Appendix 1 **Tests associated with each episode**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Episode; Principal boundary negotiating artefacts** | **1. Initial commission; Protocol and early feedback report** | **2. First formative workshop; Logic model** | **3. Interviews; Network maps** | **4. Second formative workshop; First report** | **5. Feedback interviews + publication; Draft paper** |
| **Theme** | Symbolic struggle over meaning of evaluation / struggle to gain credibility | Proposal of logic model for attachment to programmes of action | Second opportunity to negotiate meaning and scope of evaluation | Proposal of another problem-solving tool for attachment to programmes of action | Negotiated exit from collaboration |
| **Tests:** what was proposed | Facilitation through truth tests extending to reality tests | ‘Ought to be’ truth test extending to reality test | ‘Be’ truth test in the field | ‘Be’ truth test extending to reality test | ‘Be’ truth test (extending to metaphorical inverted truth test) |
| **Tests:** counter-strategies of engagement or disavowal |  | ‘Ought to be’ truth test as utopian projects (avoidance) | Mutual complaints as platform for inverted reality test | Inverted reality test (multiplication of measures and accusation of bias) | Reality test under role exchange (disavowal of tests’ consequentality by questioning evaluation’s legitimacy) |
| **Affairs:** what actually happened | Familiarisation and opening negotiations | Only ‘ought to be’ truth test | Inverted reality test failed because confined to backstage | ‘Be’ truth test (detachment of logic model from programmes of action) followed by normalisation | Collusion to lower stakes and live with discrepancies by mutual insulation of evaluator’s and partners’ domains |