Project Evaluation in Development Cooperation: A Meta-Evaluative Case Study in Tanzania

Mikiko Cars

Institute of International Education
Department of Education
Stockholm University
2006
Abstract
Project Evaluation in Development Cooperation: A Meta-Evaluative Case Study in Tanzania
Mikiko Cars

The research reported here is a meta-evaluative case study of project evaluation in the context of Official Development Cooperation (ODC) in the education sector in Tanzania, where the particular focus is on capturing the relative values attached to evaluation by various stakeholder groups.

Perspectives from the constructivist paradigm are adopted, implying relativist ontology, subjectivist epistemology, and naturalistic interpretive methodology. Based on these perspectives, a review is provided of development theories and evaluation theories, including the actor-oriented approach to development, participatory monitoring & evaluation, utilization-focused evaluation, and responsive-constructivist evaluation. An exploratory qualitative case study strategy is taken, combining several complementary methods e.g. in-depth interviews, questionnaires, document analysis, and observations.

Evaluation is considered as an applied social research, implying a managerial and political purpose. It is a reflective interactive process, where the relevance, effectiveness and impact of an intervention in pursuit of certain objectives are assessed, adding value in order to construct knowledge for the enhancement of decision-making. In order to facilitate understanding of the cases under study, their structural contexts are investigated: 1) ODC evaluation systems and strategies (international/macro context); and 2) ODC in the education sector in Tanzania (national/meso context). Each case (at local/micro level) is located within these contexts and analyzed applying a meta-evaluative framework.

Integrating the perspectives of the stakeholders, the study demonstrates the strengths of, and constraints on, each case, factors which are to some extent determined by their respective time-frames. A number of significant discrepancies between theory and practice in ODC evaluation are reported. Findings indicate the significance of constructing consensus values that are based on a synthesis of multiple stakeholders’ values and perspectives complementing each others. The study also finds that evaluation ought to be used as a powerful tool in which the values, needs and aspirations of various stakeholder groups can be reflected, especially those of local communities, who are now too often powerless in ODC projects in the education sector.

Descriptors: meta-evaluation, social programme evaluation theories and methodology, international development cooperation, development evaluation, community based approach, actor oriented approach, participatory monitoring and evaluation, responsive-constructivist evaluation, Tanzania.
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Chapter One

Introduction: The Frame of the Study

1.1 Background

A considerable number of international actions, collectively known as *development cooperation*¹ have been carried out over the last fifty years or more in various attempts to improve the standard of living of the poor in different parts of the world. The extensive range of heterogeneous ideologies, strategies, and other constructs that have underlain Official Development Cooperation (ODC) include macro-political history, geo-political strategy, humanitarian ideology and economic strategy.²

Multiple actors have been involved in *development cooperation*, integrating support from a very heterogeneous set of partners, such as international technical and funding agencies (referred to as Official Development Cooperation Agencies in the present study), non-governmental organizations (NGOs), academia and the private sectors, comprising a whole range of more or less complex methods of work. Issues in development cooperation have increasingly become more global, rather than national, holistically combining macro-economic, political, social and environmental questions.

Education has been one of the key sectors in development cooperation, as it is the one area where development of the individual is most closely aligned with the national level.³ While multilateralism in education has continuously contributed to the universalization of certain educational models, local relevancy with regard to their content and approach remains controversial.⁴

ODC evaluation is a necessary and integral part of the management of development cooperation processes and it is also to be regarded as a potentially powerful instrument for exercising influence on policy processes. At the same time, ODC evaluation has also considerable potential for foregrounding, and ensuring inclusion in the policy process of the different perspectives, concerns and issues voiced by various stakeholders on their own terms, thus allowing pluralism to enter into value construction. However, shortcomings have been highlighted concerning ODC evaluation with regard to reflecting the perspectives of local beneficiaries, in various studies (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Rebien, 1996, Rudqvist & Woodford-Berger, 1996; Forss & Carlsson, 1997; and Cracknell, 2000).

The key research questions underlying this analysis of ODC evaluation may be formulated as follows:

---

¹ See Chapter 3 for more detailed theoretical and technical discussion of development cooperation.
² See Section 3.2.3 for details.
³ See Section 3.3 for more detailed discussion.
⁴ See Section 2.5.3.
1. Who are constructing what kind of information/knowledge, how, to whom, for what purpose and to what effect? Contexts of evaluation must be carefully analyzed.
2. How are evaluation practices perceived by various groups of stakeholders?
3. What can ODC evaluation practitioners learn from academic evaluation theoreticians and vise versa?

1.2 Aims and Objectives of the Study

The overall aim of the study is to identify and analyze, at theoretical and practical levels, issues regarding the evaluation of education projects in the field of Official Development Cooperation (ODC), with particular focus on an exploration of the perspectives of various stakeholder groups on these evaluation practices. This overall aim may more precisely be broken down into the following constitutive objectives:

1. to examine the evaluation process by means of an extensive review of theories and methodologies regarding social program evaluation in order to establish an analytical foundation for the investigation of evaluation;
2. to provide an analytical overview of evaluation systems and strategies for the education programmes/projects that have been adopted by major multi/bilateral ODC agencies; and
3. to carry out meta-evaluative case studies consisting of in-depth analysis and comparison of two project evaluations in Tanzania, including investigating the perspectives of various stakeholder groups concerning the evaluation practices.

1.3 Significance of the Study

The systematic evaluation of ODC grew increasingly important from the early 1980s. It has been pointed out in much of the research (Rebien, 1996; Rudqvist & Woodford-Berger, 1996, Stokke, 1996; Forss & Carlsson, 1997; Nagao, 1999; Riddell, 1999; and Cracknell, 2000) that there are shortcomings with regard to the programme/project evaluations currently being conducted in ODC. Rebien (1996) has highlighted the lack of a systematic presentation of ODC evaluations and their relation and relevance to evaluation theories, as well as any implications for methodological and practical choices often being ignored.

The present study explores and compares the perspectives of various stakeholder groups regarding the evaluation practices and raises issues concerning discrepancies between theory and practice. Particular note should be taken here of the innovative nature of this comparative framework for this present study, where project evaluations through the Project-Based Approach are compared to those where

---

5 Stakeholder groups are defined in Section 2.3. They are to be understood as groups who represent different interests at various levels, namely the international, national, local and school levels.
the Sector Wide Approach (SWAp)⁶ are used, whereby the complex nature of ODC evaluation is clearly illustrated. As far as this author is aware, there have been no other prior studies where ODC evaluations are compared using this framework. Both the potential for, and the constraints on, evaluations through both approaches are made explicit in the present study, whereby further issues for future research are subsequently revealed. Moreover, it should also be noted here that little prior research has been carried out in the area of ODC evaluation where emphasis is placed on the perspectives of multiple stakeholders. All these points should demonstrate the significance of the present research. It is hoped that new knowledge yielded by this study will be of benefit both to the research community and to the various groups of stakeholders involved in the ODC.

1.4 Limitations of the Study

1. As a result of limitations on time and resources with regard to this study, the field-study part of the research has had to be restricted to the two cases of educational evaluations in Tanzania (one evaluation being formative and the other one summative). The significance of the comparison might have been blunted to some extent because the study involves two cases where the respective designs are by their very nature not entirely amenable to strict comparative analysis. Nonetheless, in this author’s view, the advantages have outweighed such doubts. It allowed the author to gain understanding of the particularities and complexity of each case (see Section 5.4 for more discussion).

2. With regard to the application of qualitative method, it is possible for the research process and the outcomes to be strongly influenced by the experiential data of the researcher⁷. Moreover, it has to be acknowledged that all data collection and analysis are inevitably “selective processes” to some extent either consciously or unconsciously (Miles & Huberman, 1994). And finally, as Silverman (1970) argues, an understanding of the subjective logic of social situations reveals that interpretation of the views of others inevitably involves some “element of distortion” (ibid., p. 223) of the original situations, where the degree of such distortion will be affected by the researcher’s own “contextual entity,” that is to say, socio-cultural background, language barriers, methodological skills and intentions with regard to the research. The inevitability of these factors having been recognized, steps have been taken with regard to this study in order to reduce as far as possible this “degree of distortion” through making explicit the ontological, epistemological and methodological perspectives involved, as well as through cross-checking various data sources (e.g. interviews, questionnaires, and documents) as well as through discussions with knowledgeable individuals in the field.

3. Since any evaluation is to some extent concerned with political and power relations on many dimensions, it remains a controversial issues as to the extent to

---

⁶ Discussions on the Project-Based Approach and Sector Wide Approach are given in Section 10.2 and 10.3.
⁷ See Section 5.6 for an explanation of this term.
which an external researcher, such as the present author, is able to obtain relevant information in any given context. On the other hand, the external researcher may benefit from not having any local political affiliations with the projects or with the evaluation, especially when stakeholders recognize the researcher as not posing a threat to their interests. This advantageous position was indeed confirmed during this research on several occasions by the stakeholders during the course of the field work.

4. The possibility of searching for “objective truth” as being a realistic goal is an issue that has often been questioned in the mind of this author throughout the research process, as the purpose and process of evaluation practices are always political and subjective to some extent. It has not been my intention, nor within my capacities, to “dig out” the whole truth concerning the evaluation practices. Rather, it is to be acknowledged here that, in the light of the interpretive approach that has been adopted, any search for a single interpretive truth has been discarded in favour of the multiple truths of different stakeholders, since each possesses his/her own version of truth which may well differ from those of others (see Section 2.5).

1.5 Organization of the Study

This study is composed of five parts, where Part I (Chapter 1) provides a general introduction to the research with an outline of the study. This is followed by Part II (Chapters 2 to 4), in which the conceptual and theoretical framework is presented. In Chapter 2, the analytical and conceptual frameworks of the study are outlined in order to introduce a holistic picture of the study by presenting key conceptual structure as well as the analytical perspectives of the study. The purpose of the analytical framework is to comprehensively present a means for classifying structures and aspects of the phenomena being researched. The classification is carried out at different levels, namely, the micro, meso, and macro levels, together with the technical dimension and the socio-political dimension. Key concepts that are to be utilized in the analysis and deepening of the understanding of the phenomena being researched are defined in this conceptual framework. It should be noted that the analytical and conceptual frameworks were constructed in the process of developing the rest of the research, namely chapter 3 to 9.

Chapters 3 and 4 are devoted to the theoretical frameworks for the study. The essential theoretical and technical issues concerning Official ODC, with particular reference to the education sector, are outlined in Chapter 3. Social program evaluation, a key theoretical issue of central importance to the study, is the subject of Chapter 4. Here, an extensive review of various aspects of, and approaches to, evaluation are described with the purpose of establishing the epistemological and theoretical foundation for understanding and analyzing evaluations.

In Part III (Chapter 5), the specific methodological framework for this study is introduced, together with a description of the rationale behind the particular approach that has been adopted, as well as the epistemological perspective and the methods considered to be most appropriate for the study.
Part IV (Chapters 6 to 9) is the empirical section of the study, where the cases are presented. In Chapter 6 the macro level structure of the cases are described, namely the mechanism of ODC evaluation. Here the typology of ODC evaluation, together with key issues concerning ODC evaluation, followed by the evaluation systems and rationales of various ODC agencies, are analyzed. In Chapter 7, the meso level structure of the cases are introduced, namely ODC in the education sector in Tanzania. Firstly, a country profile of Tanzania is given, with emphasis on the education system. This is followed by a study of the particular characteristics of ODC in Tanzania in terms of guiding philosophy, government development strategy, and shifting relationships with ODC agencies. Finally, ODC trends among major ODC agencies in Tanzania are presented. In Chapters 8 and 9, micro level structures are portrayed - the actual evaluation cases being researched in this study. A descriptive summary of the evaluation in each case is provided, followed by meta-evaluations based on the criteria proposed in Chapter 4 (Sections 4.1.7 and 4.5, in particular). Finally, the different perspectives of various stakeholders are presented, these being based on responses from interviews and questionnaires.

Part V (Chapters 10 to 12) contains the results of the comparison together with further analyses of the cases, but here related in more detail to the conceptual and theoretical framework presented in Part II. In Chapter 10, the contextual framework is brought more into the foreground in order to compare the differing contexts of the two cases and the subsequent construction of a comparative framework. In Chapter 11, the core results from the two evaluation cases analyzed in Chapters 8 and 9 are compared through utilizing the comparative framework constructed in Chapter 10. Finally, there is an elaboration of more general issues concerning ODC evaluation in Chapter 12, through contrasting of various theories, practices, and stakeholders' perspectives.
Chapter Two

Key Concepts and Constructs of the Study

The key concepts and constructs of this study are provided in this chapter. First of all, the overall perspective of the study is defined, namely the constructivist paradigm. It is followed by the analytical framework, which aims to depict the whole area of what has been researched in this study integrating key concepts and comparative framework. Stakeholders in this study are also defined following the structure of the analytical framework.

Finally, various concepts and theories that are used to analyze multiple layers of structures surrounding actors (agencies) and the relationships among them are discussed.

2.1 Constructivist paradigm

The perspective on the world taken by a researcher is dependent on the ontological, epistemological and methodological principles involved (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Shadish, Cook & Leviton, 1991; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). Perspectives from positivist and post-positivist paradigms imply the adoption of realist and critical realist ontology and objective epistemologies, relying on experimental and quasi-experimental surveys.

On the other hand, perspectives from the constructivist paradigm imply the adoption of relativist ontology (multiple-constructed realities), subjectivist epistemology (the researcher and the researched collaborate on the creation of understandings) and a set of naturalistic interpretive methodological procedures. Constructivism views all of our knowledge as “constructed”, because it does not necessarily reflect any external realities, but is contingent on convention, human perception, and social experience. It realizes that categories of knowledge and reality are actively constructed through social relationships and interactions.

In order to depict the complex and dynamic picture of ODC evaluation, where multiple stakeholders’ interests and perspectives exist, this study takes the perspectives from the constructivist paradigm, aiming to analyze various positions and perspectives held by multiple stakeholders, conditioned by changing power relations. In the following chapters, concepts and theories of Development (Chapter 3) and Evaluation (Chapter 4) are studied in detail, based on the constructivist perspective. The finding of the preset study indicate that the application of constructivist paradigm to evaluation, which can be seen for example in the Responsive-constructivist evaluation (see Section 4.6.4), is close to the evaluation approach that was desired by local stakeholder groups.

---

8 See Section 5.3 for implications to this study.
2.2 Analytical Framework and Key Concepts

When developing a framework for this study in order to analyze the evaluation practices of ODC projects in the education sector and the perspectives of stakeholders on these practices, there were no models or pre-conceived notions to draw on. Thus the study took on an exploratory approach, whereby the entire research process consisted of a series of continuous reflective adaptations between the theoretical parts and the empirical parts of the work. It is in the course of the research process itself that the analytical framework has taken shape. An illustration of the different levels of analysis in the study is given in Figure 2.1. The main focus of the empirical research is on the local micro level, the ODC project evaluations, whereas the macro and meso levels serve as structural and ideological contexts that impose some influence on the micro level. Nonetheless, it should also be noted here that all these levels are interdependent.

The macro level concerns the international structural context of ODC and this is elaborated on, and described in more detail, in Chapter 3. The rationale behind ODC often refers to humanitarian, political, and/or macro economic issues and interests. A humanitarian approach is grounded on a perspective in terms of basic human needs and rights. An international political approach regards ODC as a strategic tool in international relations while, at the same time, ODC strategy is always, to a greater or lesser extent, influenced by the international political climate. During the Cold War, for example, ODC had been utilized as a tool for gaining and retaining the support of allies within the Third World. ODC continues to be utilized as an important tool for establishing and maintaining international security by encouraging and supporting democratic governance, through contributing to poverty alleviation, and so on (Lumsdaine, 1993). Finally, a macro economic perspective focuses on the development of the global economic system, including private sector interests. The promotion of the economic development of the developing countries is not, however, the only aim of ODC activities since these may actually also generate a significant number of economic transactions that involve and benefit the donor. Bilateral ODC policies reflect national preferences and priorities where these three rationales are, to some extent, combined while also being based on the historical involvement of each country in the whole process of “cooperation.” Such historical involvement may range from, for example, religious missionary work to compensatory activities for aggressive colonization in the past.

Theoretically, the present study follows the alternative development paradigm, based on post-modern social theory, where multiple realities are acknowledged, constructed around local truths and discourses in a context of power structures. The emphasis is on “people’s capacity” to effect social change. Actor-oriented development and participatory development, which are embedded in the alternative development paradigm, are discussed further in order to describe the concrete methodological perspectives on international development cooperation (see Section 3.1.4 for definition and discussion).

The meso level deals with the national context which, in this study, encompasses the overall picture of ODC in the education sector in Tanzania. This includes, for instance, the political and socio-economic conditions in Tanzania, the current development strategy and priorities of the Tanzanian government, the roles...
and impacts of ODC on the education policy of the country, current issues in the education sector, and ODC trends with regard to major multi/bilateral donor agencies in the country. This meso context is presented in more detail in Chapter 7.

At the micro level, two evaluation cases are studied in depth. The comparative framework is developed in Chapter 10, whereby the two cases are placed in structural and ideological macro contexts, which are influenced by respective “spirit of time”, influenced by the “international development policy discourse” (see Section 2.5.3). The analytical framework for investigating the micro level, on which the interpretations and assessments of the cases in this study are based, includes the meta-evaluation framework, which was developed based on the literature reviews of the Evaluation, presented in the Chapter 4. The meta-evaluation framework includes 1) the context of the evaluations, 2) the evaluation practices, and 3) the perspectives of various stakeholders with regard to the evaluation practice. These are presented in detail in Chapters 8 to 11.

- **Context of the evaluations** includes such areas as the historical/political context of the project, programme content and the internal structure of the project.

- **Evaluation practices** are examined on the basis of certain meta-theoretical criteria for “ideal” evaluations. The meta-theoretical criteria are drawn from the work of Shadish, Cook and Leviton (1991) (see Section 4.5 for a more extensive review). Stufflebeam’s (1990) meta-evaluation criteria are also adopted in this study, in order to break down the model proposed by Shadish, Cook and Leviton (1991) into more pragmatic features. These criteria cover the 13 meta-evaluative aspects as shown in Section 10.4, e.g. purpose of the evaluation, timing of the evaluation, the role of the evaluator(s), the design and methods of the evaluation, knowledge construction (i.e. the manner in which the evaluators construct knowledge), value (the manner in which the value/worth/merit of the programme is to be determined), and use (the manner in which the results of the evaluation are to be used).

- **Perspectives of various stakeholders** in terms of perceived potential benefits to be derived from the evaluation practices, together with any constraints, are illustrated and summarized for each case and subsequently analyzed using a comparative framework (Table 11.2). These are then compared and contrasted with evaluation policy documents in order to identify any discrepancies between policy and implementation in reality. “Stakeholders” are defined in Figure 2.2.

---

9 See Section 4.5.1 Value for a distinction between these three concepts.
Two further dimensions of the analytical framework for this study are the technical aspects of evaluation and the socio-political aspects of evaluation. It is helpful to distinguish between these two perspectives when examining evaluations. Technical aspects of evaluation refer to evaluation practice, that is to say, methods and processes, whereas socio-political aspects of evaluation are broader and refer to the impacts of evaluation on individuals and society as well as the political implications of the evaluation e.g. participation and empowerment. It is possible to fit the macro, meso and micro levels of analysis into these two dimensions of the analytical framework, as shown in Figure 2.1.

### 2.3 Stakeholders – Actors in the Study

The term “stakeholder” was originally introduced in 1960s to describe those people who are not stockholders in (i.e. owners of) a company but “without whose support the firm would cease to exist” (Patton, 1997). In the ODC context, the term refers to all people who have some interest in the project. The OECD (2002) defines stakeholders as “agencies, organizations, groups or individuals who have a direct or indirect interest in the development intervention or its evaluation.” With regard to development cooperation in the education sector, typical stakeholders include international technical and funding agencies (ODC agencies), the general public.
concerned, governments concerned, research institutes, NGOs, project management, and “intended beneficiaries”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders (case A)</th>
<th>Levels of analysis</th>
<th>Stakeholders (case B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODC agency: Sida</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>ODC agencies: ADB,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>macro</td>
<td>SIAST, Sida,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministries (MOEC,</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCDWAC)</td>
<td>meso</td>
<td>Ministry (MoEC),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management</td>
<td></td>
<td>District, Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actors in colleges:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Actors in villages:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principals,</td>
<td></td>
<td>village leader,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers, learners</td>
<td></td>
<td>committee, facilitators,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td>learners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ADB = African Development Bank, NGO = Non-Governmental Organization, MoEC = Ministry of Education and Culture, MCDWAC = Ministry of Community and Development, Women and Children, SIAST = Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology

Figure 2.2: The three levels of analysis and stakeholders in the study

“Beneficiary” is a controversial concept as benefit in the context of ODC can often be problematic. Benefit is often assumed and defined at the national governmental level, and it can be questionable if the project actually benefits them. As is presented in Section 3.1.4, this study takes perspectives from the actor-oriented development, which emphasize the significance of incorporating the views and aspirations of people (intended beneficiaries), seeing development not merely in terms of macro-economics but also in terms of the process of enriching the life of the people. This actor-oriented perspective helps clarify the problematic meaning of “beneficiary”. In actor-oriented development, benefit is carefully assumed based on a complex interplay of social, cultural, institutional and situational factors (Long & Long, 1992, pp. 212-213).

Beneficiaries, including the subjects of development projects, are defined by the OECD (2002) as “the individuals, groups, or organizations, whether targeted or not, that benefit, directly or indirectly, from the development intervention.” In this study, intended beneficiaries include communities and school actors: colleges/villages where there are administrative staff, teachers/facilitators, and learners. Figure 2.2 illustrates the stakeholder groups in this study by cases, classified according to the three levels of analysis.
2.4 Human Agency and Social Structure Dualism

This study draws on the work of Giddens (1984) regarding human agency and social structure dualism, in order to gain a better understanding of the overall institutional and relational complex at various levels of stakeholder groups as “agency” within the structure of development cooperation. Agency acts upon and functions within social structures. Agency acts upon and functions within social structures. Agency is defined as those individual human actors, together with organized groups, organizations and nations, who act rationally and reflexively in relation to 1) power, which is the ability to influence/transform the situation, and 2) structural conditions: social, political, economic, ideological and/or cultural. In this study, stakeholder groups (Section 2.2) as agencies may be identified at all three analytical levels: macro, meso and micro.

Structures include both large-scale social structures and micro structures such as those constituting individual human relations. Giddens (1984, p. 17) defines structure as “reproduced relations between actors or collectivities organized as regular social practices,” which can be seen as an unanticipated consequences of human actions. Such a structure has profound effects on human values, thought, and actions. Thus there is a dialectical relationship between agency and structure: agency influences structure, and vice versa. Durkheim (cited in Scott & Marshall, 2005) argued that social structure comprises both “institutional structure” and “relational structure”. People act according to institutionalized role expectations and thus establish recurrent relations. These human actions are the results of a conscious choice by actors within the framework of physical and social limitations (Scott & Marshall, 2005; Ritzer, 1996). It should be noted that agency at the macro and meso levels, that is to say, ODC agencies and national governments, may be regarded as constituting an institutional structure for agencies at the micro level. In this sense, it is possible to argue that there is a further dimension to the dualism with regard to structure and agency, namely, agency can be structure and structure can be agency.

2.5 Discourse, Power, Knowledge in Development

2.5.1 ODC Evaluation in the Framework of Development Discourse

Levels and types of discourse vary from those that might be regarded as a general conversation or discussion, through various types of written texts, to formal scientific knowledge. A rather abstract phenomenon such as “development” may therefore also be incorporated into a discourse (Titscher, et al., 2000). Discourse, in this study, is defined as consisting of careful, rationalized, structured statements, having systematic structures, which can be analyzed historically, through the identification of their main elements and the relations that form elements into wholes. It is constituted through social practices, especially by institutions of power (Peet & Hartwick, 1999 pp. 129-131). Discourses constitute symbolic systems and social orders where it is possible to analyze their historical and political construction and their functioning (Howarth, 2000).

In Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), discourse is regarded as a form of social practice, implying “a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive event
and situation(s), institution(s), and social structure(s) which frame it” (Wodak, 1996, p. 15). Discourse is “socially constituted, as well as socially conditioned, - it constitutes situations, objects of knowledge, and the social identities of and relationships between people and groups of people” (ibid.). In the light of CDA, “development” may be considered to constitute a discourse with “multiple forms of knowledge, political technologies and social relations” (Escobar, 1995, p.129). Examples include development professionals possessing certain powers derived from knowledge and competence, the UN providing moral, professional and legal authority in the definition of strategies, ODC agencies exercising political and economic power and local governments representing legitimate political authority over the lives of their people. Thus, in order to understand development as a discourse, as a system of relations established among institutions, it is required that numerous aspects, such as socio-economic processes, forms of knowledge, technological factors and so on, be investigated (ibid.).

ODC evaluation is carried out within the framework of development discourse. The manner in which ODC evaluations are designed and implemented is related to all the power structures described above. An evaluation may be regarded as a tool for reproducing or re-emphasizing an already existing development discourse. But at the same time, it is also potentially able to challenge and question an already existing development discourse by revealing discrepancies between policy and practice as well as by bringing the perspectives of stakeholders to light.

2.5.2 ODC Evaluation under Knowledge and Power Structure

Foucault (1980) has demonstrated the value of local knowledge and has analyzed multiple “relations of domination,” exercised in many forms: power in its local forms and institutions, power at levels other than conscious intention, power as something that circulates or functions in the form of chains and networks, power starting from infinitesimal personal relations and then being colonized by ever more general mechanisms into forms of global domination, and power exercised through the formation and accumulation of knowledge (Foucault, 1980; Peet & Hartwick, 1999, pp.129-131). This notion of different types and levels of power is applicable to the ODC context. Peet and Hartwick (ibid.) further argue that people are socially constructed identities and society is to be understood in terms of discourses developing unevenly.

Truth is not outside of power (...) Each society has its own regime of truth, its general politics of truth (...) There is a combat for the truth, or at least around the truth, as long as we understand by the truth not those true things which are waiting to be discovered but rather the ensemble of rules according to which we distinguish the true from the false, and attach special effects of power to “the truth.” (Foucault, 1980, p. 131)

As stated in the citation above, power relations regulate practice. Foucault (1980) points out the structural and political relationships between knowledge and power by arguing that a “regime of truth” orders our knowledge, our categorization systems, our beliefs, and practices. The language of development also expresses power relations (ibid.). ODC processes are embedded in social processes that imply
aspects of power, authority and legitimization. Thus, unless local knowledge and values are taken as a point of departure, these power structures will more than likely reflect and intensify cultural differences and conflict between social groups rather than facilitate the establishment of shared values (Long, 2001).

From this perspective, it is possible to argue that what is formed as evaluation data, is constructed, to a certain extent, within, and thus influenced, by these power structures. Each stakeholder group has its own “regime of truth.” It is important that it be acknowledged that ODC evaluations also take place in this power structure, that they are viewed and used politically. Even methods of evaluation which conform to strict scientific criteria entail methodological and theoretical choices that have to be made by the evaluators. Furthermore, the actual process of evaluation, namely evaluation design, data collection and report writing, might well also be affected by the power structure of the stakeholder groups, including the evaluator’s own interests and relations to the power structure. Thus, efforts to specify methodological choices in evaluations based on the epistemological perspectives of the evaluators would help to reduce avoidable influence from the power structure over the evaluation process.

2.5.3 International Development Discourse and National Policy: A Hybridizing Mechanism of Global Discourse and Local Particularity?

That preconditions are most often attached to ODC is a key feature of international development discourse and national policy, whereby governments of developing countries are required to adopt policy reforms in specific sectors, including education, for example, to give higher priority to basic education, administrative decentralization and cost sharing (Boyd & Plank, 1994). The substantive planks in such policy reforms are often formed in a manner that reflects the current “international development discourse.” The process of such policy formulation is usually that development professionals at international conferences issue declarations and proclamations about universal norms that are then to be translated into development priorities (Närman & Simon, 1999). Chabott and Ramirez (2000) describe the mechanism whereby universal norms, for instance, education for all, poverty reduction, basic human needs and rights, eventually emerge as sub-national actions.

Over the decades there have been shifts with regard to priority sectors and types of education, for example, which have been in compliance with trends in the broader development discourse at the time, without necessarily reflecting any empirical research on education and development in a particular local context (ibid.). In other words, these universal norms are rationalized in the form of a discourse, brought into circulation through international organizations and development professionals, often at international conferences, and subsequently translated into a national/local policy framework and eventually turned into actions, often independently of local economic, political, or social conditions (see Figure 2.3). The arrows in Figure 2.3 signify directions of influences, indicating interrelationships between international

---

10 Chabott and Ramirez (2000) report that between 1944 and 1990, UN organizations sponsored more than 16 international conferences on development, such as family planning, food, employment, and so on, which have been translated into various national policies and actions.
development discourses, development actors at the international, national and local levels and international conferences.

![Diagram of international development policy making](image)

**Figure 2.3: Mechanism of international development policy making**

*Source: Modified after Chabott and Ramirez (2000, p 174)*

To gain a better understanding of this mechanism, it is appropriate here to turn to Popkewitz’s (2000) analysis of the “hybridizing” process, where he argues that the relationships between knowledge and power are not simply hierarchical, from the international level to local level, but are formed through complex patterns that are multiple and multidirectional. “International professionals,” including those who are local and indigenous, who have trained abroad, contribute to the process of “hybridizing” global discourse and local particularity. These international professionals possess “universally authorized knowledge” where, if they have foreign names, these may symbolize social, political and educational progress in national debates (Popkewitz, 2000, p 9). One consequence of this mechanism is the weakening of couplings between policies and practices with actions having less good fits to local realities. This model of coupling between international norms and local actions may be identified in many countries and has resulted in increasingly universal educational frameworks, policies, and even practices, across the most heterogeneous of countries (Chabott and Ramirez, 2000; Samoff, 1999).
Chapter Three
Theories and Practices of Official Development Cooperation and Education

In this chapter, a theoretical framework concerning Official Development Cooperation (ODC) and education is presented.

In the first section, a number of development theories are reviewed in order to provide a general understanding of various epistemological perspectives on development study. In contrast to the modernization theory, where emphasis tends to be placed on macro-economic structural change, the present study follows the alternative development paradigm, where the emphasis is on “people’s capacity” to effect social change. Consequently, actor-oriented development and participatory development are also reviewed in order to provide further concrete methodological perspectives on alternative development. A desired direction of “development” is then suggested.

In the second part of this chapter, ODC is defined and its changing mechanism through-out its history is described. Major bilateral ODC agencies are classified in types in order to illustrate the heterogeneous strategies underlying ODC. Finally, the construction of an international development discourse on the basis of the ODC mechanism is proposed.

In the third part of this chapter relationships between education and development, from economic, political and socio-cultural dimensions, are presented, followed by a discussion of the significance of education in ODC.

3.1 Theories about Development and a Definition

3.1.1 Understanding Development

Definitions are both contextual and conditioned by the ideological, epistemological and methodological orientation of the particular author concerned (Simon, 1999). Similarly, Hettne (1990) argues that there can be no fixed and final definition of development as this varies according to contexts which themselves change over time.

The epistemological perspective on development which has been considered most appropriate for this study is that which Hettne (1990) has termed “universal development”, which consists of a synthesis of both macro and micro perspectives that are highly embedded in specific contexts. Varieties of development theory are mapped out in Section 3.1.2, where the universal perspective adopted here is also explained further. From this perspective, development studies can be understood as follows:

Development studies can (…) be conceived of as a problem-oriented, applied and interdisciplinary field, analyzing social change in a world context, but with
due consideration to the specificity of different societies in terms of history, ecology, culture, etc. (Hettne, 1990, p. 4)

Development may trigger, intentionally or not, cultural, political, social, economic and ecological changes within a society where any intervention occurs. Although there are continued attempts at international conferences, and in the subsequent declarations, for more holistic approaches to development to be adopted, as may be seen, for example, in the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDG), the dominant development ideology observed in current practices since 1990s still appears to be heavily driven by a neo-liberal macro-economic ideology.

From a normative perspective, the ultimate goal of development is simply that people be able to live a good life. This would appear to be a straightforward phrase, but it does nonetheless focus concern on “people,” in every aspect of their “lives,” and on dimensions of “quality” defined by actors, and “conditions and capacity” for change to come about. In other words, the focus is not restricted to the issue of growth of the GDP. This apparently simple phrase also naturally shifts the focus to issues of “alternative development” (Edwards, 1994; Simon, 1999) or “another development” (Hettne, 1990), thereby placing emphasis on the “human” perspective. It accords with the perspective of Giddens (1984) (see Section 2.3) where, when explaining the social world, the centrality of “understanding” is emphasized. Simon (1999) re-examines development issues from postmodernist and poststructural perspectives and the following statement provides a very appropriate example of a definition of human development from a normative-substantive perspective:

(…) human development is the process of enhancing individual and collective quality of life in a manner that satisfies basic needs, is environmentally, socially and economically sustainable, and is empowering in the sense that the people concerned have a substantial degree of control over the process through access to the means of accumulating social power. (Simon, 1999, p. 21)

Development, considered from this normative-substantive perspective, may be regarded as a tool/process to empower poor and powerless people to be able to take control over those aspects of their lives they consider to be important (Edwards, 1994). In other words, it is seen as a process to strengthen personal and institutional capacities to be able to manage those resources necessary for producing sustainable and equitably distributed improvements in the quality of their lives, based on their aspirations (Pieterse, 1998, p. 353). Consequently, any “relevant” development research would be “relevant” to those whose lives it embraces (Edwards, 1994).

### 3.1.2 Orientations in Development Theories

Here, the tentative summary of orientations in development theory provided by Hettne (1990)\(^\text{11}\) is built on, together with two further dimensions: the positive-

---

\(^{11}\) Hettne (1990) refers to this as a “tentative” summary, thereby cautiously indicating the temporality of concepts and theories, as he regards development theories to be constantly evolving, reflecting previous theories.
normative and the formal-substantive, with the aim of providing an overview of the methodological diversity found within development studies (also see Figure 3.1).

The positive-normative dimension Positive studies deal with the world as it is, in the light of a presumed objectivity, whereas normative studies deal with the world as it should be. Most research contains, to some extent, elements of both dimensions (Hettne, 1990). Hettne points out the recurring tension between “a tendency to study development as it actually takes place in the light of preconceived theories, and a tendency to theorize about what development should imply according to declared values” (ibid., p. 235).

The formal-substantive dimension The formal approach defines development in terms of “a limited number of universal goals and quantifiable indicators which can be combined in a predictive model”, whereas the substantive approach regards development in the light of “historical change of a more comprehensive, qualitative and less predictable nature” (ibid., p. 236). Further, political, social, cultural and ecological dimensions of development are included in the substantive approach. The growth of development theory from simplistic economic growth models towards comprehensive and holistic theories of historical social change is reflected in this dimension. As pointed out by Chew and Denemark (1996), when addressing current developmental issues, re-conceptualization of development in a broader historical context may provide a foundation for understanding the relevant processes involved.

Based on the two dimensions described above, the framework proposed by Hettne (1990) contains four major theoretical orientations: 1) positive-formal, 2) normative-formal, 3) positive-substantive, and 4) normative-substantive. This framework allows for a better understanding of development theories, with their various methodological and epistemological perspectives. In Figure 3.1, locations are indicated for major development theories, clustering within the spaces defined by the positive-normative and formal-substantive dimensions. The circled location for Alternative Development has been superimposed on the original figure in Hettne (1990), in order to indicate the location of the perspective that has been taken in the present study, which is in line with the constructivist perspective.
It should be noted that the intention in this framework has not been to draw the limits of strict comparable units, since any one theory may contain a number of different but overlapping orientations that complement each other. Rather, the purpose of this framework is to “locate the cyclical movements within the theoretical space delimited by the two dimensions” (Hettne, 1990, p. 238).

3.1.3 Development Theories

Development studies emerged and flourished as a distinct discipline in the post-war period. Schuurman (1993) has captured the diversity of development studies in two theoretical approaches:

1) *Neo-Marxism perspective*, which approaches imperialism from the perspective of countries on the periphery with regard to such issues as dependency theory, modes of production theory, and world systems theory; and

2) *Constructivist perspective*, which emphasizes multiple forms of social knowledge, and their relationships with power, in approaching greater understanding of the social reality of development.

Brief overviews of major theories about development are given in this section, in order to provide a general understanding of various epistemological perspectives.

*Modernization theory* is regarded as the first sociological account of development where the main proponents included Rostow, Hoselitz, Prebisch and Ricardo. Modernization theory arose in the context of the emergence of new independent states and at the height of the Cold War between the capitalist bloc and the communist bloc. The principal thesis propounded in modernization theory is that
Western modernity constitutes the objective to be attained on a global level. Incorporating ideas from structural functionalism, modernization theory conceptualized development as a staged transition from tradition to modernity by means of industrialization, through an economic policy of adopting a market economy and attracting foreign investment, through a social policy of adopting Western institutions and values to reproduce wealth and improvements in living standards and through a political policy of promoting parliamentary democracy (Buttel & McMichael, 1994; Närman, 1999; Scott & Marshall, 2005).

