



Using digital technology to enhance youth participatory evaluation

Evaluation

2022, Vol. 28(4) 540–554

© The Author(s) 2022

Article reuse guidelines:

sagepub.com/journals-permissions

DOI: 10.1177/13563890221124713

journals.sagepub.com/home/evi

Tze-Chang Liu 
National Chung Hsing University

Abstract

The aim of this study is to demonstrate the challenges encountered in youth participatory evaluation and how digital technology may assist in overcoming these challenges. The study explores the meaning of youth participatory evaluation and examines the challenges faced in utilizing the approach. We argue that using digital technology can help overcome many challenges of youth participatory evaluations, with the added benefit that such technology may also attract and influence young people to engage more fully with evaluation processes. These findings show that digital technology helps *decrease adultism, increase adults' capacity to engage with youth, and respond to and empower youth*. Some practical guidelines and challenges are also discussed.

Keywords

digital technology, document review, educational technology, youth participatory evaluation

Introduction

It can be challenging for evaluators and participants to work together closely on a constant basis, especially during the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic. Digitalization allows people to work online and has become a trend in business, research, and education during the pandemic. This article argues that digital technologies can serve as helpful tools for evaluators, especially while working with young people. Youth participatory evaluation (YPE) is an approach that empowers young people, allowing them to participate in the evaluation process and activities. The level of involvement and the role that young people can play vary depending on the content and design of the specific evaluation (Checkoway and

Corresponding author:

Tze-Chang Liu, Institute of Professional Development for Educators, National Chung Hsing University, No. 145 Xingda Road, South District, Taichung City 402.

Email: tcliu0215@gmail.com

Richards-Schuster, 2003). Their involvement in the design and integration of program evaluations can empower and amplify their voices and include them and increase their visibility in evaluation. However, youth participation can also be challenging due to problems such as degree of involvement, meaningful participation, and power differences between adults and youth (Shamrova and Cummings, 2017).

The main aim of this study is to suggest ways to integrate digital technology to overcome some challenges of YPE. Digital technology may facilitate more efficient and effective conduction of YPE because it supports better communication, the data collection process, and the process of analysis. Digital technology here refers mostly to social media, mobile devices, digital platforms, and the application of digital technology, such as augmented reality (AR) or virtual reality (VR). Regarding participation, digital technology can offer more effective communication and time management tools (Bauer et al., 2017). Young participants can be invited to join, and data can be collected, shared, and discussed through digital technology (Frasquilho et al., 2018; Gibbs et al., 2020). Moreover, it enables simultaneous or asynchronous communication. This may reduce time and transportation constraints that pose barriers to conducting YPE.

While adults inevitably play a major role in many evaluation approaches, YPE emphasizes supporting young people by involving them in the evaluation processes and empowering them to act. There are multiple methods, such as lobbying to advocate for their ideas or participating in meetings, by which youth can participate in the decision-making processes that affect their lives (Checkoway and Richards-Schuster, 2003). Youth participation can determine the validity of a program, and if young people thrive, it can positively influence youth development and youth-serving organizations (Arnold and Gagnon, 2020; Arnold and Gandy, 2019). Young people can participate in evaluation processes and provide suggestions to change the program to better meet their needs.

The digitalization of society has a powerful impact on our daily lives as they are becoming increasingly virtualized and gamified (Koivisto and Hamari, 2019). Young people can express themselves more easily in a virtual environment, and the Internet influences their educational and social lives (Bicen and Arnavut, 2015). The COVID-19 pandemic also induced a digital transformation (Soto-Acosta, 2020), resulting in digital technology exerting more influence than ever. However, studies on the integration of digital technology in YPE are limited despite the importance of digital influences on young people's lives. This study makes a novel contribution to the literature by examining how digital technology can benefit YPE. It demonstrates the value of YPE and argues that taking advantage of digital technology is necessary due to the popularity of digital devices among young people.

Youth participatory evaluation

Benefits of YPE and youth participatory action research

Through YPE, young people can participate in every step of the evaluation process, including design, data collection, analysis, and evaluation reports (Gong and Wright, 2007). YPE can also be viewed as a movement in social research emphasizing as it does a shift in emphasis from action to participation through community-based methodologies (Checkoway and Richards-Schuster, 2003). Research on youth participation may offer experiences and opportunities for young people to participate in city councils and local organizations, influence

school curricula, identify injustices, and develop leadership skills (Brion-Meisels and Alter, 2018; Kornbluh et al., 2015; Ozer and Wright, 2012; Stoudt, 2009). Moreover, young participants can seek personal development and growth through a project if it is well executed and facilitates the utilization and betterment of skills (Chen et al., 2010; Foster-Fishman et al., 2010; Kim, 2016; Ozer and Wright, 2012).

