and Paris, mainly due to the travel expenses of those who attended (students and teachers) and by the charges of the (academic) institutions where the workshops were held. Another was the (legitimate) charge on the project budget made by an external investigator, employed at another UK university. His fee was excluded from the amount awarded by the ESRC for the project, despite our having appealed at the time against the cutback – a fact which contributed substantially to an overspend of some £6,000. As was pointed out at the time when the award was made, the colleague's involvement in the project was crucial to its success and, in the event, was only made possible through support from Lancaster University. Added support was provided through a department trust fund to extend the period of employment of the research assistant, Dr. Harrison, until December 2006 in order to begin work on the book.

## 6. Major difficulties

Please detail below any major difficulties, scientific or administrative/logistical, encountered during your research and comment on any consequent impact on the project. Further details should be included in the main report, including any advice you might have for resolving such problems in future projects.

Few if any difficulties occurred in the management of the project which had not been anticipated in the original proposal. They were none the less significant for that. The initial negotiation with the government agencies in the constitution of the proposal had been protracted and painstaking, but nevertheless extremely successful. Yet, despite the considerable goodwill of all concerned, it was a major challenge to identify the regions to which the students would be sent – especially in France where the official approval of each Recteur d' Académie was required before schools in that region could become involved. This obstacle was overcome through sheer persistence and with the support of the French Ministry. Recruiting student volunteer participants was also very time-consuming. These processes and the preparatory workshops absorbed the whole of the first year. As the website records, the establishment of this logistical infrastructure, absolutely essential for the project, was successfully achieved and, with the exception of 3 student withdrawals, virtually all the planned data - oral and written - was returned by the students. Student absences from the workshops were made up through correspondence and telephone calls. Data collection was less complete in the case of the teacher/mentors – due to many being unable to attend the workshops. This was truer of France than of England due mainly to the distances involved. We were able to compensate by telephoning the teacher/mentors in France and subsequently transcribing the interviews. This enriched the French data set, making comparison between individual student and teacher data possible but was harder to achieve in Britain due to the teachers' absence during the holiday period. However, most of the English teacher/mentors attended the final workshop and so were able to provide both oral and written feedback – all of which has been included in the data set.

As anticipated, the transcription and codification necessarily took place in two phases. After initial time-consuming transcription requiring close adherence to an agreed timetable and the enforcement of deadlines, the data was transferred from Word to Atlas ti5 and then codified according to an agreed template. The template differentiated between 'topic' and what we termed 'goal-driven activity', the latter being the primary focus of a given 'chunk' of discourse whose 'speaker intention' was clear. Inconsistency was minimised through careful briefing of codifiers, restricting their number, and frequent meetings. Even so, moderation checks were necessary and some further, minor, revisions carried out and transferred to the website.

By definition, systematic data analysis could not take place until this phase of the project was completed. This inevitably restricted the amount of time available for detailed research which, together with the setting up of the website, was carried out during 2006 alongside normal teaching and administrative duties. We were fortunate to have based an early paper on the pilot data and to have had it accepted for publication before the last year. By a planned programme of dissemination at which some of the main findings could be identified and selectively polarised around a series of theoretical topics, each investigator 'fronted' at least one specific paper, presented it and then wrote it up. These are now in the process of being refereed and together are contributing to the book currently under contract to Cambridge University Press in which every aspect of the project will be aired.

## 7. Other issues and unexpected outcomes

Please describe any outcomes of your research, beneficial or otherwise that were not expected at the outset or other issues which were important to the research, where these are not addressed above. Further details should be included in the main report.

None of the findings mentioned here were wholly unexpected but their extreme character was occasionally surprising. The following are only a sample of these.

- the paucity of pedagogical preparation offered to students in either country before participating in the programme;
- the extent of the difference between the tasks undertaken by assistants in France and England as a function of national educational policies and local conditions;
- the tendency of students, despite their resistance to stereotypes, to generalise from the particular to the general in their evaluation of teachers' behaviour and/or institutional culture;
- the intensity of the 'assistants' need to be 'kept informed';
- the desire to respect politeness conventions (which were more frequently flouted by the English students in France than vice versa);
- that the volume and severity of complaint was greater amongst English students than among French;
- the extent to which students were ready to modify their perceptions as their experience accumulated;
- the high standards of professionalism against which assistants judged teachers;
- the interdependence between the conventions governing 'activity types' and local cultural context.

The range of the data set is such that there is still considerable potential for further research which remains to be done on the data. This will find expression in the book for CUP for which we are currently under contract.

## 8. Contributions to ESRC Programmes

If your project was part of an ESRC Research Programme, please describe your contributions to the Programme's overall objectives, and note any impacts on your project resulting from your involvement.