Dependency theory developed in reaction to what were considered to be the overly optimistic and ethnocentric tenets of modernization theories. A variety of different theorizations concerning the relationships between developed and less developed countries evolved within the broad framework of dependency theory (Scott & Marshall, 2005). The major theorist in the dependency school is Andre Gunder Frank, whose criticism focused on the manner in which the economic, political, social and cultural institutions of the “underdeveloped” countries have been permeated with capitalism. Frank regards “underdevelopment” as the inherent historical consequence of the functioning of the world system: the periphery has become alienated by the industrial and capital ideology which has brought about dependency on the core, leading to marginalization of development potential on a large scale (Hettne, 1990).

World-system theory provides a holistic framework for the comparative analysis of the whole global capitalist system and the development of its regional parts. The main theorist is Immanuel Wallerstein (1974), who has proposed three economic spheres within the world system: core, semi-periphery, and periphery states. Core countries are characterized by efficient production systems with high levels of capital accumulation, organized administration system, and immense military power. Peripheral countries are characterized by features that are the obverse of to those displayed by core countries, while the semi-periphery countries combine elements of both. Historical arguments are propound with regard to the interdependent relationships between these three spheres, where the fundamental thesis is that dominant core regions develop advanced industrial systems and exploit the raw materials from the periphery thus systematically allowing the flow of surplus from periphery to core. Wallerstein (ibid.) argues that the modern world is rooted in an international economic order and diverse political systems that have been developing since the sixteenth century. Although world-system theory has been criticized for its neglect of the effects of endogenous culture, it does facilitate greater understanding of development as an evolutionary process of “geographical broadening and socio-economic deepening” (Hettne, 1990, p.123).

Basic Needs Approach (BNA) is a strategy adopted in the mid-1970s by several international agencies, including ILO, UNEP, and the IBRD, while “people-centered” development has naturally incorporated elements of BNA without using this terminology. From positive-formal perspectives, BNA can be seen as a universalizable concept which it is possible, to some extent, to measure and quantify.

---

12 ILO “World Employment Programme” (launched in 1969) and the ILO “Declaration of Principles and Programmes of Action for a Basic Needs Strategy of Development” (1976) have been important in that they gave wide recognition to the concept of BNA across the international community.
by making use of standardized indicators. On the other hand, normative-substantive perspectives have adopted BNA in the context of specific socio-cultural systems in terms of their historical relativity. Here it is understood in relation to quality of life that is culturally specific which, in terms of transcendental values, partly overlaps with the spheres of philosophy and religion, (Hettne, 1990). Quoting Max-Neef (1986), Hettne (ibid.) subsequently draws a distinction between “needs” and “satisfiers,” whereby positive-formal perspectives and normative-substantive perspectives on BNA are linked. The argument here is that fundamental human needs are few in number and classifiable as well as being trans-cultural, whereas the forms or the means by which those needs may be satisfied (“satisfiers”) change over time and across cultures.

Alternative development may be regarded as a counter movement to the modernist mainstream approach to development, which is a protest against the tendency to “impose abstract models of development in very different social contexts, and so these models become forms of imposing power on societies” (Kiely, 1995, p. 161). Contrary to some structuralist approaches, where macroeconomic change is emphasized, alternative development places stress on agency in the sense of the capacity of people to effect social change. The key distinguishing feature of this perspective is “an analytical emphasis on agency, the social construction of development situations” rather than treating development experience in purely structural terms (Booth, 1994, p. 17). There is no solid theoretical foundation underpinning Alternative development, rather it is a “loosely interconnected ensemble of sensibilities and practices” (Pieterse, 1998, p. 357) that include people-centered development, participatory development, autonomous development, community-based development and an actor-oriented approach.

Epistemologically, the view of the world in post-modern social theory is that it is composed of a plurality of language games, local truths and discourses in the context of power structures. In the following statement that “(e)ach society has its regime of truth, its generic politics of truth,” Kiely (1995, p. 154), citing Foucault (1981, p. 131), illustrates the relativist approach to development study, where interventions in the developing countries are to be seen “in their specific, culturally embedded context” because people’s beliefs are the key when assessing their truth or falsity. However, Kiely (ibid.) also claims that such cultural relativism should not lead to the abandonment of the search for universal principles, a view based on the recognition that there are certain features, regardless of culture, that all people appreciate in common, such as basic human needs and rights. In development studies, where the “ethical assumptions of conflicting positions” are difficult to clarify (Kiely, 1995. p. 162), such recognition is invaluable.

Since no universal model for development exists, it is necessary for each society to invent its own strategy on the basis of its needs (Hettne, 1990) while taking cognizance of the geo-historical context in order to understand each process of development. From this perspective, development efforts should be undertaken from within and be geared to basic needs, self-reliance, sustainable and endogenous development (ibid.). It should be noted, however, that efforts have been made to incorporate this perspective into mainstream development and that there is a substantial amount of evidence to demonstrate that development interventions are often more successful when there is community participation (Pieterse, 1998).
other words, with research built on the real experiences of the community, incorporating the “views, aspirations, wisdom and imperfections of real, living people” (Edwards, 1994, p. 279), it is possible to generate knowledge with extensive explanatory power that will probably eventually be used by people in a progressive manner (ibid.).

Hence, development is no longer to be simply viewed in terms of economic growth, but where human development is regarded as a more appropriate goal and measure of development (Pieterse, 1998). Human development is defined by UNDP (1990) as a process of enlarging people’s range of choices, which can be infinite and change over time, as well as the level of their achieved well being. The essential choices are for people 1) to lead a long and healthy life; 2) to acquire knowledge and; 3)to have access to resources needed for a decent standard of living. Moreover, political, economic and social freedom as well as human dignity and human rights are added as further choices that are highly valued by many people. (p.10).

The methodological implication of these perspectives is the use of the multi-disciplinary approach to development (Edwards, 1994; Chew & Denmark, 1996), which ground their investigations in local reality, seeing it from multiple perspectives by combining various disciplines, theories and paradigms from various disciplines e.g. economics, sociology, geography, anthropology, political science, and psychology, in order to view social action holistically. These ideas are elaborated upon in the next section since they are integral to the focus of this study.

3.1.4 Furthering Alternative Development Paradigm: Actor-Oriented Development and Participatory Development

**Actor-oriented sociology of development**, where social action is regarded as implying both social meaning and social practice, has intellectual roots in theories of symbolic interaction and social exchange. Social action and interpretation is context specific and contextually generated (Long, 2001). In the actor-oriented approach, consideration is paid to the complex interdependence between the strategies of specific actors, resource inputs (material/technical and social/institutional), and macro political-economic structure, whereby the location of action is to be sought in a structural context. Structural change at the national level is a vital precondition for the successful development of people.

The importance of incorporating the views and aspirations of people is stressed here, since development is seen not merely in terms of macro-economics but also in terms of the “process of enrichment in every aspect of life” (Edwards, 1994, pp. 282-285). Therefore the actor-oriented approach involves investigation of the extent to which specific kinds of knowledge are shaped by the domains of power and social relationships in which they are generated and embedded. The conceptual foundation of an actor-oriented analysis is a theory of agency, based on the capacity of actors to process their experiences through mutual learning and to act upon them. It is here understood that social action takes place within networks of relationships, shaped both by routine and by explorative practices, and is influenced by certain social conventions, values and power relations (Long, 2001).

Epistemologically, the actor-oriented approach acknowledges the existence of “multiple social realities,” (i.e. the co-existence of different understandings and
interpretations of experience), while challenging the ontological realism of positivist science (i.e. of a “real world” that is simply “out there” to be discovered). Hence, knowledge is here conceptualized as involving ways of understanding the world, based on a complex interplay of social, cognitive, cultural, institutional and situational factors (Long & Long, 1992, pp. 212-213). With regard to methodology, detailed ethnographic and reflexive type of understanding of everyday life and of processes are required.

Practices involving participatory development have had a long history. It is possible to identify three major shifts regarding the debate on participation (Laderchi, 2001). In the 1970s, many international development agencies emphasized “popular participation” as an important component in rural development and basic needs strategies. In the 1980s, the concept of participation was coupled with discourses on grassroots self-reliance and self-help, with the firm support of NGOs. In the 1990s, participation was promoted on a larger scale, from the level of individual projects or grassroots interventions to the level of macro social, economic and political life. Here, participation was regarded both as a tool and as an end in itself, in relation to policy objectives such as “empowerment” and “good governance” (ibid.).

In the context of ODC, participation has been defined as “a process through which stakeholders influence and share control over development initiatives and the decisions and resources which affect them” (World Bank, 1996, p 3). Participatory methods developed in the context of Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) became the central tool for development agencies when embracing participation. Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) may be defined as a growing family of approaches and methods in order to enable local people to express and analyze the realities of their lives and conditions, and to plan, monitor and evaluate their actions themselves. Understanding that epistemologies are multiple and complementary, the approach of Chambers (1997) promotes the meta-value of value diversity, whereby all values are tolerated excepting those that do not tolerate others, in a spirit of plural tolerance and mutual learning.

Dialogue and participatory research are utilized in PRA in order to enhance awareness and confidence of people (Chambers 1994). The significance of valuing local realities has also been clearly articulated by Holland and Blackburth (1998) as follows:

(…) relevant and sustainable policy making requires local voices to be heard, Local perceptions and priorities must be listened to and addressed, and participation by “beneficiaries” ensured early and meaningfully in decision making at policy, program and project levels. (Holland and Blackburth, 1998,p 1)

Public participation has been broadly defined as “an opportunity for citizens and public and private organizations to express their opinions on general policy goals or to have their priorities and needs integrated into decisions made about specific projects and programmes” (Feeney, 1998, p. 10). It is an essential component of the democratization process, which is closely related to the capacity development of individuals in order for them to be able to participate in political life, and also to facilitate an increase in the ownership and accountability of public administration (ibid.). Arnstein (1969)’s classification according to the levels of participation
provides more concrete degrees of participations (See Figure 3.2). Here, participation is graded from manipulation (least citizen participation) to citizen control (most citizen participation). Citizen participation is defined as the redistribution of power that enables the powerless, presently excluded from the political and economic processes, to be deliberately included in the future.

At the level of nonparticipation, power holders “educate” or “cure” the participants. At the level of tokenism, powerless are allowed to hear and to have a voice, but without any power to influence. Placation is considered to be a higher level tokenism because powerless are allowed to advise to the power holders, but without any decision power. At the level of citizen power, degrees of decision-making power increases. Partnership level enables powerless to negotiate with power holders, and at the levels of delegated power and citizen control, powerless obtain the majority of decision-making power, or full managerial power.

The participatory approach allows a greater understanding of the heterogeneity of stakeholder groups, such as the differences with regard to their interests and inequalities with regard to their power. Triangulation of the voices of these various stakeholders ensures that consideration is paid to these differences. It is only by means of these processes that it becomes possible to ground policy debates in local realities and local interpretations (ibid.). However, there are a number of limits to the participation approach that should also be recognized.

For example, participation may lead to significant levels of psychological, and even physical, pressure on those who are the most socially and economically disadvantaged and who are typically the prime potential beneficiaries of community-driven development projects, where free and genuine participation might involve them taking positions that are contrary to the interests of more powerful groups.

![Figure 3.2: Arnstein (1969)'s ladder of citizen participation](image)
(Mansuri and Rao, 2004). Therefore, participation requires that political structure, power relations, socio-economic hierarchies are all to be taken into consideration and to be revised.

### 3.1.5 Towards Comprehensive and Contextualized Development Theory

Thinking in the development discourse is normative by nature (Hettne, 1990). In addition, problems and needs with regard to development vary qualitatively from one society to another, both because of domestic conditions and as a result of the position of the country in the world system (ibid.). The process by which development theories are advanced contains dynamic interactions of various theoretical perspectives.

Therefore Hettne’s meta-theory is found helpful in gaining a comprehensive understanding of future directions of thinking in the development discourse, whereby the global diffusion of Western mainstream development theories is regarded as a synthesis while the indigenization process, as represented in the alternative paradigm, is regarded as an antithesis and, finally, the universalization process of the conception of development, which is a more comprehensive and contextualized development theory, is regarded as a synthesis (ibid. p. 241-243). Any attempt to search for a single universal “model” of development may be regarded as formalistic. A universal conception of development would, nonetheless, allow a substantive dimension to be utilized as methodology and thus would introduce flexibility in bringing to bear historical, socio-economic, political and environmental contexts on the ideological, epistemological or methodological orientation.

### 3.2 Official Development Cooperation: National Development to Global Development

#### 3.2.1 Definition of Official Development Cooperation (ODC)

For technical purposes, the concept of aid most often used is Official Development Assistance (ODA). According to the OECD (2005 b), ODA is defined as those grants or loans to developing countries and territories contained in the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) List of Aid Recipients, which are: a) undertaken by the official sector, b) where promotion of economic development and welfare is the main objective, c) and, if a loan, on concessionary financial terms, having a grant element of at least 25 per cent. Technical Co-operation is also included in aid, in addition to

---

13 The term “official” makes clear that the reference is to government-led development interventions but excludes non-governmental development interventions. When reference is made in this study to more comprehensive development interventions, where both governmental and non-governmental interventions are included, “international development cooperation” is the term used.

14 Transfers made in cash, goods or services where repayment is not implied or required.

15 Technical cooperation includes both grants to nationals of aid-recipient countries undergoing education or training at home or abroad, and payments to consultants, or similar
financial flows. By convention, ODA\textsuperscript{16} flows comprise contributions of donor
government agencies to the governments of developing countries, an arrangement
that is termed bilateral ODA, as well as to multilateral institutions.\textsuperscript{17} The term
Official Development Cooperation (ODC) has been coined for this study to signify
the same interventions to those known as ODA in order to indicate a preference for
the term “cooperation” rather than “assistance.”

Since the understanding of development cooperation entertained by Sida is
both holistic and comprehensive, it is considered appropriate to cite it here:

\begin{quote}

Development cooperation can contribute implementing democracy, creating
equality or eliminating poverty through creating the conditions for sustainable
development by supporting 1) peace and stability; 2) democratic political
conditions; 3) institutional conditions e.g. efficient public administration, active
civil society, and a sound legal system; 4) economic conditions; 5) physical
conditions e.g. construction and maintenance of infrastructures; 6) human
conditions, i.e. education, public health, human rights; and 7) environmental
conditions (Sida, 1997, pp. 18-19). 
\end{quote}

Terms that are frequently used, such as \textit{foreign aid}, \textit{development assistance},
and \textit{development aid} can be both misleading and express prejudice since they
symbolize a unilateral view of humanitarian intervention. In reality, official wealth
transfers are not unilateral since they may imply economic and political control
mechanisms, principally based on agreements between governments on both sides of
the transfer. More specifically, on the side of the donor, these transfers might be
regarded as an important tool for exercising economic influence over the recipient
government, for example with regard to national strategies. From the side of the
recipient, the official wealth transfers might imply issues concerning
political/economic sovereignty as well as coordination with the “international
accordance” (OECD, 2005b).

However, Närman (1999) argues that the in reality, terms \textit{aid}, \textit{assistance}, and
\textit{cooperation} refer to basically similar interventions, even though each may also be
used with some specific normative connotations. Degrees and forms of conditionality,
as well as different types of bilateral relationship, differ from case to case, and from
cooperation based on “partnership” to neo-colonial assistance (see Section 3.2.2). It
should be noted, as discussed in Section 3.1 above, that, since it is not possible to
usefully generalize about development interventions or define them as a fixed
personnel, as well as teachers and administrators serving in recipient countries (OECD,
2005b).

\textsuperscript{16} The World Bank has introduced a new cooperation measure known as Effective
Development Assistance (EDA), which provides a more accurate measure of real cooperation
flows than the traditional ODA measure. EDA is the sum of grants and the grant equivalent of
official loans, and aims to measure the pure transfer of resources. EDA is defined as the grant
equivalents of all development flows in any given period. Grants tied to technical assistance
are excluded from EDA.

\textsuperscript{17} These are the international institutions with governmental membership, where a significant
proportion of their activities are dedicated to development. They include e.g. multilateral
development banks, United Nations agencies, and regional groupings (such as certain
European Union and Arab agencies).
concept, it should be understood rather as a complex and changing concept reflecting an evolving development discourse. The European Commission, for example, regards development cooperation in terms of a broader framework: political, security, scientific, cultural and economic.

Taking cognizance of the risks involved in ignoring diversity at the national level, and to avoid unnecessary confusion and complications, while still attempting to increase common understanding, the term Official Development Cooperation (ODC) is used in this study where appropriate, rather than the terms “aid” or “assistance,” which imply neo-colonial power relations between “donors” and “recipients.” Consequently, the term ODC agency here refers to both “donor” and “International Technical and Funding Agency.”

A similar argument may be made with regard to the terms “South” and “Third World” which are generally used to refer to countries whose governments have requested and received official aid from wealthier countries. “Least Developed Countries” (LDCs) is another term used by the United Nations in order to identify a certain group of countries. A country is classified as an LDC when it falls below a certain minimum limit established for income, economic diversification and social development. The DAC List is updated promptly to reflect any change in the LDC group (OECD, 2004 a).

In this study, the relatively simple terms “developing countries” or “LDCs” are used when reference is being made to the group of countries whose governments receive Official Development Aid (ODA). Although other terms such as “partner government” or “partner country” are increasingly prevalent in official documents and reports, these terms have been avoided as there is certain ambiguity regarding which side of a partnership they signify.

3.2.2 Multi/Bilateral Organizations in International Development Cooperation - Historical Development of ODC Mechanism

Foreign aid emerged as a form of political and economic force in the 1950s, in the context of decolonization and the Cold War. Beginning with the Marshall Plan in the late 1940s, a proposal was put forward by President Truman of the US for a new programme of technical assistance to less developed countries, calling for international solidarity with the aim of supporting, from a humanitarian perspective, the self-support efforts of “the least fortunate” of the world against “human oppressors, hunger, misery and despair” (speech by Truman, quoted in full in Lumsdaine, 1993, pp. 221-222). Truman’s proposal won firm support from the international community and within the next three years a number of actions were set

---

18 Currently, 50 countries are listed as LDCs. Information available at the UN Office of the High Representative for the Least Developing Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States. www.un.org/special-rep/ohrlls/ldc/list.htm.
19 Over time, the term as “foreign aid” was eventually used in a sense that embraced more “development cooperation,” more professional interventions, and more poverty-oriented programmes, various values were incorporated as readjustments were made to the changing international context.
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in motion, including development lending on the part of the World Bank\(^{20}\) in 1949 and 1950, the Colombo Plan\(^{21}\) for South Asian countries from 1950 and the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance (EPTA)\(^{22}\) of the United Nations.

Lumsdaine (1993) analyzes explanatory factors behind the relative rapid expansion of foreign aid, where international humanitarian and civic considerations were combined with economic and political self-interest of donor states,\(^{23}\) in the context of the emergence of new nations after de-colonization, with increased demands for self-determination and support for human dignity. Based on a historical and comparative analysis of international relations, Lumsdaine (1993) focuses on the time factor, and argues that the articulation of new humanitarian aid programmes were launched at an opportune moment as the international climate had become sufficiently prepared for this reaction since developing values of liberal internationalism had been maturing for the prior half century. Three factors, de-colonization, new policy and the general international climate accorded well with the values of commitment to an egalitarian and humane society within a peaceful international order.

Further institutionalization of ODC took place from the late 1950s and early 1970s, including the establishment of the International Finance Corporation (IFC) as an affiliate of the World Bank, the founding of the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB), the proclamation of the 1960s as the Development Decade, the creation of the International Development Association (IDA) as a soft-loan affiliate of the World Bank, major policy statements by some donor countries, the establishment of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in 1961 and the subsequent setting up of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the OECD. Throughout the rest of the 1960s and up until the late 1970s, organizational expansions took place while ODC funding through multilateral organizations and the proliferation of multilateral programmes increased significantly, such as the establishment of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), the African Development Bank in 1964, the Asian Development Bank in 1966, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) in 1967, the ILO World Employment Program in 1969, the African Development Fund in 1972, the Asian Development Fund in 1974, and so on (Lumsdaine, 1993).

---

\(^{20}\) The World Bank shifted its lending from European reconstruction to development loans for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs).

\(^{21}\) The Colombo Plan is an international economic organization created in a cooperative attempt to strengthen the economic and social development of Southeast Asian and the Pacific countries, mainly through technical assistance. It was formally launched in 1951 under the title, the Colombo Plan for Cooperative Economic Development in South and Southeast Asia (source: The Columbia Encyclopedia, 2005).

\(^{22}\) EPTA provided advisory services, expert assistance, fellowships and equipment. 1959 saw the creation of the UN Special Fund, which supported large-scale pre-investment projects and was intended to enhance the efforts of the EPTA. In 1965, the two programmes were merged, leading to the establishment of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

\(^{23}\) Similarly, Grant and Nijman (1998) argue that the motives of donors can be explained by combinations of various factors, such as geopolitics or geo-strategy (Lebovic 1988; Orr 1990), economics (Hook 1995), special relationships and regional clustering (McKinalay and Little 1978; Holdar1993) and humanitarianism (Lumsdaine 1993).
Foreign aid was utilized as a powerful strategic tool in the polarized world of the Cold War, through which it was used to implement the foreign policies of donor countries, with the exception of France, Sweden and the Netherlands, who had adopted independent foreign policies from the bi-polarized foreign policies under the Cold War structure. During the 1970s and 1980s, while the interest of the United States in foreign aid was cooling, other OECD countries began to increase their commitment to aid, especially after the end of the Cold War, when there was an even more significant increase in their involvement (ibid.).

The 1980s are recalled as a particularly disastrous period for many LDCs, with extensive drought and famine, especially in Africa, HIV/AIDS abruptly emerged and rapidly became widespread, world commodity prices declined by almost a half, bringing about a collapse of the economies of LDCs and the flow of aid money was nowhere near enough to recover from the negative growth rate. Furthermore, the IMF withdrew money from Africa for a several years, in accordance with the then current monetarist theories, while the USA and UK raised their domestic interest rates and cut back the level of aid. It was in this context that, by 1980, the “Basic Needs” approach was being re-emphasized whereby the poverty alleviation aspect was added to the Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs)\(^\text{24}\). Nevertheless, the consequences included an underestimation of the importance of the role of the state and the political and socio-cultural effects of intervention being overlooked. As financial crises deepened, more emphasis was placed on SAPs and less on basic needs (Goldthorpe, 1996). Many subsequent studies have revealed that the most devastating effects of SAPs were on basic health services and education systems (Chew and Denmark, 1996, Goldthorpe, 1996, Odora, 1998). At the same time, France and Japan increased the quality and quantity of their ODC, Japan eventually becoming the largest single aid donor by the end of the 1980s and Norway, Finland and Italy also substantially increased their funding (Lumsdaine, 1993).

Lumsdaine (1993), when analyzing the history of changing international relations in political and economic contexts, concludes that international humanitarian and civic considerations have been the major driving force behind the struggle to maintain ODC, in the face of contrary pressures from global economic conditions, and resisting the alternative policy of reducing both the quality and quantity of aid.

The 1990s are to be regarded as a decade where universal humanism was promoted as part of a search for a new world order after the collapse of the polarized world. Many global conferences were held under the auspices of the United Nations during this decade as efforts to promote commitments to sustainable human social, economic and environmental development.\(^\text{25}\)

\(^{24}\) The intention of SAPs was to encourage a liberal market-oriented approach, including cutbacks to local government expenditure, currency devaluation, reductions in subsidies for staple goods, removal of import quotas, tariff reductions, reforms of interest rate policy, revision of agricultural prices, reductions in the powers of state marketing boards and the privatization of state-owned enterprises (Chew and Denmark, 1996, p.6).

All these international efforts and commitments constituted an international development discourse, or “sustainable global development” discourse (Sida, 2004b, 2005), in various forms, along multiple dimensions and at multiple levels. The agenda was elaborated in the 2000 UN Millennium Declaration, which included commitments to peace, security and disarmament, development and poverty reduction, sustainable environment, human rights, democracy and good governance, protection for the most vulnerable groups, as well as paying particular attention to the special needs of Africa.

This international discourse on development cooperation brought about a significantly increased emphasis on both improved effectiveness of ODC and poverty reduction as a strategy for holistic and sustainable development. There can be no doubt that throughout the 1990s and up to the present time, significant international efforts to improve ODC have been carried out. There has been greater focus, with the World Bank taking the lead, on the effectiveness of ODC delivery, part of which are efforts to harmonize practices of the ODC agencies. Sector-Wide Approaches have been implemented (see Section 10.3 for a more detailed discussion). With regard to the education sector, significant efforts have been made to attain the goal of Education for All (EFA) (see Section 3.3 for more details). A poverty reduction strategy was spelled out in 2000, with quantitative objectives to be attained in the form of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). This is important because the education sector has always been a central issue in the context of poverty reduction. Over and above these strategic and sector specific improvements, the share of multilateral ODA increased whereby the weight of control was shifted from bilateral ODC agencies to organizations more specialized in development, such as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

### 3.2.3 Types of Bilateral ODC Agencies

Three types of guiding principles can be identified with regard to the ODC, namely geo-political strategy, humanitarian ideology and economic strategy (Yamatani, 1994). The first type is concerned with the geo-political strategies and interests of each country, typically seen in American ODC. During the Cold War period, the ODC was used as a political means of winning and maintaining allied countries lined up against the Soviet Union. In addition, since the Camp David Agreement of 1978, the US has been providing significant flows of ODC to Egypt and Israel, which reflects changes in American foreign policy and geo-political strategy in the Middle

East (Yamatani, ibid.; Zunes, 2001). In the case of the UK, the flows of ODC cover over 130 countries, where most weight is in favour of both Commonwealth countries and other countries of diplomatic significance. In the case of France, those countries which are former colonies are her main partners, with additional resources for promotion of French culture and language added to normal ODC objectives.

The second type of guiding principle is the approach based on humanitarian ideology, grounded on a basic human needs and rights perspectives. It is most clearly characterized by the Nordic countries, which display “well-intended humanitarianism on moral grounds” (Närman, 1999). Here there are attempts to channel solidarity and resources to partner countries in order to support their sustainable self-development. For these countries, disbursements of ODC as a proportion of their Gross National Income (GNI) exceed the official targets of 0.7 per cent set by the UN. The history of Swedish ODC, for example, goes back to the end of the 19th century (for further discussion, see Section 3.2.5). The key objective of Norwegian ODC is to reduce poverty in the very poorest countries where half of their ODC budget is channeled through multilateral organizations such as the UN and the World Bank, indicating a preference for such multilateral cooperation. ODC of Nordic countries are experimental in design, implementing poverty reduction strategies and aid harmonization and so on, while always entailing a distinct humanitarian character (Grant & Nejman, 1998).

Finally, the third type of guiding principle is based on the economic strategies and interests of each country concerned, a good example being Japanese cooperation, most of which consists of non-grant but loans26 (Yamatani, 1994). Japan considers that economic growth is the main driving force for development and therefore actively promotes regional economic co-operation agreements and free trade agreements, which are expected to eventually be mutually beneficial to both Japan herself and her partners. It is stated in the revised ODA Charter of 2003, that the ultimate objectives for Japanese ODA is “to contribute to the peace and development of the international community, and thereby to help ensure Japan’s own security and prosperity” (Japan’s ODA Charter, 2003, cited in OECD, 2003b). However, there is always a risk that strong adherence to narrower national interests may over-ride the general principle of development, namely to benefit the developing countries (OECD, 2003b).

The three main guiding principles presented in Table 3.1 have been identified as useful for characterizing major ODC agencies. But it should be noted that this is a relative characterization and that these are by no means the only principles which might guide any particular agency. Naturally, for each country, a complex of guiding principles may be identified, including, in various degrees, components such as political interests, humanitarian ideology and economic strategy, which are then reflected in the unique set of principles of each ODC agency. Any particular complex of components may also change over time, for example, being influenced by shifts in national policy or changes in the international discourse on development. It is also

---

26 The proportion of loans represented 55 per cent of total bilateral ODA in 2002. The motivation for Japan’s focus on loans is mostly due to her own experience of having received credit from the World Bank for her own post-war reconstruction (OECD, 2003b).
important that careful attention be paid to geo-historical contexts when considering the complex of development principles identified in any particular country.

### Table 3.1: Types of guiding principles for ODC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main guiding principle</th>
<th>Country examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geo-political strategy</td>
<td>US, UK, France, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian ideology</td>
<td>Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic strategy</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the partner countries of major bilateral ODC agencies, net disbursement of the ODA and its percentage of GNI, 2003-2004 Average, derived from statistical data prepared by the OECD are presented in Table 3.2.

### Table 3.2: Some of the bilateral ODC agencies’ ODA allocations to partner countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 10 partner countries in terms of gross ODA by the order of volume of disbursement per country</th>
<th>Net disb* (ODA/GNI)</th>
<th>Names of ODC agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA, Iraq, Congo, Egypt, Russia, Jordan, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Colombia, Israel, Ethiopia</td>
<td>19,705 (0.17)</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development (USAID)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India, Bangladesh, Tanzania, Iraq, Ghana, Zambia, Congo, Afghanistan, Malawi, South Africa</td>
<td>7,883 (0.36)</td>
<td>Department for International Development (DFID)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, French Polynesia, New Caledonia, Senegal, Cameroon, Madagascar, Morocco, Pakistan, Poland</td>
<td>8,473 (0.41)</td>
<td>French Development Agency (AFD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, Tanzania, Mozambique, Russia, Afghanistan, Ethiopia, Nicaragua, Uganda, Palestinian Authority, Serbia &amp; Montenegro</td>
<td>2,722 (0.78)</td>
<td>Swedish International Development Agency (Sida)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan, Tanzania, Mozambique, Palestinian Authority, Sudan, Serbia &amp; Montenegro, Uganda, Iraq, Somalia, Zambia</td>
<td>2,199 (0.87)</td>
<td>Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan, Iraq, Poland, Ethiopia, Congo, Bangladesh, China, Mali, Ghana, Tanzania</td>
<td>2,599 (0.27)</td>
<td>Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China, Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand, India, Viet Nam, Ghana, Iraq, Malaysia, Sri Lanka</td>
<td>8,906 (0.19)</td>
<td>Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), Japan Bank for International Cooperation (JBIC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net disb. = net disbursement, ODA/GNI = percentage of ODA budget set against GNI.²⁷

Source: OECD, Gross Bilateral ODA, Average 2003-2004

The ODA allocations to partner countries may indicate the selection criteria of donors, based on recipient characteristics, for example, geo-political significance such as oil exports or military expenditure, commercial value through trade, and development needs and potential (income, governance) (Roodman, 2005).

²⁷ GNI = Gross National Income
It is possible to identify the manner in which ideological, political, and geo-historical foundations for development interventions differ from case to case, but as Kiely (1995) points out, selectivity of “priority nations” largely reflects Western foreign policy concerns.

3.2.4 Challenges in Development Cooperation

It has been pointed out in this chapter that extensive efforts have been made by the international community with the aim of improving development cooperation. The mechanism of development cooperation displays a considerable degree of complexity, with dynamic multidirectional power relationships between, and overlapping, the macro, meso, and micro levels, as is illustrated in Figure 2.3.

A challenge confronting ODC is the issue of coordination and harmonization of overlapping interventions, where institutional measures have been undertaken, based on the framework in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (see Section 7.3.3 for detailed discussion). In addition, the issue of lack of ownership on the part of developing countries, which is the other side of the coin of what is considered to be the excessive control on the part of ODC agencies, has also been addressed through improvements within the wider framework of the partnership discourse (see Section 7.3.2 for detailed discussion).

Yet a further challenge facing ODC is the dependency created by ODC itself (Närman, 1999) when increasing “aid dependency” was brought to prominence during the 1980s, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa. Conditionality in ODC has made it difficult for developing countries to disregard demands from donor countries, particularly with regard to the Structural Adjustment Program, and as a consequence, the fiscal structure of developing countries has been modified in such a way that significant flows of ODC over decades have become a necessary component. This indicates the power structure around ODC. Bauer (1995) argues against the necessity of such “external donations,” claiming that economic achievement depends on “personal, cultural, social and political factors, that is, people’s own faculties, motivations, and mores, their institutions, and the policies of their rulers” (p. 363). To achieve this requires changes in attitude and strengthening of capacity in developing countries as well as in ODC agencies.

3.2.5 Swedish ODC and Tanzania - International Context of Case A

In this section, Sida’s current ODC strategy and its cooperation with Tanzania is provided as an example of bilateral ODC agency. Sida, in this study, is an important agency, as it is a key stakeholder in Case A. Reviewing its ODC strategy will help the understanding not only of Case A, but also of the international development discourse as has been discussed above.

The roots of Swedish international development cooperation go as far back as Swedish missionary work in Ethiopia in the 1860s. These efforts eventually became institutionalized through an Act in 1962, establishing the Board for International Development Assistance (Sw.Nämnden för internationellt bistånd) which, in 1965,
was replaced by the Swedish International Development Authority (SIDA)\textsuperscript{28}. SIDA like other similar international agencies, supported the modernization process of developing countries, based on humanitarian and moral commitments (for detailed discussion on development of Swedish ODC, see Närman, 1999).

Sweden has traditionally been one of the leaders in the DAC with respect to ODC volume. Following the establishment of the ODA concept in the middle of 1960s, Sweden was among the first DAC Members to provide over 1 per cent of GNP as ODA net disbursements in 1982, and through the 1980s Sweden provided between 0.80 per cent to 0.96 per cent of its GNP in ODC net disbursements (OECD, 1996). A large proportion (16 per cent in 2003) of Swedish ODC is allocated to humanitarian aid.\textsuperscript{29} While, in support of the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals, Sida has been committed to increasing its ODC budget, being the seventh largest donor in the world in terms of volume and representing 0.77 per cent of Sweden’s Gross National Income (GNI), it is also committed to increase this to a level of 1 per cent in both 2006 and 2007, which is more than the United Nation’s target of 0.7 per cent (OECD, 2005c and Sida, 2005b).

The Policy for Global Development (PGD), approved by the National Parliament(2003/04:UU3), forms the guide for Sweden in an overarching poverty reduction mandate and prescribes a government-wide approach to sustainable global development. In the new policy, one stated goal for development cooperation is\textsuperscript{30} “to contribute to an environment supportive of poor people's own efforts to improve their quality of life.” In addition to the PGD, Sida’s fundamental principles and values are stipulated in two internal documents: Perspectives on Poverty (2002) and Sida at Work (2005a). Perspectives on Poverty (2002) is one of the guiding documents for Sida, whose overall mission is defined as being poverty reduction. Here, poverty is understood as being a dynamic, multidimensional and context-specific condition, which is arising from an absence of power and choice and lack of material resources. Operational principals and methods with regard to the work of Sida are provided in Sida at Work (2005a). Sida is actively implementing harmonization of ODC, through the adoption of a holistic approach to development cooperation in a spirit of partnership (OECD, 2005c, Sida, 2006). Sida’s partnership arrangement is based on shared values, well defined roles and the commitment of the parties, including ownership structures. Respecting equality and mutual trust as basic principles, mechanisms to facilitate the exchange of information and joint decision-making should be developed, which ought to be flexible enough to meet changing development conditions (Sida, 2005a, p. 20).

\textsuperscript{28} In 1995, SIDA (Swedish International Development Authority) became Sida (Swedish International Development Agency) with the amalgamation of the five aid agencies (SIDA, SAREC, SwedeCorp, BITS and the Sando Course Centre), in order to focus resources and to ensure a holistic approach, as well as to reduce administrative costs.

\textsuperscript{29} Humanitarian assistance is provided regardless of political considerations in the recipient country, dealing with situations caused by natural disasters and man-made crises. Basic principles that guide humanitarian action are: humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence, based on the Geneva Convention.

\textsuperscript{30} Sida’s former development goals were: economic growth, economic and social equality, economic and political independence, democratic development, environmental care, and gender equality.
Tanzania has been one of the most important partners for Sida in terms of ODC disbursement since the 1960s. Swedish-Tanzanian relationships might be characterized as being based on “emotional ties shaped by feelings of solidarity and ideological similarities,” i.e. social egalitarianism, strengthened by “bureaucratic commitments” rather than based on political/economic strategies (Elgström, 1992). Trade flows between the two countries have been minimal and no strategic resources have been exchanged (ibid.). Such a relationship represents a classical model, seen as a long-term “partnership,” based on “humanitarian conviction,” “moral duty” and “international solidarity.” The missionaries at that time preferred to settle in English-speaking East African countries. The emphasis on humanitarian and development work, based on religious convictions, was an important characteristic of Swedish missionary work in Africa and Asia (Heppling, 1986). The other basic motive behind Swedish ODC policy is related to the era of “de-colonization,” beginning in the 1950s. Sweden, in line with the policy of the United Nation, supported newly independent countries through financial and technical cooperation. The driving force here was “moral duty” and “international solidarity” in order to diminish the gap between poor and rich countries (Elgström, 1992).

Information for 2004, in numerical form, regarding Sida’s ODC with Tanzania, by sector, is provided in Table 3.3. It shows that Swedish ODC prioritizes the social sector including education and health, occupying as it does one third of the budget.

Table 3.3: Sida’s development cooperation with Tanzania in 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disbursements</th>
<th>SEK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human rights and democratization</td>
<td>84,550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sectors (education, health, etc.)</td>
<td>205,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure, commerce and urban development</td>
<td>131,389,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resource management</td>
<td>58,908,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>3,558,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>130,140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>613,744,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sida (2005b)

Cooperation between Sweden and Tanzania has contributed to a number of improvements, including extensive reform of the public administration, education, the development of the power sector, research collaboration, clean water and more sustainable agricultural methods. According to the Tanzanian country strategy, the overall objective of development is to combat poverty. The spirit of partnership, whereby Tanzania has primary responsibility, has been central to the entire enterprise of cooperation. Three areas have been noted as constituting priority areas, namely pro-poor growth, human development and democratization (Sida, 2005b).