Youth participatory action research (YPAR) may provide YPE with a theoretical and practical foundation. YPAR can be a form of critical participatory action research that provides opportunities for young people to identify injustices in their current social realities and take action to improve their community or program. Furthermore, YPAR, along with other similar concepts such as youth–adult partnerships, can be integrated into one conceptual framework (Hall, 2019). YPAR highlights the importance of incorporating young people’s voices and input in decision-making, in addition to the perspectives of adults (Chen et al., 2010; Kornbluh et al., 2015). Young people can gather and analyze data and further determine actions to diminish the negative influences they experience (Brion-Meisels and Alter, 2018). YPAR can support young people in their educational activities, promoting their sociopolitical development, participation, and leadership skills (Kornbluh et al., 2015). In other words, youth involved in YPAR can learn and develop skills that help them mature and encourage them to act to address or improve their communities or schools. However, it is also challenging for researchers and educators to include young people in their projects without forethought, suitable relationship building, and adequate project design (Kim, 2016; Kohfeldt et al., 2011; Kornbluh et al., 2015).

Digital technology can be used as part of a strategy to engage young people to build their self-esteem and self-efficacy as well as to promote health, community development, civic engagement, and social activism (Akomo et al., 2016; Flicker et al., 2008). Unlike YPAR, YPE mainly focuses on involving and empowering young people in the evaluation process rather than in action research. YPE can be carried out based on the theory and practice of YPAR to conduct youth-centered and participatory evaluation to achieve a social justice ideal.

YPE and other evaluation approaches

In addition to YPAR, YPE involves concepts from a number of previous evaluation approaches such as participatory, responsive, utilization-focused, and empowerment evaluation. YPE is also highly similar to participatory evaluation (supporting participation) (Cousins and Earl, 1992, 1995; Von Thiele Schwarz et al., 2016) but focuses on empowering young people and encouraging them to become involved in the evaluation process. Another approach, responsive evaluation, emphasizes stakeholders’ interests and utilizes both democratic and participatory values to include their voices and enhance their understanding by including young people as stakeholders (Abma et al., 2017; Schwandt, 2001; Stake, 1975). Some evaluation approaches can also support YPE, such as utilization-focused evaluation (emphasizing utility) (Patton, 2012) and empowerment evaluation (empowering stakeholders) (Fetterman, 1997; Miller and Campbell, 2006; Phillips et al., 2019). These evaluation approaches are focused on program improvement and enable participants to exert more influence over the program they are involved in. Some of these approaches also emphasize the social justice aspect of evaluation (Gong and Wright, 2007). Despite the importance of integrating young people into evaluations and research, various challenges are encountered while conducting YPE.

Challenges in YPE

This study focuses on three possible challenges of conducting YPE, namely, adultism, the capacity of evaluators, and the capacity of the youth involved. Adultism is a critical challenge, defined as the assumed right to power that adults have over young people and their right to take actions that influence the lives of young people (Gong and Wright, 2007). Adultism can be defined as “. . . behaviors and attitudes based on the assumptions that adults are better than young people, and entitled to act upon young people without agreement” (Bell, 1995: 1). This form of adults’ control over young people is further justified due to irrational youth rebellion, risky behaviors, a lack of orientation toward the future, and a tendency to resist adult authority (Camino and Zeldin, 2002; Gong and Wright, 2007). Youth oppression operates in multiple ways, such as creating “childhood” as a subordinate social status, assuming childhood to be a period of helplessness and dependency, or by believing that young people cannot achieve maturity until they grow up and become civilized adults (DeJong and Love, 2015). Youth oppression maintains unequal and hierarchical relationships between adults and youths (DeJong and Love, 2015). In short, some adults think young people are irrational and behave less maturely and thus that adults should exert control over them.

However, adults and young people can develop partnerships to conduct authentic decision-making, natural mentoring, reciprocity, and community connectedness for positive youth development and civic engagement (Zeldin et al., 2012). Reducing adultism can directly influence youth participation. Given that YPAR can be a valuable tool for challenging adultism and focusing on equity among participants (Bettencourt, 2018), YPE may also be used to reduce adultism. The manner in which adultism is overcome becomes critical when conducting YPE.

The second challenge is evaluators’ skills and knowledge in relation to conducting YPE. Adult evaluators need suitable knowledge, skills, and a positive attitude to engage with young people before evaluation or research begins; indeed, when placing young people at the center of evaluation, it is important to put their psychological, social, and developmental needs first (Walker, 2007). Moreover, youth participation may involve power relationships and issues related to structure (Anderson, 2020; Ozer et al., 2020). Therefore, adult evaluators need the capacity to understand youth, communicate, and manage power issues before conducting YPE.

The third challenge is young peoples’ capacity to be involved in YPE. Some young people may view themselves as lacking the ability to organize their own projects or lacking the legitimacy in society when they attempt to enact regulations (Checkoway and Richards-Schuster, 2001). Meaningful evaluation requires young people and adults to learn and develop the necessary capacity and knowledge (Gong and Wright, 2007). Moreover, YPE requires supporting young people in playing a role in evaluation (Gong and Wright, 2007; Lau et al., 2003; Sabo, 2007); this is challenging if young people are not well prepared before engaging in YPE. Thus, the aforementioned three challenges may pose difficulties in conducting YPE, while digital technology may provide possible solutions.