Not strictly applicable. However, there were at least three aspects of the Project which we feel have promoted the aims of the ESRC generally. All three have to do with the interaction between research, social policy and the quality of social life. The first has been the strength of the working relationship between the project team, the British Council and the French authorities. The project has been a catalyst in sharpening the dialogue between the different categories of people involved in the assistants' programme: university teachers, government agencies, local education authorities, students and schools. This work has not finished. We hope that the publication of this report and the subsequent circulation of the book which will be its most enduring

outcome will enable the preparation of language assistants and their role in schools to be enhanced. The second is the interaction between the activities of the project and the interaction between assistants and teacher/mentors. Many teachers commented that the fact of generating the data required by the project assisted them in fulfilling obligations towards the students which they might otherwise have overlooked. Thirdly, the participation in the workshops by the students before and during the period abroad as well as the exercise of reporting on their impressions caused them to understand the experience better and thereby to derive more benefit from it. In that sense, the research can be seen to be 'relevant' to a programme which is constantly undergoing re-evaluation in response to changes in the way that foreign languages are taught in schools in France and England.

## 9. Nominated Rapporteur

Please suggest the name of one person who would be suitable to act as an independent rapporteur for your project. Please state full address and telephone number.

Dr. Helen Spencer-Oatey, Language Centre, University of Cambridge, Downing Place,  
CAMBRIDGE CB2 3EL

Tel. (01223) 335058

## 10. Nominated User Rapporteur (Optional)

Please suggest the name of one non-academic user who would be suitable to act as an independent rapporteur for your project. Please state full address and telephone number.

Ms. Joan Hoggan, Director, Assistants Programme, British Council, 10 Spring Gardens,  
LONDON SW1A 2BN

Tel. (0207) 389 4163

## GUIDELINES

### PART ONE: THE RESEARCH REPORT

#### 1.1 Use of the Guidelines

The purpose of these guidelines is to set out the requirements for End of Award Reports. Award holders should consider them carefully before preparing the report. If in doubt, award holders should contact the Evaluation Team, quoting the reference number of the award.

#### 1.2 Use of EOA Report Form

The form provided must be used. All parts of the report must be completed as instructed in these Guidelines.

#### 1.3 Layout of EOA Report

The report is comprised of the following sections:

- Form  
Signed Declarations  
Project details  
Activities and achievements questionnaire.
- Free Text  
Full report of activities and research results.
- Directly Submitted  
Regard data.

#### 1.4 Additional Materials

Up to two outputs from the research, whether published or in draft form, may be nominated for assessment with the End of Award Report. If nominated, eight copies of these outputs must be supplied together with the End of Award Report. The majority of nominated outputs tend to be in printed form, but Award Holders are welcome to nominate outputs in any media, such as datasets, software and websites, subject only to any practical difficulties which may be presented in making them available to Rapporteurs. If nominating a website a printed hard copy of the information on the site must be provided. The research will be assessed on the basis of the content of the End of Award Report and the nominated outputs. Researchers not submitting outputs with their Report are not penalised in any way.

##### 1.4.1 Additional Materials: Annexes

Additional material, such as statistical tables, copies of questionnaires or other material clearly necessary to support the report may be included as an annex to the End of Award Report. With the exception of confidential material, which genuinely cannot be placed in a public document, annexes containing significant amounts of additional text and/or publications will not be acceptable. Any confidential annex, which should not be copied to the British Library and Regard, must be indicated clearly as such.

Award Holders should note that the complete End of Award Report will be sent to Rapporteurs and that the ESRC will take appropriate advice, before accepting the Report, in any case where disseminating a confidential annex may raise a question of the ESRC becoming exposed in the area of libel.

### 1.5 Responsibility for Report

Three months prior to the end of the Award, notification is sent to the Principle Award Holder advising when the End of Award Report is due and the information on where to download the form itself. The completed final report is due three months after the project terminates. The responsibility for preparation and submission of the report is that of the Principal Award Holder. In most cases, the original Principal Applicant for the award is the Principal Award Holder. In some circumstances, ESRC will agree a change of Principal Award Holder during the course of the award; it would be helpful if this could be noted in the covering letter when submitting the report. On occasion, awards will be made to joint award holders; in such cases the report is a shared responsibility.

### 1.6 Research Report

A full report on the research should accompany the completed report form. The length of this should not exceed 5,000 words. The report should be a succinct, self-contained document, giving a straightforward and critical appraisal of the research in, as far as possible, non-technical language. The following standard headings should be used:

- Background

Including, for example, relevant previous or parallel research. Theoretical positions and hypotheses where relevant.