Within the education sector, the major areas of Swedish support have been vocational training, adult education and primary schools, including production of primary-school textbooks and teacher training. Most of the support to adult education was disbursed in the 1970s, while support to vocational training was dominant in the 1980s. Priority areas for Sida, at the time when Case A was being implemented, were the two major components of basic education, i.e. primary and adult education, which
account for 75 per cent of the total of disbursements made in the context of bilateral agreements (Sida, 1997b).

3.3 Education and Development

3.3.1 Economic, Political, and Socio/Cultural Dimensions of Education and Development

The importance of the relationships between education and development has been recognized from various perspectives, such as macroeconomic, democratic political development, basic human needs, human rights, demography, and so. Fägerlind and Saha (1989) identified the following key dimensions: economic, political and socio/cultural, for gaining a comprehensive understanding of “education and development.”

Rostow’s theory of economic growth and Shultz’s human capital theory, for example, have significant explanatory power with regard to explicating the close relationships between education, economic growth and development. Education is able to contribute to economic growth through developing skills and knowledge in the population, while economic growth may in turn enhance further qualitative and quantitative expansion of education. However, as Fägerlind and Saha (1989) point out, efforts should be made to contextualize educational content to the local socio-cultural, economic and political conditions, otherwise education may not only be inappropriate but even dysfunctional for economic development.

The second dimension is socio-cultural impact of education on development, which can be discussed from the social-psychological and the sociological modernization processes. Social-psychological modernization processes refer to changing attitudes and values with regard to social developments whereas sociological modernization signifies the impact of modernization on improvements in the quality of life based on fundamental human values. Education widens and deepens each person’s body of knowledge, values, and beliefs, equipping one for increasing control over, and rationalization of, many aspects of the human condition (ibid.). Moreover, impacts on demography, that is improvements in conditions with regard to childbirth, health and life expectancy as well as advancements in technology and expansion of its application, add further aspects of educational effects on sociological modernization.

The third dimension is education and political development. Borrowing the definition provided by Coleman (1965), political development is here defined as acquisition by a political system of qualitatively enhanced political capacity, institutionalizing new patterns of integration and participation and resource distribution. Integration refers to societal capacity to create unity and solidarity among people, relating to a sense of national identity. The concepts of participation and integration imply a consensus-oriented system consistent with individual rights and duties. In relation to political development, Fägerlind and Saha (1989) argue that education is able to function as the main agent for the political socialization of people with regard to the national political culture while, at the same time, it may function as the primary agent for the selection and training of political elites.
Chinapah and Daun (1981) further argue challenges be acknowledged in development cooperation in the education sector, which serves as a concluding remark to this section. Difficulties in educational cooperation, they argue, lie in the existence of a situational context in which the educational system operates. Education is conditioned by existing political, socio-cultural, economic, ecological as well as pedagogical factors, which must be carefully taken into consideration (ibid.).

3.3.2 International Cooperation in Education and Development

Education has been one of the key sectors in ODC in the post-colonial era, as newly-independent countries aimed to also gain socio-economic independence. The powerful indirect influences of ODC on the process for the formation of education policy have been the subject of extensive research (Samoff, 1996, Mundy, 1998; Chabott & Ramirez, 2000). The part played by ODC with regard to policy formation in the education sector may be regarded as the continuation of a process of standardization in education which had already emerged in the eighteenth century, in the context of colonialism, but which has recently become accelerated, with the intensification of cooperation through multilateral organizations (McGinn, 2000). Mundy (1998) analyzes educational multilateralism in a similar manner, as represented by UNESCO, which has contributed to the construction of educational models whereby learning is embedded within an ideology of state-led economic modernization and the promotion of individual productivity.

The human rights approach and the human capital approach are two dominant perspectives from which support for the claim with regard to the significance of education in ODC may be drawn. In the first approach, education is regarded as a human right, based on the framework of Article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (United Nations, 1948) as well as Articles 13 and 14 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (United Nations, 1966). Typical ODC agencies that actively support this approach are various UN agencies and the Nordic bilateral agencies. Often in this approach, education is not only regarded as a right in itself but also as a means of promoting peace and respect for all human rights and fundamental freedoms (UNESCO and UN Economic and Social Council, 2003). In the second approach, education is regarded as an investment, based on the framework of Human Capital theory, as articulated by Schultz (1961). This approach is typically supported by the World Bank and IMF, based on the expected economic returns on the investments in education both at the macro (national and societal) and micro (individual) levels.

Nonetheless, there are also other perspectives on approaches to supporting education, over and above the rather rigid ones of “rights” and “human capital,” which recognize natural human needs on the basis of some sort of universal value embedded in one’s culture throughout history. Samoff (1999), for example, argues along similar lines that educational cooperation often merely reflects a functional and an instrumental understanding of education as a system, thereby failing to incorporate important values such as the cultivation of critical minds, promoting national unity, self-reliance and self-confidence because these are more difficult to measure.

At the policy level, the 1990 World Conference on Education for All (EFA) was held in Jomtien, Thailand, sponsored by four multilateral organizations, namely
Official Development Cooperation and Education

the World Bank, UNESCO, UNICEF, and UNDP. It resulted in the World Declaration on Education for All, which has ever since exercised significant influence on ODC in the education sector. Changes with regard to cooperation policy are laid out in annual reports and official documents of the World Bank (World Development Report 1991, Priority and Strategy for Education 1995, and Education Sector Strategy 1999), OECD DAC, UNESCO, UNDP and UNICEF, where priority has been given to primary education and with particular attention being paid to the education of girls. However, these movements in the 1990s, whereby priority has been placed on basic education, have lead to a lower priority being given to higher education and vocational education. In the light of poverty reduction efforts, more stress was placed on the importance of non-formal education which led to the launching of the UN decade of literacy during the period between 2003 and 2012. A follow-up conference to the 1990 EFA was held in Dakar, Senegal, in 2000, which resulted in the Dakar framework of action on EFA. According to UNESCO (Rahman, 2004), there are still roughly 862 million people who are illiterate today and about 115 million, or 20 percent, of children between the ages of 6 to 11 in LDCs are not attending school. In line with the Millennium Development Goals, the international community has been working to fulfill the goals of EFA by the target year of 2015.

3.4 Capacity Development

“Aid effectiveness with local relevance” is a slogan that has been emphasized throughout more recent approaches to ODC, which may be represented by the Sector Wide Approach (SWAp) (see Section 10.3 for more details). The issue of capacity development of actors at various levels became critical, not only on the side of the developing countries but also on the side of ODC agency.

Capacity development in the context of ODC may be understood as the “capacity to plan, manage, implement, and account for results of policies and programs, (...) from analysis and dialogue through implementation, monitoring and evaluation,” making “effective use of existing capacities” and being “responsive to the broader social, political and economic environment, including the need to strengthen human resources” (2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness31). Capacity development, as set out in the 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, is one of the key areas of consensus for many ODC agencies and developing countries, whereby it has been agreed that capacity development, as a central issue of partnership, is the primary responsibility of developing countries, with ODC agencies playing a supportive role.

Capacity development is a long term process that must be sustained in order to match the transformations and transitions of development. However, the multi-dimensional nature of the concept of capacity raises methodological questions about capacity measurement (De nevers, Léautier, & Otoo, 2005). Although success is usually assessed by comparing achievements with stipulated goals for attainment, defining capacity goals is concerned with more difficult assessments involving determining needs at the organizational level, at the cross-sectoral level, and across

31 See Section 7.2.3 for details
the entire societal level. It also involves measuring institutional or organizational change and individual skill-building as well as changes in attitude. Conditions for supporting capacity development remain a difficult and contentious issue. It is acknowledged that capacity is enhanced in a context of “good governance” and effective leadership, whereas it may deteriorate when government is less accountable. Nevertheless, as Manning (2006) points out, there is still far to go before reaching a consensus as to the circumstances in which resources directed at capacity development may turn out to be useless or even harmful. Strategic long-term commitments, carefully planned by the national government together with harmonized support from ODC agencies, create the institutional platform for sustainable capacity development.

3.5 Concluding Remarks

As is described in this chapter, development is approached in the present study from a normative-substantive perspective (see Section 3.1.2). Quoting Hettne (1990), development is here understood as “a historical change of comprehensive, qualitative and less predictable nature.” It involves constant efforts, based on, and towards, desired values held by heterogeneous actors.

In line with the normative-substantive perspective adopted to the study, alternative development, which is epistemologically based on post-modern social theory, is regarded here as the most appropriate approach to ODC, where the focus is on the capacity of people to effect social change. The framework provided by Hettne’s (1990) meta-theory is helpful in the search for more holistic and contextualized development theory. Here the search for a single universal model of development is rejected in favour of the proposal for an universal concept of development which would allow flexibility with regard to the influence of historical, socio economic, political, and environmental contexts on the ideological, epistemological or methodological orientation.

The intention here has been to comprehensively present, against the historical background, a general picture of Official Development Cooperation (ODC). Shifts in ODC strategies, influenced by the macro political structures at international and national levels are also presented. Heterogeneous strategies underlying ODC are not only based on macro-political history but also on different types of strategies or ideologies held by ODC countries, such as geo-political strategy, humanitarian ideology, and economic strategy (Section 3.2.3). The model presented by Chabbott and Ramirez (2000) (see Figure 3.2) is helpful in gaining an understanding of the complex mechanism by which ODC policies are formed, as well as to critically view the doubtful relevance locally of national policy which may be a hybrid in a global development discourse.

Finally, significant relationships between education and development are discussed along economic, political, and socio/cultural dimensions. In the context of ODC, education has always been one of the key sectors. Educational multilateralism, represented by the UNESCO, as well as bilateral educational ODC, have contributed to the construction and universalizing of those educational models which have affected education policies in developing countries.
Chapter Four

Social Program Evaluation: Theories and Methodologies

This chapter contains the key theoretical and methodological features of the research reported in this study whereby the frameworks for the Social Program Evaluation (hereafter, referred simply as “evaluation”) are described and analyzed. For the purposes of this study, considerable time and effort have been invested in the exploration of such features of the concept of evaluation as the distinction between evaluation and basic research, the political, ethical and interpersonal aspects of evaluation, the challenges to be confronted in the evaluation unintentional outcomes, particularly in the field of education, and the various functions of evaluation. Therefore it is with some confidence that it is possible to claim here that an appropriately thorough understanding of these features of evaluation forms the basis for the frameworks adopted for this research. In addition, it has also been considered useful for the purposes of the present study to introduce a concept of meta-evaluation since the research reported here contains elements of qualitative meta-evaluation.

Following on from the presentation of the results of this thorough review of the concept of evaluation, there is discussion, in Sections 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4 below, on issues that are of a more macro-typological nature. Subsequently, a summary of the historical evolution of evaluation as a discipline, followed by a typology of evaluation, are presented, the purpose being to provide a comprehensive theoretical overview. This is followed by a description of the methodological dimensions of evaluation. Next, in Section 4.5, the meta-theory of Social Program Evaluation is presented, as described by Shadish, Cook and Leviton (1991), which is here regarded as an essential input for the establishment of the theoretical dimensions for the research reported in the present study.

Finally, in Section 4.6, having reviewed various approaches to evaluation on the basis of epistemological perspectives and selection of a methodology, the focus becomes those alternative evaluation paradigms that accord with the epistemological perspectives of the present study. A number of evaluation approaches from naturalistic/qualitative research are described, such as Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation, Case Study Evaluation, Utilization-Focused Evaluation, and Responsive-Constructivist Evaluation. The intention is that the whole of chapter four will provide a sufficiently comprehensive theory-based understanding of the discipline of evaluation.
4.1 Concept and Rationale of Evaluation

4.1.1 Understanding Evaluation

Since evaluation may take many forms, from what might be considered to be everyday commonsense evaluation to those displaying methodological sophistication and everything in between. There is consequently no widely agreed-upon definition. Multiplicity is therefore a characteristic of the discipline of evaluation, based on the paradigmatic perspectives of the individual evaluators and reflecting profound differences in their philosophical and ideological stances with regard to the aim and nature of social inquiry (Caracelli, 2000, p. 101).

Nonetheless, systematic inquiry that is scientifically and politically disciplined, performed within a particular social system, is to be regarded as a general characteristic of evaluation (Cronbach & Suppes, 1969). Other characteristics of evaluation include the requirement that it be comparative, concerned with standards, involving value, and be directly oriented to decision-making processes (House, 1980). It should also be methodologically rigorous and systematic in order to reduce subjectivity as far as possible, while maintaining sensitivity towards the context of the *evaluand* (people or object to be evaluated), that is to say, attention is to be paid to the political, economic, socio-cultural, religious, traditional-modern, ideological conditions of that context.

Evaluation is often considered to be applied social research, with a managerial and political purpose. It is a reflective interactive process, where the relevance, effectiveness and impact of an intervention in pursuit of certain purposes are assessed, adding values in order to generate information and knowledge in order to enhance decision-making. Although evaluation procedure very much resembles that of social science research, the explicit intention of evaluation to understand and improve a programme (especially in the case of formative evaluation) or to record the history and progress of a programme with value judgments added (especially in the case of summative evaluation). From the management point of view, evaluation may also lead to improved utilization of available resources (House, 1980; Chinapah & Miron, 1990; Walberg & Haertel, 1990; Rossi & Freeman, 1993; Reiben, 1997; Weiss 1998; Cracknell, 2000).

There are many factors that may potentially influence the outcomes of an evaluation, such as the purpose of evaluation, decisions with regard to methodology, the power structure among the stakeholders, power relationships between those commissioning the evaluation and evaluators, the cultural background of the evaluators, organizational dynamics, external pressures on evaluation, and the evaluation capacity of an organization.

---

32 *Basic research* is directed toward advancement of knowledge; it is research where the primary aim of the researcher is a comprehensive understanding of the subject under study rather than a practical application thereof. *Applied research*, on the other hand, is directed toward practical applications of knowledge, where almost immediate utility is expected (Worthen & Sanders, 1987, p.26).
4.1.2 Distinction between Research and Evaluation

There are significant differences between research and evaluation, particularly with regard to the respective frameworks of inquiry and objectives. Whereas the orientation of the researcher is towards a particular discipline and science, that of the evaluator is towards a policy and management. In terms of practice, the purpose of the researcher is concerned with advancement of front-line scientific knowledge based on research requirements, whereas that of the evaluator is concerned with the improvement of a project/programme and to exercise some influence on decision-making.

Worthen and Sanders (1987) have pointed out the difficulty involved in drawing a clear distinction between these two complex activities as both are subdivided into several relatively distinct types, based on their respective epistemological assumptions although often adopting similar methodologies. In fact, Rebien (1996) suggests that research standards and criteria are also relevant as a guide for evaluation. The choice of purpose, focus and methodology for an evaluation should be based on explicit considerations similar to those found in academic research (ibid., p. 170).

The term “evaluation research” does in fact sometimes occur, with reference to the application of research methods from the social sciences to evaluation. However, Worthen and Sanders (1987) have expressed concern that the use of such a term might obscure, more than it would clarify, any distinctions between research and evaluation activities. But it should be emphasized that it is not the actual application of methods from social science that determines such distinctions but the purposes to which they are put (ibid., pp. 22-32). On the basis of these distinctions between research and evaluation, the work reported in the present study is to be regarded as research on ODC evaluation, not as an evaluation or evaluation research.

4.1.3 Political, Ethical and Interpersonal Aspects of Evaluation

Social programme evaluation, although based on scientific method, is primarily a political activity performed within a social system and therefore is value-loaded (Cronbach, 1977, Chinapah & Miron, 1990). Evaluation may be used politically, where for example, it might frequently be used to legitimize consensus among stakeholders or decisions already taken, while leaving out the possibility of managing conflicting issues and situations (Chinapah & Miron, 1990, p.23) Nonetheless such functions are rarely explicitly stated to be an aspect of any evaluation. One example that highlights this political aspect of evaluation is Decision-Oriented Evaluation, as described by Borich (1990), where data is strategically generated to fulfill the requirements of decision-makers when considering administrative or political decision-making structures. Here evaluation is regarded as a process for the purpose of identifying areas of decision-making of concern, for selecting appropriate information, and for collecting and analyzing data.

---

33 World Bank report (2005 b) points out that evaluation often provides “political cover” for decision makers who already know what needs to be done but who prefer that unpopular or sensitive messages come from the external evaluators.
Weiss (1975), when linking evaluation to policy research, outlines three means by which political forces impact on evaluation:

1. programmes and policies that are the subject of evaluation are products of political decisions;
2. evaluation reports can be political documents as they support decision-making; and
3. evaluation implicitly makes political statements.

Furthermore, it is hardly possible to underestimate the extent of political pressures on evaluation, thereby more or less distorting the results of evaluation that are subsequently selectively disseminated and used, or in the most extreme case, even completely suppressing an evaluation report (Hedrick, 1988).

Worthen and Sanders (1987) expand on the role of those political and human factors that impinge on the evaluation process and outcomes, classifying them into three categories: interpersonal, ethical, and political. Political factors have been discussed above, while interpersonal and ethical factors will be discussed in the following. With regard to interpersonal factors, establishing and maintaining good communications between evaluators and stakeholders, based upon genuine stakeholder involvement and open dialogue throughout the life of an evaluation, might well positively influence the process and the quality of the outcomes of the evaluation. Nonetheless, it should be recognized that there is some degree of inherent potential bias in certain interpersonal inquiries, given the complexity of interpersonal, financial, and organizational relationships between the evaluator and other stakeholders. Furthermore, as Cracknell (2000, p. 301) points out, socio-cultural differences, asymmetries of power, and divergences of views concerning evaluations may greatly influence the process and outcomes of evaluation.

It is essential that close attention be paid to issues arising from ethical considerations. The American Evaluation Association (2004) has clearly spelled this out when stating that “(e)valuators respect the security, dignity and self-worth of respondents, program participants, clients, and other evaluation stakeholders.”

34 Interpersonal relationships. The objectivity of evaluators, for example, may potentially be affected, either positively or negatively, by cumulative social and economic ties to certain stakeholders. Financial relationships. Evaluators, for example, may prepare a report favorable to the financier. Organizational relationships. There may, for example, be a tendency for evaluators to be more biased when they are employees of the organization whose programme they are evaluating than they would be as employees of an outside agency (Worthen & Sanders, 1987, pp. 281-295).

35 Two professional bodies were founded in 1976: The Evaluation Research Society and The Evaluation Network, which subsequently merged with the American Evaluation Association (AEA) in 1985. The AEA now has approximately 4000 members, with representatives in all 50 states of the US as well as in over 50 foreign countries (AEA, 2006). AEA developed the Guiding Principles for Evaluators in 1994 (reviewed and approved in 1999, and 2004). These principles have contributed to the standardization of the quality of evaluation. The full text, with comments and criticisms, of the Guiding Principles is available on their web site: www.eval.org
4.1.4 Evaluating Unintentional Outcomes of Education

The timing of impact evaluation varies from project to project (Cracknell, 2000). It is not possible for the full impact of a project to be encompassed if sufficient time has not elapsed after completion of the project whereas the impact will have become weaker when too much time has elapsed before evaluation is carried out. In addition to investigating intentional impacts on beneficiaries, it is also desirable that unintentional or indirect impacts be taken into consideration. This may well be a sensitive issue, for example, where a host government is reluctant to bring evaluators into contact with those stakeholders who have been negatively affected by the project. Unintentional effects and/or the gradual emergence of impacts over time after evaluation are not uncommon features, particularly in educational settings. The following quote from an interview during the field work in Tanzania provides a telling example:

… during my school years, I used to get up at five in the morning and take care of animals, milk cows, and walked to school. There was something important I learned from this, like disciplining oneself and attitude of hard working, which are important for one’s life. Of course, I did not recognize such values I was learning then at that time. Perhaps this was more important than for example mathematical calculations that I learned in the classroom. (…) Also teachers’ values and attitudes which gave me influence then or afterwards. This is called unintentional impact or outcome of education. How do you evaluate such? (interview, local scholar T, 2000)

That there are substantial difficulties involved in gaining greater understanding of the indirect impacts of evaluation has been argued by Kirkhart (2000). She questions the symbolic use of the term “utilization of evaluation,” criticizing such an approach for discounting any influence of an evaluation that are not encompassed in the reported results. The argument is that it is not possible to clearly perceive the influence of an evaluation through a lens where only results-directed influences are in the field of vision.

Kirkhart (2000) advances the theory of evaluation “use” by mapping “influence” along three dimensions:
- source, addressing results-based and process-based influence;
- intention, addressing intentional and unintentional influence and;
- time, addressing influence that occurs during evaluation, on completion of evaluation, and in the future.

Influence is defined as the capacity or power of persons or things to produce effects on others by intangible or indirect means. “Influence” is broader than “use;” creating a framework with which to examine effects that are multidirectional, incremental, unintentional, and noninstrumental, alongside those that are unidirectional, intended and instrumental. (Kirkhart, 2000, p 7)
Examining “influences” instead of only “outcomes” may facilitate a more thorough and systematic understanding of methods of evaluating unintentional outcomes of education.

4.1.5 Functions of Evaluation

On the basis of the literature review carried out for the purposes of this study, six key functions of evaluation have been identified, namely, formative, summative, (socio-) psychological, professional, organizational, and political.

1. **formative function**, which improves and develops an ongoing intervention;
2. **summative function**, which (de-)certifies and (de-)legitimizes, or adds accountability to intervention, as well as archiving the history of the project;
3. **(socio-) psychological function** which affects motivation and awareness of the evaluand at the individual as well as at the collective level;
4. **professional function**, which increases understanding of the programme, demonstrating the eventual effectiveness or failure of plans and strategies being implemented through suggesting corrective action;
5. **organizational function**, which facilitates the re-strengthening of institutional capacity, assisting organizations to promote organizational learning and positive changes; and
6. **political function**, which generates new debate on important issues with regard to promoting citizen participation (Bhola, 1990).

In the context of ODC, evaluation functions as
- policy formation for future intervention;
- project/programme management;
- information/knowledge archiving; and
- accountability and evidence when spending public financial resource.

Further elaboration and discussion on these functions of evaluation are to be found in Chapter 6.

4.1.6 Evaluation as an Integral Part of the Project Cycle

Monitoring is defined as the systematic assessment on the progress of a project in the framework of original goals in order to regulate activities and to undertake corrective actions. Sound monitoring requires a management information-system based on the keeping of records of inputs and outputs and other related data (Bhola, 1990). Monitoring supplements and complements a built-in evaluation system (Chinapah & Miron, 1990), primarily serving the needs of the immediate project management. However, in the case of community-based projects, where a participatory approach has been adopted, there have been reports of increasing difficulty in distinguishing monitoring and evaluation as the data requirements for monitoring and evaluation are almost identical (Cracknell, 2000).

Figure 4.1 locates evaluation as an integral part of a dynamic project cycle, which has the following stages: planning, implementation, evaluation and feedback.
It should be clear from Figure 4.1 that evaluation is not to be regarded as one of the stages of the project cycle but is rather a process that is integral to all stages of the project cycle. Therefore the conception and design of evaluation should occur at the earliest stage, the planning stage of the project, while the results of the evaluation throughout the project cycle should provide feedback not only for policy formation (see Section 6.1.3 for a more detailed discussion of feedback) but also in order to facilitate improvements in the future life of the project. In other words, this project cycle is repeated during the life of the project, providing opportunity for regular improvements not only in this project but also in similar projects, as indicated by the large bold left-to-right arrow in Figure 4.1.

4.1.7 Meta-Evaluation

Meta-evaluation, a concept originally introduced by Scriven (1969), refers to a complex scholarly assessment of the methods, procedures and conclusions of evaluation, in most cases also including an assessment of results and use of evaluation. The purpose of meta-evaluation is to obtain heterogeneous perspectives, which serve to increase the credibility and validity of the primary evaluation results and raise consciousness about the key issues and policy implications (Straw & Cook, 1990). Classified as a special type of evaluation, the methods of meta-evaluation are similar to those of social program evaluation. They involve collection and assessment of evaluation contracts, plans, instruments, data, and reports and evaluator qualifications. The meta-evaluator may interview, survey, and collect information and perspectives from stakeholders involved in the evaluation process (Stufflebeam, 2000).
Whereas formative meta-evaluation may be able to lead to the improvement of an evaluation during its life-time, summative evaluation can add credibility to final evaluation results (Worthen & Dusen, 1999). Despite its importance in defending the quality of evaluations, meta-evaluation is still rather uncommon in practice (Worthen & Dusen, 1999; Stufflebeam, 2000).

Stufflebeam (1999) has developed a checklist for meta-evaluation on the basis of the four quality standards listed in the Program Evaluation Standards of the Joint Committee (1994). These four are:

- **Utility standards** - which aim to ensure that evaluations satisfy the information needs of intended users in a timely and credible manner;
- **Feasibility standards** - which are to ensure that evaluations are realistic and efficient;
- **Propriety standards** – which aim to ensure the ethical aspect of evaluations; and
- **Accuracy standards** – which are to ensure the factual accuracy of evaluations.

In the present study the meta-evaluation checklist proposed by Stufflebeam (1999) has been adapted, as indicated in Table 4.1, where the standards to which ideal evaluation should conform are listed.

As is discussed previously, the present study is a meta-evaluative case study, including an analysis of evaluation reports and evaluation processes, where the strengths and weaknesses of various approaches and methodologies that have been adopted are described, together with the perspectives of stakeholders and the manner in which they have used evaluation. The above check list forms a part of frame for analyzing evaluation.

### Table 4.1: Meta-evaluation checklist: standard to which ideal evaluation should conform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feasibility</th>
<th>Propriety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>F1 Practical Procedures</strong></td>
<td><strong>P1 Ethical issues</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Realistic schedule (time, human/financial/material resources)</td>
<td>☑ Respect for stakeholders’ diverse values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Involvement of local stakeholders in evaluation process where feasible and appropriate</td>
<td>☑ Respect for confidentiality agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F2 Political Viability</strong></td>
<td><strong>P2 Fair Assessment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Consideration of different positions and interests of multiple stakeholder groups</td>
<td>☑ Reporting effects of the evaluation’s limitations on the overall judgment of the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Awareness to pressures against evaluation</td>
<td>☑ Report balanced, informed conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Encouragement for cooperation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Reporting divergent views</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F3 Cost Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td><strong>P3 Conflict of Interest</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Provision of accountability information</td>
<td>☑ Identification of potential conflicts of interest in the early stage of evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Use of local resources in order to be cost-effective and to increase sustainability</td>
<td>☑ Engagement of multiple evaluators if feasible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☑ Maintenance of evaluation records for independent review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37 The Joint Committee is one of the leading international authorities in matters concerning the development of evaluation theory and methodology.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>U1 Stakeholder Identification</strong></td>
<td><strong>A1 Project Documentation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identification of stakeholders and their needs&lt;sup&gt;38&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- Collection of various project documents from multiple sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stakeholder involvement throughout evaluation process where feasible</td>
<td>- Analysis of project’s initial operation plan, actual implementation, and results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U2 Evaluator Credibility</strong></td>
<td><strong>A2 Context Analysis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Qualification of evaluators according to evaluation’s Terms of Reference</td>
<td>- Analysis of the context’s technical, social, political, organizational, and economic features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Good communication and trust building with stakeholders</td>
<td>- Report of contextual influences that appeared to significantly influence the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U3 Information Scope and Selection</strong></td>
<td><strong>A3 Evaluation Purposes and Procedures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Priority assignment on relevant issues</td>
<td>- Clarification of evaluation purposes and procedures and flexibility through evaluation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Flexibility to adjust questions in the evaluation process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Combining multiple data collection methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U4 Values Identification</strong></td>
<td><strong>A4 Information Sources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use of relevant sources of values for interpreting evaluation findings, e.g. community needs, organizational needs, and project goals</td>
<td>- Triangulation of multiple data sources / methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clarification of epistemological base for value judgments</td>
<td>- Reporting data collection instruments, limits and biases in obtained data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Consideration of the stakeholders’ multiple values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U5 Report Clarity</strong></td>
<td><strong>A5 Information Validity and Reliability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Executive summary or technical report attached</td>
<td>- Assessment of the comprehensiveness of information obtained to answer evaluation questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Comprehensive and appropriate language used</td>
<td>- Report of factors that influenced reliability, e.g. data collection conditions and evaluators’ biases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U6 Dissemination of results / feedback</strong></td>
<td><strong>A6 Qualitative Data Analysis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provision of provisional reports to intended users</td>
<td>- Verification of accuracy of findings with confirmatory evidence from multiple sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provision of summary in local language if needed</td>
<td>- Report of limitations of referenced information, time periods, analyses and conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provision of follow-up in interpreting and applying findings for future operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Publicizing findings if appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A7 Fair Reporting</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Report of perspectives of all stakeholder groups regarding findings especially opposing views</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Public presentations of findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* adapted from Stufflebeam (1999)

<sup>38</sup> See section 6.1.4 for discussion on issues concerning stakeholder analysis.
4.2 Historical Evolution of Educational Evaluation as a Discipline

This section presents the evolution of educational evaluation as a discipline, along with contemporaneous social changes. This history is described in stages, the characteristics of each stage determining the general direction of the development of educational evaluation up until the present time. With regard to this development, Madaus, Scriven and Stufflebeam (1983) have classified the years from 1800 to 1990 into six basic stages, namely the Age of Reform (1800-1900), the Age of Efficiency and Testing (1900-1930), the Tylerian Age (1930-1945), the Age of Innocence (1946-57), the Age of Expansion (1958-72), and finally, the Age of Professionalization (1973-90). A summary of each of these stages is presented in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Evolution of educational evaluation as a discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Evaluation examples or Key theorists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1800-1900</td>
<td>The Age of Reform</td>
<td>Behavior recording; Mental tests; Written examinations; Spelling tests; Use of external inspectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Age of Efficiency and Testing</td>
<td>Establishment of centers specializing in school evaluation; Standardized tests; School survey movement Objective tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Tylerian Age</td>
<td>The Eight-Year Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Age of Innocence</td>
<td>Key theorists: Tyler; Guliksen; Lindquist and Bloom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Age of Expansion</td>
<td>Key theorists: Caro; Campbell; Cronbach; Provas; Sanders; Stake; Stanley; Stufflebeam; Tyler; Weiss; Worthen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Age of Professionalization</td>
<td>Key theorists: Guba and Lincoln; Stufflebeam; Weiss, Stake; Worthen; Sanders; Rossi and Freeman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Madaus, Scriven and Stufflebeam (1983)

During the Age of Reform, there were extensive, and often rapid, economic and technological transformations which collectively eventually became known as the Industrial Revolution. This industrial revolution has had considerable social impacts and resulted in increased and diverse demands for the improvement of educational and social programmes, particularly in the United Kingdom and the United States. Hence considerable strides were made in the development of philosophies and methodologies in educational research, for example, in the recording of human behavior and in the use of the term mental testing, while external school inspectors,
written examinations and spelling tests became widespread. Issues similar to those originally raised with regard to these social institutions in this seminal period are still encountered today, such as the potential tension between the roles of evaluator as facilitator and improver versus documenter and/or judge of outcomes, together with the responsible use of evaluation results in informing social policy.

During the Age of Efficiency and Testing, the most important developments were a growing acceptance of systematic, empirical studies of programme effectiveness and an increasingly close identification of evaluation with the application of standardized tests. However, despite the increase in the general availability and application of standardized tests, whereby comparisons across school districts became feasible, implementation of evaluation throughout this period almost exclusively addressed local information needs and questions.

Eventually, the implementation of Tyler’s\(^{39}\) evaluation of the Eight-Year Study, which ran from 1932 to 1940, was to result in significant impact on modern evaluation research because of its scale (1500 students from 30 schools), the sophistication of the experimental design and the use of a broad battery of outcome measures. This Tylerian model is goal-driven, where comprehensive consideration is paid to intended learning outcomes, focusing on the degree to which the objectives of a programme have been attained. Thereby, there was a tendency for evaluation to be concentrated on comparing actual and intended outcomes.

The period after the Second World War (1946-57) brought about a significant expansion in standardized testing and technical improvements in test design and in scoring technology. However, educational evaluation continued to be focused on local needs and the goal-driven Tylerian approach maintained its dominance. Nonetheless, according to Madaus, Scriven and Stufflebeam (ibid.), a number of major technical innovations appeared during this period, such as the development of the rationale for curriculum design and evaluation (Tyler, 1949), consolidation and systematization of classical measurement theory (Gulliksen, 1950), extension and application of principles of experimental design (Lindquist, 1953) and the organization of cognitive learning outcomes as a systematic taxonomy (Bloom, 1956).

Subsequently, during the 1960s, there were further developments in evaluation theory as well as the establishment of evaluation as a profession. In the United States, this was in large part driven by the expansion of the federal role in social policy and programmess. Eventually, the limitations of experimental designs that were too rigorous were recognized and a number of new evaluation models were developed, such as those of Stake (1967), Stufflebeam et al. (1971), Weiss (1972), Worthen and Sanders (1973) and others, as practical alternatives, taking the multiple purposes of evaluation into account (Madaus, Scriven & Stufflebeam, ibid.).

\(^{39}\) Ralph W. Tyler is recalled as one of the foremost American educators of the 20\(^{th}\) century, serving as an education adviser to six U.S. presidents. For more details, see http://www.stanford.edu/dept/news/pr/94/940228Arc4425.html.
Evaluation has been developing as a distinct profession since the mid-1970s. The evaluation network has become even more widespread since then, including that for the field of ODC evaluation, as is shown in Table 6.1 in Section 6.1.

4.3 Typology of Social Programme Evaluation

Between 1967 and 1987, nearly 60 evaluation models were developed by various theorists (Worthen & Sanders, 1987). A typology of major evaluation theories is presented in Table 4.3, based on those theoretical criteria that it has been possible to identify from the extensive literature search carried out for this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theorists</th>
<th>Type: Descriptive summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scriven, 1967</td>
<td><strong>Summative/formative evaluation</strong>: While the aim of summative evaluation is to measure the effects of given interventions, the aim of formative evaluation is to measure the ongoing process of the intervention in order to improve implementation of intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthen &amp; Sanders, 1987</td>
<td><strong>Six approaches</strong>: Classification according to approach adopted, namely objective-oriented, management-oriented, consumer-oriented, expertise oriented, adversary oriented, and naturalistic and participant oriented approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guba &amp; Lincoln, 1989</td>
<td><strong>Fourth generation evaluation</strong>: Classification according to epistemological assumptions of evaluations namely measurement, description, judgment and responsive-constructivist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhola, 1990</td>
<td><strong>Internal/external</strong>: From the empowerment, self-management and cost perspective, internal evaluation should be the core while use of external evaluation is to supplement strategically, depending on the context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadish, Cook and Leviton, 1991</td>
<td><strong>Three stages and five theoretical dimensions</strong>: Works of seven major evaluation theorists are categorized chronologically into three stages namely measurement, description, and judgment, which are thoroughly analyzed based on five theoretical dimensions i.e. social programming, knowledge construction, value, use, and evaluation practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scriven, 1993</td>
<td><strong>Six views</strong>: Classification according to the perspectives namely decision support view, relativistic view, rich description approach, social process school, the fourth generation approach, and the trans-disciplinary view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patton, 1997</td>
<td><strong>Utilization focused evaluation</strong>: Classification according to methodological paradigm i.e. originally dominant experimental statistical paradigm, naturalistic qualitative paradigm as alternative, and utilization focused paradigm as synthesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stufflebeam, 2001</td>
<td><strong>Four classifications of twenty-two approaches</strong>: Twenty two evaluation approaches are classified according to four categories namely pseudo-evaluations, questions/methods oriented approaches, improvement/accountability-oriented approaches, social agenda/advocacy approaches.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40 The appearance of professional journals, for example, Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, Evaluation Review, New Directions for Program Evaluation, The American Journal of Evaluation and the founding of the American Evaluation Association have all contributed to the development of evaluation as an independent discipline.
The purpose of this typology is to facilitate the identification of various evaluation models and approaches. Since the purpose here is to develop a holistic view of the various typologies, not all the models have been provided with a detailed description. On the other hand, explorations of the models proposed in the work of Shadish, Cook and Leviton (1991), Patton (1997), and Guba and Lincoln (1989) are described in detail in the next section, since they have been utilized in the present study to provide a theory-based analytical framework for the investigation of the evaluation case-studies that are the subject of the research reported here.

4.4 Methodological Dimensions of Social Programme Evaluation

Debates concerning the dimensions of evaluation methods may be classified into three stages. Initially, in the context of widespread social and educational experimentation in the 1960s and 1970s, evaluation was dominated by the natural science paradigm\(^\text{43}\) of hypothetical deductive methodology, as seen in logical positivism, in which quantitative measurement, experimental design and statistical analysis are at a premium. By the mid-1970s, the dimension had shifted, and by the end of the 1970s, an alternative qualitative/naturalistic approach\(^\text{44}\) has been articulated. This was then followed by a further stage of debate which resulted in multiple methods and syntheses of approaches becoming more common\(^\text{45}\) (Patton, 1997, pp. 265-299).