Benefits of using digital technology to overcome challenges in YPE challenges

Digital technology, including the Internet and social media, may be used to enhance YPE and overcome some of its challenges. Digital technology can make communication and data collection easier, which can directly enhance YPE. Through the use of mobile technology devices

and services, one can communicate, collaborate, and conduct seamless learning with others with no time or space limitations (Krull and Duarte, 2017; Traxler, 2016). Students today can engage in sophisticated learning activities anywhere and anytime using mobile technology (Murphy et al., 2014). YPE can also use these mobile technologies for better communication, learning, empowerment, and data collection. Integrating digital technology in action research may prove beneficial in searching, collecting, annotating, analyzing, visualizing, interpreting, and publishing data and information (Bauer et al., 2017). The online systems can enable communication and interaction simultaneously or asynchronously. This can reduce time and resource costs compared with not using digital technology. This is because the use of digital technology enhances the effectiveness of the analysis tools, communication, data storage, and data sharing.

Moreover, digital technology can encourage more democratized decision-making processes and offer opportunities to organize, mobilize, and transform social and material conditions, especially with the growing use of digital technology among low-income and minority communities (Akom et al., 2016). Furthermore, it provides alternative methods and tools to conduct YPE. There are three main advantages of integrating technology into YPE.

Decreasing adultism

Digital technology can decrease adultism by promoting learning, communication, and collaboration. Adults may encounter challenges, and this may lead to frustration among young people if adults hold disrespectful attitudes toward the youths or lack the necessary knowledge and skills to adequately involve and engage with the youths (Finn and Checkoway, 1998). A useful way for adults to learn about youth is by interacting with them. Moreover, digital technology can provide online learning resources and platforms, such as social media, through which adults can gain knowledge about young people. Thus, a better understanding of young people among adults can help reduce adultism.

Effective communication among participants is essential for evaluators and leaders, particularly while balancing multiple considerations and involving young people in crucial tasks (Larson and Walker, 2010). Digital technology can support young people in communicating and participating (Flicker et al., 2008; Jackson, 2018; Kornbluh et al., 2016; Livingood et al., 2017). For example, the Internet can offer non-hierarchical opportunities for participatory communication to participants to help them work collaboratively beyond the influence of social institutions and provide real-time engagement when conducting participatory action research (Glassman, 2020).

More effective communication using digital technology can reduce tension and misunderstanding between young people and adults. Online social networks are the most common form of communication (Pelling and White, 2009), and the use of digital devices can help evaluators, adult stakeholders, and youth communicate within the digital environment. Social media offers platforms for social support and convenient communication (Phu and Gow, 2019; Valkenburg et al., 2006). Moreover, it can support the development of social capital and community cohesion while promoting psychological well-being through online social networks (Malinen, 2015; Thomas et al., 2017; Wellman et al., 2001). Social media plays a significant role in how young people interact with each other and can enhance familiarity, stimulate online interaction with others (Levordashka and Utz, 2016), and generate closeness (Lin et al., 2016). In terms of research, some adults have used social media to recruit adolescent

participants, conduct adolescent-designed action research (with adult guides), gather data, and present results on websites (Frasquilho et al., 2018; Gibbs et al., 2020). Thus, adult evaluators can take advantage of digital technology to easily interact and communicate with young people at individual, community, or team levels through the use of social media.

Promoting collaboration is another way to reduce adultism. Both young people and adults need to be supported to establish collaborative partnerships (Camino, 2000). Lack of trust and power imbalance between adult and youth participants can hamper the evaluation process (Kim, 2016). Adults need to unlearn adultism practices to create positive collaborative relationships with youth (Kennedy, 2018).

Digital technology can benefit youth's participatory process, especially in the exchange of ideas and the development of group norms for collaborative work (Gibbs et al., 2020). Evaluators should take advantage of digitalization as social media may foster young people's social capital and civic engagement (Kornbluh, 2019). This may also help in developing positive relationships between adults and youth. In addition, self-disclosure often leads to closeness and positive interpersonal impressions between strangers (Sprecher et al., 2012). When a person reveals something to another, a sense of familiarity is generated (Finkel et al., 2015). Social media is a valuable platform for fostering this intimacy (Levordashka and Utz, 2016; Lin and Utz, 2017). Young people may use social media to bind a community together by establishing connections with others and developing their personal identities (Ellison et al., 2007; Sosik and Bazarova, 2014; Thomas et al., 2017). For example, Facebook can increase one's sense of belonging, which can be used to effectively generate positive perceptions and learners' engagement (Dougherty and Andercheck, 2014; Saini and Abraham, 2019). It can also deepen civic engagement by enabling youth to use local knowledge in an innovative manner to address issues pertaining to social inequality using digital tools (Akom et al., 2016; Middaugh et al., 2017). Thus, digital technology, through social media, can promote collaboration between adults and young people.

Increasing adults' capacity to engage with youth

The evaluator also needs to assist other adult stakeholders in understanding how to interact with young people in a project. Digital technology furnishes flexible, ubiquitous, and on-demand access to learning materials that are essential for adult education and human resource development (Gegenfurtner et al., 2020). Therefore, adults can acquire knowledge and skills to effectively interact with youth using digital technology.

Moreover, adult evaluators and participants may need to learn and develop the capacity to collaborate and build positive relationships with young people. Digital learning platforms can provide learning resources for evaluators. Young people may find it easier to interact and express themselves using digital technology platforms; therefore, adults can learn by interacting with them when they share their knowledge and thoughts. Digital technology affords effective learning resources through which to provide adults easier access to knowledge regarding young people and build skills to engage with them.