- Objectives

Aims and objectives of the research and any changes to these. You should state clearly how each objective has been addressed and whether the objective has been met or not, referring to other parts of the report as required. Where an objective has not been addressed or has not been met successfully, you should state the reasons for this. This will ensure that genuine difficulties faced in the course of the research are recognised and taken into account by the evaluators.

- Methods

Specific reference to methods used, including survey design, special equipment, new methods and analysis of results.

- Results

A report of the results of the project and analyses to date.

- Activities

To include related activities such as conferences, networks etc.

- Outputs

Publications, other dissemination, datasets (with confirmation of deposit at the Data Archive where applicable), software etc. These should not duplicate the Regard return but may be used to highlight particularly important outputs.

- Impacts

Are there instances of the research results being used or applied outside of the project, including commercial exploitation, either actual or proposed? Please detail any links with, or interest shown by, users of the research.

- Future Research Priorities



Are there lines of research arising from this project which might profitably be pursued (not necessarily with ESRC funding)?

#### 1.7 Ethics

Where ethical considerations have arisen in the course of the research these should be explicitly detailed in the full report of research activities and results in the End of Award Report. Details of Codes of Ethics which have been referred to in the course of the research should also be included and, if necessary, appended to the Report form.

#### 1.8 Confidentiality

If the report needs to refer to material which may be sensitive, this should be put in an annex clearly marked as confidential. A covering letter should be added to the report emphasising this.

#### 1.9 "Society Today"

"Society Today" is the ESRC's publicly available research database on the WWW, containing summary details of all ESRC research projects and their associated publications and outputs. From Feb 2005, the texts of Summary and Full reports from End of Award Reports will also be available. Society Today will provide an excellent opportunity for researchers to publicise their work; the database will potentially have a large user base, drawn not only from Higher Education, but increasingly from government, voluntary agencies, business and the media.

Summary details of publications and/or other outputs of research conducted under ESRC funded awards must be submitted to the Society Today database.

Please contact: ESRC Communications (Info Centre), Economic and Social Research Council, Polaris House, North Star Avenue, Swindon, SN2 1UJ. Tel: 01793 413122; e-mail; [infocentre@esrc.ac.uk](mailto:infocentre@esrc.ac.uk) (general enquiries) or [infocentresupport@esrc.ac.uk](mailto:infocentresupport@esrc.ac.uk) (technical enquiries)

It is necessary for the Principal Award Holder to sign the "Society Today" declaration on P4 of the End of Award Report form.

#### 1.10 Acceptance

Once the End of Award Report has been formally accepted, no additions or revisions will normally be acceptable, other than in cases of genuine error. Award holders noticing an error in their report at a later stage should contact Evaluation without delay. Such cases will usually be addressed by means of an erratum slip.

## GUIDELINES

### PART TWO: THE EVALUATION OF ESRC PROJECTS

## 2 The Evaluation of ESRC Research

### 2.1 ESRC Evaluation

The ESRC is committed to the evaluation of all the research it supports. These evaluations typically involve an examination, through peer and merit review, of the effectiveness of research, the academic quality of the research achievement and the impact of that achievement on decision-makers in the private and public sectors. ESRC's evaluation activities are managed by the Evaluation Team within the Council's Communications and Information Directorate.

### 2.2 The End of Award (EOA) Report

The first stage of any project or programme evaluation is the End of Award Report. The report, completed by the named investigators, is used to provide an assessment of individual projects. The report is intended to reflect on the organisation of, and activities pursued during, a research project and on the substantive research achievements and impacts to date.

### 2.3 Evaluation of the EOA Report

Each Report is processed through the following stages:

- Submission

The report is completed by the named investigator(s) and must be submitted to ESRC no later than three months from the end of the award. Researchers not submitting a report do not receive the final payment of the award and are barred from future ESRC funding until an acceptable report is submitted.

- Acceptance

If the Report is acceptable, the Evaluation Team acknowledges receipt and the final payment on the award is released. If it is unacceptable, revisions are required. The most common reasons for The Evaluation Team being unable to accept a report are: lack of necessary signatures; lack of a Regard declaration; insufficient copies of documents.

- Rapporteurs

Rapporteurs are selected by the ESRC's Research Support Teams. Each rapporteur receives a copy of the Report, nominated publications when provided, the original proposal, references and other relevant information. Rapporteurs are asked to comment on the conduct, scientific contribution and impact of the project and to assign a grade reflecting the achievements of the project.

- Grading

The Evaluation Team considers the Rapporteurs comments and assigns an overall grade on the following scale:

O - Outstanding

REFERENCE No.

G - Good  
P - Problematic  
U – Unacceptable

Grades assigned to individual awards are confidential to the ESRC.