In the quantitative/rationalistic approach, methodological rigour is emphasized as a means of increasing the accuracy, reliability, and validity of evaluation data. The methodology requires clear definition of evaluation objectives and variables, a sampling plan, appropriate statistical techniques in the analysis of data, and generalizability of results. The qualitative approach, on the other hand, is derived most directly from the ethnographic and field study traditions of anthropology and

\(^{41}\) The 22 approaches are: 1) public relations-inspired, 2) politically controlled 3) objectives-based, 4) accountability/payment by results, 5) objective testing programs, 6) outcome/value added, 7) performance testing, 8) experimental, 9) management information systems, 10) cost-benefit analysis, 11) clarification hearing, 12) case study, 13) criticism/connoisseur-based, 14) programme theory based, 15) mixed methods, 16) decision/accountability-oriented, 17) consumer-oriented, 18) accreditation/certification, 19) client-centered/responsive, 20) constructive, 21) deliberative democratic, and 22) utilization focused (Stufflebeam, 2001).

\(^{42}\) The term “pseudo-science” was used by Scriven (1991) to refer to those evaluations which claim to be scientific but which do not display any credible methodological and epistemological foundations.

\(^{43}\) Kuhn (1996) regarded science as an especially authoritative form of knowledge and defined “paradigm” as a widely-authorized and legitimate model or example of scientific practice, theory, application, and instrumentation, that provides theoretical and methodological rules and also forms an object of further research.

\(^{44}\) Here, the works of Guba (1978), Patton (1978) and Stake (1978) may be regarded as examples.

\(^{45}\) Here, the works of House (1980) and Brewer and Hunter (1989) may be regarded as examples.
sociology. It is influenced by phenomenology, symbolic interactionism and naturalistic behaviorism, ethno-methodology, and ecological psychology. These philosophical origins of qualitative methods emphasize the importance of understanding the meanings of human behavior and the social-cultural context of social interaction (Patton, 1987, p. 20). This naturalistic approach assumes that the world is both found (as objective reality) and made (socially constructed by each individual). The evaluator who employs a naturalistic approach searches for understandings of the specific situation that may later illuminate other, somewhat similar, situations. Such an evaluator is not searching for generalizable laws, but rather for insights that it might be possible to transfer from one context to another (Bhola, 1990, p.29). While quantitative data do offer detailed, rich descriptions, conserving variations between cases, this is more appropriate for smaller samples while quantitative data is more appropriate for larger samples as it facilitates comparisons with standardized scales and thus allows trends and/or relative features to be highlighted. These contrasting themes, found in the debate over methodological approaches, including the approach that was originally dominant and the subsequent alternative approach, are summarized in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Methodological dimensions for social programme evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Dominant Approach</th>
<th>Subsequent Alternative Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical doctrine</td>
<td>Logical positivism, objectivist epistemology</td>
<td>phenomenology, symbolic interactionism, naturalistic behaviorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement</td>
<td>quantitative data</td>
<td>qualitative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>experimental statistical designs</td>
<td>naturalistic inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry mode</td>
<td>Deduction</td>
<td>Induction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualization</td>
<td>independent and dependent variables</td>
<td>holistic interdependent system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Distance, detachment</td>
<td>proximity, involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach to study of change</td>
<td>pre-post measures, time series, static portrayals at discrete points in time</td>
<td>process-oriented, evolving, capturing ongoing dynamism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation to prior knowledge</td>
<td>confirmatory, hypothesis testing</td>
<td>exploratory, hypothesis generating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling</td>
<td>random, probabilistic</td>
<td>purposeful, key informants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>descriptive and inferential statistics</td>
<td>case studies, content and pattern analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>“objective truth”, scientific acceptance</td>
<td>understanding, gaining perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach to study of change</td>
<td>pre-post measures, time series, static portrayals at discrete points in time</td>
<td>process-oriented, evolving, capturing ongoing dynamism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation to prior knowledge</td>
<td>confirmatory, hypothesis testing</td>
<td>exploratory, hypothesis generating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling</td>
<td>random, probabilistic</td>
<td>purposeful, key informants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Patton, 1997, p. 299

The history of the methodological debate in the evaluation discourse parallels the history of methodological debate in the social sciences. As stated above, the

46 For details regarding qualitative methods and discussion of their use, see Patton (1987).
Social Programme Evaluation was dominated by the quantitative/experimental approach in the 1960s and 1970s. The aim of evaluation design at that time was to enable comparisons to be made with regard to the effectiveness of different programmes and treatments by employing rigorous controls and experiments. From its origins in the mid-1970s, alternative qualitative/naturalistic evaluation became a widely used approach and subsequently, there was a period of pragmatism and dialogue, giving rise to a trend of multiple methods and synthesis of methodological approaches. This methodological tolerance and flexibility is reflected in the Program Evaluation Standards (Joint Committee 1994).

4.5 Meta-Theory of Social Programme Evaluation

Although there has been extensive debate about evaluation as a discipline and methodological issues, there has been relatively little with regard to theoretical issues. Shadish, Cook and Leviton (1991), when presenting a comprehensive meta-theory for social programme evaluation, provide criteria for selecting appropriate methods for different situations and/or for different purposes. This allows various social programme evaluation methods to be employed in combination, and thus makes a greater range of conceptual and practical options feasible when implementing evaluations. Meta-theorizing offers systematic methods both for understanding existing theories as well as for deepening the level of understanding of theories. It also facilitates the framing perspectives that overarch sociological theory (Ritzer, 1996, pp. 622-629).

Social programme evaluation theory aims to specify feasible practices that evaluators are able to employ when constructing knowledge of the value of social programmes that can subsequently be used to ameliorate those social problems to which such programmes are relevant. It makes it possible to describe and justify why certain evaluation practices lead to the particular kinds of outcomes that confront evaluators. Appropriate evaluation theory would:
1. clarify the activities, processes, and goals of evaluation;
2. explicate relationships among evaluative activities and the processes and goals they facilitate; and
3. empirically test propositions to identify and address those that conflict with research or other critically appraised knowledge about evaluation (Shadish, Cook & Leviton, 1991).

4.5.1 Theoretical Dimensions in Social Programme Evaluation Theory

Shadish, Cook and Leviton (1991) analyze key social programme evaluation theories, using a meta-theory based on these five theoretical dimensions: social intervention; knowledge construction; valuing; knowledge use; and evaluation practice, each having a corresponding knowledge base to evaluation theory. This meta-theory is subsequently used to analyze the extensive works, from 1965 to 1990, of seven prominent evaluation theorists, namely Scriven, Campbell, Weiss, Wholey, Stake, Cronbach and Rossi, in order to classifying them chronologically into three stages.
Table 4.5: Five dimensions for social program evaluation theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Aspects to be analyzed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social programming</strong></td>
<td>The ways that social programmes and policies are developed, improved,</td>
<td>Internal structure of programmes, their functions, and the modes of operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and changed, especially with regards to social problems</td>
<td>Relations of programmes to external context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relations between programme change and social change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge construction</strong></td>
<td>The ways evaluators learn about social action and construct knowledge</td>
<td>Ontological assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Epistemological assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Methodological assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value</strong></td>
<td>The ways value can be explicitly attached to programme descriptions as well as the ways value implication of programmes may be analyzed</td>
<td>Meta-theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prescriptive theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Descriptive theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use</strong></td>
<td>The ways social science information is used to improve programmes and policies</td>
<td>Description of possible kinds of uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Description of the time frames in which use occurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explanation of what the evaluator can do to facilitate use under different circumstances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation practice</strong></td>
<td>The pragmatic concepts, general strategies, and methods of implementation involved in evaluation practice</td>
<td>Timing of evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purpose of the evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Role of evaluator (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation design and methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategies to facilitate use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation practice</strong></td>
<td>The pragmatic concepts, general strategies, and methods of implementation involved in evaluation practice</td>
<td>Timing of evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purpose of the evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Role of evaluator (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation design and methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategies to facilitate use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* Adapted from Shadish, Cook and Leviton (1991, pp. 19-71)

**Social Programming** It is assumed for the purposes of programme evaluation that solving social problems will be more successful when there are incremental improvements to on-going programmes or through termination of inappropriate or ineffective programmes and subsequently replacing them with programmes that ameliorate problems to a greater extent. Shadish, Cook and Leviton (1991) argue that
Theories of social programming would facilitate the analysis of the conditions and methods of such processes by investigating the following three relevant aspects:

1. internal programme structure and function whereby the following issues are investigated: key stakeholders, resources, outcomes, internal budget allocations, social norms, facilities, and organizations;

2. socio-political, and economic contexts, such as financial resources, local logistics, micro to macro power structures based on socio-political values, that affect the operation of a programme; and

3. relationship between changes in the programme and social change which can be observed by introducing incremental improvements in small practices and/or by introducing radical shifts in values and priorities.

These issues need to be understood by evaluators in order for them to be able to contribute to change in a purposeful way.

**Knowledge Construction**

Knowledge construction refers to the notion that evaluators should make explicit the ontological, epistemological and methodological considerations and decisions in evaluation. In other words, knowledge construction is concerned with that which is considered as acceptable knowledge about the evaluand by various stakeholders, the application of methods to construct credible evidence, and with the philosophical assumptions with regard to the kinds of knowledge being sought. Ontology, which is an inquiry into modes of being and their relationships, concerns the question of the nature/existence of reality. For example, the constructivist approach to evaluation (Guba & Lincoln, 1989), the approach which inspired the present study, rejects a realist ontology which would claim the absolute existence of objective reality, accepting instead a relativist ontology where value pluralism in social reality is recognized. Epistemology, the philosophical theory of knowledge, is concerned with the certainty that can be placed in the knowledge that is being constructed. Shadish, Cook and Leviton (1991) stress the importance of the following points being recognized:

1. no paradigm of knowledge construction can be considered to be superior to all others, because certain and specific difficulties are to be found in all epistemological, ontological approaches;

2. since various methodologies display different strengths and weaknesses, selection and combination should be carried out carefully, on the basis of the purpose in hand; and

3. since there is no methodology that is routinely feasible and unbiased, no study can therefore ever be completely free of error (ibid., p. 42).

The most appropriate theory of knowledge would optimally clarify and justify the reasons for selecting particular methodologies on the basis of the ontological and epistemological perspectives and consequently also acknowledge any possible discrepancies between the evaluator’s standards of knowledge and those held by stakeholders (ibid.).

**Value**

Value, in the context of evaluation, is to be understood as representing the underlying ideas of some permanence that people entertain about that which is
regarded as good and that which is not. The value dimension in evaluation theory is concerned with both the role values play in evaluation and the process of making value judgments in evaluation, that is to say, those values which should be represented in an evaluation. Evaluation is not only concerned with describing programmes but also about constructing value, merit, or worth. While some authorities have claimed that such value should be descriptive rather than prescriptive (for example, Shadish, Cook & Leviton, 1991) others, such as House (1980), claim that prescriptive ethics are integral to evaluation because evaluation is by its very nature a political activity in order to be able to be of service to decision-makers. House (1980) argues further that there are dangers in impartiality being reduced in evaluation when too great stress is placed on the objectivity of employing externalized and repeatable procedures and goes on to underline rather the importance of balanced and fair value-judgments concerning the various interests in the programme.

On the other hand, in the intuitionist-pluralist approach it is acknowledged that value is dependent on the impact of the programme on each individual, in line with subjectivist epistemology. Here the plurality of criteria and judgments are recognized and the evaluator is placed in the role of a portrayer of different values and needs (Worthen & Sanders, 1987, p. 48). Stake (1975), in an explicit discussion on “value,” claims that values should be investigated in a descriptive manner because an evaluator ought not to impose one particular ethical view on a programme in a socio-political system that is characterized by value pluralism. Stake (ibid.) goes on to claim that it is only possible to construct descriptive values through taking cognizance of the views of stakeholders. In order to achieve optimal evaluation utility for the maximum number of stakeholder groups, evaluation should be based on descriptive value theory, taking into consideration the “political legitimacy” of the power structure and the political process.

Meta-theory describes the how and why of the value statements are constructed, analyzing the nature of and justification for valuing. It may include certain descriptive and prescriptive theories.

**Use** “Use” is an important concept as it is incorporated in the pragmatic nature of evaluation, a characteristic that makes it distinct from pure research, where any intention of being useful to policy-makers is disclaimed. The identification of process use was clearly articulated by Patton (1997), in the approach described as

---

47 Value refers to the relative excellence of persons or things. It indicates something (as a principle or quality) intrinsically valuable or desirable. Worth refers to the essential value of persons or things. It signifies the value of something measured in terms of its qualities or by the esteem in which it is held. Merit refers to some superior quality or excellence. It suggests the praiseworthy quality or qualities. (Takebayashi, 2002; Merriam-Webster Online).

48 Theories of valuing can have three elements according to Beauchamp (1982). Meta-theory concerns the nature of and justification for valuing, while prescriptive theory advocates the primacy of particular value, whereas descriptive theory describes values without claiming one value as superior to others. (Beauchamp, 1982 quoted in Shadish, Cook and Leviton, 1991, pp. 47-48)

49 Process use refers to the use of the evaluation process itself rather than its outcomes, creating shared understanding or enhancing confidence.
Utilization focused evaluation. Shadish, Cook and Leviton (1991) propose a theory of use in order to identify how, when, where and why it is possible for useful evaluation results to be produced. Theories of use have three elements:

1. a description of possible kinds of use, such as instrumental use\(^{50}\) conceptual use\(^{51}\) (Leviton & Hughes, 1981), enlightenment use\(^{52}\) (Weiss, 1977), symbolic use\(^{53}\), and persuasive use\(^{54}\);
2. a depiction of time frames in which different uses occur; and
3. an explanation of the possibilities for the evaluator to facilitate use under different circumstances.

Shadish, Cook and Leviton (1991) raise the following issues concerning the use of evaluation. Firstly, the use of evaluative results may be perceived as posing a threat to interests that are already established. Secondly, the slow, incremental nature of policy change implies that instrumental use will also be slow and incremental. Thirdly, policy-makers often afford higher priority to ideology, interests and feasibility than to evaluation results. Fourthly and finally, limitations on available time and resources restrict the use of evaluation results. Further, they also point out the risk of “trivializing evaluation” when too great emphasis is placed on local instrumental use, neglecting any knowledge of political and organizational constraints that shape the questions that are being asked, which results in a confusion between evaluating a programme and constructing a management information system within it (ibid., p. 56). Concerning obstacles to the use of evaluation, Weiss (1998) argues that organizational resistance and political constraints are two further major reasons for the under- or non-utilization of evaluation results. She also indicates the difficulties with regard to social change as well as the extent to which social problems are resistant to intervention. However, she also points out the utility of evaluation findings with regard to “stimulating incremental increase in knowledge and in program effectiveness” (ibid., p. 319).

Evaluation Practice Theories of evaluation practice address issues such as whether or not an evaluation should be conducted, bearing in mind the extent to which there is cost-benefit balance and political implications, the purpose of the evaluation, the evaluator’s role, evaluation questions, evaluation design and strategies which facilitate use (Shadish, Cook & Leviton, 1991). Although theories of evaluation practice overlap with the other four dimensions of evaluation theory that have been discussed above, it is nonetheless concerned with setting priorities within given condition in a realistic manner. As Shadish, Cook and Leviton (1991, p. 61) have written, the very point of the theory is that “practice cannot be comprehensive

---

\(^{50}\) Instrumental use refers to where evaluation is directly used as an input to decision-making.

\(^{51}\) Conceptual use refers to the use of evaluation in order to gain deeper understanding of an activity, but is not a direct input to decision-making.

\(^{52}\) Enlightenment use refers to the use of evaluation to think about issues, define problems and gain new ideas and perspectives.

\(^{53}\) Symbolic use refers to where evaluation was conducted only for the organizations to appear legitimate or acceptable, while the evaluation results are not actually used to make decisions.

\(^{54}\) Persuasive use refers to where evaluation results are used to advocate for or against a policy.
because of limited time, resources, staff, interests, and skills.” However, as stated in the AEA Guiding Principles for Evaluators (AEA, 2004), efforts should be made by evaluators to discuss issues regarding the values, assumptions, theories, and methodologies used and which might affect interpretation of the findings of the evaluation. In other words, the limitations imposed on the evaluation and its results should be made explicit and clarified.

4.5.2 Ethics of Evaluation

With regard to the political aspects of the evaluation, in terms of both the political context and the political nature of the evaluation (see 4.1.3 for detailed discussion), “ethics” are a very important element since it is possible that the process and/or the results of the evaluation could be contrary to the interests of particular groups of people. Integrity/honesty and respect for people throughout the evaluation process have been identified by the AEA (2004) as two of the five principles laid down for evaluators. Where appropriate, open discussions and negotiations should be held regarding financial and operational matters as well as the limitations with regard to methodology, the projected scope of the results, and the eventual use of evaluation data. AEA (2004) suggests that it is primarily the responsibility of the evaluator to initiate such discussions and negotiations in order for these issues to be made explicit and clarified. Respect afforded to people refers to respect for the security, the socio-cultural or religious values, the political circumstances together with the dignity and self-worth of various stakeholders. Efforts should be made to deepen and broaden understanding, in a comprehensive manner, of the key features of the context for an evaluation based on these ethical principles.

4.6 Alternative Evaluation Paradigms and Approaches

As can be gathered from the descriptions earlier in this chapter, there is a diversity of evaluation approaches that has evolved along with the growing diversity with regard to philosophy, ideologies and methodologies. As one of the aims of this study is to investigate, understand and portray the complexities of ODC evaluations, a review is provided of naturalistic/qualitative approaches to evaluation, which reflects the multiple perspectives of various stakeholder groups (for further elaboration and discussion of naturalistic/qualitative approaches to evaluation, see Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Patton, 1986; 1997). The significance of naturalistic inquiry approaches to evaluation is clearly stated as follows:

The naturalistic evaluator typically provides richly detailed description and holistic explication of program processes and outcomes as they occur amidst the complexity of the “real world”. (…) And since naturalistic evaluation portrays program processes and effects in terms consonant with participants’ ways of experiencing reality, it enables program managers and sponsors to act on the evaluation in ways that take into account and respond to the needs, concerns, and viewpoints of participants in local settings (Dorr-Bremme, 1990, p. 68).
4.6.1 Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation

Even though the history of Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) goes as far back as the 1960s, the trend towards the use of participatory methods in monitoring and evaluation has now become the most significant current change taking place in the field of ODC evaluation (Cracknell, 2000). The concept of the participatory approach has diverse origins, including political science and the management traditions in the social sciences (see Section 3.1.4 for more details). Enderud (1974), for example, provides a framework for the study of participation constituting a causal model of ways of participation, intensity of participation, effects of participation and causes of and conditions for participation (cited in Rebien, 1996), which facilitates greater in-depth and systematic understanding of the concept.

The concept was introduced into the ODC arena as an instrument and/or strategy for involving local beneficiary group in the process of ODC interventions. The World Bank, for example, defines Participatory Evaluation as follows:

Participatory Evaluation (PE) can be defined as self-assessment, production of collective knowledge, and cooperative action in which the stakeholders in development interventions participate substantively in identifying evaluation issues, designing evaluations, collecting and analysing data, and acting on the results of evaluation findings. (...) PE seeks to give preferential treatment to the voices and decisions of the least powerful and most affected stakeholders: the local beneficiaries of intervention (Jackson, 2000, p.116).

Four basic principles of PM&E, according to Guijt and Gaventa (1998) are:
1. participation of key stakeholders, especially those most directly affected by the intervention;
2. negotiation to reach consensus over evaluation design and evaluation process;
3. learning which becomes the basis for subsequent improvement; and
4. flexibility to adjust to changing contexts and conditions.

A similar approach to the participatory evaluation is that of empowerment evaluation, which has its origins in community psychology and action anthropology, employing self-evaluation and reflection for self-motivation. Fetterman (1996) compares “traditional evaluation” to “empowerment evaluation”, where the goal of the former is the systematic investigation of the worth or merit of an object, whereas empowerment evaluation has multiple goals that involve self-assessment of merit as a tool to foster improvement and self-determination at every stage (ibid.). Compared to participatory evaluation, empowerment evaluation, as the name suggests, has capacity building and (re)vitalizing of “self” as the core of its approach.

55 For more extensive work on empowerment evaluation, see Reason (1988), Oja and Smulyan (1989), and Fetterman (1996).
Table 4.6: Four basic principles of conventional monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conventional M&amp;E</th>
<th>Participatory M&amp;E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who plans and conducts M&amp;E?</td>
<td>Project management, international experts</td>
<td>Local people, project staff, managers, and other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stakeholders, with help of a facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of stakeholders at community level</td>
<td>Provide information</td>
<td>Design and adapt methods, collect and analyze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>data, share and act on findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How success is measured</td>
<td>Externally-defined, mainly quantitative indicators</td>
<td>Internally-defined indicators, including more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qualitative judgments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Predetermined</td>
<td>Adaptive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Guijt and Gaventa (1998)

PM&E is largely consonant with the discourse on partnership, ownership and decentralization, where it can be regarded as a tool available to ODC agencies in order to optimally and systematically focus on the ultimate goal of improving the life of poor people (Guijt & Gaventa, 1998). However, there have been various challenges to such use. Rebien (1996), who has conducted extensive research on participatory evaluation, points out that PM&E has inherited conceptual weaknesses that are found in the general debate on participation. In terms of methodology, the issue of the lack of a clear definition as to what actually constitutes participatory evaluation has often been raised. In addition, the issue of stakeholder representativity is also controversial, as this is affected by the methods adopted for stakeholder analysis. Moreover, as Guijt and Gaventa (1998) have stated, there is a considerable challenge to be faced in deciding the manner in which the different perspectives of various stakeholders are to be presented. Chambers (1998) has reported that politically, the term participation has often been “used” rhetorically without it containing any real substance and notes that, despite the extensive literature on PM&E, there are very few empirical reports where the approach has been implemented. Furthermore, those commissioning evaluations have other political priorities to take into account, aside from technical evaluation results, when making decisions concerning the operation of a programme. A limitation of participatory evaluations, according to Chambers (1998), is exactly this difficulty of transcending political, economic or structural concerns of ODC as a whole.

4.6.2 Case Study Evaluation

Case-study evaluation is used to assess the individual project/programme in a particular geographical, socio-cultural, organizational and historical context, with the object of illuminating its particularity, although not necessarily to assess and judge its merit and worth, and also to investigate a wide range of its intentional and unintentional outcomes. The aim of case-study evaluation is to provide stakeholders and their audiences with in-depth, well-documented explications of the

---

56 More discussion of the case-study method, based on the works of Yin (1994) and Stake (1995, 2000) is to be found in Sections 5.4.
project/programme by employing multiple methods in order to obtain and integrate information from multiple sources. Typical questions to be investigated are the concept and practice of the project/programme, its evolution over time, positive/negative side-effects, the manner in which, and degree to which, various stakeholders value the programme, the extent to which the programme meets the needs of the beneficiaries, the major reasons for the successes and failures of the programme, major unresolved issues, and cost efficiency (Stufflebeam, 2001).

4.6.3 Utilization-Focused Evaluation

Utilization-focused evaluation was introduced by Patton (1978), where the concept of “process use” is intended to shed light not only on the use of the outcomes of evaluation but also on the use of actual processes of evaluation. Utilization-focused evaluation requires the continuous drawing up of strategy for the intended use by proposed users throughout the implementation of evaluation, with the information needs of proposed users being taken into consideration. Careful stakeholder analysis is required at the conceptualization stage of evaluation, for the identification of primary group of proposed users, including the analysis of the degree and nature of interests among various stakeholder groups. Political awareness and sensitivity, together with ethical judgments, are involved in the identification of the primary group of proposed “users” and their “uses.”

According to Patton (1997), it is possible for the intended uses to be identified and classified as either “primary uses of findings” or “process uses.” There are three primary uses of findings as follows: judging merit or worth (e.g. summative use), improving programmes (instrumental use) and generating knowledge (conceptual and formative use). As to types of process use, they include enhancing shared understanding, reinforcing interventions, supporting participant engagement and developing programmes and organizations (ibid.).

Active involvement of proposed users in the evaluation process is vital, as this increases relevance, understanding and ownership of the evaluation, which all facilitate informed and appropriate use (ibid.). Here, the issue of capacity strengthening becomes critical, that is to say, training stakeholders in evaluation methods and processes, not only to contribute to a greater use of evaluation over time but also to develop the culture of evaluation among various stakeholder groups.

4.6.4 Responsive-Constructivist Evaluation

Responsive-constructivist evaluation (or Fourth generation evaluation) was developed by Guba and Lincoln (1989). The term constructivist here refers to the interpretive methodology actually employed in conducting an evaluation. The responsive mode of focusing refers here to the efforts by the evaluators to address various claims, concerns and issues about the evaluand that are identified by stakeholders. Ideally, these items are jointly negotiated among stakeholders, in the process of evaluation, in an attempt to reach consensus (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, pp. 39-40). Ontologically, responsive-constructivist evaluation highlights the belief that reality is a social construction of the mind and that an objective reality does not exist (ibid.). Conventional evaluation is here classified into three stages/generations, namely
1. the *Measurement Generation* (1900 to early 1930s), characterized by the test and measurement movement in the field of education;

2. the *Description Generation* (early 1930s to late 1960s), where descriptions of the extent to which objectives were matched by performances were emphasized; and

3. the *Judgment Generation* (late 1960s to early 1980s), where evaluators graded the intervention according to merit or value, against criteria external to the intervention, while also retaining the earlier measurement and descriptive functions.

(for further detailed discussion, see Guba & Lincoln, 1989, pp. 21-38)

Responsive-constructivist evaluation is an adaptation of *responsive evaluation approach*, first introduced by Stake (1975). The process of responsive evaluation is based on interaction and negotiation, attempting to be responsive to various understandings, concerns and issues voiced by stakeholders in their own terms. It brings subjectivity and pluralism into value construction. The evaluators own perceptions are recognized as subjective in the process of the evaluation exercise. With regard to evaluation feedback, the provision of multiple reports in appropriate forms and languages in concordance with any particular group of stakeholders is encouraged (Stake, 1995). A summary of the premises on which responsive-constructivist evaluation rests, in comparison to conventional evaluation, is provided in Table 4.7.

### Table 4.7: Conventional evaluation vs. Responsive-constructivist evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Premises</th>
<th>Conventional Evaluation</th>
<th>Responsive-Constructivist Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontological</strong></td>
<td>Realist ontology: assuring absolute existence of objective reality.</td>
<td>Relativist ontology: recognition of multiple socially constructed realities ungoverned by natural laws, each representing their contextual and situational values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epistemological</strong></td>
<td>Objectivist / subject-object dualism epistemology: objectivity from the observed assures the value freedom of inquiry.</td>
<td>Subjectivist epistemology: acknowledgement that dialectic and interpretive process of inquiry creates findings. Responsive: focusing and grounding in the constructivist paradigm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodological</strong></td>
<td>Manipulative and controlling, aiming at measuring outcomes in light of evaluation objectives.</td>
<td>Evaluation process as continuous, interactive chain between subject and object.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guba & Lincoln (1989) characterize responsive-constructive evaluation as an “emergent socio-political process,” compared to conventional evaluation where processes are more “techno-scientific.” In responsive-constructivist evaluation, the question as to *whose values* are represented in an evaluation or, alternatively, “*how value differences might be negotiated,*” becomes the central issue (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 34). Some academic evaluators may carry out evaluation out of intellectual curiosity or out of interest in a basic research question that might be possible to address by evaluation (Shadish et al, 1991, p. 59). But the roles of evaluators in responsive-constructive evaluation are more that of educators, consultants, facilitators, and counselors (for more details, see Morabito, 2002, pp. 324-328). With the aim of establishing a community of organizational learners, evaluators are expected to facilitate collaborative, open environments and to manage dynamic...
discussion (ibid.), employing evaluation designs that are “relevant, meaningful, understandable, and able to produce useful results that are valid, reliable, and believable” (Patton, 1987, p. 22).

It is recognized, in responsive-constructive evaluation, that evaluation reconstructs multiple socially-constructed realities with values added. Every aspect of evaluation is understood as a successive process of selection of values influenced by the value system of the evaluators: what to evaluate, selection of evaluation model, methods, interpretation of data and so on. In this sense, every act of evaluation becomes a political act (ibid.). Here conventional approaches to evaluation are accused of failing to accommodate the value pluralism of social reality, of lacking context, of producing results found to be irrelevant at the local level, of leading to non-use of the evaluation findings. Furthermore, it is claimed that they have a tendency towards over-dependence on quantitative measures and over-generalization of findings, of managerialism that results in the disempowering of primary stakeholders (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 37).

Evaluation outcomes are not descriptions of “the way things really are” or “really work,” or of some “true” state of affairs, but instead represent meaningful constructions that individual actors or groups of actors form to “make sense” of the situations in which they find themselves. The findings are not “facts” in some ultimate sense but are, literally created through an interactive process that includes the evaluator as well as the many stakeholders that are put at some risk by the evaluation. What emerges from this process is one or more constructions that are the realities of the case. (…) the constructions through which people make sense of their situations are in a very major way shaped by the value of the constructors. (ibid., p. 8)

The strengths of the responsive-constructive approach to evaluation include an acknowledgment of the highly complex inter-subjective nature of value construction, as represented in the evaluation process and the outcomes. Here the findings of evaluation are not taken to be an authoritative “truth” or as a means of legitimizing “facts,” but as co-construction on the part of the evaluators and the stakeholders through interaction and negotiation, based on the epistemology of constructivism. This is claimed to increase joint responsibility and shared accountability while at the same time facilitating the clarification of the different value constructions of respective stakeholders.

### 4.7 Concluding Remarks

It has been the intention of this chapter to provide a comprehensive theory-based overview of evaluation as a discipline, particularly the various theoretical and methodological frameworks of Social Program Evaluation, with further explorations

---

57 Managerialism is a term introduced by Scriven (1983), to refer to the collaborative relationship between those commissioning an evaluation and evaluator. He claims that the former stands outside of the scope of the evaluation, with accountability then resting on those lower down on the power hierarchy. Evaluators are often tied to the purposes of those commissioning an evaluation.
of alternative evaluation paradigms and approaches. The theoretical, conceptual and methodological issues covered in this chapter are explicitly and/or implicitly used below, in order to gain a better understanding and analysis of the evaluation case-studies that are the subject of the research reported in this study.

While this chapter has dealt almost exclusively with Social Program Evaluation, in Chapter 6, the focus is narrowed, presenting an elaboration of, and discussion on, evaluation in the context of Official Development Cooperation (ODC). But first, in Chapter 5, the research methodology adopted for the research reported in this study is presented and discussed, the aim of the approach adopted being to capture the complex contexts of such ODC evaluation.
Chapter Five
Research Methodology

The purpose of this chapter is to present the research methodology that has been adopted for the research reported in this study. In order to comprehensively encompass the complex contexts of Official Development Cooperation (ODC) evaluation, the research strategy that has been considered to be the most appropriate for the purpose is that of the exploratory qualitative case study. Its ontological and epistemological perspectives are also described in this chapter. Thereafter, the rationale for the selection of cases, a review of experiences from the fieldwork, together with a description of the methods for data collection and analysis are provided. Finally, the issues of validity, reliability and ethics are discussed.

5.1 Qualitative Approach

The present study attempts to capture the “complexity of reality” (Strauss, 1987) through particularization of the object of the research. The study, being an exploratory qualitative case-study, was initiated in a relatively open-ended manner in order to gain a holistic picture of the object of the research and consequently the construction of questions and the data-coding process have also been relatively open-ended to avoid excessive limitations being imposed on the data through close adherence to some ready-made framework.

Limitations being acknowledged in Section 1.4, the substantial advantages of qualitative research include its flexibility and depth, given that there is no requirement to adhere to any particular preferred methodological practice and making it possible to adopt an approach that is “interdisciplinary” and “trans-disciplinary” (e.g. crossing the boundaries between the humanities and the social sciences) (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000 pp. 6-7). The value of the multi-method approach has now become widely recognized as is the case with regard to the naturalistic perspective and interpretive understanding of human experience. It is also now generally acknowledged that this field is fundamentally political and shaped by multiple ethical and political positions (Nelson et al., 1992 p. 4, cited in Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 7).

5.2 The Researcher and the Researched

This study interprets and assesses both evaluation practices (indicated as 3b in Figure 5.1, below) and the manner in which various groups of stakeholders themselves

---

58 Here, “exploratory” means, borrowing Stebbins’ (2001) term, exploration for discovery, which aims to be as broad and thorough as possible in order to understand the full picture of the area under study. Starting out as exploratory, the research process became increasingly purposive and systematic as the focus became clearer.
interpret and assess evaluation exercises (indicated as 3a in Figure 5.1, below). The arrows in Figure 5.1 signify the actions of interpretation and/or assessment.

In a strict sense, there are three processes of interpretation involved in this research. The first process is concerned with the evaluators’ interpretation and assessment of the successes and failures of the projects, which are indicated by arrow 1 in Figure 5.1. As discussed in Chapter 4, the evaluation process is concerned with constructing values while at the same time assessing the relevance, effectiveness and impact of an intervention dedicated to certain purposes. It involves the evaluators’ interpretation of the projects in reality. The second process is concerned with the various stakeholder-groups’ interpretation and assessment of the evaluation practice, which are indicated as arrow 2 in the figure. The third process is concerned with the researcher’s interpretation and assessment of that which is represented by arrows 1 and 2, that is to say, the researcher’s interpretation of stakeholders’ perspectives on evaluation practices (arrow 3a) as well as the researcher’s interpretation and assessment of the evaluation practice (arrow 3b).

![Figure 5.1: Processes of multi-interpretation in research](image)

It is appropriate at this point, therefore, to explicitly clarify the position taken by the present researcher responsible for this research. As opposed to the situation with regard to the natural sciences, in the social science the extent to which it is possible for a researcher to attain, or even defend, “objectivity” is a controversial issue. All researchers entertain some epistemological perspective and therefore necessarily approach the “world” with one set of ideas or another and a particular theoretical framework, whereby they investigate the world on the basis of a methodology which is consonant with these. Therefore it is considered to be important that all theoretical and methodological underpinnings, as well as an acknowledgment of the researcher’s own socio-cultural position in relation to the world being researched, be made explicit.

The researcher in this study had been professionally involved in the ODC working for a Japanese ODC agency, the Japan International Cooperation Agency...
(JICA). As a programme officer for the African Division of the Training Affairs Department, her main duties included a) coordinating training programs for 35 English and French speaking African countries and b) conducting country needs analysis for some of those countries. There were two instances of participation in evaluation missions: a) joint formative project evaluation with World Health Organization (WHO) in Ghana; and b) country evaluation for Tanzania in the public administration sector. These professional experiences deepened her interests in ODC, making her aware that education is a key sector for development, and evaluation can be an important tool for making changes in order to bring voices from the “grassroots” to the policy level of the ODC agency. The epistemological perspective of this research has been influenced by her conviction through her experiences that local knowledge, values, and needs should be taken as a point of departure for the ODC.

5.3 Ontological and Epistemological and Methodological Perspectives

Qualitative research employs multi-method, involving an interpretive, naturalistic approach to its subject matter in their natural settings, attempting to co-understand and co-interpret phenomena (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994).

Paradigm or an interpretive framework may contain researcher’s epistemological, ontological, and methodological premises (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 19). As is discussed in Section 2.1, this present study, following constructivist paradigm, consists of the relativist ontology, subjectivist epistemology, and interpretive naturalistic set of methodological procedures.

Relativist ontology: The intention in the present study has been to capture the relative values attached to respective evaluations by various stakeholder groups. As emphasized in the Responsive-Constructivist Evaluation approach of Lincoln and Guba (1989) (for more details, see Section 4.6.4 above), the manner in which pluralistic values in social reality are reflected in evaluation is brought into focus through a process of analyzing those evaluations. In this study, relativist ontology is maintained through-out, thereby acknowledging the importance of foregrounding the views of local actors with regard to enhancing the sustainability of, and strengthening the justification for, development while recognizing the constraints on its implementation.

Subjectivist epistemology: The perspective adopted in the present study is founded on the belief that there is a multiple-interpretive world, each having its own criteria for interpretation, rather than any single interpretative truth. Subjectivist epistemology presumes that the reality exists as a projection of human subjects and that knowledge is a human construction. It acknowledges all knowledge as value-based, emerging from a certain perspective (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). Understanding and interpretation are closely related, and some interpretation is involved in all acts of understanding (Scott & Marshall, 2005).
Interpretive-naturalistic methodology: Emphasis on interpretation is the most distinctive characteristic of qualitative research (Stake, 1995, p. 8). The goal of interpretive sociologists in general is to inter-subjectively understand shared meanings in social realities at the level of subjective experience (Morgan & Burrell, 1979). The subjective nature of interpretation is acknowledged in this study with regard to the creation and understanding of “data,” which concerns the perspectives of stakeholders. As is illustrated in Figure 5.1, this study incorporates several levels of multiple-interpretations.

5.4 Comparative Case Study

In order to understand and describe the complexity and particularity of evaluation practice, including contextual conditions at the micro, meso, and macro levels, as described in Section 2.1, an exploratory qualitative case-study strategy has been deemed to be most appropriate for this study. The case-study approach facilitates investigation of the holistic features of contemporary phenomenon in real life and allows concepts, and their relationships within and around the case in question, to be constructed (Yin, 1994, Stake 1995). Moreover, micro-level case studies can suggest that there are wider trends in development which can be applied to other circumstances across time and space (Edwards, 1994).

This study compares two cases, based on the comparative framework presented in Chapter 10. In the light of the contextual frame (see Section 10.1), the comparative framework (see Section 10.4) was applied to the cases, based on the analytical framework presented in Section 2.1, together with the theoretical frameworks presented in Chapter 4.