Responding to and empowering youth

By using digital technology in YPE, adults can learn to respond to and effectively empower youth. Previous studies also confirm that using digital technology can encourage young people

to participate in their communities or further enhance their interest and that it can support young people in developing positive relationships with others (i.e. adults and peers) (Frasquilho et al., 2018). Digital technology provides evaluators the opportunity to interact with youth at any time. Adult evaluators can use digital technology to understand how youth think and to respond to their concerns or interests anytime and anywhere. Digital technology, such as the Internet, e-mail, social media, and communication apps, can improve interactions between evaluators and youth so that these evaluators can respond to young people effectively.

Adults can offer learning resources to empower youth, and young people may also offer knowledge to adults. Numerous programs exist that may increase young people's capacity for leadership, communication, and inquiry (Kornbluh, 2019). Evaluators may use digital technology to create platforms by which to offer learning materials, interact with individuals, or build a sense of community. Social media can potentially act as a powerful learning tool because it supports interaction, collaboration, community building, and information and resource sharing (Imlawi et al., 2015; Saini and Abraham, 2019). Young people may prefer learning through a digital environment, as certain online activities can better assist them in learning and building skills through interaction (Eom et al., 2006; Marks et al., 2005). Online learners are intrinsically more motivated when compared to on-campus learners (Shroff et al., 2008); thus, digital learning may more effectively motivate young people. Therefore, the use of digital technology is likely to motivate young people to learn and become empowered as they enhance their learning capacity.

Utilizing digital technology may pose risks to young people. For example, it may inflict unintentional harm, such as in the form of social exclusion, political violence, or emotional distress. Social action within a given power structure brings possible and probable consequences (Cornwall and Jewkes, 1995; Kim, 2016; Ross, 2011). Moreover, digital technology alone cannot replace or change the social or material conditions of oppressed people, though, when combined with community organization, it may help reduce oppression (Akom et al., 2016). Evaluators may use digital technology to interact with young people, thereby increasing trust in these relationships. However, adult evaluators must be trained in ethics and follow ethical rules when interacting with youth through social media. Evaluators can also interact with other experts and experienced evaluators through digital platforms or social media to improve YPE skills. Adult evaluators and stakeholders may need to learn to use digital technology and avoid potential risks when conducting YPE via this approach.

Recommendations and practical guidelines

This study assumes that integrating digital technology into YPE enhances it; however, determining successful approaches to conducting YPE using digital technology can be challenging. Therefore, this section provides recommendations and practical guidelines for evaluators conducting YPE with digital technology based on previous research. It also considers some principles that can guide collaborative approaches to evaluation (Shulha et al., 2015) and practice (Richards-Schuster and Elliott, 2019) for both adults and young people engaged in YPE.

First, the reduction of adultism should be focused on to build capacity and empower participants (especially youth) via digital technology. Digital technology can facilitate the learning process because it is flexible, ubiquitous, and easily accessible. This advantage has been highlighted during the COVID-19 pandemic in particular, as many people were not able to go to school or the office due to lockdown. Even post-COVID-19, digital technology has offered the

advantage of supporting the education of both adults and youth. The learning process can also empower both adult evaluators and stakeholders of all ages to overcome the impact of adultism. Furthermore, skill development is crucial for traditionally disempowered young people in terms of civic engagement (Anyon et al., 2018). Thus, evaluators can develop digital learning platforms, which are easily accessible to both adults and young people, to aid in effective learning and capacity building as well as to empower them to conduct YPE.

Second, digital technology should be harnessed to motivate and build collaborative relationships with youth. Digital technology can offer better interactive platforms and communication techniques to achieve these goals. For example, social networking sites help youth build communicative relationships (Kornbluh et al., 2016). The development of digital technologies may motivate young people and prove beneficial for the evaluation process, thereby aiding youth participation and resulting in enhanced YPE. Moreover, young people are often more familiar with digital devices and can use these devices to record or collect data easily without adult intervention or professional barriers, resulting in both young people and adults becoming equally involved in the YPE. Evaluation teams can interact with young people through digital platforms, so as to gain a better understanding and establish more productive collaborative relationships. Evaluators can use social media, information and communication technology, and digital devices to attract youth, seek their participation, and motivate them to interact and collaborate with the evaluators.

Evaluators also need to understand new innovations in digital technology and explore whether they can be used in YPE. New digital technology includes developments in VR, AR, mixed reality (MR), X-reality (XR or cross reality), human interaction, robots, artificial intelligent (AI), and 5G. For example, AI may optimize the efficiency and response to student learning experiences (Dixon-Román et al., 2020), and VR may enhance young students' learning experiences, such as via the translation of knowledge across sign-making systems (Mills and Brown, 2021). Thus, evaluators may use innovative technologies to seek youth participation and engagement in data analysis.