- **Confirmation of Grade**

A suitable member of the ESRC Board which commissioned the project is asked to confirm or reconcile grades where Rapporteurs are not in agreement.

- **Feedback and comment**

The grade and anonymised rapporteurs' comments are sent to researcher(s) for information. Researchers may comment within four weeks.

- **Reporting**

The Evaluation Team reports grades for all projects, in confidence, to the funding Boards through the ESRC Research Evaluation Committee Annual Report.

- **Additional Action**

All Reports are kept on file at the ESRC, lodged with the British Library Document Supply Centre (where they are publicly available) and, since 2000, made available on the Regard website. Reports are reviewed by the ESRC's External Relations Division for dissemination opportunities. Reports graded Unacceptable are retained within the ESRC.

- **Updating**

Where a Problematic grade has been assigned, the Evaluation Team may consider re-grading upon the submission of substantial new evidence. Where an Unacceptable grade has been assigned a re-grading will be considered if a new End of Award Report is submitted. In both cases a Board Member and the Research Evaluation Committee will confirm any change of grade.

#### 2.4 Failure to Submit an EOA Report

The ESRC has a responsibility to ensure the proper expenditure of public funds. No further awards will be made to any award holder whose End of Award Report is overdue (see the ESRC Research Funding Booklet, available from the Registrar's Office at HE institutions and at [http://www.esrc.ac.uk/ESRCContent/researchfunding/rf\\_rules.asp](http://www.esrc.ac.uk/ESRCContent/researchfunding/rf_rules.asp). As the ESRC makes awards to the host institutions to which the award holder is attached, it is necessary to notify the host institution if the End of Award Report becomes overdue. If you are unable, for any reason, to submit the report on time please contact the Evaluation Team immediately.

#### 2.5 Deadline Extensions

In exceptional circumstances, the Evaluation Team may agree to extend the deadline for submission of an End of Award Report, if requested prior to the report due date. Requests for extensions, stating full reasons, should be sent to [Alex.Bottoms@esrc.ac.uk](mailto:Alex.Bottoms@esrc.ac.uk).

## 2.6 Further Evaluation

The Evaluation Team commissions evaluations of Programmes and groups of responsive mode grants. All such evaluations build on the End of Award Report as a first stage of evaluation. The Evaluation Team also reviews the factors that support and inhibit successful research with a view to advising ESRC policy. So we are concerned to know about the difficulties and problems encountered as well as the successes and achievements.

## 2.7 Publicity, Publication and Dissemination of Results

The attention of all award holders is drawn to the ESRC Research Funding Booklet which contains the requirements for publicity, publication and dissemination of results. One of the principal requirements is that the Council's support, including the award reference number, must be acknowledged in all publications and announcements.

## 2.8 Datasets

A machine-readable copy of any dataset arising from the research must be offered for deposit with the ESRC Data Archive within three months of the end of the award. The ESRC will withhold the final payment of an award if the dataset has not been deposited to the required standard within three months of the end of award, except where a modification or waiver of deposit requirements has been agreed in advance. All enquiries should be addressed to: The Director, ESRC Data Archive, University of Essex, Wivenhoe Park, Colchester, CO4 3SQ. The Data Archive maintains an informative website at <http://www.data-archive.ac.uk/>

### 2.8.1 Qualitative Data

Award Holders submitting qualitative data should refer to the Qualidata website at <http://www.essex.ac.uk/qualidata>

## 2.9 Research Outputs.

Summary details of ESRC awards and details of their published outputs are entered on Regard, ESRC's public-access database on the WWW. You will be contacted periodically after the award has ended to ensure that this data is correct and to allow you to add details of further outputs. Regard is at <http://www.regard.ac.uk>

REFERENCE No.

CHECKLIST

BEFORE SENDING YOUR REPORT, PLEASE CHECK THAT THE FOLLOWING ARE INCLUDED:

- |   |  |                          |
|---|--|--------------------------|
| 1 | 8 x Completed EOA form   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2 | 8 x Full Report  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3 | 8 x Any nominated outputs  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4 | All necessary signatures are provided on page 3 of the EOA form      | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5 | The 'Society Today' declaration on page 4 of the EOA form is signed. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6 | The Data Archive declaration on page 5 of the form is signed         | <input type="checkbox"/> |

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE EOA REPORT WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED UNLESS YOU HAVE MET ALL THE ABOVE REQUIREMENTS.

Non-acceptance often results in lengthy correspondence which inevitably leads to delay in payment of the final award instalment. Additionally, as with award holders whose reports are overdue, award holders who have submitted incomplete reports will not be eligible for further ESRC funding until the report has been completed and accepted.