Comparison is a powerful analytical tool, whereby those features which are amenable to comparison are brought to the foreground and the other features are relegated to the background (Stake, 2000). Comparison allows analysis from certain specific angles but at the same facilitates an understanding of the broader picture where the phenomena in a particular case may be observed under different conditions. The effectiveness of the case study approach is, according to Stufflebeam (2001), enhanced when multiple case studies are conducted within a single area.

However, there are weaknesses with regard to the case-study approach that it is necessary to address, for example, as Stake (2000, p. 449) states, “the methods of qualitative case study are largely the methods of disciplining personal and particularized experience.” In addition, since in this approach, it is not possible for observations or interpretations to be replicated, methods of triangulation ought to be adopted in order to minimize any risk of misinterpretation (Stake, 1995, 2000).

5.4.1 Strategy for Selecting Cases

Purposeful sampling was adopted as the strategy for the selection of the cases for this study. One advantage of purposeful sampling, according to Patton (1987), is that by selecting cases that are potentially rich in information, it is possible to learn a great deal about the issues that are of importance to the purposes of the study. Patton
(1987) provides a list of ten strategies\textsuperscript{59} for purposefully selecting information-rich cases, two of which have been particularly useful in the context of the present study, namely \textit{maximum case sampling} and \textit{snowball sampling}.

\textit{Maximum variation sampling}, according to Patton (ibid.) aims to utilize the heterogeneity of individual cases through the selection of a relatively small sample displaying significant diversity. Any common patterns that emerge from such diversity are considered to indicate the core impact of intervention. Data collection and analysis are here expected to yield two types of findings: 1) detailed descriptions of the cases which are useful for capturing the particularity of each, and 2) significant shared patterns across cases which derive significance from having emerged from heterogeneity.

\textit{Snowball sampling} is used to locate key information-rich cases. This sampling technique is initiated by contacting a core of known informants who can provide information about locating cases, who subsequently point in the direction of additional, new case information. This it is not random sampling and no claim can be made that the selected cases are to be regarded as being statistically representative of any population.

5.4.2 Rationale for Selecting Sweden and Tanzania

Bearing in mind the selection strategies adopted for the present study, namely \textit{maximum variation sampling} and \textit{snowball sampling}, the cases that were eventually to be included in the research were identified by narrowing down the potential number and bringing them into focus. There are three reasons for the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) being brought into focus and eventually being included in the sample as a case of an ODC agency. Firstly, among various ODC agencies, Sida is considered to be relatively advanced in terms of their operations, including, if in somewhat modified form, innovative humanistic approaches, such as \textit{The Sector Wide Approach}, \textit{partnership} and \textit{global development}, as may be observed in their evaluation policy. Secondly, because all governmental agencies in Sweden, including Sida, are legally required to adhere to an open information policy\textsuperscript{60}, accessibility to information is much more advanced in their case compared to other similar agencies. With regard to the present study, ease of access to information and the possibility of conducting follow-up interviews, when necessary, was greatly facilitated by the fact that the researcher is resident in Sweden. Thirdly, Sida has been actively supporting the education sector in Tanzania since the 1960s.

The ODC relationship between Sweden and Tanzania can be seen as representing a classic model, being a long-term “partnership” based on “humanitarian

\textsuperscript{59} These include extreme or deviant case sampling, maximum variation sampling, homogeneous samples, typical case sampling, critical case sampling, snowball or chain sampling, criterion sampling, confirmatory and disconfirming cases, sampling politically important cases, and convenience sampling. The logic of each strategy, according to Patton (1987), serves a particular evaluation or research purpose.

\textsuperscript{60} The open information policy provides the general public the right to access all documents that have been prepared within, as well as any external correspondence to or from, a public authority or agency.
convictions,” “moral duty” and “international solidarity” (see Section 3.2.5 for a more detailed discussion). Tanzania has been one of Sida’s most important partners in terms of disbursement since the 1960s, initially because Swedish missionaries preferred to work in English-speaking East Africa and later because of the shared political views of these two countries, namely social egalitarianism.

In this relationship between Sweden and Tanzania more emphasis is considered to have been placed on a humanitarian approach to development rather than on any international political strategy approach or economic strategy approach (see Section 3.2.3 for further details). Compared to ODC relationships between other countries, this relationship can be seen as being closest to the development paradigm that has been determined as the most appropriate for this study (see Section 3.1 for more detailed discussion). The contention is that these reasons given here as constituting the rationale for the selection of these particular cases, would all facilitate the collection of relevant data for this study.

5.4.3 Rationale for Choosing Two Project/Programme Evaluations as Cases

After it had been determined that the focus of this study was to be on Sweden and Tanzania, the next stage of the research involved consulting all the evaluation reports on educational programmes/projects in Tanzania commissioned by Sida between the years 1995 and 2001, with the purpose of selecting an evaluation case. A number of programme officers at Sida were interviewed regarding their assessment of various evaluations. Thereafter, two sets of fieldwork were conducted in Tanzania, in 1999 and 2001 respectively, in order to investigate two particular cases of evaluation. The criteria for the selection of these two cases were the richness of information they would furnish and the comparability between the project evaluations where the common denominators were to be that both cases constituted evaluations of non-formal adult education projects in Tanzania. One case that was eventually selected is a typical “ODC agency evaluation under the framework of the Project-Based Approach” (see Section 8.2.2 for more details) while the other is a “community evaluation under early implementation stage of the Sector Wide Approach” (see Section 8.3 for more details). The potential advantages and constraints concerning research on both these cases are discussed further in Chapter 10.

The rationale for selecting Case A is as follows:

1. The evaluation report provided well elaborated information, reviewing a tremendous amount of documentation over a period of twenty years and raising many points that are controversial with regard to stakeholders;

2. The evaluation can be seen as a typical but thorough ODC agency evaluation with substantial financial and long-terms inputs, including qualified international team members in respective areas; and

3. The nature of the case facilitated the study of the advantages and disadvantages of external evaluation. These advantages might include the relative objectivity of
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61 Sida’s cooperation with Tanzania amounted to around SEK 614 m in 2004, one of the highest among Sida’s partner countries (source: Sida, 2005 b) For more details of Swedish cooperation with Tanzania, see section 3.2.5.
views on the project on the part of outsiders and allowing the possibility of new perspectives to emerge on summarizing cooperation. One disadvantage might be the relative low level of empathy for, and understanding of, the project and its context, compared with the perceptions of project insiders.

After the selection of Case A, the focus shifted to the selection of a second case, where a number of evaluation reports were studied, both at Sida headquarters in Stockholm, Sweden, and at various international agencies in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, including the local Sida office, other ODC agencies and Dar es Salaam University. The Institute of Development Study and the Adult Education Department at Dar es Salaam University in particular have provided considerable advice and support during work on this study, where their extensive knowledge about various educational evaluations that have been carried out, in conjunction with their thorough understanding of the educational context in Tanzania since independence, has been particularly valuable.

The rationale for the eventual selection of Case B is as follows:
1. It has features in common with Case A that facilitate comparative research, since both are evaluations of non-formal adult education projects in Tanzania;
2. The time-frames for Case A and Case B are different whereby changes in development policy at both the national and international levels may be reflected thus enabling richer comparisons; and
3. Case B is regarded as constituting a project evaluation using a Sector Wide Approach, while Case A is regarded as constituting a project evaluation using a Project-Based Approach (see Chapter 10 for more detailed discussion).

5.5 Data Sources and Instruments Used in Data Collection

5.5.1 Schedule and Experience of Data Collection
The strengths of fieldwork, according to Brewer and Hunter (1989, p. 45), include the potential it offers for generating realistic theories based on the complexity of actual social life. A further strength is that it allows the researcher to gain “an empathic understanding of societal phenomena,” encompassing both the “historical dimension of human behavior and the subjective aspects of the human experience” (Nachmias & Nachmias, 1996, p. 280).

The fieldwork for this study was carried out in three different locations at various times during the period 1998 and 2003. The first location was the Sida headquarters in Stockholm, Sweden, the second at a number of different places in Sweden to interview key informants and, thirdly, in Tanzania. Data collection at Sida headquarters proceeded relatively smoothly since many programme officers offered generous cooperation and support. A number of interviews were also carried out at the Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit (UTV) at Sida headquarters, at various times between 1998 and 2002, the purpose of which was to gain deeper understanding of their approach to, and views on, evaluation and the use that is made of evaluations in their organization. Another set of interviews were carried out at the Education Division, Sida, where the initial purpose was to further the selection of the most appropriate case of evaluation and, subsequently to gain deeper understanding
of Sida’s perspectives on the particular case of evaluation that was eventually selected, namely Case A. Various relevant documents and reports have been provided both by the appropriate operational departments and the Information Centre at Sida.

With regard to Case A, the cooperation programme came to an end in 1997, since when a significant number of the key individuals involved had left Tanzania to various parts of Sweden. Several lengthy interviews were carried out with the members of the management team who had been responsible for implementation of this programme. These interviewees have enabled the collection of a considerable amount of information and knowledge, not only concerning this particular programme evaluation but also with regard to general cooperation on adult education in a historical perspective.

The fieldwork in Tanzania was carried out in two separate phases. The first phase was carried out over a period of three intensive weeks in 1999, which was for confirmation to be obtained with regard to the appropriateness of the general direction of the research through three main means. Firstly, the details of the current situation and future policy for the education sector in Tanzania were investigated. Documents were acquired concerning the main issues confronting the national government, ODC agencies and others involved in the education sector. Secondly, a deeper understanding was gained of the colleges concerned since the completion of the final evaluations and the views on the final evaluation on the part of various stakeholder groups was investigated. A variety of stakeholders were located and interviewed using the snowball-sampling method. From the responses of the interviewees, it became very apparent that the different stakeholder groups held quite different views regarding the evaluation (Case A), which confirmed that the evaluation was a controversial and sensitive one. Thirdly, the search was continued for further case(s) of evaluation that would provide appropriate comparisons with the case already selected, namely Case A. Interviews were carried out for all these reasons as was the continuous search for any further relevant material and documents (see Section 3.5.2 for more details).

The second phase of the fieldwork in Tanzania was carried out in 2001 over a period of two intensive weeks, for the purpose of collecting further data on the two cases of evaluation that had now been selected. With regard to Case A, prior to this second period of fieldwork, questionnaires had been distributed, through the office of the Tanzanian Ministry of Education and Culture (MOEC), to all college principals. These were subsequently returned and analyzed at the beginning of this period of fieldwork in order for the responses to the questionnaires to be reflected in the interview questions. Using an interview guide, semi-structured interviews were then carried out with various stakeholder groups such as Ministries, ODC agencies, project management, schools, communities, NGOs, and the University. Originally, the intention had been to carry out interviews with key actors at the school and community levels, that is to say, principals, teachers, students and communities but for two reasons it was eventually decided to restrict these to teachers and principals. The first reason was that, through the responses to the interviews, it became clear that few students and community members had been involved in the final evaluation. Secondly, it was the principals who were most familiar with the evaluation, rather than other actors at the school and community levels (This applies only for Case A.
For Case B, learners were also interviewed as they were actively involved in the evaluation).

The date, time and location of the interviews were usually arranged by appointment. Although the normal location was the office of the interviewee, at the MOEC or the Ministry of Community Development Women and Children (MCDWAC), it was found that time spent in the waiting room, in the corridors, before the pre-arranged meetings, offered an effective site for both establishing new contacts and spontaneous interviews. Principals and teachers at various colleges traveled to the MOEC to deliver reports and so on, whereby interviews could be held with them in the corridor doubling as a waiting room. Some of the spontaneous interviews held on this site were also informative and useful.

Another location was in the United Kingdom, where an extensive and intensive interview was carried out with the head of the evaluation team for Case A, the purpose of which was to gain perspectives and knowledge of the evaluator, as well as to cross-check the data which were obtained from the prior fieldwork in Tanzania.

It has probably been advantageous with regard to the effectiveness of the interviews, that the researcher was regarded as a “Japanese post-graduate” investigating the evaluation of a “Swedish” project in “Tanzania” carried out by “a UK-based” evaluation team. As stated earlier, since evaluation is always more or less politically loaded, it is probable that the personal characteristics of the present researcher would be regarded as also representing a relatively nonaligned political stance with regard to this particular evaluation and therefore would not be regarded by any of the stakeholders as an ally or enemy of anyone. Consequently, this may have contributed to the openness of the interviews and dialogues with various stakeholder groups, an observation that has been clearly and explicitly confirmed by no small number of interviewees.

With regard to Case B, document collection, interviews, and observations were carried out and questionnaires distributed to stakeholders at various levels, in order to facilitate and enhance a holistic and contextual understanding of monitoring/evaluation. A personal visit was carried out to one of the project sites and a class observed in order to obtain some impression and understanding of the interaction between facilitators and learners through the use of the participatory method. Through this study visit, ideas were clarified as to the practical manner in which participatory methods are used for monitoring and evaluation. Further, group interviews were conducted with facilitators and learners (local communities) with the assistance of the district officer. Questionnaires were distributed at all levels: the Ministry, district, ward, and communities, encompassing all four project sites. The process of data collection and dialogue between the researcher and key informants continued on a regular basis through-out the subsequent work on this study by using the internet and electronic mail.

5.5.2 Data Collection

For the purposes of this study, both Case A and Case B have been investigated in their respective contexts in order to facilitate the interpretation of the data. The data

62 Its limitation is stated in the Section 1.4.
collection methods used are outlined in Table 5.1. The figures given in the column, Data Application, represent an approximate estimate of the proportion of the total data obtained that has been used in the study as well as in which section of this thesis they are to be found.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Type of methods</th>
<th>Types of data</th>
<th>Data application (estimate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi/Bilateral ODC agencies (OECD/DAC, the World Bank, Sida, USAID, JICA, CIDA)</td>
<td>Document collection</td>
<td>Data from documents on educational cooperation</td>
<td>20 % of 3000 pages Chap. 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview data to explore organizations perspectives on evaluation (conducted with Sida HQ, Sida Tanzania, CIDA, JICA, OECD, and World Bank in Tanzania)</td>
<td>20 % of 22 hours (20 interviewees) Chap. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzanian Ministries (MOEC and MCDWAC)</td>
<td>Document collection</td>
<td>Data from national education policy documents</td>
<td>30 % of 3000 pages Chap. 7-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview data to explore and understand the perspectives/assessments of Ministries regarding evaluation practices</td>
<td>20 % of 25 hours (19 interviewees) Chap. 7-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management</td>
<td>Document Collection</td>
<td>Data from any relevant documents on project evaluations</td>
<td>20% of 300 pages Chap. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview data to explore and understand perspectives/assessments of managers regarding evaluation practice</td>
<td>30 % of 15 hours (2 interviewees) Chap. 8, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School actors (principals, teachers, facilitators, learners)</td>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>Questionnaires data to understand perspectives/assessments regarding evaluation practices</td>
<td>100 % of 114 respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview data to explore and understand their perspectives/assessments of evaluation practices</td>
<td>40 % of 12 hours (22 interviewees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluators</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview data to explore and understand perspectives/assessments regarding evaluation practices and involvement</td>
<td>30 % of 22 hours (2 interviewees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other key informants (NGO, local scholars)</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview data with other key informants in order to understand context of project evaluations as well as perspectives/assessments regarding evaluation practices</td>
<td>30 % of 34 hours (6 interviewees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literatures/Documents</td>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>Data from relevant literature in order to develop theoretical/conceptual framework for the study</td>
<td>Chap. 2-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More precisely, it is 11 hours (8 interviewees) plus 1 hours of group interview with 14 people.
Participant observation has also been used for Case B, in order to gain greater insight into the interactions of participants during the implementation of the participatory method. Since it has been acknowledged that all methods are subjective to some degree, several diverse but complementary methods have been used here in order “to reveal different aspects of empirical reality” (Denzin, 2000).

As Brewer and Hunter (1989) have argued, diversity of methods implies greater opportunities for cross-validating and cross-fertilizing research procedures, findings and theories. More details regarding the distribution of the questionnaires, as well as the number of interviews and categories of interviewees are provided in Table 5.3 in the following section on Questionnaires.

**Document Analysis:** After the acquisition of extensive documentation, as listed in Table 5.1, the documents were analyzed in conjunction with the data that had been collected from interviews and questionnaires. It should be noted that analysis considered to be the most appropriate here has been the purposive selection of texts from the documents available on the basis of analytical criteria previously described (see Nachmias & Nachmias 1997, p. 598 for more discussion on this process). In other words, as Prior (1997) argues, documents provide representational messages as text where, in the process of analysis, “parts” are purposefully and systematically selected.

**Interviews:** The interview data is the product of a dynamic dialogue through the constructive collaboration of interviewer and interviewees concerning the topic in which the interviewer is interested. The credibility of interview data is dependent on a combination of multi-dimensional elements, such as the socio-cultural background of the interviewer relative to that of the interviewees, the power relationship between them and personal chemistry, sensitivity of the interviewer and the purposes of the interview (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Fontana and Frey (2000) point out that interviews are not to be regarded as “neutral tools of data gathering” but rather as “active interactions” between the interviewer and interviewees, which lead to “negotiated, contextually based results” (ibid., p. 646). In practice, the following points by Miles and Huberman (1994) make this active interaction more explicit:

The informant and interviewer (…) co-construct meaning, producing a “story” around the “facts” as each person “reads” signals: phrases, pauses, digressions, initiation of a new question, insistence on a line of questioning, asking for more on one item but not another, cutting off the discussion, and so on. The informant “learns” what the interview is about and decides what can be said - what this story will be about and how it will be represented. (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 89)

The less structured the interviews, the greater the importance of the influence, skill and sensitivity of the interviewer to the responses. However, the considerable advantages of less structured interviews include the flexibility to capture the complexity of contextual issues and a holistic account of the views of interviewees.

The research reported in the present study involved interviews being held with 94 people. The duration of these interviews varied from about 30 minutes to a full
day and several people were interviewed on a number of different occasions. With the permission of the interviewees, all interviews were tape-recorded, then subsequently transcribed. This procedure avoided any lapses of memory or post hoc errors in data recording that could possibly have resulted in some bias with regard to the selection and interpretation of the data on the part of the researcher, even though the extent of such inaccuracy usually depends on the skill of the researcher. Here it has been concluded that the use of the tape-recorder has not seriously detracted from the contexts of these interviews being regarded as “natural” settings (although interviews anyway hardly ever take place in a completely natural setting, even without a tape recorder being used). In addition to the tape-recording, notes were also occasionally taken in order to follow and direct the development of the interview and to highlight key points. The interviews were prepared through the construction of an interview guide in order to facilitate the conduct of the interview in a semi-structured manner. Since it was not possible to contact or meet all stakeholders as potential interviewees because of time constraints and the unfamiliarity of the researcher with local circumstances, the snowball sampling method was considered to be the most appropriate for the purposes at hand. The intention here has not therefore been to construct a method entailing purely random sampling or purposeful sampling. Inspired by Patton (1986), the purpose has been to create openings and opportunities, through a dialectic reflective process, for the exchange of open thoughts, feelings, knowledge, and experiences on the part of both the interviewer and the interviewees.

When visiting school sites, the group interview method was employed, where only a small number of core questions were used. Since the present researcher was recognized as coming from a different socio-cultural context and unfamiliar with these sites, unable to speak the local language (Kiswahili), as well as being a complete outsider with regard to the programme, at the district level, to conduct these group interviews. The person who conducted these interviews was considered to be appropriate as a group interviewer as she was already known to the members of the group and, sitting next to the researcher, was able to put the questions in a comprehensible and comprehensive manner. Therefore, during the interviews, it was possible to reduce the “strangeness” of the researcher while also offering the opportunity for observations to be made regarding the interactions of group members with each other and with the questioner.

**Questionnaires:** The questionnaires used in this research contained questions that would facilitate the gaining of a deeper understanding of the involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation process and their perspectives/assessments of that evaluation. For Case A, questionnaires were distributed at the school level and for Case B, at the national, ward, district, and village level. Questionnaires for Case A were distributed to all the 52 college principals by the MOEC a month before the second period of fieldwork in Tanzania, in 2001. A total of 31 out of 52 questionnaires have been completed and returned by the beginning of this fieldwork in Tanzania. These responses not only provided information about the evaluation practices, but also provided contextual information.
With regard to Case B, questionnaires were distributed to all four pilot project sites by the Ministry who subsequently also collected a total of 83\(^4\) completed questionnaires from the ministries, districts, wards and communities, as indicated in Table 5.2. Over and above some basic questions concerning the respondent’s own involvement in the programme, in monitoring and evaluation, questions were also asked regarding their perspectives on 1) the advantages and constrains with regard to the use of participatory methodology in monitoring and evaluation, 2) suggestions for improvements and 3) their assessments regarding evaluation. Subsequently, follow-up questions were submitted to the MOEC by electronic mail.

Table 5.2: Returned questionnaires by districts and by stakeholder group (Case B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>District L</th>
<th>District S</th>
<th>District M</th>
<th>District Mos</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOEC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AED</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P &amp; DP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School inspector</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEC = District Education Coordinator, AED = Adult Education Department, WEC = Ward Education Coordinator, P & DP = Principal and Deputy Principal, FAC = Facilitator or group coordinator, TRC = Programme coordinator at the Teacher Resource Centers, SI = School inspector

The total number and types of interviewees and questionnaire respondents for Case A and for Case B, together with general policy issues, are provided in Table 5.3, below.

Table 5.3: Number and categories of interviewees and questionnaire respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Tanzanian education policy</th>
<th>Case A</th>
<th>Case B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of interviews</td>
<td>ministries: 5 development professionals: 5 ODC agencies: 8 ministries: 6 project managers: 2 local scholars: 4 NGOs: 2 schools: 7 evaluators: 1</td>
<td>ODC agencies: 3 ministries: 8 local scholars: 3 district officers: 1 schools: 14 evaluators: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Total: 30</td>
<td>Total: 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Distributed to all 52 colleges 31 colleges responded</td>
<td>Distributed to all 4 pilot project sites 83 responded(^5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School = principals, teachers, learners

\(^4\) As the questionnaires were distributed in a “snow ball” way, i.e. a respondent forward extra questionnaires to potential respondents, the total numbers of distributed questionnaires is unknown.

\(^5\) See Table 5.2 for details.
A usual technique for statistical sampling that is often recommended implies drawing a sample from some population, but in the present circumstance there were obstacles to the adoption of such a procedure where it was not possible to define the population. This is because, with regard to Case A and Case B, such a population was constantly in flux and therefore it was considered that it would not be possible for any “sample” to be regarded as being representative of a population. Nonetheless, in the exploratory qualitative approach that has been adopted for this study, every effort has been made to ensure that as many relevant interviewees and respondents as was feasible have been included.

5.6 Qualitative Data Management and Analysis

Data analysis has been carried out for this research in a manner adapted from the work of Strauss (1987) and Miles and Huberman (1994), as presented in Figure 5.2 below, illustrating the circular dynamics of this process of qualitative data analysis. At the initial stages of the circular dynamics, the process of data analysis is carried out in a relatively open and exploratory manner, where three constructs are established and then adapted throughout the subsequent research process, namely experiential data, analytical framework, empirical data and theoretical/methodological literatures.

Experiential data, according to Strauss (1987) is that body of knowledge available to the researcher based on personal values derived from the specific socio-cultural and professional background, research experience, and theoretical and methodological knowledge from a review of relevant literature. In this study, such knowledge from the literature review as well as field research experience play the most important role whereas the researcher’s body of knowledge based on her socio-cultural and professional background experience can rather be regarded as a factor that might have influenced the research process.

In the present study, an analytical framework was developed from research objectives and research questions, in accordance with the relevant theoretical/methodological information from a review of literature carried out for that purpose. The empirical data for this research consists mainly of documents, interview and questionnaire data, together with notes from the fieldwork, as described above. Here it is important to recall that for this research, empirical data collection has been regarded as “data making,” as a selective process, guided by the particular research interests at hand, with the empirical data being consequently “openly coded” (Strauss, 1987).

In the process used in this study, codes were conceptually created both from the empirical data and from experiential data, particularly the information derived from the reviewed theoretical/methodological literature. In this sense, as Strauss (1987) argues, two types of code may be created: sociologically-constructed codes, i.e. those codes derived from experiential data that have appropriate “analytic utility” (ibid., p. 34), and en vivo codes, i.e. codes derived from the raw data from the fieldwork which have “local interpretative meaning” (ibid., p. 34). During the process employed in the present research, coded data was organized and categorized into emerging core categories and sub-categories. Subsequently, relationships among
them emerged. This is a process of data induction: selecting, focusing, abstracting and transforming the data. Derived from the literature review, the strategy that has been adopted in the present study has been to maintain an appropriate balance between data-based conceptualization and theory-based conceptualization. These data are subsequently “displayed,” that is to say, this process results in “an organized, compressed assembly of information that permits conclusion drawing” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 11).

![Figure 5.2: Circular dynamics of qualitative data analysis](source: adapted from Strauss (1987) and Miles & Huberman (1994))

### 5.7 Issues of Reliability, Validity and Ethics

To a considerable extent, the validity and reliability of qualitative data are determined by the methodological skills, sensitivity and training of the researcher conducting the study (Patton, 1987). In this respect, the following clearly describes the responsibilities that are placed squarely on most qualitative researchers:

Most qualitative researchers work alone in the field. Each is a one person research machine: defining problems, doing the sampling, designing the instruments, collecting the information, reducing the information, analyzing it, interpreting it, writing it up (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 262).

Although it is probably an unattainable goal, especially in social science, to uncover completely and correctly all aspects of a particular issue, it is nonetheless an important and desirable goal to attempt to be as reasonably accurate and comprehensive as others would regard as possible.

Qualitative studies take place in a real social world, and can have real consequences in people’s lives; that there is a reasonable view of “what
happened” in any particular situation (...) shared standards are worth striving for. (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 277)

**Reliability**  
Reliability refers to the replicability of the research, where there are two principal forms of repetition, namely *temporal reliability* (the stability of research results over time) and *comparative reliability* (the stability of research results across researchers and/or cases). Since the case-study strategy has been adopted, it has not been deemed necessary to “control” the reliability of the results of the research. However, in order to maintain reliability at an appropriate level, the following points have been implemented:

1. The role and status of the researcher at each site are described (Section 5.2).
2. Epistemological and methodological perspectives, as well as analytic constructs, together with their relationship to theory, are specified (Sections 5.3 and 2.1).
3. Since the research is not amenable to replication of the observations or interpretations, triangulation\(^{66}\) has been adopted in order to reduce as far as possible the possibility of avoidable bias. Also, cases have been viewed from various complex perspectives of different stakeholder groups in order to report multiple interpretations of the cases.

**Internal Validity / Credibility**  
Internal validity, that is to say, credibility, refers to the “truth” value to the people involved and to readers. Maxwell (1992) distinguishes between four types of understanding in a qualitative study (cited in Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 278): *descriptive* (what happened in specific situations), *interpretive* (what it meant to the people involved), *theoretical* (concepts and their relationships employed to explain actions and meanings), and *evaluative* (judgments of the worth or value of actions and meanings). Bearing in mind these different types of understanding, in this study, the following measures with regard to validation have been taken in the research reported here in order to check data quality:

1. It is acknowledged that the environment or setting for data collection affect the quality of interview data and therefore the time for each interview was relatively long and conducted in informal settings, and reported first hand.
2. Appropriate parts of the draft of the study were scrutinized by informants to correct any factual errors and to provide feedback.
3. In order to maintain “confirmability” (Miles & Huberman, 1994), methods and procedures are described in detail (Chapter 5). Personal characteristics and perspectives of the researcher are expressly stated in order to reduce the possibility of interference based on personal bias (Sections 5.2 and 5.3).

As to external validity, or the issue of transferability, three levels of generalization are possible in theory: from *sample to population*; *analytic* (theory-connected); and *case-to-case transfer* (Firestone, 1993, cited in Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 277).

---

\(^{66}\) Triangulation refers to the use of multiple data source (e.g. persons, times, places); method (e.g. observation, interview, questionnaires, document analysis); researcher (e.g. investigator A, B); theoretical perspectives; and data type (qualitative text, recordings, quantitative data) for research on one issue in order to complement and verify the other, in order to strengthen research results (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 267).
In the opinion of the researcher, the context of each case has been described in sufficient detail to permit adequate comparisons, without over generalization. Various theoretical insights were gained in the study such as in applying the actor-oriented approach with a meta-evaluative comparison.

**Ethics**

To be ethical, being able to avoid unintentional harm to the people concerned in the research study is phrased as follows:

(...) being ethical is a broad, evolving personal process that both resembles and is related to the process involved in becoming a competent social scientist. Ethical problems (...) are problems having to do with unanticipated conflicts of obligation and interest and with unintended harmful side effects of evaluation. To be ethical is to evolve an ability to anticipate and circumvent such problems. It is an acquired ability (Sieber, 1980, p. 53, cited in Worthen & Sanders, 1987, p. 292)

With regard to general research ethics, in the course of this study, close attention has been paid to ensure the avoidance of any harm or discomfort to the people concerned. As stated earlier, evaluation is always to some extent political and value-loaded, there is always the danger that a study such as the present one might inadvertently become involved in controversial relational issues or value conflict issues. Therefore every effort has been made here to assure anonymity as far as this has been feasible. In addition, there have been a number of marginal findings that are of research interest but are not reported in the study in order not to endanger the integrity of the people involved.

Immediate feedback to informants from the research have not always been possible in the manner one might have wished because of the qualitative exploratory research design used in this study. It has been imperative that the process of analysis and interpretation of the data from interviews and questionnaires be carried out with care and caution which has given rise to some delay in providing informants with feedback. Although it could be claimed that it was deficiencies with regard to the skills of the researcher that occasioned these delays, it is nonetheless the case that it has been the ethical concern to avoid unnecessary harm or discomfort to informants that has been paramount. Nonetheless such delays detracted from the efforts made on the part of the researcher in creating mutual trust and respect through establishing and maintaining good contact with informants.

**5.8 Concluding Remarks**

This chapter contains a detailed description of methodological issues related to the present study. It explained selection of appropriate paradigm (constructivist), which includes relativist ontology, subjectivist epistemology and an interpretive-naturalistic set of methodological procedures, with case study strategy. It has also included a full description of the nature and experiences of the fieldwork. In the next chapter, attention is turned to the international context of the present study.
Chapter Six

International Context:
Programmes/Projects Evaluation in ODC agencies

The aim in the first part of this chapter is to provide a relatively comprehensive review of ODC evaluation. The focus of the discussion is first on the historical development of ODC evaluation, followed by the development of a typology of ODC evaluation in order to clarify their complexity. Subsequently some key issues, such as the utilization aspects of evaluation, organizational learning and feedback mechanism, are discussed. Next, participatory monitoring and evaluation are presented, these being at present a major measure in the field in line with the alternative development paradigm. This is followed by a discussion of evaluation from the perspectives of the beneficiary stakeholders and, finally, the issue of international cooperation in ODC evaluation is considered.

In the second part of this chapter, the evaluation systems of various multilateral/bilateral ODC agencies are reviewed, with particular emphasis on their organizational structures. Six organizations have been selected for this purpose, namely OECD DAC, the World Bank, USAID, Sida, CIDA and JICA. The evaluation system of each, together with the views of each agency with regard to evaluation, including their definitions, purposes, principles and criteria of evaluation, are comparatively analyzed.

6.1 ODC Evaluation

6.1.1 Historical Development of ODC Evaluation

It is possible to identify some early evaluation procedures in the field of ODC from the late 1960s onwards. Although the OECD had subsequently produced two evaluation manuals, one in 1978 and one in 1979, only a few ODC agencies had by that time established evaluation units within their organizations (Cracknell, 2000). The World Bank had also begun to play a significant role in development of ODC evaluation from the earliest stage and its internal operating guidelines were used as a model for developing evaluation methods by various ODC agencies. However, not until the early 1980s was evaluation used systematically as a part of regular ODC practices, except in the USA and a few UN agencies (Rebien, 1996; Cracknell, 2000).

---


It was at that time that the DAC Expert Group on Aid Evaluation was established and produced *Methods and Procedures in Aid Evaluation* in 1986.

But eventually, during the 1990s, significant changes in ODC evaluation did take place, including the more widespread application of participatory methods in evaluation, in line with the then contemporary partnership discourse. An increasing number of areas of cooperation were developing that are relatively difficult to evaluate, such as good governance, community empowerment, human rights and so on. In addition, there was a shift of ODC modalities, from a project-type approach to Sector Wide Approach, the latter also requiring changes in approaches to evaluation. As a consequence, more space and attention were given over to Joint Evaluation (see Section 10.3.2 for further discussion), where multiple donors collaborate on conducting evaluation. While, on the part of the countries on both sides of the programme, it is crucial that there is development of evaluation capacity, from the local to the national level, it is equally critical that there is continuous adaptation to new evaluation environments on the part of ODC agencies. The results of research provided convincing warnings that evaluation of many ODC projects lacked any adequate analysis of the relationship between the impact of a project and developments in the wider social context (Närman, 1999). There are many grounds for more recognition being granted to the significance of evaluation in ODC, including the strengthening of democracy, the effective use of ODC resources, the increasing complexity of development problems and an emphasis on feedback to stakeholders (Cracknell, 2000). In short, ODC evaluation plays “an essential role in the efforts to enhance the quality of development co-operation” (OECD, 1991, p. 4).

International cooperation with regard to ODC evaluation has been growing in importance since the late 1980s and has included seminars and workshops organized by various multilateral/bilateral ODC agencies. The OECD DAC Network on Development Evaluation has functioned as an umbrella organization for the coordination of the activities of various agencies (see Section 6.2.1 for more details) with the purpose of enhancing the building and sharing of knowledge among both network members and the wider evaluation community. The well-established and extensive international network, the OECD DAC Network on Development Evaluation, embraces multilateral/bilateral ODC agencies, civil society, researchers, academics and the wider evaluation community, and is represented in Table 6.1.

---

69 For example, the new online site, DEReC (DAC Evaluation Resource Centre), was launched in November 2005, to make available the development evaluation reports and guidelines published by the Network and its 30 bilateral and multilateral members.
Table 6.1: The OECD DAC network on development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAC evaluation network members</th>
<th>Australia, Canada, Denmark, EC, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, UK, USA, ADB, ADB, EBRD, IADB, IMF, UNDP, World Bank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Bond, Euforic, F3e, Interaction Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: EC= European Commission, ADB= African Development Bank, ADB= Asian Development Bank, EBRD=European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, IADB=Inter American Development Bank, IFAD=International Fund for Agricultural Development

Source: OECD (2004c)

6.1.2 Typology of ODC Evaluation

Three examples of typology of ODC evaluation are presented in this section in order to comprehensively illustrate this in terms of the various types and levels, namely evaluation in relation to policy stages, in relation to focus and in relation to purpose.

With regard to the first of these typologies, those ODC policy objectives in which are reflected ODC principles, forming the basis for the overall ODC strategy, as indicated in Figure 6.1. Consequently, programmes are developed as a means for attaining policy objectives. In line with ODC principles and ODC policy objectives, programmes are developed by the individual ODC agencies, which in turn determine concrete planning, for example, the budget, allocation of resources and time, expected outcomes, and so on. Projects further operationalize the programme and implement it. Management of the projects is normally carried out by the operational departments of the ODC agencies concerned together with their local offices in programme countries.

Although both Case A and Case B evaluations fall into this evaluation type, it should be noted that the use of such evaluation has decreased under more recent ODC modality i.e. SWAp, where programmes are established according to the Sector Plan of the LDC government. Instead of conventional programme/project evaluations, “joint evaluation” is becoming more common (see Section 10.3.2 for more discussion on Joint Evaluation).
Within these stages, the purpose of evaluation is to determine the extent to which policy is functioning as it was initially planned, that is to say, maintaining consistency with regard to policy objectives throughout programmes and projects (Yamatani, 1994). It is possible to observe different levels of ODC evaluation, namely that of principles, that of policy, that of the programme, and that of the project. In practice, the most common of these is evaluation at the project level.

![Figure 6.1: Evaluation in relation to the policy stages of the ODC](adapted from Yamatani (1994))

The second typology is classification according to the focus of the evaluation. This includes thematic evaluation (for example, gender equality, capacity building, sustainability), institutional evaluation that assesses the cooperation of particular ODC organizations (for example, the World Bank programmes in the education sector, UNICEF educational projects in Tanzania), and evaluation of programmes and projects. Project evaluation is mainly conducted by the operational department responsible for project implementation together with the overseas office, while programme evaluation is mainly conducted by the evaluation department of the ODC agency. Project evaluation can further categorized according to the different project stages (see Table 6.2).

---

71 Evaluating sustainability: according to the DAC Expert Group on Aid Evaluation (OECD, 1989), a development programme may be defined as being sustainable when it can deliver an appropriate level of benefits over an extended period of time after the termination of major financial, managerial, and technical assistance from an external donor.
Table 6.2: Project evaluation / project cycle stages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of evaluation by project stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ex-ante evaluation (Base line survey)</td>
<td>Assessment of relevance of the project in relation to agency’s country programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-term evaluation/ Formative evaluation</td>
<td>Assessment of project process and attainment to the evaluation criteria of the agency, allowing for adjustments throughout project implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Evaluation/ Summative evaluation</td>
<td>Assessment of efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability of the project on completion of the project. Evaluation influence future direction of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-post Evaluation/ Follow-up evaluation</td>
<td>Lessons for similar cooperation are explored after a certain period has elapsed after the termination of the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: adapted from JICA (2002); Cracknell (2000)

Finally, the third type of ODC evaluation in this typology is that developed by Rebien (1996). In order to provide a comprehensive picture at different levels, ODC evaluations are here classified into three types according to their purpose: accountability, operational efficiency,\(^22\) and sectoral/thematic consistency (see Table 6.3).