Third, a focus on monitoring YPE processes and outcomes using digital technology is recommended. All YPE participants and evaluators can easily and efficiently collect, record, store, analyze, and share data using digital devices and platforms. Evaluators can also interact with all stakeholders easily through digital platforms, allowing them to triangulate their analysis. Young people can also use digital tools to record and collect data for analysis (Akom et al., 2016). Evaluators and participants can monitor the evaluation process more easily if information is collected and analyzed in a timely manner, and young people can express their thoughts while discussing an evaluation inquiry or while interpreting data. Evaluators and youth stakeholders can track the utility of evaluation outcomes using digital technology. Young people may seek to improve their community using digital tools (Akom et al., 2016) while also improving evaluation tools or programs (Arnold and Gandy, 2019). Because youths are more interested in using digital technology, they can be motivated to participate in monitoring YPE. Therefore, YPE can use digital technology to enhance program development. Evaluators, participants, and young people can use social media and digital platforms to monitor evaluation processes and the impact of evaluation outcomes.

To integrate digital technology into YPE, these three practical guidelines can be referred to when taking advantage of digital technology. The use of digital technology may help in the implementation of YPE, aid in bringing about positive changes in the programs being evaluated, and more heavily influence young people through these programs.

Potential concerns for future research

Despite the positive features of digital technology in YPE, there are several concerns that remain. First, evaluators need to be aware of certain aspects of interactions that are carried out in the digital world, especially with youth. Individuals may feel the need to perform on different and discrete stages of social networks, as young people may have to manage different aspects of their selves when engaging with various digital worlds (Marwick and Boyd, 2010; Thomas et al., 2017). Young people express their concerns while establishing an online persona and shaping a digital identity (Orzech et al., 2016). Being authentic on platforms such as Facebook may provide psychological benefits (Grieve and Watkinson, 2016) and coherence between the true self and the public/Facebook self; moreover, it may be associated with better social connectedness and less stress (Grieve and Watkinson, 2016), as young people may use alternative selves on the Internet. Because of this, evaluators may need to confirm or identify the truthfulness of young people's expressions on the Internet. Moreover, ethical concerns may arise while making evaluation judgments and attempting to prevent harm to participants or avoid hurting their feelings, especially in the case of young people.

The second concern is the issue of the digital divide. In some evaluations, the targeted young people may not have access to the Internet or social media. According to an October 20, 2020, estimate, 59.5 percent of the population in Asia, 47.1 percent of that in Africa, and 63.2 percent worldwide use the Internet (Internet World Stats, 2020). This indicates that many young people around the world do not have Internet access. Digital inclusion should enable young people's critical digital abilities and truly empower them (Pawluczuk, 2020). The digital divide and lack of digital capacity may limit the utility of digital technology in YPE. Therefore, evaluators may need to assist or provide digital access opportunities for youth to facilitate their use digital technology during the YPE process. Moreover, digital technology should not be the sole method for gaining information from or interacting with young people.

A third challenging issue is the digital capacity of young people. Young people find it difficult to develop digital skills and knowledge without deliberate instruction (Claro et al., 2018). Digital or online networks may support young people in fostering key competencies for their sociopolitical development and a stronger desire to participate in social action; however, the quality of interaction and adults' attitudes may limit young peoples' innovative ideas or participation (Kornbluh et al., 2016). Therefore, YPE evaluators may need to identify participants' digital capacity and educate them, whether youth or adult, on how to use digital technology to enhance their evaluation activities.

Fourth, youth data privacy and protection issues are of concern. The use of digital technology will eventually help rectify data privacy and protection challenges. Digital technology may enable evaluators to collect data easily, such as in the case of collecting young people's opinions through social media. However, this may sometimes be difficult during data collection and analysis. When young people post their feelings, this does not necessarily mean that evaluators can collect such data without their permission, even when the data are available online and appear meaningful for evaluation. Therefore, evaluators need to understand the regulations, ethical concerns, and ways to protect collected data and respect individual privacy.

Fifth, digital technology develops rapidly, and it can be challenging to integrate new technological innovations into YPE. Digital technology and new devices develop fast, and

evaluators or participants may not be familiar with the new developments. Moreover, transforming the latest digital technology into YPE or even benefiting from YPE can be challenging. For example, AI technology, such as applying learning analytics that identify each learner's status, may involve algorithmic reasoning and sociopolitical relations (Dixon-Román et al., 2020), but evaluators need to understand how to use such systems before actually using them for the purpose of evaluation.

Conclusion

This article discussed strategies to overcome the challenges of YPE by using digital technology. More research is needed to explore practical ways to enhance YPE through the use of digital technology. The core elements of YPE are the inclusion of young people's perspectives and the empowerment of stakeholders (both adults and youth) in evaluation processes. Through YPE, the increased participation of young people can be sought in programs, and these young people can access better opportunities to positively impact their communities. Although it may be challenging, evaluators can build capacity to engage youth and stakeholders, respond to youth stakeholders, empower them, and include multiple perspectives in evaluations. In terms of practical guidelines, the following foci are recommended with respect to use of digital technology: reducing adultism to build capacity and empower participants, motivating and building collaborative relationships with youth, and monitoring YPE processes and influences on outcomes.

Evaluators may find it easier to interact with young people and other stakeholders through digital devices. Further exploration is needed regarding the exact methods and techniques with which digital technology can best be utilized to enhance YPE and evaluation research. Some important concerns need to be considered with regard to conducting YPE via use of digital technology. Moreover, knowing how to interact with young people in the digital world is important for YPE, and the digital divide and digital capacity are also crucial issues which need to be considered. Certain research studies may target students of low socioeconomic status who may have difficulty accessing the Internet outside school; this requires further discussion and investigation. YPE evaluators also need to be aware of the digital capacity of young people in particular, and ways to overcome data privacy challenges and integrate new technological innovations need to be explored. Despite certain challenges, the benefits of conducting YPE through digital technology cannot be ignored.

Declaration of conflicting interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

ORCID iD

Tze-Chang Liu  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4745-4571>

References

- Abma TA, Leyerzapf H and Landeweer E (2017) Responsive evaluation in the interference zone between system and lifeworld. *American Journal of Evaluation* 38(4): 507–20.
- Akom A, Shah A, Nakai A, et al. (2016) Youth participatory action research (YPAR) 2.0: How technological innovation and digital organizing sparked a food revolution in East Oakland. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 29(10): 1287–307.
- Anderson AJ (2020) A qualitative systematic review of youth participatory action research implementation in U.S. high schools. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 65(1–2): 242–57.
- Anyon Y, Bender K, Kennedy H, et al. (2018) A systematic review of youth participatory action research (YPAR) in the United States: Methodologies, youth outcomes, and future directions. *Health Education and Behavior* 45(6): 865–78.
- Arnold ME and Gagnon R (2020) Positive youth development theory in practice: An update on the 4-H Thriving Model. *Journal of Youth Development* 15(6): 1–23.
- Arnold ME and Gandy J (2019) Youth participatory evaluation: Matching 4-H youth experience to program theory. *The Journal of Extension* 57(4): 11.
- Bauer R, Himpsl-Gutermann K, Sankofi M, et al. (2017) Brave new digital tools for action research in education: A beginner's guide. In: Şad S and Ebner M (eds) *Digital Tools for Seamless Learning*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global, 42–64.
- Bell J (1995) *Understanding Adulthood: A Major Obstacle to Developing Positive Youth-Adult Relationships*. Somerville, MA: YouthBuild.
- Bettencourt GM (2018) Embracing problems, processes, and contact zones: Using youth participatory action research to challenge adulthood. *Action Research* 29: 153–70.
- Bicen H and Arnavut A (2015) Determining the effects of technological tool use habits on social lives. *Computers in Human Behavior* 48: 457–62.
- Brion-Meisels G and Alter Z (2018) The quandary of youth participatory action research in school settings: A framework for reflecting on the factors that influence purpose and process. *Harvard Educational Review* 88(4): 429–54.
- Camino L and Zeldin S (2002) From periphery to center: Pathways for youth civic engagement in the day-to-day life of communities. *Applied Developmental Science* 6(4): 213–20.
- Camino LA (2000) Youth-adult partnerships: Entering new territory in community work and research. *Applied Developmental Science* 4(1): 11–20.
- Checkoway B and Richards-Schuster K (2001) Lifting new voices for socially just communities. *Community Youth Development* 2: 32–7.
- Checkoway B and Richards-Schuster K (2003) Youth participation in community evaluation research. *American Journal of Evaluation* 24(1): 21–33.
- Chen P, Weiss FL and Nicholson HJ (2010) Girls study Girls Inc.: Engaging girls in evaluation through participatory action research. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 46(1–2): 228–37.
- Claro M, Salinas A, Cabello-Hutt T, et al. (2018) Teaching in a digital environment (TIDE): Defining and measuring teachers' capacity to develop students' digital information and communication skills. *Computers and Education* 121: 162–74.
- Cornwall A and Jewkes R (1995) What is participatory research? *Social Science and Medicine* 41(12): 1667–76.
- Cousins B and Earl LM (1992) The case for participatory evaluation. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 14(4): 397–418.
- Cousins B and Earl LM (1995) Participatory evaluation: Enhancing evaluation use and organizational learning capacity. *Evaluation Exchange* 1(3–4). Available at: <https://archive.globalfrp.org/evaluation/the-evaluation-exchange/issue-archive/participatory-evaluation/participatory-evaluation-enhancing-evaluation-use-and-organizational-learning-capacity>