Table 6.3: Three types of ODC evaluation by purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Accountability Evaluation</th>
<th>Operational Evaluation</th>
<th>Sectoral/thematic consistency; country evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td>Public accountability about use of tax revenues</td>
<td>Operational improvement lesson learning</td>
<td>Horizontal strategy/policy development across an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re-examination of whole ODC principle and policy; Cost effectiveness of intervention</td>
<td>Assessment of intervention process and degree/way of attaining objectives</td>
<td>Assessment of intervention according to evaluation criteria, e.g. sector, theme, country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>Formative and summative</td>
<td>Mainly summative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary users</td>
<td>Parliament, media, general public</td>
<td>ODC agencies, research institutions, consultants, project insiders</td>
<td>ODC agencies, research institutions, consultants, national government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation location</td>
<td>Evaluation as an end product</td>
<td>Evaluation as a part of policy or project cycle</td>
<td>Evaluation as a tool to assess intervention from other perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator types</td>
<td>External evaluation with general accounting office of international and/or national side(s)</td>
<td>External or internal evaluation with operational unit of ODC agency, national government, consultants, researchers</td>
<td>Evaluation unit of the ODC agency together with national government, consultants, researchers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: adapted from Rebien (1996), Cracknell (2000)

---

\(^{22}\) In the work of Rebien (1996), the original terms used are “aid delivery” or “intervention delivery” but in the present study, the more conventional term “operational” is used.
While the aim of *Accountability Evaluation* is to justify to the general public the expenditure of tax resource, re-examining the whole principle and policy of ODC, the focus of *Operational Efficiency Evaluation* is on the level of the programme/project, where the aim is to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the intervention. On the other hand, in *Sectoral/Thematic Consistency evaluation* and *Country evaluation*, the aim is to develop horizontal policy/strategy with regard to one particular issue, such as the promotion of gender equality, poverty reduction or human rights.

### 6.1.3 Organizational Learning and Feedback Mechanism

Although it is generally considered to be necessary for the results to be effectively fed back to the primary users of the evaluation, research has clearly indicated that little use has been made at any level of the results of ODC evaluations in the programme country concerned and consequently their evaluation capability remains inadequate (Rebien, 1996; Patton, 1997; Carlsson 1999). Carlsson (1999) demonstrated that there are few opportunities for stakeholders at the grass-roots level to make use of the results of evaluation since relevant information on evaluation is not available to them. However, the situation at the ODC agencies is not much better since very few agency staff themselves actually read evaluation reports in their entirety because they do not regard this as being part of their duties within their demanding schedule (Cracknell, 2000).

The theoretical aspects of “evaluation use” which underpin the significance of the “use” to which evaluation results are put, were discussed in Chapter 4 (see Section 4.6.3). In the present section, “use” is considered from the operational perspective, where the key concepts are “organizational learning” and “feedback.”

#### Organizational Learning

The aspect of organizational learning should not be neglected when new possibilities for the results of evaluation to be useful for stakeholders are being realized (Forss et al., 1998; Cracknell, 2000; OECD, 2001; Pesce & Vanelli, 2002). Organizational learning in this context is defined as a process which builds on knowledge acquisition, distribution, analysis and organizational memory that result in changes in behaviour and improved performance (Forss et al. 1998).

The manner in which an organization operates is in part dependent on the nature of the interaction of interests of individuals, both within and outside of the organization. The motivations of individuals with regard to the use of the results of evaluation may vary according to their roles in the organization. Thus, while senior management may use the results of evaluation to strengthen the organization in relation to those authorities to which it is most accountable, operational departments may be more concerned about the efficiency of implementation (Cracknell, 2000). From the results of evaluation, it may be possible for organizations to learn about new ideas and concepts, about the effectiveness of operations in relation to policies, and to garner empirical evidence for use in debates about future directions.

The internal structure and size of an organization affects the degree of organizational learning: where the organization is small and only operates locally, then the possibility of organizational learning and innovative change taking place are
higher. On the other hand, if the organization is large, with a complex structure, and operating globally, then such learning is likely to be more modest and incremental (Forss et al. 1998). Another important aspect of structure is the extent to which informal interactions across various organizational units are found (Cracknell, 2000).

External pressures also affect the degree of organizational learning and change. In the case of ODC agencies, major influences for strategic change come from the involvement of politicians concerned, the academic community, civil society organizations, both at national and at international levels. Although the outcomes of evaluation do not result in immediate policy change, efforts need to be made to effectively articulate these external influences on organizational change (ibid.). Policy changes occur incrementally as a result of the interaction of various influences, and the use to which the results of evaluation are put may be limited to one of legitimizing decisions already about to be taken on other grounds. It is necessary that organizational cultures be flexible and receptive to new ideas as well as to be engaged in dialogue and mutual learning.

Feedback Mechanism Feedback is generally recognized as posing a major challenge for ODC evaluation systems (OECD DAC, 2001). From the policy formation perspective, effective feedback contributes to the improvement in policy development, programmes and practices by providing policymakers with the relevant information concerning evaluation. Various stakeholder groups acknowledge the necessity of tailoring feedback systems to suit their different conditions and information needs (ibid.). Feedback from an evaluation should be carefully planned, taking into consideration the organizational structures and mechanisms of the parties concerned (Cracknell, 2000). Four levels of feedback have been identified in ODC evaluation by Cracknell (ibid.): the project level, the programme/institutional/sectoral level, the policy/strategy level and the level of local beneficiaries.

1) **Feedback at the Project Level**: Feedback can be institutionalized as a normal function within an organization, using the results of evaluation to improve or establish projects.

2) **Feedback at the Programme, Institutional or Sectoral Level**: Seminars and discussions may be organized at the sub-sectoral or sectoral level, based on the results of evaluation and involving the stakeholders concerned.

3) **Feedback at the Policy/Strategy Level**: Timely, effective and efficient feedback at this level requires a formal system for the presentation of results and recommendations to senior management.

4) **Feedback to Beneficiaries**: Feedback at this level is often overlooked in ODC evaluations, due to the absence of a division of responsibility on the issue between the ODC agency and the programme country (Cracknell, 2000).

---

73 Organizational culture is defined as a set of values and attitudes that are held in common in the organization. In this context, the concerns are the manner in which organizations make decisions, set objectives, resolve internal conflicts, and learn.

74 Some ODC agencies such as Sida, DANIDA, NORAD, and the World Bank, organize feedback seminars in the programme countries whereby the parties concerned are invited to involve themselves in the projects.
Without feedback to the local beneficiaries, where the results of evaluation might have the most immediate and vital impact, evaluation remains merely an organizational ritual with the purpose of “archiving” the accountability of ODC agencies. Another issue raised by Cracknell (2000) is the sensitive treatment of the results of evaluation in the programme country, as these results might be a problematic issue from the political point of view in certain local situations. Efforts ought to be made to balance conflicting social and political viewpoints of the parties concerned before an evaluation report is published (ibid.).

6.1.4 Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation in ODC

Turning to methods, application of Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) is one of the most significant changes currently taking place in the field of ODC evaluation (Cracknell, 2000). In the Synthesis Report prepared by the DAC Expert Group on Aid Evaluation (OECD, 1997), participation is defined as “a process by which people take an active and influential hand in shaping decisions that affect their lives.”

In ODC, the term “stakeholder” refers to actors at various levels on cross-cultural dimensions (see Section 2.3). When the participatory approach has been adopted, it is important to clarify the questions as to who is to participate and to what extent. The challenges confronted here are the identification of the major stakeholders and the making of a fair representation of them, as well as taking into consideration the great variation among stakeholders with regard to the extent of their participation (Rebien, 1996). One solution would be to narrow down the list of potential stakeholders to a more specific group of primary “intended users” of the evaluation (Patton, 1997) thereby enhancing the utility of the results of the evaluation to key stakeholder groups as well as involving them more actively in the evaluation process by maintaining the utility aspect as a feature throughout the course of the evaluation.

Some examples of the necessary conditions for the successful use of participatory approaches to evaluation include: 1) shared understanding of project goals, objectives, and methods by all the key stakeholders; 2) readiness by all key stakeholders to allocate sufficient time and resources to evaluation; 3) adoption of a participatory approach throughout the course of the project; and 4) a reasonably open and egalitarian social structure (Sida, 2004 b). The distinguishing features of participatory evaluation, compared to conventional evaluation have been enumerated by Rebien (1996) and these are summarized in Table 6.4.

---

75 The DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation is an international forum where bilateral and multilateral development evaluation experts meet periodically to share experiences in improving evaluation practices and strengthening the use of evaluation as an instrument for development cooperation policy. For more details, see section 6.2.
Table 6.4: Features of participatory evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Role of stakeholders</th>
<th>Functions of evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conventional evaluation</td>
<td>Accountability, strategy/policy</td>
<td>Deductive approach with assumed causal relationship between input, output and effects</td>
<td>Data objects in the evaluation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory evaluation</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Evaluation as a formative input to an intervention process</td>
<td>Conduct evaluation together with evaluator as a facilitator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: adapted from Rebien (1996)

Rebien (1996) points out that the focus of conventional ODC evaluation is mainly on accountability and strategy/policy concerns, in line with the evaluation policy of the ODC agencies, whereby the implementation aspect is awarded relatively less significance. The focus of conventional evaluation is on structure rather than on individuals and, with regard to intervention, on external conditions rather than internal ones. Further, referring to the logical framework approach as an example, he contends that there are risks that conventional evaluation becomes entirely based on a logical, linear and deductive mode of thinking about social interventions, where causal relationships between input, output and effects are assumed. In such an evaluation process, stakeholders are often regarded as being no more than “data objects” controlled by external evaluators, who offer judgments and prescriptions about the intervention but pay very little attention to the use of the evaluation results.

6.1.5 Evaluation as Viewed by the Beneficiary Stakeholders

Programme countries often regard evaluation as a donor-driven activity from which they themselves derive very little benefit (Cracknell, 2000, p. 302 citing Khan, 1998). Insufficient coordination on the part of ODC agencies has often resulted in an unreasonable number of evaluation missions to the programme country to gather similar information (see Section 7.3.3 for more discussion). Although the evaluators for ODC agencies may usually be equipped with a high level of professional methodological skills, they most often have less understanding of the political and socio-cultural context of the project than do the local stakeholder groups.

One important difference with regard to various perspectives on evaluation is that on the part of ODC agencies, evaluation is increasingly seen as “a means of ensuring transparency, of informing the public, of stimulating policy reform, and indeed as a tool of democracy”, whereas on the part of the programme countries, it is instead regarded as “an internal means of informing policy makers of the results of their decisions, and is not something to be shared with a wider public” (Cracknell, 2000, p. 306, citing OECD/IADB76, 1994). Moreover, evaluation may expose their administrative system to critical scrutiny, risking resources being cut back (Berlage & Stokke, 1992). These contrasting perspectives on evaluation on the part of ODC agencies and programme countries are outlined in Table 6.5.

---

76 IADB = Inter-American Development Bank
Table 6.5: Evaluation emphases, ODC agencies contrasted with programme countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ODC agencies</th>
<th>Programme country governments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest in maximizing economic rate of return e.g. by using expatriate managers and setting up enclave project administrations</td>
<td>Interest in skill transfer, acquiring management expertise, and strengthening of institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undervaluing significance of political factors but emphasizing cost-effectiveness, timeliness and technical efficiency</td>
<td>Being aware of importance of political and social factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in sustainability and impact on beneficiary group</td>
<td>Interest in good project design and successful project implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation as a means of informing the public, and as a tool of democracy</td>
<td>Evaluation more as an internal policy management tool</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: adapted from Cracknell (2000)

In programme countries, limited resources for M&E activities i.e. insufficient training, limited financial resources and poor career structures for evaluators are often regard as critical problems. Management of acquired knowledge is also a critical problem, where, for example, after staff has been trained, they are often transferred to other position and their acquired skills and knowledge are transferred with them. As a means of strengthening evaluation capacity in a programme country, Cracknell (2000) proposes that active involvement of local consultants and researchers, as integral members of evaluation teams, is crucial. One further urgent measure is the development of an awareness of the benefits of evaluation within governments, with a full commitment on the part of the top political leadership, in order to institutionalize the culture of evaluation.

6.2 Evaluation Systems and Strategies of ODC agencies

In this section, the evaluation systems and strategies of various multilateral/bilateral ODC agencies are presented and compared. This is done both with regard to their organizational structures and the manner in which agencies view and understand evaluation from an examination of evaluation strategies: i.e. their definitions of evaluation, their purposes concerning evaluation and their evaluation principles/criteria.

Six multilateral/bilateral ODC agencies have been selected as examples. Each of these agencies employs elaborated evaluation strategies, which are quite diverse from one another. The criteria for selection were 1) the diversity in evaluation strategies among the agencies, and 2) innovativeness and information richness in evaluation strategies.

**OECD DAC** The Network on Development Evaluation of the OECD DAC functions as a global forum for development cooperation organizations, whereby it is possible for them to share knowledge and experience of evaluations in order to improve, harmonize and standardize evaluation practices and methodologies. As indicated in Table 6.1, this Network encompasses evaluation experts and managers
from 30 bilateral and multilateral development agencies. The DAC Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance (OECD, 1991) is regarded as comprising the most significant policy principles for addressing the key requirements of the evaluation process. The main purposes of evaluation are 1) to improve future ODC policy, programmes and projects through feedback of lessons learned; and 2) to provide a basis for accountability.

Impartiality and independence throughout the evaluation process are regarded as being an important aspects in the Principle. Impartiality is considered to contribute to the credibility of evaluation and to the avoidance of bias in the evaluation process, where as independence provides legitimacy to evaluation. As to the credibility of evaluation, the methodological skills and independence of the evaluators, as well as a high degree of transparency in the evaluation process, are regarded as being crucial as is the active participation of the developing countries. Three points are considered to be crucial in the promotion of the usefulness of the evaluation, namely reflecting the needs and views of various stakeholders, easy accessibility to the results of the evaluation, and timely reporting to the decision-making process. Joint collaboration between ODC agencies and developing countries, as well as between ODC agencies themselves, is considered essential for mutual learning to be attained and to avoid duplication of work. Finally, methodological issues concerning ODC evaluations are also detailed in this document in order to ensure the quality of evaluation. These include the designing and implementation of evaluation, as well as reporting/dissemination of the results of evaluation.

The DAC Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance continue to be clearly reflected in the evaluation policy of ODC agencies. DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance (hereafter DAC Criteria) are listed in this document and have been adopted by various ODC agencies. These five criteria are effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, impact, and sustainability.

The World Bank The distinction between the World Bank and the other ODC agencies is that the former is a global financial institution and not a governmental organization. Consequently, unlike governmental agencies, where lesson learning and external accountability are important issues with regard to evaluation, the World Bank places greater weight on archiving and internal accountability with a well-established project evaluation system. The World Bank has gained experience of evaluation over a period of more than thirty years (see Grasso et al, 2003 for more details). Recent change in the evaluation system of the World Bank Group may be observed in the process of merging the mandate of three formerly independent

---

77 A complete list of criteria may be retrieved from the following internet site: http://www.oecd.org/document/22/0,2340,en_2649_201185_2086550_1_1_1_1,00.html

78 Effectiveness: the extent to which a development intervention attains its objectives; Relevance: the extent to which the development intervention is in line with the needs and priorities of local beneficiaries, partner countries and ODC agencies; Efficiency: the extent to which the inputs of development interventions can be justified by the results attained; Impact: the positive and negative changes, both intended and unintended, resulting from development interventions; and Sustainability: the continuation of benefits of development interventions after their termination.
evaluation entities across the World Bank Group. This merger resulted in the creation of the Independent Evaluation Group (IEG). (World Bank, 2005 a, e-mail interviews with staff at the World Bank, 2005). Evaluation is regarded by the World Bank as an instrument for identifying the most effective and efficient means for managing and facilitating development cooperation (World Bank, 2005 a).

The evaluation principles of the Bank: usefulness, credibility, transparency, and independence. The World Bank employs an objectives-based approach to evaluation. At the project level, this approach focuses on outcomes, sustainability, and institutional development impact of the operations of the Bank. This objectives-based approach has also been extended to country, corporate, sector, thematic and global policy evaluations through appropriate adjustments to the criteria.

USAID Whereas the World Bank has long regarded the independence of the evaluation unit as being critical, the evaluation policy of USAID has been largely driven by management requirements. The structure for the management of the internal regulation of USAID, including policy directives and necessary procedures, are provided by the Automated Directives System (ADS). The primary feature of evaluation in USAID has been the recognition that the different design and types of evaluation methodology are dependent on the scope and purpose of the evaluation. When selecting evaluation methods, Operating Units consider the nature of the information, analysis, and feedback requirements, together with cost-effectiveness; cultural considerations, the timeframe with regard to management requirements for information; and the amount of time and resources available. The second feature has been the active participation of key stakeholders in planning and conducting evaluations, including the direct involvement of USAID staff in evaluations that have been conducted for lesson-learning purposes. Operating Units are strongly encouraged to use collaborative and participatory approaches. In many instances, the

---

79 Evaluation units of three World Bank Group were merged, namely: the Operations Evaluation Department (OED) in the World Bank; the Operations Evaluation Group (OEG) in the International Finance Corporation (IFC); and the Operations Evaluation Unit (OEU) in the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA).

80 Usefulness refers to the results of evaluation being found to be useful and timely for decision-makers and relevant to current operational concerns. Credibility refers to the credibility of evaluation being judged on the professional qualities of the staff, the rigour of their methods and the timely availability of the results. Transparency refers to evaluation reports being issued to the member governments of the Bank and the Bank management and being made available to all staff. The evaluation process itself is subject to independent annual reviews. And finally, independence refers to IEG evaluations being independent of line management at all stages of the evaluation process in order to maintain objectivity.

81 IEG evaluates outcomes by considering three factors: 1) the relevance of the objectives of the intervention in relation to the needs and institutional priorities of the country; 2) efficacy, i.e. the extent to which the developmental objectives have been attained, and 3) efficiency, i.e. the extent to which the objectives have been attained with regard to the level of resources employed.

82 The institutional development impact measure evaluates the extent to which a project improves the ability of a country or region to make more efficient, equitable and sustainable use of available human, financial, and natural resources.
Operating Unit is responsible for arranging the translation of the executive summary into the local written language.

**Sida**

Swedish Sida, in a similar manner to USAID, has not only been actively conducting project evaluation but also programme, sector, country and sector evaluation from various perspectives, where the nature of the evaluation reports have been more descriptive and case-oriented rather than conforming to any particular standardized comparative form. Sida has adopted the Evaluation Principles of OECD DAC (for more information with regard to their application, see Sida’s evaluation manual 2004). The fundamental principles for guiding evaluation activities are Spelled out in Sida (1999): 1) evaluation to be conducted in a spirit of partnership, encouraging a partner country to take an active role; 2) objectivity and impartiality to be maintained; 3) data collection and analysis methods employed in evaluation to be clearly described in the evaluation report; 4) credibility of an evaluation is dependent on the competence and integrity of the evaluators as well as on the degree of transparency in the evaluation process; and 5) evaluation is to be regarded as an integral part of the project cycle.

Joint evaluations have been increasingly regarded as important and cases of joint evaluation have both grown in number and become increasingly systematic, although this is an approach that is still under development. These are the consequence of a greater recognition of more complex and horizontal issues e.g. poverty eradication, and good governance, together with efforts toward harmonization and partnership dialogue.

**CIDA**

Canadian CIDA regards evaluation as a tool for assessing performance, measuring effectiveness, identifying results achieved, and determining alternative ways to attain its objectives, as well as a tool for demonstrable public accountability and transparency (CIDA, 2004). It appears from their evaluation guidelines that the focus is more on decision-making aspects, to assist senior managers in their assessment of policy and programme performance. CIDA expects evaluations to bring about improvements with regard to “investments” by the Agency in development cooperation through decision-making and problem-solving that is better informed. Evaluators are to ensure that evaluations are results driven, incorporating the principles and practices established through the over-arching Results Based Management (RBM) approach adopted by the Agency (ibid.).

**JICA**

Japan’s ODC has undergone major reforms and significant restructuring recently. The evaluation system and methods employed by JICA have

---

83 Objectivity is expected to be maintained by drawing distinctions between value judgements and factual statements based on reliable methods. Impartiality is to be observed by respecting the different perspectives of various stakeholders at each stage of the evaluation.

84 The 1992 version of the Official Development Assistance (ODA) Charter was revised in 2003 in a manner that reflected the changing national and international context. The former Overseas Economic Cooperation Fund (OECF) and the Export-Import Bank of Japan (JEXIM) were merged in 1999 to become the Japan Bank for International Cooperation (JBIC) while in 2003 the legal status of the Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA) was changed and more autonomy granted.
also been reformed and improved. In order to ensure the results of evaluation are utilized as a means of project management, the evaluation framework is composed of three stages: 1) studying and understanding the context of the project; 2) assessing the value of the project on the basis of OECD DAC’s Five Evaluation Criteria (1991); and 3) drawing lessons and making recommendations to be provided as feedback.

The systematic use of the Logical Framework Approach\textsuperscript{85} in Project Cycle Management is a characteristic of JICA, of which evaluation is an integral part. In this approach, the specific objectives of a project are to be clarified at the design stage where the planners should identify project inputs, outputs, purposes and goals, along with objectively verifiable indicators of progress with regard to the attainment of these objectives, hypotheses about causal linkages and assumptions about conditions in the project environment on which these were based. Although there are potential uses for this Logical Framework Approach, for example, highlighting problems as well as visualization of measurable reference points which might be used in management of the project; there are also some constraints as a consequence of the reductionistic nature of the approach where there is a risk of oversimplification of a complicated social intervention (Cracknell, 2000).

**Summary of Evaluation Systems and Strategies of ODC agencies**

The evaluation systems and evaluation strategies of various multilateral/bilateral ODC agencies, discussed above are summarized in Table 6.6 and Table 6.7, below. A strategy of descriptive comparison has been adopted here in order to preserve as far as possible the original forms of expression used by the agencies concerned, which to some extent implicitly highlights the differences with regard to their respective approaches. Here, evaluations are restricted to those which involve ODC agencies, i.e. Intervention Delivery Evaluation and Sectoral/Thematic/Country Evaluation. Accountability Evaluations are not included as they are mostly conducted by the general accounting office, independent from the ODC agencies. Basic evaluation systems of the ODC agencies, founded on their organizational structure, together with key documents concerning evaluation policy and methods, are presented in Table 6.6.

---

\textsuperscript{85} LFA was introduced by USAID around 1970 as a conceptual framework for guiding project design, implementation, and evaluation efforts. It was subsequently adopted by CIDA and then by GTZ, the German agency, and in 1983 by ODA, the British agency. In the early 90s, JICA adopted it and applied it intensively to their projects thereby improving the already existing models. The latest agencies to adopt the system are the World Bank and Sida. Many UN agencies, the African Development Bank and NGOs have also adopted this approach.
Table 6.6: Summary of evaluation systems and key evaluation documents of selected ODC agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ODC agencies</th>
<th>Evaluation system</th>
<th>Key Evaluation Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>Composed of a) operating units; b) strategic objective (SO) teams; c) regional bureaux; d) pillar bureaux; e) bureau for policy and programme coordination (PPC); and f) office of general counsel (GC)</td>
<td>ADS 203 (2004): assessing and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>Composed of a) operative departments for project evaluations and b) performance review branch (PRB) for evaluations according to Executive Committee’s priorities</td>
<td>CIDA evaluation guide (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JICA</td>
<td>Composed of a) evaluation study committee, b) advisory committee on evaluation, c) office of evaluation and d) operational departments &amp; overseas offices</td>
<td>JICA guidelines for project evaluation (2004)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.7 indicates the manner in which evaluation is regarded by the ODC agencies included in this study, including their definition of evaluation, evaluation purpose and evaluation principles.

---

86 Operating Units Support Teams are responsible for preparing annual reports to their Bureau. **SO team** is responsible for attaining the strategic objectives of the agency. **Regional Bureaus** conduct annual reviews of SO-level performance. **Pillar Bureaus** contribute to annual assessments of progress across all SOs in a particular area, for purposes of management, decision-making and external reporting. The **PPC** is responsible for the quality check of performance of each Bureau, and for preparing an annual agenda for agency-wide evaluations. The **GC** provides legal counsel concerning relevant legislation.

87 The **Evaluation Study Committee** has a leading role in developing and improving evaluation methodologies. The **Office of Evaluation**, located within the Planning and Coordination Department plans and coordinates overall evaluation activities, as well as carrying out ex-post evaluation such as country programme evaluation and thematic evaluation. In order to ensure objectivity and transparency in evaluation, the **Advisory Committee on Evaluation**, composed of external experts, was established in 2002 as an advisory body to the Evaluation Study Committee. In 2003, the post of **Evaluation Chief** was established and assigned to each department and overseas office aiming to improve the quality of evaluation.
Table 6.7: Summary of evaluation strategies of selected ODC agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of Evaluation</th>
<th>Evaluation Purpose</th>
<th>Evaluation principles/criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OECD DAC</td>
<td>1) improving future cooperation policy, programmes and projects through feedback of lessons learned 2) provision of information 3) internal / external accountability</td>
<td>- DAC principles for the Evaluations of Development Assistance (1991); - Five Evaluation Criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>1) institutional memory 2) internal / external accountability</td>
<td>Evaluation principles: usefulness, credibility, transparency, independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>A management tool for 1) decision-making, 2) accountability reporting, and 3) learning,</td>
<td>Evaluation criteria: validity, integrity, precision, reliability, and timeliness (AID, 203, 3.5.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sida</td>
<td>1) improving cooperation 2) lesson learning 3) accountability</td>
<td>- Adoption of Five DAC criteria - Adoption of the Evaluation quality standards: propriety, feasibility, accuracy and utility 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>1) assessing performance and measuring effectiveness, 2) determining alternative ways of attaining objectives, 3) public accountability and transparency</td>
<td>Evaluation criteria: effectiveness, consistency, sensitivity, feasibility, usefulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JICA</td>
<td>1) Project operation and management 2) Lesson learning process at the personnel and organizational levels 3) Public accountability</td>
<td>Adoption of DAC principles and criteria: 1) usefulness, 2) fairness and neutrality, 3) credibility, 4) participation of partner countries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of general observations may be made regarding Table 6.7. Firstly, regarding definition of evaluation, all the agencies concerned share a similar fundamental understanding of evaluation, which might be summarized as “evaluation is a systematic and objective assessment of project/programme/policy.” Although this fundamental definition of evaluation might not vary across these agencies, there are nonetheless differences of emphasis derived from the preferences or strategy of each agency. Consequently, the World Bank stresses the accountability aspects of evaluation perhaps more explicitly than the other agencies, while USAID and CIDA

88 These are the standards of the Program Evaluation Standards of the American Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1994).
are more explicitly conscious of management needs being reflected in the content of evaluation and for JICA, evaluation is explicitly linked to each stage of a project.

Secondly, regarding evaluation purpose, five types of purposes, which overlap to some extent, have emerged from the stated purposes of these agencies: 1) accountability; 2) lesson learning; 3) improving project operations; 4) decision-making; and 5) determining alternative ways.

Accountability is the only purpose that is explicitly stated by all these agencies. Lesson learning or institutional memory, is a purpose that is explicitly stated by all these agencies except CIDA, which seems significantly driven by the Result Based Management approach. Improving project operation is a purpose explicitly expressed by OECD DAC, Sida, CIDA and JICA. Decision-making is a purpose explicitly stated by USAID and, to some extent, by CIDA. Determining alternative ways is a purpose of evaluation that is recognized by CIDA.

Thirdly, regarding evaluation principles/criteria, the DAC Principles for the Evaluation of Development Assistance (1991) have been widely adopted by almost all these agencies, either directly with the Principles in some form or as some form of the five Criteria, which have been extracted from the Principles.

6.3 Concluding Remarks

The aim in this chapter has been to provide a comprehensive understanding of ODC evaluation. There have been significant harmonization and standardization efforts in evaluation methodologies among all ODC agencies, based on the OECD DAC Network on Development Evaluation. Nonetheless, the particular strategies and priorities of each agency continue to be reflected, both explicitly and implicitly, in their respective policy for evaluation. Although more active links between the evaluation research community and the ODC agencies are to be desired, as pointed out by Rebien (1996), nonetheless the results of continuing efforts to inject theoretical issues from the discipline of evaluation into the evaluation policies and methods of ODC have to some extent been observed here in each of these agencies.

In the next chapter, the focus turns from this overall review of ODC agencies to investigations into ODC and certain ODC agencies in a particular sector in a single country, namely the education sector in Tanzania.
Chapter Seven

National Context:
Official Development Cooperation in the Education Sector in Tanzania

A review of ODC in the education sector in Tanzania is presented in this chapter, in order to provide the national context for the Case A and Case B.

First of all, a brief country profile is provided as a background to the study of ODC evaluations conducted in Tanzania. Thereafter, an overall picture of the education in Tanzania is provided by presenting historical development of education sector as well as the current education system. The chapter also presents the trends in education sector reforms, which have displayed dynamic progress since the mid 1990s. Finally, ODC in Tanzania is analyzed by reviewing the national development strategy, followed by a presentation of the volume and character of ODC in Tanzania by major multi-bilateral agencies. Some of the key issues i.e. partnership as well as donor coordination and harmonization are also reviewed, which may be regarded as some of the international influences on national policy.

7.1 Tanzania: Country Profile

The United Republic of Tanzania was formed in 1964 through the political union between Tanganyika and the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba, after gaining independence from Britain (Tanzania mainland in 1961, and Zanzibar in 1963). Zanzibar maintains considerable autonomy over its internal affairs, having a semi-autonomous status and its own legislature and an executive that is streamlined in ministries e.g. Trade, Education, Agriculture, Health, and Finance.

There are 26 administrative regions (21 on the mainland and 5 on Zanzibar), and 130 administrative districts (120 on the mainland and 10 on Zanzibar). Tanzania was ranked 164 out of 177 on the 2003 UNDP Human Development Index (HDI). About 35.7% of the population live below the national poverty line (1990-2002), nearly 60% survive on less than 2 USD per day and 27% do not have any sustainable access to an improved water source (UNDP, 2005). Nevertheless Tanzania has made a firm commitment to poverty reduction, as spelled out in the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRSP) which has led to some tangible development results. For example, the net enrolment rate at the primary school level has increased from 58.8% in 2000 to 90.5% in 2004. The percentage of the population with improved access to water has increased from 32% in 1990 to 58.3% in 2003, 73% in urban areas and 53% in rural areas (World Bank, 2005 a). General country information about Tanzania is presented in Table 7.1 below.
Table 7.1: Tanzania – country information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>945 000 km²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Dodoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>37.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual population growth rate (%)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life expectancy at birth (years)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant mortality rate (‰)</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National currency</td>
<td>Tanzanian Shilling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita (USD)</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public expenditure on education as % of GDP</td>
<td>2.2⁸⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Mainland</td>
<td>Christian 30 %, Muslim 35 %, indigenous beliefs 35 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Zanzibar</td>
<td>Muslim 99 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy rates (15 years and older)</td>
<td>Male 85.2, Female 69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>945 000 km²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Politically, Tanzania is one of the most stable countries in Africa (World Bank, 2004). Turning to foreign policy, Tanzania has carried out a “positive non-alignment” strategy since becoming independent in order to preserve political independence by diversifying interactions with the international community across political ideologies (Buchert, 1994). Under Julius K. Nyerere (president of Tanzania from 1964 until 1985), Tanzania had played a central role in the North/South dialogue within the Organization of African Unity (OAU). It was also one of the strongest forces in regional co-operation to combat the apartheid regime in South Africa. Moreover, over the years Tanzania has provided asylum to refugees from many countries, sheltering an estimated 850,000 refugees by the year 2000, particularly from Burundi, Rwanda and the Democratic Republic of Congo. In recent years, Tanzania has been ensuring good relationships with neighbouring countries, placing great emphasis on regional cooperation. On the initiative of President Mkapa, East African co-operation between Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania was restored in 1996, which was formalized in an agreement in 1999 creating the East African Community with the aim of establishing a customs union and free movement of people to increase economic growth and political stability in the region. Tanzania is a member of the Southern Africa Development Community (SADC) and an active supporter of African unity through the African Union (AU) and the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD). Except for certain political conflicts on Zanzibar, Tanzania has benefited from maintaining a peaceful multi-ethnic and multi-religious society ever since independence (DANIDA, 2002; NORAD, 2003; OECD, 2003 a; World Bank, 2004).

⁸⁹ UIS estimate
7.2 Education in Tanzania

7.2.1 Historical Development of Education in Tanzania

During the 1970s and 1980s, Tanzania had enjoyed a golden age in literacy, recording a literacy rate of 90 per cent in 1986⁹⁰. Behind this success lay a strong political will under President Nyerere's leadership. Literacy classes were organized with the support of the ruling political party (TANU). A policy of socialism and self-reliance had been declared in 1967, after which nation-wide mass literacy campaigns were started with 1970 being declared as “Adult Education Year”. Within a framework of encouraging attainment of Party goals e.g. freedom, equality and democracy, these campaigns were centred on functional literacy. However, the subsequent economic crisis of the 1980s was a severe set-back for the country and led to a general falling off of motivation both among learners and teachers.

By classifying the period of 1919-1990 into four stages, Buchert (1994) has illustrated the complexity of the function of education in the historical development of Tanzania.

1919-46 Under the British administration, the policy of Education for Adaptation was adopted where the underlying goal was to preserve existing indigenous societies and cultures and to blend these with selected modern Western values and institutions. Through this policy, skills, knowledge and values were provided which would support the ruling political system.

1947-61 In accordance with the social development vision of the British administration during this period, the policies of Education for Modernization and Education for Adaptation were implemented simultaneously. Since the aim of Education for Adaptation was the development of the traditional rural sector, this was only provided for Africans, while the aim of Education for Modernization was to support the economic development of a modern urban and capitalist sector in order to establish a Western national politico-economic unit and was therefore provided for Europeans and Indians in competition with a small and selected numbers of Africans.

1962-81 Educational reform was initiated on the assumption that an educated population was crucial for facilitating political stability and economic development. Under the Education for Self-reliance policy, primary and adult education were extended to the mass of the population. During the 1970s, in the context of the ujamaa⁹¹ socialism policy and the Basic Human Needs strategy, the community school movement was established, where schools were regarded as tools for the transfer of specific skills and attitudes in order to develop the community.

---

⁹⁰ This literacy rate is to be treated with caution because of some degree of unreliability with regard to the statistics e.g. all primary school leavers were presumed to be literate (Car-Hill, Kweka, Rusimbi, & Chengelele, 1991).

⁹¹ Ujamaa was the concept that formed the basis of Julius Nyerere's social and economic development policies in Tanzania. Ujamaa comes from the Kiswahili word for “extended family” or “familyhood” and which signifies that a person becomes a person through the people or community. Thus, Ujamaa, which was a base of African socialism, is characterized by a community where co-operation and collective advancement are the rationale of every individual's existence. (source: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ujamaa)
1982-1990 The Socialism and Self-Reliance policy was discarded when the structural adjustment programme was launched. Equality and participation were replaced by economic efficiency and political pluralism as central political platforms. The education sector was downgraded in favour of those sectors that are directly productive. The introduction of cost-sharing and the reduction of public responsibility for education, especially for adult education, negatively affected mass education and equality that had previously enjoyed higher priority (Buchert, 1994).

1990- The formation of education policy during the 1990s was significantly influenced by the international framework to support “Education for All” as formulated at the Jomtien Conference in 1990. One consequence of this rapid quantitative expansion of the sub-sector was a falling off with regard to quality together with an increased imbalance in development of the secondary and tertiary/higher education sub-sectors of the education system (Kinunda, Mnari, Robinson & Sarvi, 1999). However, many major movements in the education sector have been observed since 1995, such as the Education and Training Policy (ETP, 1995), introduction of the Sector Wide Approaches (SWAp)\(^\text{92}\) into the education sector, the Education Sector Development Programme (ESDP, 1999) and the Primary Education Master Plan (PEDP, 2001) (see the following section, Education Sector Reform, for a more detailed discussion).

For several decades in Tanzania, education has been regarded, from various ideological standpoints, as a vital tool in political, economic and social development and the country has become a party to many international conventions and agreements. Education is defined by the Government of Tanzania (GoT) in the Education and Training Policy (1995) as follows.

> Education is a process by which the individual acquires knowledge and skills necessary for appreciating and adapting to the environment and the ever-changing social, political and economic conditions of society and as a means by which one can realize one’s full potential. In Tanzania, traditional education emphasized principles of good citizenship, acquisition of life skills and the perpetuation of valued customs and traditions. (MOEC, GoT, 1995, p.i)

### 7.2.2 The Education System in Tanzania

In the Education and Training Policy (ETP, 1995), the education system is defined as a structure, consisting of organizations that support the system\(^\text{93}\), implying rationalization and the organization of programmes and resources, especially in terms of efficiency and effectiveness.

---

\(^{92}\) See section 10.3 for more detailed discussion of the Sector Wide Approach.