- DeJong K and Love BJ (2015) Youth oppression as a technology of colonialism: Conceptual frameworks and possibilities for social justice education praxis. *Equity and Excellence in Education* 48(3): 489–508.
- Dixon-Román E, Nichols TP and Nyame-Mensah A (2020) The racializing forces of/in AI educational technologies. *Learning, Media and Technology* 45(3): 236–50.
- Dougherty KD and Andercheck B (2014) Using Facebook to engage learners in a large introductory course. *Teaching Sociology* 42(2): 95–104.
- Ellison NB, Steinfield C and Lampe C (2007) The benefits of Facebook “friends”: Social capital and college students’ use of online social network sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 12(4): 1143–68.
- Eom SB, Wen HJ and Ashill N (2006) The determinants of students’ perceived learning outcomes and satisfaction in university online education: An empirical investigation. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education* 4(2): 215–35.
- Fetterman D (1997) Empowerment evaluation: A response to Patton and Scriven. *Evaluation Practice* 18(3): 253–66.
- Finkel EJ, Norton MI, Reis HT, et al. (2015) When does familiarity promote versus undermine interpersonal attraction? A proposed integrative model from erstwhile adversaries. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 10: 3–19.
- Finn JL and Checkoway B (1998) Young people as competent community builders: A challenge to social work. *Social Work* 43(4): 355–45.
- Flicker S, Maley O, Ridgley A, et al. (2008) E-PAR: Using technology and participatory action research to engage youth in health promotion. *Action Research* 6(3): 285–303.
- Foster-Fishman PG, Law KM, Lichty LF, et al. (2010) Youth ReACT for social change: A method for youth participatory action research. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 46(1–2): 67–83.
- Frasquilho D, Ozer EJ, Ozer EM, et al. (2018) Dream teens: Adolescents-led participatory project in Portugal in the context of the economic recession. *Health Promotion Practice* 19(1): 51–9.
- Gegenfurtner A, Schmidt-Hertha B and Lewis P (2020) Digital technologies in training and adult education. *International Journal of Training and Development* 24(1): 1–4.
- Gibbs L, Kornbluh M, Marinkovic K, et al. (2020) Using technology to scale up youth-led participatory action research: A systematic review. *Journal of Adolescent Health* 67(2): S14–23.
- Glassman M (2020) The internet as a context for participatory action research. *Education and Information Technologies* 25(3): 1891–911.
- Gong J and Wright D (2007) The context of power: Young people as evaluators. *American Journal of Evaluation* 28(3): 327–33.
- Grieve R and Watkinson J (2016) The psychological benefits of being authentic on Facebook. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking* 19(7): 420–5.
- Hall SF (2019) A conceptual mapping of three anti-adultist approaches to youth work. *Journal of Youth Studies* 23(10): 1–17.
- Imlawi J, Gregg D and Karimi J (2015) Student engagement in course-based social networks: The impact of instructor credibility and use of communication. *Computers and Education* 88: 84–96.
- Internet World Stats (2020) *World Internet Usage and Population Statistics: 2020 Year Estimates*. Available at: <http://www.internetworldstats.com/stats.htm> (accessed 30 October 2020).
- Jackson S (2018) Young feminists, feminism and digital media. *Feminism and Psychology* 28: 32–49.
- Kennedy H (2018) How adults change from facilitating youth participatory action research: Process and outcomes. *Children and Youth Services Review* 94: 298–305.
- Kim J (2016) Youth involvement in participatory action research (PAR): Challenges and barriers. *Critical Social Work* 17(1): 38–53.
- Kohfeldt D, Chhun L, Grace S, et al. (2011) Youth empowerment in context: Exploring tensions in school-based YPAR. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 47(1–2): 28–45.

- Koivisto J and Hamari J (2019) The rise of motivational information systems: A review of gamification research. *International Journal of Information Management* 45: 191–210.
- Kornbluh M (2019) Building bridges: Exploring the communication trends and perceived sociopolitical benefits of adolescents engaging in online social justice efforts. *Youth and Society* 51(8): 1104–26.
- Kornbluh M, Neal JW and Ozer EJ (2016) Scaling-up youth-led social justice efforts through an online school-based social network. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 57(3–4): 266–79.
- Kornbluh M, Ozer EJ, Allen CD, et al. (2015) Youth participatory action research as an approach to sociopolitical development and the new academic standards: Considerations for educators. *Urban Review* 47: 868–92.
- Krull G and Duarte JM (2017) *Moving to Seamless Learning: A Framework for Learning Using Multiple Devices*. In: Power R, Ally M, Cristol D, et al. (eds) *IAmLearning: Mobilizing and Supporting Educator Practice*. International Association for Mobile Learning. Available at: <https://iamlearning.pressbooks.com/>
- Larson RW and Walker KC (2010) Dilemmas of practice: Challenges to program quality encountered by youth program leaders. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 45: 338–49.
- Lau G, Netherland N and Haywood M (2003) Collaborating on evaluation for youth development. *New Directions for Evaluation* 98: 47–59.
- Levordashka A and Utz S (2016) Ambient awareness: From random noise to digital closeness in online social networks. *Computers in Human Behavior* 60: 147–54.
- Lin R and Utz S (2017) Self-disclosure on SNS: Do disclosure intimacy and narrativity influence interpersonal closeness and social attraction? *Computers in Human Behavior* 70: 426–36.
- Lin R, Levordashka A and Utz S (2016) Ambient intimacy on Twitter. *Cyberpsychology: Journal of Psychosocial Research on Cyberspace* 10(1): 6.
- Livingood WC, Montcalvo D, Bernhardt JM, et al. (2017) Engaging adolescents through participatory and qualitative research methods to develop a digital communication intervention to reduce adolescent obesity. *Health Education and Behavior* 44(4): 570–80.
- Malinen S (2015) Understanding user participation in online communities: A systematic literature review of empirical studies. *Computers in Human Behavior* 46: 228–38.
- Marks RB, Sibley SD and Arbaugh JB (2005) A structural equation model of predictors for effective online learning. *Journal of Management Education* 29(4): 531–63.
- Marwick AE and Boyd D (2010) I tweet honestly, I tweet passionately: Twitter users, context collapse, and the imagined audience. *New Media and Society* 13(1): 114–33.
- Middaugh E, Clark LS and Ballard PJ (2017) Digital media, participatory politics, and positive youth development. *Pediatrics* 140: S127–31.
- Miller RL and Campbell R (2006) Taking stock of empowerment evaluation: An empirical review. *American Journal of Evaluation* 27(3): 296–319.
- Mills KA and Brown A (2021) Immersive virtual reality (VR) for digital media making: Transmediation is key. *Learning, Media and Technology* 47(2): 1–22.
- Murphy A, Farley H, Lane M, et al. (2014) Mobile learning anytime, anywhere: What are our students doing? *Australasian Journal of Information Systems* 18(3): 331–45.
- Orzech KM, Moncur W, Durrant A, et al. (2016) Opportunities and challenges of the digital lifespan: Views of service providers and citizens in the UK. *Information, Communication and Society* 1: 14–29.
- Ozer EJ and Wright D (2012) Beyond school spirit: The effects of youth led participatory action research in two urban high schools. *Journal of Research on Adolescence* 22(2): 267–83.
- Ozer EJ, Abraczinskas M, Voight A, et al. (2020) Use of research evidence generated by youth: Conceptualization and applications in diverse U.S. K-12 educational settings. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 66(1–2): 81–93.
- Patton MQ (2012) *Essentials of Utilization-Focused Evaluation*. Washington, DC: SAGE.

- Pawluczuk A (2020) Digital youth inclusion and the big data divide: Examining the Scottish perspective. *Internet Policy Review* 9: 1–18.
- Pelling EL and White KM (2009) The theory of planned behavior applied to young people's use of social networking websites. *Cyberpsychology and Behavior* 12(6): 755–9.
- Phillips GII, Lindeman P, Adames CN, et al. (2019) Empowerment evaluation: A case study of city-wide implementation within an HIV prevention context. *American Journal of Evaluation* 40(3): 318–34.
- Phu B and Gow AJ (2019) Facebook use and its association with subjective happiness and loneliness. *Computers in Human Behavior* 92: 151–9.
- Richards-Schuster K and Elliott SP (2019) A practice matrix for involving young people in evaluation: Possibilities and considerations. *American Journal of Evaluation* 40(4): 533–47.
- Ross L (2011) Sustaining youth participation in a long-term tobacco control initiative: Consideration of a social justice perspective. *Youth and Society* 43(2): 681–704.
- Sabo FK (2007) *Youth Participatory Evaluation: Strategies for Engaging Young People*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Saini C and Abraham J (2019) Implementing Facebook-based instructional approach in pre-service teacher education: An empirical investigation. *Computers and Education* 128: 243–55.
- Schwandt TA (2001) A postscript on thinking about dialogue. *Evaluation* 7: 264–76.
- Shamrova DP and Cummings CE (2017) Participatory action research (PAR) with children and youth: An integrative review of methodology and PAR outcomes for participants, organizations, and communities. *Children and Youth Services Review* 81: 400–12.
- Shroff RH, Vogel DR and Coombes J (2008) Assessing individual-level factors supporting student intrinsic motivation in online discussions: A qualitative study. *Journal of Information Systems Education* 19(1): 111–25.
- Shulha LM, Whitmore E, Cousins JB, et al. (2015) Introducing evidence-based principles to guide collaborative approaches to evaluation: Results of an empirical process. *American Journal of Evaluation* 37(2): 1–23.
- Sosik VS and Bazarova NN (2014) Relational maintenance on social network sites: How Facebook communication predicts relational escalation. *Computers in Human Behavior* 35: 124–31.
- Soto-Acosta P (2020) COVID-19 pandemic: Shifting digital transformation to a high-speed gear. *Information Systems Management* 37(4): 260–6.
- Sprecher S, Treger S and Wondra JD (2012) Effects of self-disclosure role on liking, closeness, and other impressions in get-acquainted interactions. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 30(4): 497–514.
- Stake RE (1975) *Evaluating the Arts in Education: A Responsive Approach*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
- Stoudt BG (2009) The role of language and discourse in the investigation of privilege: Using participatory action research to discuss theory, develop methodology, and interrupt power. *The Urban Review* 41: 7–28.
- Thomas L, Briggs P, Hart A, et al. (2017) Understanding social media and identity work in young people transitioning to university. *Computers in Human Behavior* 76: 541–53.
- Traxler J (2016) Inclusion in an age of mobility. *Research in Learning Technology* 24: 31372.
- Valkenburg PM, Peter J and Schouten AP (2006) Friend networking sites and their relationship to adolescents' well-being and social self-esteem. *Cyber Psychology and Behavior* 9(5): 584–90.
- Von Thiele Schwarz U, Lundmark R and Hasson H (2016) The dynamic integrated evaluation model (DIEM): Achieving sustainability in organizational intervention through a participatory evaluation approach. *Stress and Health* 32: 285–93.
- Walker K (2007) Youth empowerment evaluation: Learning voice. *American Journal of Evaluation* 28(3): 321–6.

- Wellman B, Haase AQ, Witte J, et al. (2001) Does the Internet increase, decrease, or supplement social capital? *American Behavioral Scientist* 45(3): 436–55.
- Zeldin S, Christens B and Powers J (2012) The psychology and practice of youth adult partnership: Bridging generations for youth development and community change. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 51: 385–97.

Tze-Chang Liu is currently the Coordinator of practicum and internship in the Center of Teacher Education (NCHU) and involved in the “technology supporting self-regulated learning” project of the Ministry of Education.