\(^{93}\) According to the EPT (1995), formal and non-formal basic education in mainland Tanzania is to be mainly the responsibility of the Ministry of Education and Culture (MOEC) and the President’s Office - Department of Regional Administration and Local Government (PORALG). Vocational training is to be the responsibility of the Ministry of Labour, Youth, and Sports Development (MLYS) together with the Ministry of Community Development, Women and Children (MCDWAC), while higher education is the responsibility of the Ministry of Science, Technology and Higher Education (MSTHE). Other ministries are engaged in more sector-specific professional education and training.
of manpower, finance and time, in order to facilitate attainment of the stipulated goals (ibid., p. 11).

The 1978 Education Act No. 25 (amended in 1995) remains the basic legal document with regard to education in Tanzania. Here the roles of different actors in the education sector are defined, including the Ministry, the Commissioner, local authorities together with the owners and managers of private institutions. In addition, the Local Government Council Acts of 1982 and 1986 are relevant to the management of primary schools (UNESCO, 2003; MOEC & Ministry of Education Zanzibar, 2001).

The main feature of the education system in Tanzania is the policy with regard to bilingualism whereby children are required to learn both Kiswahili and English. English is taught as a compulsory subject during primary education whereas English is the medium of instruction in post-primary education (GoT, 2004).

The structure of the Formal Education and Training System in Tanzania consists of two years of pre-primary education, which is mainly under private ownership, seven years of compulsory primary education, four years of junior secondary education (Ordinary Level), two years of senior secondary education (Advanced Level) and up to three or more years of tertiary education. These years of education are thereby classified into three levels: basic, secondary and tertiary. Basic level education includes pre-primary, primary and non-formal adult education. Secondary level education includes the Ordinary and Advanced levels of secondary schooling. Tertiary level education includes programmes offered by the institutions of higher education (see Education and Training Policy Paper, 1995, for more details).

7.2.3 Education Sector Reforms

Reforms in the education sector form part of the nation-wide Public Service Reforms, initiated in 1993, which aim to support the liberalization of the economy, multi-party democracy, decentralization, and cost-sharing in relation to the provision of public services, including education. The current series of reforms in the education sector were initiated in 1995, aiming to improve the quality of education while ensuring equity to access to education.

The Education and Training Policy (ETP) \(^{94}\) embraces both formal and non-formal education, vocational training and higher education. GoT decided in 1996 to introduce Sector Wide Approaches (SWAp) \(^{95}\) into the education sector, whereby increased efforts were to be made to re-establish or re-strengthen partnerships for development and to promote harmonization. The Basic Education Master Plan (BEMP) was developed in 1997 by the GoT to guide development in the provision of basic education. The devolution of responsibility to local school committees has been prepared in compliance with the Local Government Reforms Act of 1998. In order to assess the feasibility of the Education Sector Reform and framework for development, in 1999 the Education Sector Development Program (ESDP) appraisal was conducted to assess consistency with broader reforms such as the Civil Service
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\(^{94}\) EPT determines the overall principles and goals for the education sector, as well as clarifying the importance of cooperation between the Government of Tanzania and the international funding and technical agencies.

\(^{95}\) See section 10.3 for more detailed discussion of the Sector Wide Approach.
Reform Programme, the Local Government Reform Programme, Vision 2025, the Social Sector Strategy and the Education and Training Policy (ETP).

As the ESDP views the education sector in a holistic manner, with regard to the formulation of basic policies for the sector as well as the defining of development objectives and strategies for each sub-sector, concrete development plans have been consequently to be established for each sub-sector. As the first step, the Primary Education Development Plan (PEDP) was developed in 2001 for the primary education sub-sector, which has the highest priority within the education sector. Some of the major strategies included are: 1) increasing the student enrolments ratio by abolishing school fees, increasing the number of teachers, building new classrooms, and expansion of non-formal education; 2) improvements in quality through the provision of textbooks for all students together with the development of pedagogical methods and curricula; and 3) capacity building by strengthening abilities of actors in educational management at various levels and the introduction of the Education Management Information System.

Following on from the PEDP, the Adult and Non-Formal Education Sub-Sector Strategy was established in 2002 for the non-formal education sub-sector. In 2003, the Secondary Education Development Plan (SEDP) was introduced. At the secondary school level, curricula have been diversified to include practical and occupational subjects as well as such subjects as gender studies, family life education, environmental education, health and HIV/AIDS prevention skills (MOEC & Ministry of Education Zanzibar, 2001; Kamei, 2005).

### 7.3 Official Development Cooperation in Tanzania

The guiding philosophy for development measures in Tanzania is to attain self-reliance, therefore Tanzanian perspectives on education and development have been formulated in the following manner:

The relationship between education and development depends on the extent to which the kind of education provided and its methods can meet the expectations of the individual and the needs of society. (…) Tanzania aspires and is committed to continue following the people-centred development and improvement strategy and in doing so, to concentrate on equitable and sustainable development. (GoT; MOEC, 1995; p. ix)

Since being granted independence in 1961, Tanzania has been one of the largest recipients of ODC, in absolute terms, in sub-Saharan Africa. In 2003, the annual total Official Development Assistance (ODA) to Tanzania was about 1.7 billion USD, equivalent to 46.5 USD per capita (UNDP, 2005). It amounts to over 30% of total public expenditure and about 85% of the capital budget (DANIDA, 2002). Tanzania is ranked as one of the top two of the 48 LDCs in terms of receipt of net ODA during

---

96 The number of different subjects taught at school has been reduced from 13 to 7, and now includes Kiswahili, English, Mathematics, Social Studies, Natural Science, Life Skills and Religion.
the period of 1997-99, receiving an 8 % share of the total ODA to all LDCs (OECD, 2001). Table 7.2 indicates rough amount of ODA provided to Tanzania recently.

Table 7.2: ODA Statistic for Tanzania (2001-2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Net ODA (USD million)</th>
<th>Bilateral share (gross ODA)</th>
<th>Net ODA/GNI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1271</td>
<td>71 %</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>68 %</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1669</td>
<td>56 %</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OECD, Aid Statistics, Recipient Aid Charts 2005

A large number of ODC agencies are represented in Tanzania, where the major bilateral partners are the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, United States of America, Denmark, Japan, Italy, Sweden, Germany and Norway. Its largest multilateral partners are the World Bank, the EC, the African Development Bank and the UN. Approximately 70 % of financing are grants (OECD, 2005 d).

7.3.1 Government Development Strategies and Priorities

Around the beginning of the new millennium, many development strategies were introduced and actively followed up. The recent development strategy of the Tanzanian government has been formulated in the following documents: Vision 2025 (1999), the National Poverty Eradication Strategy (1998), the Tanzania Assistance Strategy (TAS) (1999/2000), the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) (2000), the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP) (2004), and Joint Assistance Strategy (JAS) (2004).

Development Vision 2025 states three objectives for national development: improving quality of life, good governance and a strong economy. The importance of increasing the involvement of the people at every level is emphasized, with the ultimate aim of attaining sustainable development for the population. Although Vision 2025 can be criticized for being over-ambitious, considering the shortness of the stipulated time-span, the extensiveness of the areas covered as well as simply repeating many of the points contained in the Arusha Declaration (Mallya, 2000), the ambition nonetheless remains that it will provide “direction and a philosophy for long-term development of the nation” (GoT, 2004).

Tanzania Assistance Strategy (TAS) provides the national strategic framework for guiding ODC programmes in Tanzania, with the aims of strengthening Tanzanian ownership of her development agenda, of improving the partnership between the GoT and key stakeholders and of enhancing effectiveness of development cooperation. In other words, the Strategy serves as the framework for coordination of all support from ODC agencies, based on Tanzanian development plans. The priority areas in the Strategy are the rationalization of consultation missions using Joint Reviews as well as capacity building for external resource management (OECD, 2003a). This Strategy was later replaced in 2005 by the Joint Assistance Strategy (JAS).

Continuing on from TAS of 2002, the JAS (2005) has been designed to encourage the alignment of external assistance with national development priorities
under the NSGRP/MKUKUTA\textsuperscript{97}, to translate the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), and the Rome (2003) and Paris (2005) Declarations on aid effectiveness into measures at the country level, according to the principals. Table 7.3 shows principals of JAS.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{l}
\hline
National ownership and government leadership  
Division of labour based on comparative advantage  
Delegated cooperation  
Dialogue with a broad range of stakeholders;  
Move to general budget support  
Technical assistance for sustainable capacity building  
Use of national systems, processes and procedures  
Collective and mutual accountability for effective use of resources  
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Principals of Joint Assistance Strategy}
\end{table}

\textit{Source:} ECOSOC Coordination Segment, 2005; Sida, 2005 a

The Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) guides implementation of poverty reduction programmes, describing the macro-economic, structural and social policies for promoting growth and reducing poverty in Tanzania. Implementation of the strategy in accordance with the PRSP was a condition for debt relief to be granted under the Heavily Indebted Poor Country (HIPC) initiative\textsuperscript{98}. The GoT updated the PRSP three times in the form of progress reports\textsuperscript{99} and these developments in the PRSP were carried out by means of a participatory process and the identification of priority sectors with regard to poverty. In the social sector, a number of intermediate objectives for 2003 were proposed in the PRSP.\textsuperscript{100} Improvements with regard the rule of law together with local authority reforms were emphasized in the PRSP. A new PRS, the NSGRP/MKUKUTA is based on the achievements in three major clusters of broad outcomes with regard to poverty reduction, namely: 1) growth, together with the reduction of income poverty; 2) improved quality of life and social well-being; and 3) good governance and accountability.

In this revised strategy, more emphasis is placed on economic growth, where the role of the private sector as an engine of growth is recognized together with a

\textsuperscript{97} A new PRS, the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP), better known by the acronym in Kiswahili, MKUKUTA (Mkakati wa Kukuza Uchumi na Kuondoa Umaskini Taifa), was introduced in 2004, for the years 2005-2010, to replace the previous Poverty Reduction Strategy.

\textsuperscript{98} The Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative was established in 1996 by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), with the aim of reducing the excessive debt burden on the poorest nations. As of September 2004, twenty-seven countries are receiving debt relief under the Initiative (World Bank, 2004).

\textsuperscript{99} The first PRSP Progress Report of August 2001, the second PRSP Progress Report of March 2003 and the third PRSP Progress Report of March 2004, where status with regard to poverty was analyzed using PRS indicators.

\textsuperscript{100} The strategy indicators in these areas include: the proportion of children who attend school, the quality of schooling (examination results), infant mortality rates, life expectancy for children and mothers, measures to combat malaria and HIV/AIDS, and water supply.
greater focus on policies to improve the business and investment environment (Sida, 2005; Tanzania Development Partners Group, 2005). NSGRP/MKUKUTA is expected to enhance transparency and accountability in the management of public resources, to strengthen links between national policies and budget allocations and to provide an important platform for stakeholder consultations. This new strategy is focused on integrating the MDGs, on enhancing coordination within existing national policies, strategies and initiatives and on strengthening the Poverty Monitoring System at the central and local levels (ECOSOC Coordination Segment, 2005).

7.3.2 Partnership Discourse – Shifts in Relative Power in Bilateralism

Since the 1970s, the concept of “partnership” has been used in the ODC discourse (McGinn, 2000). Although the term “partnership” has been in even wider currency since the mid-1990s, the concept has frequently been used without any appropriate theoretical underpinning (Ahonen, 2000). Partnership is based on agreed criteria and shared values and may be regarded as one of the bilateral relations that are undergoing change. King (1999) presents three versions of bilateralism:

a) *Bilateral relations during the Cold War*: geo-political intensions had priority even in the case of less democratic and more corrupt regimes.

b) *Criteria-based version of bilateral relations*: where universally shared criteria, such as good governance, macro-economic policy, democracy, are to be in place and practiced as pre-conditions; and

c) *Multi-faceted partnership*: extended version of criteria-based bilateral relations. Rather than being restricted to governmental relations, partnerships here extend to more multifaceted relations that include all manner of civil society linkages between two countries, e.g. popular movements, cultural/educational exchanges, and trade.

In this study, partnership in ODC is understood in a broad sense, as a collaborative relationship directed towards consensus, based on mutual understanding, respect and trust for the partners concerned, working towards shared development objectives. Domains of partnership may theoretically be extended to include civil society and markets on both sides. In reality, partnership practices in ODC at present lie somewhere between versions b) and c) of bilateralism, as defined above. However, the use of the term “partnership” certainly implies some changes, such as shifts in the relative power in the relationships between “donors and recipients”, especially regarding the attitudes of donors in the context of agency conditionalities and the imposition of structural adjustment policies (King, 1999, p. 15).

There are variations with regard to types and degree of partnership both among different ODC agencies and between ODC agencies and their respective partner countries. The Nordic countries, especially Sweden, have taken the lead in practicing partnership, in the spirit of the Partnership with Africa (Sweden, MoFA, 1997). New Directions and New Partnership (1995) from the World Bank, together with the OECD DAC’s Development Partnerships in the New Global Context (1996), have
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also contributed to the process of gaining a deeper understanding and operationalization of the concept of partnership.

The main issues with regard to partnership are selectivity and the pre-conditions. A shift is observable, away from structural adjustments, that is to say, the imposition of macro-economic conditionality on the structure, towards the imposition of structural pre-conditions whereby the donors in the North select a smaller numbers of genuine partners on condition that such governments in the South have fulfilled certain internationally recognized criteria, such as policies that are pro-democracy and pro-human rights, macro economic stability, pro-gender equality, and pro-environmental commitments that support sustainability. Using the terms from Elgström (1992), this “asymmetrical” relationship is seen as “issue-specific structural power”.

Another problem that has received notice as a hindrance to the further development of genuine partnership is the observed imbalance between the two partners with regard to monitoring performance. Although the performance of developing countries is measured and assessed in increasing detail by the international community, assessment of the performance of their respective donor “partners,” the results of which could well facilitate understanding and improvement of the partnerships, hardly ever occurs. Genuine partnership in development requires external monitoring of donor performance at the level of individual programme countries (Helleiner, 2000). In response to this neglect, OECD DAC has established a task force with the aim of strengthening ownership on the part of developing countries of development programmes by improving donor practices (see the country case-study for Tanzania by Ronsholt, 2002) and the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) has provided a blueprint for ODC agencies and developing countries in order to be able to monitor each other’s performance and progress. There are healthy signs that more balanced and mutually accountable development cooperation is emerging (De nevers, Léautier, & Otoo, 2005).

Under the Partnership Agreement (1996) between the government of Tanzania (GoT) and the Nordic countries, (Denmark, Norway, Finland and Sweden), the GoT has agreed to proposals for the establishment of a good policy platform, to respect democracy and human rights, to fight against corruption and for good governance, to emphasize macro-economic stability, to increase domestic resource mobilization, and to focus government activities on core functions in cooperation with civil society and the private sector (Embassy of Sweden, 1998, pp. 4-5). The key concerns in forming the collaboration is that Tanzania’s own visions and policies should be respected, that devolution of authority and capacity development to the local level be encouraged, and that a sense of ownership be increased. It has also been agreed that the financial contributions of GoT in support of the programmes be increased over time.

7.3.3 Donor Coordination and Harmonization

It has been estimated that ODC agencies currently fund more than 60,000 development projects around the world. Some partner countries enter into as many as 800 new projects a year, host more than 1,000 missions to monitor the work, and are required to prepare 2,400 quarterly reports on progress (World Bank, 2004). This “flood of cooperation” is creating an impasse with regard to effective development,
international context

Brought with it an overwhelming amount of bureaucratic administrative work for hosting countries. Each ODC agency has its own agenda, a fact which also places further burdens on the hosting government. Some of the examples reported by the Tanzanian government are: preconceived priorities of ODC agencies coming into conflict with its national priorities; inconsistent demands with regard to other agencies; and demands which are beyond national capacity and excessive control on the part of the agencies (Ronsholt, 2002).

As a solution to confront this alarming situation constructively, the High-Level Forum on Harmonization was held in Rome in 2003, resulting in the Rome Declaration. However, in the education sector, where any coordination exercise may involve as many as nine different ministries, it is no easy task to achieve such coordination even within the government itself (Bigsten, Mutalemwa, Tsikata, & Wangwe, 1999). A further High-Level Forum on Harmonization was held in Paris in March 2005, which resulted in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, resulting in the following commitments:

1) More effective leadership by the LDC countries over the formation of development policies as well as streamlining donor procedures;
2) Support of the national development strategies by the ODC agencies;
3) Increased harmonization efforts, keeping transparency by the ODC agencies;
4) Consensus by the ODC agencies and LDC countries regarding mutually accountable for development outcomes.

7.4 ODC Trends among Funding Agencies in Tanzania

7.4.1 Volume and Character of ODC in Tanzania

ODC in Tanzania is characterised by donor dependency and relatively mature government-donor relations. More than 50 bilateral agencies have been involved in cooperation with Tanzania (Ronsholt, 2002). Historically-speaking, the Scandinavian countries (Sweden, Norway and Denmark) have been the major partners, accounting for over 30% of the total ODC receipts of the country between 1970 and 1996, of which Sweden has provided nearly half (Bigsten, et al., 1999).

Recent reports indicate that the World Bank, now accounts for 20% of the total ODA to Tanzania. A group of donors, including the European Commission/EIB102, UK/DFID, and the African Development Bank/Fund, each of which typically contributes 8-10% of the total. Denmark, Norway, Sweden and the Netherlands, who have long been prioritizing cooperation with Tanzania in a coordinated manner, each account for about 5% of the total. Major DAC group i.e. Japan, USAID, Switzerland, Belgium, Germany and Ireland each contribute 2-3% (Ronsholt, 2002).

Most of the ODC to Tanzania during the 1970s was derived from bilateral sources, while multilateral agencies contributed an average of about 10% annually until the early 1980s, after which contributions from multilateral agencies increased considerably. Major multilateral partners include the IMF, the World Bank, ADB,

102 EIB = European Investment Bank.
EU, UNDP and UNHCR with the World Bank’s International Development Association (IDA) disbursing about half of the total ODC from multilateral donors (Bigsten, et al. 1999).

With regard to distribution by sector, most of the cooperation in the 1960s and the early 1970s was in the agriculture sector and the transport sector. Since the mid-1970s, the trend has been a shift away from agriculture towards industry and energy, with transport becoming an important sector in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Transport and communications became important sectors in the 1990s, dominating with about half of the ODC flows, followed by agriculture, human resources development, health, integrated regional development and energy (ibid.).

7.5 Concluding Remarks

An overall picture of Official Development Cooperation (ODC) and the education sector in Tanzania has been presented in this chapter. Tanzania is one of the countries that is proactively adopting the new ODC modalities, including the Millennium Development Goals, Poverty Reduction Strategy, partnership, harmonization, and aid effectiveness, etc. As has been described in this chapter, government development strategies are relatively well elaborated in Tanzania, and in alignment with the current international discourse on development. It has been the intention in this chapter to capture and describe those dynamics of ODC in Tanzania which provide the macro- and meso-contexts for the specific cases of ODC evaluation that are the subject of the following two chapters, Chapter 8 and Chapter 9.
Chapter Eight

Case A

This chapter begins with a profile of Case A (an ODC evaluation), in terms of the historical and socio-political context of the project which was evaluated together with the content and internal structure of the project.

This is followed by the presentation of the meta-evaluation, based principally on the analytical and theoretical frameworks described in Chapter 2 and Chapter 4, above. Finally in the present chapter, the different perspectives of various stakeholder groups concerning the evaluation process and results are reported and analyzed. Data used for this chapter are presented in Table 5.1 in Chapter 5.

8.1 Context for the Meta-Evaluation

8.1.1 Historical and Socio-Political Context of the Project

The Folk Development Colleges (FDCs) Project in Tanzania was implemented between 1975 and 1996, in cooperation with Sida. In the early 1970s, a request had been received by the Swedish government from the Tanzanian government, under President Nyerere, for assistance in establishing residential adult teaching institutions, based on the model of the Folk High Schools, one of the oldest forms of adult education in Sweden. This was during a period when the international community expressed considerable enthusiasm for non-formal forms of education, which were at that time considered to constitute a significant complement to formal systems of education. This view accorded well with those aspects of President Nyrere’s Arusha Declaration of 1967, concerning commitments to the parallel development of education for adults together with the provision of universal education for children.

It was envisaged that the proposed FDCs would engage in activities based on self-reliance and the generation of income thereby serving as models for the local communities while providing short residential and non-residential programmes to meet local development needs. However, while the focus of Swedish Folk High Schools has been on individual or personal development, the Tanzanian FDCs were to develop instead a focus more concerned with areas of national and local economic development. Subsequently, the colleges became hampered by low numbers of enrolments and the final report from the project (Lundin & Norbeck, 1997) identified the main causes of this to be 1) the curricula were centrally designed and only rarely reflected the learning needs of the various communities and participants concerned; and 2) all courses were residential and lasted from six months to two years, making it almost impossible for the majority of the women who might have wished to participate, to do so in practice, because of their domestic responsibilities. Eventually, the colleges were transformed into vocational training centres for young people who had completed primary school.
Over and above financial and technical support through-out the years the project was running, Sida was also engaged in staff development activities during the 1980s, including study visits to Sweden for FDC principals from Tanzania. Two courses were organized, in the early 1980s, under the auspices of Linköping University, Sweden, as part of their international training programmes for developing countries in non-formal education. By 1984, 54 FDCs had been established in 20 districts in Tanzania. The TANDEM project, which ran from 1991 to 1996, differed from earlier phases of cooperation which were more focused on facilities, while this later project was more focused on aspects of strengthening management capacity with the aim of facilitating the comprehensive development of the colleges in Tanzania. The project was under the management of Linköping University in close collaboration with the Dar es Salaam Office of Sida (Lundin, Norbeck & Åkesson, 1994; Lundin & Norbeck, 1997).

In 1990, for political reasons, measures were carried out in Tanzania which involved administrative restructuring, whereby responsibility for the FDC programme was first moved from the MOEC to the Ministry of Local Government and later the same year, to the newly-established Ministry of Community Development Women Affairs and Children (MCDWAC), and these shifts inevitably affected the nature of the project. During the first period, when the FDC project was under the auspices of the MOEC, the focus was firmly on “adult education” where the intention was to provide a post-literacy stage for those adults who had successfully completed the national adult literacy programme. However, after responsibility for the project was shifted, the FDC became a component of the “community development” programmes and consequently there was less focus on education. It was necessary for the FDC to manage these major changes simultaneously: 1) from education-oriented to development-oriented approaches; 2) from centralized to more local decision-making structures; and 3) from government funding to self-supporting financial responsibility (Rogers, Chadwick, & Oglesby 1997).

At the same time, Sida was also subject to a number of major changes such as substantial cut-backs in ODC funding and a shift in the priorities of the Swedish government away from adult education to the education of children and young people. As the discrepancy increased with regard to fundamental vision of the Swedish management team, who wished the FDCs to retain their educational focus and that of the new ministry, who wanted them to be more oriented towards community development, Sida remained fully aware of the difficulties to be overcome with regard to bridging the two visions. The combination of all these macro-level and project-specific obstacles was the main reason for Sida eventually phasing out their involvement after twenty years of cooperation (Rogers, Chadwick,

---

103 Financial support from Sida was intended for the construction and renovation of buildings, installation of electricity, water and telephones, purchase of furniture and the production of teaching materials, as well as transport facilities for all the FDCs, books and other educational materials (ToR for the evaluation, p. 1).

104 TANDEM is a name of a comprehensive development programme for the whole of the FDC sector, both the colleges and the Ministry, focusing on the capacity development of the staff.
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8.1.2 Project Content
For the Case A, the evaluand is the TANDEM project, which ran between 1991 and 1996, as one phase of the long-term cooperation in the FDC programme in Tanzania. The input to the project consisted of collaboration between the Tanzanian Ministry and Linköping University in Sweden. The main features of the project included:

- the management training program (TanMan), for the principals and senior staff of the FDCs and Ministry staff;
- a technical assistance programme for the FDC section of the Ministry staff, including a computerized education management information system (EMIS);
- a training of trainers programme (TOT) to develop a training group within the FDC;
- a teacher-training programme (TT) for teaching staff at the FDC;
- skills training programme run at various FDC;
- curriculum development;
- monitoring of the performance of the FDC; and
- maintenance and upgrading of physical facilities. (Lundin & Norbeck 1997)

8.1.3 Internal Structure of the Project
A Joint Planning Group, composed of representatives of the Tanzanian Ministry and Linköping University, was formed in 1992, in order to facilitate the joint efforts to improve operations in the project. The project fell under the auspices of the FDC section of the Training Department at the Ministry. The Tanzanian representatives included the head of the Training Department, the head of the FDC Section and a number of other members of the Ministry staff who were directly involved in teacher training and other administrative duties, including monitoring.

The Swedish representatives included staff from the International Unit of the Centre for Adult Educators at Linköping University, the contract institution for the TANDEM project, including a general adviser (who acted as project leader and project coordinator), a technical adviser, and the head of the International Unit (who had overall responsibility for the project, the training of teacher trainers and the teacher training). It was unanimously agreed by the Tanzanian and the Swedish representatives that leadership and the main teaching responsibilities with regard to the various staff training courses would initially fall under the auspices of management. Subsequently, in pace with the acquisition of new knowledge and skills, these responsibilities were eventually to be transferred, as far as possible, to their Tanzanian counterparts. This plan was successfully implemented throughout the project (Lundin & Norbeck, 1997; interview data: MCDWAC officer M and B).
8.2 Meta-evaluation

8.2.1 Purpose and Timing of Evaluation and Role of Evaluators

Purpose of Evaluation: On the part both of Sida and the Ministry, the intentions of evaluation was to carry out “a formative and summative evaluation of the changes that have taken place within the FDC programme and summing up the experiences from the TANDEM project” (Terms of Reference of the evaluation, 1995, p. 1). The stated purpose of this joint effort was to undertake an in-depth evaluation of the TANDEM project, in order to assess the training programme and its impact on both the local and the national level, and to investigate the effectiveness of the other aid interventions that formed part of this project (Rogers, Chadwick, & Oglesby 1997, p.1). Whereas this measure was a formative evaluation from the perspective of the FDCs, it was a summative evaluation from the perspective of Sida. This evaluation provided a holistic summary of the cooperation as a whole, from its origins onwards, as well as an analysis of possible impacts on stakeholders at various levels and in various dimensions in line with the objectives of the project.

Timing of Evaluation: The point in time at which any impacts of educational projects are to be evaluated is a controversial issue (see Section 4.1.4 for more discussion). While there are a number of factors, such as changes in the number of students/teachers; the number of courses and teaching hours and course content, that might be assessed as direct and immediate impacts of inputs to a project, there are factors, on the other hand, that are more difficult to assess and where a critical period of time must elapse before some or all the effects emerge, such as management training and capacity building.

Thus, the timing of the final evaluation in Case A, that is to say, when the project was still on-going, was perhaps appropriate from the overall management perspective at the level of the ODC agency, but it was nonetheless more controversial from the perspective of the local project. At the level of the FDCs, termination of the project was regarded as having come about too abruptly since the government had failed to inform them in an appropriate manner that Sida was planning to withdraw from the project, a course of action which had been agreed upon well in advance by Sida and the government (interview data: Sida HQ officer A and B, Sida Tanzania officer A, MCDWAC officer M and T, and FDC principal C, D). The FDC were not informed in advance of the meaning or function of the terms formative evaluation and summative evaluation. In addition, it can often be difficult to assess the effect of input to educational management within a limited time framework as potential effects may take quite sometime to be realized and visible. This point has been repeatedly made, not only by the project insiders but also by the evaluation team itself in their report on the evaluation. Again, the summative evaluation from the perspective of Sida was a mid-term (formative) evaluation of the project. Many stakeholders expressed a need for some other type of evaluation to simply evaluate the actual outcomes of the project (interview data: MCDWAC, project management, FDC principals).

Roles and Quality of the Evaluators: The stated role of the evaluators for the project in Case A was to evaluate the impacts of the project and to offer their assessment of
the worth of interventions in relation to the criteria of evaluation laid down in the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the evaluation, where a thoroughly contextualized understanding of the project was called for. It is stated in Sida’s general policy for evaluation criteria, at the organizational level, as follows:

To avoid conflicts of interest and safeguard the credibility of evaluations, individuals should normally not be engaged as evaluators of activities in which they have a personal stake. This is especially important in evaluations undertaken for purposes of accountability. Where learning is the main purpose of evaluation, beneficiaries and other stakeholders in the activities evaluated may sometimes be engaged as members of the evaluation team if this can be done without jeopardising the credibility of the evaluation. Regardless of the purpose of the evaluation, participation of local evaluators and close consultation with local stakeholders may well be a prerequisite for the credibility and use of an evaluation in the partner country (Sida, 1999).

According to this policy framework, Sida regards the role of the evaluator in the present case as “generalizable accountability-making with objectivity,” which, on the other hand, might be regarded, from the local perspective, as “detached unempathetic authoritative”. Responses in the interviews indicate that the evaluation was appreciated by Sida for the replicable lessons it contained while it has been criticized by stakeholders at the FDC level, as being “an intellectual conceptualization exercise of project reality” (interview data: Key insider D, MCDWAC officer T).

The award of the contract for the evaluation was made through a process of open tender, where the most important criteria for a successful bid was to be the team with members holding the highest qualifications (interview data: Sida HQ officer A, Sida Tanzania officer A). The team that was eventually awarded the contract was based in the UK and comprised four specialists in the following areas: education and development, non-formal adult education, monitoring and evaluation, gender, inspectorate, and curriculum development. Two Tanzanian consultants were attached to the team and both groups were “outsiders” to the project, in the sense that none of them had been involved at any stage in project prior to the evaluation. The perceived advantage of this arrangement was that it was considered that outsiders would be in a better situation to provide relatively objective and fresh perspectives when summarizing and evaluating this long-term cooperation (Sida, 1999). The perceived disadvantage was that a relatively limited understanding of, and sharing in, the socio-cultural context in which the project had been implemented might lead to questions being raised regarding the validity of the results of the evaluation (interview data: Key insider A, D). For example, Cracknell (2000) argues that evaluation is essentially a subjective exercise and any results will be greatly influenced by the cultural background of the evaluator(s). Following a similar line of argument, some interviewees state that certain misconceptions in interpreting the nature and realities of the project might arise because of the background of the evaluators (interview data: key insider A, MCDWAC officer M, principal D). Moreover, where building trust between all project insider groups is always a difficult task, this is especially so when different philosophical and ideological standpoints are involved.
8.2.2 Evaluation Design and Methods

A proposal with regard to the manner in which evaluation has been carried out, based on the reviews of documents and interviews carried out for this study, is presented in Figure 8.1. The illustration in Figure 8.1 is restricted to an attempt to capture only the basic structure of the evaluation procedures, while omitting those details which are provided in the following sections of this chapter. The arrows indicate interactions between the evaluators and key stakeholders that have taken place in the process of evaluation.

![Diagram](image)

*Note: Arrows are linked to only 2 out of the 6 colleges to symbolically represent the fact that only 11 out of the 52 colleges were visited for data collection.*

**Figure 8.1: An interpretation of the approach adopted for the project evaluation**

The ToR for evaluation was produced by Sida, in consultation with the project management team, drawing on their extensive knowledge and experience of the project. Both the international and local evaluation teams were selected by Sida according to their criteria namely the quality of the team members in terms of experience and knowledge in the field and of evaluation, as well as being “outsiders” to the project, in order to ensure “objectivity” and assure accountability. The evaluation was conducted between August 1995 and December 1996, during which extensive documentation and literature was collected that related to the project, constituting contextual data for a period of over 20 years, as well as data from various stakeholder groups, visits to 11 of the 52 FDCs, which is about 20% of the total number, as shown in the Figure 8.1 (indicated by the arrows between the evaluation team and FDCs). Detailed procedures and methods used in the conduct of the evaluation are to be found in the evaluation report.

**Evaluation Objectives:** According to the ToR for this evaluation, the main objectives were as follows:

- to evaluate the extent to which the project had attained its objectives;
• to evaluate the impact of the project on both the local level and the central level;
• to evaluate the sustainability of the project;
• to provide information on the design and execution of ongoing activities; and
• to design future support of the same or similar kind.

More specific objectives were to identify and evaluate
• the changes in the structure of the FDC programme;
• effects on the central administration of the programme e.g. guidelines, administrative routines, reporting system, and allocation and monitoring of funds disbursed;
• effects on college administration e.g. administrative structure, involvement of staff and students in college affairs, staff development, delegation of power and responsibilities;
• effects on the cooperation of the college with the surrounding community;
• effects on the ability of the FDCs to be financially self-supporting by running viable self-reliance projects, generating other types of revenue, and cost sharing with participants;
• effects of the training programmes run at the FDCs e.g. correlations with local needs;
• effects on the manner in which teachers conduct learning situations for the students; and
• effects on the students regarding their attitudes towards, and quality of, learning, improved skills after completion of studies, as well as in terms of self-confidence and analytical powers.

In short, the aim of the evaluation was to assess the extent to which the project had been successful as well as to identify and evaluate the impacts of the project. The objectives of the evaluation listed above were dealt with comprehensively in the evaluation report, where an initial statement made explicit the awareness on the part of the evaluators of the “interpretive nature” of evaluation of this kind (Rogers, Chadwick, & Oglesby, 1997 p. 3). The report also contains lists of recommendations to the key stakeholder groups.

Resource and Time spent: The evaluation had been commissioned by Sida in connection with the planned phasing out in 1996 of Sida’s support for the programme. Sida announced the call for tenders for the evaluation where the estimated budget was to have a ceiling of SEK 200 000. As to the total time spent carrying out the fieldwork for the evaluation, 5 man-weeks were to be spent in Sweden and 17 man-weeks in Tanzania, in the period between August 1995 and December 1996 by four international evaluators in consultation with two local evaluators. This relatively long time-frame reflects a suggestion in the ToR that “in order to get a more profound evaluation, the evaluation team should be given more time to get a thorough understanding of the character of the FDC program and the Tandem project than is normally the case” (ToR, p. 3). Compared to other evaluations of ODC projects, which are normally conducted over a couple of weeks by one or
two evaluator(s), the evaluation being reviewed here, which adopted ethnographic
approaches, was relatively more extensive in terms of depth and quality, with a
considerable amount of man-weeks and knowledge input on the part of the evaluation
team.

Data collection: Of the 52 FDCs involved, 11 were visited twice and surveyed in
depth. The criteria for the selection of the latter included the number of staff, and
attainment of a representative number of women principals, a balance between
colleges that had participated in the TANDEM project and those which had not done
so, geographic distribution, and accessibility (Rogers, Chadwick, & Oglesby, 1997).
Principals, teaching staff, students and neighbouring villagers were interviewed for
each visit. The evaluation team collected extensive documentation and literature,
including evaluation and research reports, mainly around the project, past programme
phases, and adult education in Tanzania in general, on which they based their
analysis. From an information management perspective, those at Sida and those of the
project staff in Tanzania who have read the evaluation report all admit the richness of
the report content, covering many issues based on appropriate literature and
documents (interview data: Sida HQ, Sida Tanzania, project managers, college
principals, Ministry officials). In order to establish a solid foundation for the
evaluation of the final phase of the programme (TANDEM project between 1990 to
1996), the report provides a comprehensive picture of historical developments and
changes with regard to the FDCs in Tanzania between 1975 and 1990, analyzing
these together with the ideological and macro socio-political shifts in Tanzania and
modifications in Sida’s policy, all of which had affected implementation of the
projects.

Stakeholder involvement: This evaluation had not been designed to be a participatory
evaluation, therefore it cannot be expected that stakeholder involvement would
appear everywhere in the process of evaluation. Although interviews were conducted
during this evaluation with some stakeholders at various levels, subsequently many
reported to this current study that they felt that they had not been able to exercise very
much influence by means of the evaluation process (interview data: principals, key
insider C, MCDWAC officer M). The ToR for the evaluation had recommended that
10% of all the 52 FDCs be surveyed, which would have been a total of 5, but the
evaluation team considered such a sample to be too small and therefore more than
doubled the number to 11, even though the different locations of the colleges are very
scattered geographically and available means of transport very restricted. However,
from the point of view of the colleges, even this enlarged sample size was
unsatisfactory because there are tremendous variations across the different
community contexts. They maintain, therefore, that it would have been more
appropriate for all the colleges to have been visited for the evaluation and thereby the
real situation and needs of each community would have been included in the report
(interview data: principals, project management, local scholars). The results from the
questionnaires carried out for the research reported in the present study (31 out of 52
FDCs responded) indicate that almost half of the respondents (18 out of 31) had no
knowledge of the evaluation and many pointed out the low level of stakeholder
involvement as well as the unsatisfactory nature of data selection during the evaluation process. Examples of such views are expressed as follows:

The main idea of the evaluation was to make people understand the context of the project and the process, but they missed that point. They never came and asked the process we have developed. They became faults finders rather than empathetic viewers of the process. (…) They made many criticism some of which we could have explained if they asked us in the evaluation process (Key insider A, 1999).

I thought that I could have some influence to the evaluation, but after I have read the evaluation report, I do not know… I have a mixed feeling. I thought that I was sincere telling them (evaluators) how I felt about the project for having been principal, facilitator, and a Tanzanian. My points were not reflected in the evaluation report (Key insider C, 1999).

Many project insiders who have been interviewed as part of the research reported here, claim that the results of the evaluation are not very credible as an insufficient number of voices were included and the data and the evidences from the field were not sufficiently comprehensive.

Report clarity: The evaluation report has a clear, logical and comprehensive structure where three steps had been followed: description, analysis and conclusions drawn. The descriptive part encompasses the original objectives of the project and their modification during the period the project was running, principal approaches and strategies employed to attain those objectives, organization, management and coordination of the project and the manner in which each item listed above the objectives of the evaluations had been dealt with. The analysis part encompasses an assessment of the extent to which the objectives had been relevant and realistic, the degree to which the objectives of the project had been attained, review of the organization, management and coordination of the project, the measurement of sustainability with regard to the FDCs after the phasing out of support from Sida and the extent to which the project had enabled the individual FDCs to attain their goals. Through describing and analyzing the historical and organizational context in detail, an attempt has been made in the evaluation report to provide a comprehensive picture of the cooperation in its entirety from the perspective of the evaluation, involving a high level of conceptualization and theorization of the interventions under consideration.

Project documentation and content of the report: The complex history of the project is portrayed in the evaluation report in a comprehensive and analytical manner. The report also contains an executive summary, providing a brief overview of the history of the project, the content of the project together with its impacts, project sustainability, and follow-up strategies for various key stakeholder groups.

The first chapter presents the evaluation methodology: the background and qualifications of the evaluation team, the context of the evaluation, the limitations on the evaluation, the structure of the evaluation report, specific definitions and
applications of key concepts in the report, such as. “adult education” and “development.”

The second chapter outlines the origins and intended goals of the FDCs and the ideological shifts over time with regard to the intentions concerning the project as well as the difficulties associated with the introduction of a “cultural product” (Swedish Folk High School) to some other “cultural context” (Tanzania), which is termed “cultural transfer” in the evaluation report. A number of constraints are listed that had confronted the FDCs in their efforts to deliver curricula that would be relevant to their varied local requirements while remaining within the framework of a central curriculum which had been produced by the Ministry.

The third chapter describes those changes at the national and local levels that have impacted on the FDCs in the period between 1975 and 1990.

The fourth chapter contains a summary of the background to the TANDEM project, covering the period from 1990 to 1996, analyzing first those changes that have taken place at the FDC level and subsequently those that have taken place at the various ministries concerned, together with those at Sida which had resulted in a shift of priorities from adult education to the education of children and young people.

The fifth chapter characterizes the evaluation of the TANDEM project in terms of its design, implementation (in terms of staffing, training curriculum, materials, training methods, trainees, and gender), description of the assessment and formative evaluations throughout the period the project had been running, sustainability of the project in the light of the socio-political and organizational contexts.

In the sixth chapter, evaluation of the management and staffing aspects of the project are covered, based on the extensive documentation that had been collected as well as on data collected from colleges. Here the internal management structures of the FDCs, were investigated such as their activities, financial issues (the reality of under-funding and over-staffing), and staffing issues (central allocation system, significance of staff imbalance, gender issues, staff responsibilities, staff evaluation).

The seventh chapter reports on the evaluation of programmes and activities, analyzing the effects of the introduction of school fees with regard to the students, (socio-economic) characteristics of the students enrolled in the colleges, and their motivations for taking the courses. The curriculum itself is also evaluated, where it is pointed out that the content of the curriculum from the central authorities had rarely been modified since 1975, therefore very few of the various community requirements were reflected. The issue of the detachment of the colleges from their communities is also discussed. Some interviews had been carried out with those who had completed courses. There are also reports concerning physical facilities compared to similar local institutions, where particular note is taken of the poor condition of the

---

105 Significant imbalances are identified in the evaluation report with regard to staff, e.g. 1) imbalance in staffing numbers across colleges and 2) inappropriate dispatch of teachers of a subject, which was no longer being offered.

106 In discussing curriculum development and local needs, Rogers framework (1992) is used in the report to distinguish “aspirations and intentions” (what the local community intends and plans to do, not what it needs) and “potentialities” (what can be developed using local resources).
libraries. The most significant factors reported are the low morale of the staff together with the inadequate management skills and unclear division of responsibilities.

In the eighth chapter, there is a summary of the disagreement between the newly responsible Ministry of Community Development Women Affairs and Children (MCDWAC) and the management of the TANDEM regarding their respective visions for the project.

In the ninth chapter, the achievements and impact of the TANDEM project are analyzed, including both the general impacts of the project and impacts of each component of the project. There are sections of this chapter dedicated to the issue of gender balance, for example, on boards and among the principals, teachers and students as well as gender-related aspects of the training curriculum. Assessments are also made in the light of stated aims and objectives that are based on the extensive data that had been collected as to the extent to which the project had attained these as well as their relevance.

The tenth and concluding chapter contains discussions and criticism with regard to future measures, where issues are raised concerning the relevance of the aims and objectives of the project, in the context of a growing discrepancy with regard to the educational visions of TANDEM and the new Ministry. Ambiguities in the identification of target groups as well as unrealistic expectations on the part of the participants are also pointed out. The evaluation report purposes that Sida should link the FDC project to Sida’s other current projects in Tanzania in the interest of greater efficiency and effectiveness. The report accepts the justification for Sida’s planned phasing out\textsuperscript{107} on a number of counts, in line with the trend among other international agencies in reducing ODC funds to Tanzania. Nonetheless, the report also addresses the impact of the relatively sudden withdrawal of financing by the Ministry, following the announcement of Sida’s planned phasing out of support. In conjunction with the recommendations for future strategies, the voices of various stakeholder groups are also included, which include suggestions that have been forwarded to the Ministry together with a repeated emphasis on the need for external funding from the international agencies.

Finally, the importance of linking the FDCs to the Tanzanian local network is stressed. The appendices are also informative, where the ToR for the evaluation are reproduced, together with documentation on the qualifications of the team, a detailed schedule and itinerary; the statistical data used for analysis; a background paper on the FHS in Sweden; an essay on the concept of cultural transfer; Swedish financial support to the FDCs year by year and the issue of gender in Tanzania and in FDCs. It is suggested in the evaluation report that utilization of existing local expertise and experience, the strengthening of local competencies as well as building more effective networks within the country are all important for sustainability to be realized.

\textit{Context analysis:} There is a comprehensive analysis in the report concerning multiple correlated factors that have affected the project along different dimensions. Firstly, various factors are pointed out in the report with regard to the national political

\textsuperscript{107} Sida’s plans for the phasing out of their support had already been made known to the government of Tanzania in 1993.
context, such as the transition to a multi-party democracy, the partial liberalization of the economy, the devolution of local government and a more market-oriented approach to adult education having been adopted by the government. Secondly, the transfer of responsibility for the colleges from one ministry to another, that is, from MOEC to MCDWAC, was identified as being a causal factor in the increasing uncertainties, ambiguities and inefficiencies in administrative procedures. Thirdly, discrepancies with regard to visions for the project are ascribed in the report to the shift in ministerial responsibility mentioned above. It is described in the report how tension grew between, on the one hand, the project management team, who wished to emphasize the liberal adult education/personal growth model of the FHS ideal, and, on the other, the MCDWAC who wished to re-orientate the colleges towards a model of alternative community development centres. Finally, the introduction of tuition fee is taken up in the report. In 1994, the Government of Tanzania had withdrawn funding for the colleges and they were required to become self-financing, which placed a tremendous burden on the colleges. All these factors were discussed extensively in the report in order to portray the nature of the complicated picture of the context in which the project had been running.

Nonetheless, some stakeholders in the present research reported in the present study have claimed that there are shortcomings in the report with regard to depictions of the varying socio-cultural and political conditions of each community which surrounds each college, which is considered to be essential in order to be able to appreciate the project, this being the view of local academics, project management, and some MOEC officials who have been interviewed.

Value Description: Value judgements regarding the project that have been reached in the report by the evaluators are largely based on their own profound experiential knowledge as well as on their analysis of the data in the extensive documentation. Although the report contains descriptive and analytical contents, it is also to some extent prescriptive on a number of points (see Section 4.5.1 for a more detailed description of the concept of value). One shortcoming in the report is a relative failure to recognize the plurality of the values entertained by various groups of stakeholders. Many of the stakeholders in the project and those at the level of the college, who have been interviewed for this study, are not in agreement with the interpretation of the evaluators with regard to some of the intentions of, and realities regarding, the project. One example is the issue of cultural transfer that the evaluation report claims to be part of the development cooperation, where the points repeated on several occasions in the evaluation report may be illustrated by the following statements:

(…) we believe that it would be inappropriate for Sweden to continue to try to influence the FDC structure substantially. Such continued support as may be given must not prevent the FDCs from finding within Tanzanian society their own niche which is likely to be very different from the FHSs in Sweden. (Evaluation report, 1997, p. 2)

One of the most significant results of the TANDEM project was that it isolated the FDCs rather than integrated them into Tanzanian society. It did nothing to tie the colleges into any kind of Tanzanian network. (Evaluation report, 1997, p. 82)
Very few of the stakeholders interviewed in this study, including project managers, Ministry officials, college principals and teachers, professors at the University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM), all who had been deeply involved in the project, have either agreed with the statement, or even acknowledged, that any aspect of the project had been regarded at the time as “cultural transfer” or “cultural imposition.” The following are very strongly expressed examples of such views:

I disagree with “cultural export” criticism. It was neither Tanzanian view nor Swedish view. (…) Swedish FHS and Tanzanian FDC are different things. In Tanzania, we teach things which directly connect with income, which is not the case in Sweden. (…) The local and international evaluation teams disagreed over some of the argument but the international team had more authority so they wrote the report that way. (Key insider C)

I have never felt that the project was some sort of imposition of Swedish concept. Simply the basic concept was to help rural illiterate by education. Teaching of skill was adjusted to community needs and community environment. Framework was from Sweden but Tanzanian planted their own seeds which resulted in their fruits. (Key insider B)

Sometimes, evaluation findings are different from our understanding of the project reality but they give you some other aspects of the project. It could be problem of awareness… having difficulty of knowing the project…so for the whole project there were many success but it is difficult to incorporate in the evaluation findings unless the study takes place visiting all the FDCs. It may be that the results which were needed by the people were not obtained. (Key insider A)

Many interviewees claimed that the concept of cultural transfer does not chime at all with the insiders’ view but is rather a perspective or an interpretation of the situation adopted by the evaluators. Some interviewees, as insiders to the project, have criticized such arguments, characterizing them as an “intellectual exercise with no practical value” (interview data: MOEC officer G). They stressed that needs and expectations with regard to evaluation vary across different stakeholder groups and that the value described or prescribed in the evaluation report would therefore also be perceived variously according to the value system of each particular group of stakeholders.

The management of the project have praised the evaluation report for raising many important points and for collecting such extensive documentation but have criticized it for failing to accurately capture the actual processes involved in the project. In their own final report (Lundin & Norbeck, 1997), the management of the project subsequently presented a number of arguments to counter this particular point in the evaluation report, by spelling out their conscious and consistent efforts to avoid imposing the ideal of the Swedish FHS but, rather, to localize the content of the programmes:

From the very beginning we tried to emphasize the need for the FDCs to work with and for the local community. (…) We stressed very much the importance
of improving the income-generating activities and we tried to assist them in doing so. (Final project report, 1997, p.11)

It is pointed out in the final project report that “factual errors, misconceptions and contradictions” may arise in any evaluation judgments. It is possible that significant discrepancies with regard to the perceptions of project insiders and those of the external evaluators may have their source in the differences between their respective epistemological perspectives on adult education, which are apparent in two reports: the 1997 evaluation report prepared by the evaluation team and the 1997 final project report prepared by the project management team. For example, the issue of subjectivist interpretation has been explored by Silverman (1970, p. 223), who states that distortions of reality may be the natural consequence of sociological efforts to conceptualize and systematize social life in compliance with the rules of an academic discipline. But, as many interviewees have claimed, the source of such discrepancies with regard to perceptions may also possibly have their source in the methodology adopted whereby the evaluation investigations did not extend to all or at least more of the 51 colleges whereby a great number of project insiders would have been involved. Since this was not the case, then it is possible to raise questions regarding both the accuracy and the validity of the data concerning project insiders. But the issue perhaps concerns even more the question of a form of psychological alienation arising as a result of the non-participatory approach adopted for the evaluation. If the evaluation had been conducted through the adoption of a participatory approach, then the pluralistic values of various stakeholder groups could have been taken into consideration, however modestly. This would have also subsequently facilitated a consensus being reached by the project insiders on the findings of the evaluation and consequently thereby also increasing the utility of any recommendations. In addition, the fact that the evaluators were from backgrounds in different socio-cultural contexts than those in Sweden and Tanzania may also have affected the process and outcomes of knowledge construction in the evaluation. Sadler (1981) constructed a classification of evaluation bias which ought to provide some theoretical insights here:

- unconscious distortions resulting from the idiosyncratic background and experience of each evaluator;
- biases introduced unwittingly by limitations in the information-processing abilities of an evaluator; and
- ethical compromises or distortions resulting from a perception of possible payoffs and penalties on the part of an evaluator (cited in Worthen & Sanders, 1987, p. 289).

Dissemination of results/feedback: The evaluation report was published by Sida, but subsequently it received only limited distribution as a result of a vacuum with regard to responsibility for its dissemination between Sida and the Tanzanian government. Consequently, the points raised regarding further action, suggestions and recommendations in the evaluation report directed at the various stakeholder groups, did not come to the knowledge of the intended audience and therefore could not be put to any practical use. More generally, with regard to the impact of the evaluation, there is not one single interviewee in this study who was able identify any change that
had been brought about as a result of it. The obvious frustration with regard to this situation on the part of the stakeholders interviewed for this present study is clear in the following statements:

The problem is, when researchers conduct evaluation, dissemination lacks. People do not go further. You do a research, dump it into the office, put it on the shelf, and that’s all!! (…) Quite often, research ends at report writing and not more. (Key insider A)

I think that all the leaders of colleges should have gotten the evaluation report, so that we could at least have known what was written in the report. Otherwise how can we improve? (Key insider E)

There are three general points of criticism that might be raised with regard to feedback from the results of evaluation, based on empirical data and a review of the literature carried out for the present study. First, there is apparently a tendency for the feedback stage of evaluation to be neglected as a consequence of the view being entertained that evaluation is merely a tool to be used to legitimize political decisions and to secure public accountability. Second, the passivity on the part of the Tanzanian government with regard to this stage of evaluation is probably a reflection of their undue dependency on the initiatives of ODC agencies. Third, the low degree of utilization of the results of the evaluation is probably in part a consequence of the bureaucratic culture underlying ODC interventions, where evaluations might be conducted at various levels but are nonetheless regarded as being merely a kind of ritual. As Cracknell (2000) suggests, the developing countries need to evolve feedback systems for disseminating evaluation findings including short summaries, seminars, and in-depth briefings by evaluation teams. Although methodologies and feedback systems for evaluation continue to develop on the part of ODC agencies, feedback at the programme/project level in the developing countries themselves remains nascent (ibid.).

Use of the evaluation results: From the interview and questionnaire data in this study, it is evident that the respondents in all the stakeholder groups consider that only Sida found the results of the evaluation to be useful in any way. These evaluation results have been useful to Sida in that the organization thereby acquired an objective summary of an instance of long-term cooperation, over and above any possible lessons that they might be able to utilize in the future for similar projects in other programme countries. Therefore Sida regarded this evaluation report as one of many bodies of knowledge that they had acquired over the years from different sources, such knowledge acquisition being considered by Sida as one of the criteria for assessing the total effects of long-term cooperation. Thus, had the results of the final evaluation indicated stronger positive aspects of the project, indicating the necessity of a continuation, then it is possible that a prolongation of the project would have been considered (interview data: Sida Tanzania officer A).

The Ministry in Tanzania had not found the results of the evaluation to be particularly useful although they also considered that they had been provided with too few copies of the report to distribute. This unfortunate but relatively common
scenario is indicative of a certain imbalance with regard to power relationships and sense of responsibility or interests between ODC agencies and ministries in host countries. Even one of the main recommendations in the evaluation report, that a conference be organized for college staff and Ministry officials to discuss the findings and their application in future activities, was not realized.

Follow-up conference? There was no gathering. We did not gather even once after the project has finished. We meet only by the zone unit. (Principal E)

From the point of view of improving the project, it would seem to be crucial that the results of the evaluation should have been disseminated to the school level. Although some such efforts were made by the evaluation team themselves (interview data: evaluator), they nonetheless did not reach as far as the colleges. Only five respondents to the questionnaire (16%) had received any form of feedback regarding the evaluation and only two respondents (6%) had actually read the evaluation report. Although the colleges had been keen to be informed of them, they had not been so informed since the results of the evaluation had not been disseminated in any systematic manner, which is often the case with regard to evaluation practice in general. "Utility," one of the key factors in evaluation practice, is often overridden by other political factors such as "legitimizing political decisions" and "organizational ritual." By involving stakeholders more actively in evaluation practices, this situation of imbalances could be ameliorated.

8.3 Stakeholder Perspectives on Evaluation

8.3.1 Assessment of the Evaluation by Different Groups of Stakeholders

The present study is inspired by constructivist paradigm, where the focus is on those pluralistic values constructed by individuals or groups as agents, in accordance with their respective networks of socio-cultural and political contexts. Consequently, the perspectives and assessment of evaluation practices on the part of various groups of stakeholders are analyzed here and presented in Table 8.1. It should be noted that categories in the table emerged, based on the data from the questionnaires and interviews carried out as part of the research for the present study. Key issues have been identified from the data from the different groups of stakeholders although this was not carried out through systematic analysis that would have resulted in greater consistency in their identification across the various stakeholder groups.
Table 8.1: Assessment of evaluation practices by different groups of stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHG Involvement in the evaluation</th>
<th>Assessment of evaluation process/results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ODC agency: HQ/Local office</strong></td>
<td>Archiving: Good informative summary of the long-term cooperation both for Sida and for the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioned evaluation</td>
<td><strong>Lessen learning:</strong> New perspectives provided could be applied to other similar projects in other programme countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established Terms of Reference</td>
<td><strong>Use in decision-making:</strong> Evaluation findings used as one of the criteria of judging degree of success/failure of the entire cooperation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected evaluation team</td>
<td><strong>Dissemination of results:</strong> Publication of an evaluation report. Dissemination in Tanzania is national government’s responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little involved in evaluation process</td>
<td>Partly involved in reporting seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in reporting seminar</td>
<td>Value construction: Many good objective points raised. Too critical and fails to address the real situation. Lack of context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Method:</strong> Inadequate stakeholder involvement. “Whose voices were represented in the report?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Use:</strong> Findings/recommendations were not used due to inadequate distribution of the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tanzania ministries</strong></td>
<td>Archiving: Good evaluation, collecting extensive documentation, information raising many points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some officers interviewed in depth</td>
<td>Value construction: Lack of project process and context. “Danger of being fault finders rather than empathetic viewers of the process.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in the reporting seminar</td>
<td><strong>Method:</strong> Insufficient stakeholder involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project management</strong></td>
<td><strong>Method:</strong> “All the colleges should have been visited and each situation should have been analyzed.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established Terms of Reference</td>
<td><strong>Value construction:</strong> Results needed by project insiders were not obtained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little involved in evaluation process</td>
<td><strong>Use:</strong> Little use. Hardly anyone informed of the evaluation results as results inadequately disseminated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in reporting seminar</td>
<td><strong>Value construction:</strong> Lack of description of various needs of communities surrounding colleges. “Whose voices is the evaluation team representing?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colleges</strong></td>
<td><strong>Use:</strong> Useful for ODC agency. Not for the community to whom the project should have been targeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 percent of colleges visited,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interviewed and questionnaire-surveyed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local university</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less involved compared to previous evaluations: interviewed few times.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in reporting seminar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ODC agency (Sida) considered that the evaluation had been useful as a tool for **archiving**, **lesson learning**, and **decision-making**. The ODC agency, together with those other stakeholder groups who did have access to the evaluation report, had found the report to be informative, covering various aspects of interest. Naturally, as an ODC agency, Sida viewed the “lesson learning” value of the report at a more macro level that is to say, from the level of the cross country and pan-programme perspectives, rather than at the level of the individual project. Sida was satisfied with the new perspectives provided by the evaluation. As to the utility of the evaluation results, Sida made it clear that these evaluation findings were considered as only a small part of the body of knowledge gathered by the agency over a long period of cooperation, and that a number of other reports and forms of evidence were taken into account.

---

108 A reporting seminar was held by the evaluation team in order to present the draft of the evaluation report and to receive feedback from key stakeholders. The main participants were Sida HQ and Sida Tanzania, Ministries, project management, and the local university.
account when assessing the success of the project (interview data: Sida Tanzania officer A; Sida headquarter officer N).

With the exception of the ODC agency, all members of the other stakeholder groups who were interviewed during this study, expressed considerable doubts about the methodology adopted for the evaluation, particularly with regard to the issues of stakeholder involvement and data selection/collection. Although from statistical point of view, the selection of the colleges visited could be considered to be valid, project insiders would have preferred all colleges to have been visited in order for the varying contexts to have been captured, as well as for the needs and situation in each school community to have been analyzed. The credibility of the results of the evaluation has therefore been called into question by the key stakeholder groups. Although the ultimate purpose of this type of ODC evaluation might be regarded as being to legitimize cooperation and to support public accountability, this does not necessarily imply that it should thereby ignore contributing feedback of valuable information for the improvement of the project.

Since the evaluation of any project involves heterogeneous groups of stakeholders, it should adequately cover the different value they entertain on the one and same project. Such differences not only occur across the various groups of stakeholders but also within each group, based on each member’s political and ideological standpoint with regard to the project concerned. Therefore it is important to note that the credibility and the utility of the results of the evaluation might well also differ from one individual stakeholder to the next. However, in Case A, value constructed by the evaluators was called into question by the project insiders, namely some of the Ministry officials, who had been working closely with the colleges over recent decades, but also by the management team for the project, college principals and academics from the local university.

Turning to the utility of the evaluation process and results, the responses from all groups of stakeholders, except the ODC agency, have indicated that these have unfortunately been of little or no use to them, while bearing in mind the extensive data that had been collected and analyzed in the evaluation report. Nonetheless, this collection and analysis of extensive data on the part of the evaluators also had the consequence, first, that controversial but essential issues were raised, such as cultural transfer, whereby Tanzanian ownership of the project was challenged, and second, that a number of suggestions and recommendations were made to key stakeholder groups. Responsibility for this failing was placed by the Ministry on the ODC agency and vice versa. It would seem to be obvious that there ought to be some systematic means for disseminating the results of an evaluation to all groups of stakeholder groups, including a summary, and a translation to any local language.

The conclusion here must be that no strategy had been adopted in this evaluation regarding “use of evaluation” on the part of the various key stakeholder groups during the course of the evaluation process, except for the ODC agency, who would appear to have been the only intended user of the evaluation. As discussed in Section 4.6.3, above, a careful analysis, first, of the various stakeholders in order to identify primary intended users and, second, of the nature of the various interests of different groups of stakeholders groups, could have lead to both the evaluation report and the evaluation process being experienced as meaningful to some extent to most of the groups of stakeholder groups. In other words, although the evaluation was
regarded as having conceptual use and summative use on the part of the ODC agency, it unfortunately failed to provide formative use whereby it could have lead to improvement of the programme.

### 8.3.2 “Good evaluation” from the Perspective of the Stakeholders

As discussed in detail in Chapter 4, theories and methodologies of evaluation continue to develop and, as indicated in Chapter 6, the system of ODC evaluation continues to grow in complexity and sophistication, involving more relationships of political power on multiple levels and dimensions. On the other hand, the following statement from an interviewee indicates how sharp the criticism can be with regard to the manner in which ODC evaluations are often carried out in the real world.

> Evaluations are carried out to satisfy the donors’ needs, and if you write a “good report” which pleases the institution then you are called in to write another one and another one and another one (...) If one manages to make two or three evaluation each year, his economic status will start to change. Whether the evaluation findings make sense or make any contribution to development, it does not matter. I think that the donors should learn from the past mistake. Ask the people why it does not work. If both sides sit down frankly and discuss what went wrong, they should be able to come up with some solution. (Local Scholar K)

Based on an assumption that the purpose of an evaluation determines and justifies the particular approach and methodology adopted, it might be claimed that a great many ODC evaluations are carried out only to meet the needs of the ODC agency and that they fail to address the needs and perspectives of the grass-roots stakeholder groups. Many interviewees in this study have expressed the view that an evaluation should be a synthesis of the voices of various stakeholders, which on a theoretical level is in accord with the basic assumption behind a responsive-constructivist evaluation (see Section 4.6.4 for detailed discussion), whereby subjectivity and different value constructions of the respective stakeholders are clarified through interaction and negotiation based on the epistemology of constructivism, with some real attempt to be responsive to the understandings, concerns and issues voiced by stakeholders on their own terms.

> Let other people say what they see very frankly. And from there, donors will begin to see what is missing. (Key insider D)

When it comes to stakeholder involvement, many people should be involved in order to inform political leaders different voices; voice of the community, voice of the principals, teachers and students of the colleges, voices of the donors, and voices of the experts. These voices should be put together to show different voices of different actors and the report should be the synthesis of different voices including where the conflict arises. (Local Scholar K)

When the value pluralism implicit in social reality is not accommodated, then the subsequent evaluation result might well be deemed at the local level to be irrelevant, leading to the non-utilization of those finding that might have been
potentially useful (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). On the other hand, in an evaluation inspired by the responsive-constructivist approach, the results of that evaluation are regarded as a co-construction on the part of the evaluators and the stakeholders rather than a collection of authoritative facts. Another point that appears repeatedly in the responses from the stakeholders interviewed concerns the comprehensiveness of stakeholder involvement as well as the necessity of a good feedback system for dissemination of the evaluation results (see Section 8.2.2 for more detailed discussions). In the contemporary development discourse, much has been claimed concerning the significance of the involvement of grass-roots stakeholder groups but the challenge still persists as to how to combine this with the role of decision-making stakeholder groups:

Talking about “stakeholders”, one cannot exclude political leaders. They are big stakeholders if they talk about transparency and democracy. In reality, they are not reading evaluation reports or get these reports. How do we get them read the report? (Local scholar M)

As discussed in Section 6.1.3, a timely, effective and efficient feedback system for dissemination of the evaluation results is needed at the level of senior management. Finally, some interviewees in this study have referred explicitly to the role of evaluator:

(…) as an evaluator I would not like to pose as a specialist. I would only want to see views of other people and summarize them and after that I give my ideas. I would not like to impose my own ideas to a situation before those people have spoken first. (Local scholar A)

In the responsive-constructive approach, the role of evaluator is regarded in the same light as in the statement above, where it is claimed that “evaluators are expected to facilitate collaborative open environments and to manage dynamic discussion, employing evaluation designs that are relevant, meaningful, understandable, and able to produce useful results that are valid, reliable, and believable” (extracted from Section 4.6.4, above). This attitude is important in ODC evaluation where apparent power discrepancies exist between various stakeholder groups. As Chambers (1997) claims, it is important that the powerful listen to the powerless in the context of ODC.

8.4 Concluding Remarks

A profile of Case A, one example of an ODC project evaluation, has been reported in this chapter, where the aim has been to provide an in-depth analysis of an educational project evaluation in the light of theoretical and methodological knowledge gained through this research. The project evaluation has been presented, together with the content and internal structure of the project, and in terms of the historical and socio-political context.

The meta-evaluation used in the present study is based on both theoretical and methodological knowledge as well as the perspectives of the various groups of stakeholders gained from the research carried out for this study. The data and
discussion in this chapter clearly demonstrate that there are a number of important issues that continue to be controversial concerning evaluation practices such as evaluation methodologies, stakeholder involvement, context analysis, dissemination and utilization of the results of evaluation and value description.

The importance of stakeholder involvement in, as well as the incorporation of value pluralism into, the evaluation has been highlighted through the research on Case A. Similarly, it is reported here that the significance and relevance of evaluation has escaped the informants at the local level which raises the question as to whether such relevance at the local level has been adequately reflected in the stated purpose of this particular evaluation or in the evaluation system of the ODC agency and the national government. The negative answer to this question is further reinforced by evidence of serious shortcomings in the feedback system for the results of this evaluation.

The findings on Case A will subsequently be compared and contrasted with the findings on Case B, the subject of Chapter 9.
Chapter Nine

Case B

In this chapter, a profile is provided of Case B following a mode of analysis similar to the one used in Chapter 8. Data used for this chapter are presented in Table 5.1 in Chapter 5.

9.1 Context for the Meta-Evaluation

9.1.1 Historical and Socio-Political Context of the Project

In response to the findings of the national literacy census conducted in 1992, which revealed increasing rates of illiteracy, the Tanzanian government policy has implied a commitment to support non-formal basic education programmes for young people and adults to parallel the strategy for the formal system of education (Mushi, Malekela, & Bhalalusesa, 2002). Since then, two programmes have been implemented: Complementary Basic Education in Tanzania (COBET), for young people between 7 and 18 years of age not attending school, which started in 1998, and Integrated Community Based Adult Education (ICBAE) for those older than 18 years of age, which has been implemented since 1995. The ICBAE has been officially adopted by the government as the model for the national approach to adult literacy. The government has stressed the importance of a community-based approach in the education sector, stating that “socio-economic development is only meaningful if it encompasses the needs, expectations and roles of all the individual beneficiaries of the results of development efforts in the whole society” (MOEC, 1999, p.1).

The aim of the government’s general policy for education has been the devolution of power and authority away from the central government and more towards communities in order for them to manage their own educational activities. The goals of the ICBAE programme are in line with this policy by supporting post-literacy initiatives in the country through the development of a learner-centred and community-based approach using literacy at the community level as a tool and a catalyst in the development of local income-generating initiatives (Mnjagila, 1998; Saverase, 1996).

The Tanzanian Ministry of Education and Culture (MOEC), in collaboration with the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida) and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), through the Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology (SIAST), developed the ICBAE programme in 1993. The programme is based on models developed in a four-year pilot project.

---

109 The aims of the ICBAE programme have been carefully linked to the major components of the Basic Education Master Plan (BEMP) within the framework of the Education Sector Development Programme (ESDP)
(1993-1997) in four districts for country-wide adaptation and replication\textsuperscript{110}. Thus, ICBAE stands for both the pilot project and the model to be expanded in adult education, and Case B for this study refers to two evaluations of this ICBAE pilot project.

\subsection*{9.1.2 Project Content}

The main objective of the programme was to enable the beneficiaries to acquire permanent literacy skills and vocational and life skills in order to be able to improve their standard of living. The specific project objectives, as stated in the government paper are as follows:

- Promoting and strengthening participation and empowerment of the direct beneficiaries at the village level with specific attention to existing gender imbalances and attitudes. Communities are given power to make decisions on what to do, how to do it, why and when to do it for their own benefit;
- Ensuring the realization of the basic human rights of Education For All (EFA) and to complete formal education. The overall goal is to contribute to increased and improved access to quality, equity and sustainable non-formal education for adults and out-of-school youth particularly girls;
- Mobilizing and increasing resource allocation through increased share of development and recurrent budgets. Involvement of communities in contributing to the budgets in terms of labour, financial and material resources is expected to increase sustainability of the programme;
- Inculcating in the beneficiaries a sense of ownership and build a sense of accountability and responsibility (MOEC, 1997, cited in MOEC 2002b, pp. 31-32).

These project objectives were subsequently first translated into an implementation strategy and thereafter into more specific actions, namely:

- Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA)\textsuperscript{111} tracer study: to conduct a PRA appraisal/needs assessment survey in order to obtain data on the dynamics of community organization, needs and interests of the beneficiaries;
- capacity strengthening of trainers, district councils and village authorities;
- establishment of REFLECT\textsuperscript{112} circles at the community level;

\textsuperscript{110} The project was later on scaled up to include further eight districts in 2000, funded by the African Development Bank (ADB). These include Masasi, Newala, Songea Rural, Tunduru, Nachingwea, Liwale, Biharamulo and Kigoma. The ratio of the levels of funding between the ADB and the Tanzanian government was 12:1 (ADB/USD 122,155 : GOT/USD 10,633) (MOEC, 2002).

\textsuperscript{111} See 3.1.4 Participatory Development for more detailed explanation of PRA.

\textsuperscript{112} REFLECT (Regenerated Freirean Literacy through Empowering Community Techniques) is an approach to adult learning and social change which combines the theories of Paulo Freire with the methodology of participatory rural appraisal (PRA). It is a structured participatory learning process, which facilitates people’s critical analysis of their environment, placing empowerment at the heart of sustainable and equitable development. It respects people’s existing knowledge and skills, regarding literacy as something which people can use on their
selection and training of programme facilitators in REFLECT and UNESCO Triple A methodologies\textsuperscript{113} as well as training facilitators specifically for the disabled;

development of facilitator manuals;

establishment of Community-Based Resource Centres, utilizing existing libraries;

use of mass communications and publicity in order to create awareness amongst stakeholders regarding ICBAE implementation; and

ensure supplies for attaining effective implementation and monitoring of the programme (MOEC, 1999; 2000 c; 2002 b).

The adult literacy circles were run by facilitators using participatory and dialogue discussion techniques adapted from the REFLECT methodology, where common local issues were discussed such as environment, health, poverty, gender, income and expenditure. This methodology was in sharp contrast to conventional literacy approaches where text-based and non-participatory teaching and learning are used (Mushi, Malekela, & Bhalalusesa, 2002). The expectation here was that involving villagers in this way would ultimately lead to the social and economic development of their communities (Munyoga, 2001).

According to Mushi (1998), the basic features of the ICBAE model are,

- **Learner Centredness**: learners are actively involved in identifying their learning needs, programme design, requirements regarding teaching and learning process through participatory approaches, and subsequently in the evaluation of the programme.

- **Community Building**: the model is community-based, where the aim is the improvement of the standard of living in each particular community. Working in small groups, the community members are to identify their own needs and problems and to initiate appropriate action programmes.

- **Integrative Development**: the model focuses on holistic improvements in socio-economic and political fields – health, education, environment, livelihood, gender, and so on, encouraging collaborative planning among various levels of stakeholder groups.

- **Community Capacity Building**: community members are trained in planning, problem solving, management of resources, book keeping, programme evaluation, and so on.

\textsuperscript{113} The UNESCO Triple Approach. Triple A indicates the three steps to be followed in implementing a community-based participatory programme. \textit{Assessment}: an assessment of the needs, resources, and problems of a community. \textit{Analysis}: analysis of the results of the assessment, mainly conducted by the beneficiaries. \textit{Action}: After achieving a consensual understanding of the problems and alternative solutions, development workers and villagers work together in taking action.
Numerous positive outcomes have been reported for this project, not only with regard to higher levels of literacy and numeric skill, but also in terms of improved cooperation and teamwork, life skills, environmental awareness, agricultural techniques and knowledge, nutrition and hygiene, increased household incomes, craft skills, change of attitudes to the education of children, income-generating projects and small businesses, as well as sensitivity to gender issues (Mnjagila, 1998).

9.1.3 Internal Structure of the Programme

The roles and responsibilities in the implementation of the programme at various administrative levels are presented in Table 9.1. At the national level, the staff consisted of the Coordinator and an assistant. At the district level, the staff consisted of an Adult Education Coordinator and three assistants. At the ward level, the programme was managed by a Ward Education Coordinator. Overall management and administration of the programme was under the auspices of the MOEC, in collaboration with other ministries and NGOs.

### Table 9.1: Roles and responsibilities for implementation of the programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Roles and responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| National | - To mobilize resource from international agencies and channel them to lower levels  
          | - To formulate policy for programme implementation |
| Regional | - To train key staff for the programme  
           | - To make appropriate adjustments and alternative interventions in the programme in consultation with MOEC  
           | - To collect and analyze implementation reports at respective levels |
| District | - To plan and budget for the expansion of the programme  
           | - To involve Ward Development Committees in the process of implementation and evaluation of the programme  
           | - To seek advice from higher levels and various institutions, collect and analyze reports at their respective levels  
           | - To organize training of key staff in the district |
| Ward | - To identify needs and allocate and mobilize resources together with villagers  
         | - To work with villagers on planning, budgeting, implementation, and reporting and to deliver supplies to the project sites  
         | - To carry out follow-up visits, monitor and evaluate project activities |
| Village | - To provide data on population, institutions, key community leaders, and so on  
          | - To plan, budget and manage the project in the village  
          | - To appoint trainers and facilitators |
| Project | - To provide labour for creating educational and other service facilities  
          | - To budget for implementation of project activities  
          | - To attend and participate in meetings, REFLECT circles, decision-making groups and income-generating projects  
          | - To participate in monitoring and evaluating the development of circles and income-generating projects  
          | - To learn and maintain reading and writing skills |

*Source: adapted from Mnjagila, 1998; MOEC 1999*
In all through the measures in support of adult literacy and non-formal education, emphasis has been placed on the decentralization and delegation of responsibility for programme activities down to the levels of the district, ward and village/community. The government had recognized that should the programme be established on the basis of a top-down model for planning, whereby the needs and interests of each particular local communities would not be taken into account, this would not have provided an effective tool for transforming the perceived socio-economic constraints on the participants (Mnjagila, 1998). Based on this realization, a two-way (both bottom-up and top-down) communication system was established for the ICBAE programme, as illustrated in Figure 9.1. The arrows pointing to the right are intended to indicate reporting and arrows pointing to left are intended to indicate consultation.

![Figure 9.1: Administrative structure of the ICBAE programme](image)

This administrative structure facilitated problems being identified and solutions found at the village level, as far as possible. Various committees were established by the participants at the village level in order to implement the programme to meet their own needs. Facilitators were to be trained in REFLECT methodology by participating in different workshops in order for them to be able to “sensitize” and “empower” participants (Mnjagila, 1998). In the case of particularly intractable difficulties, the village leader would take these up to the ward level, where the Ward Education Coordinator would take responsibility for addressing the issue concerned. Should any difficulty be of such an intractable nature that it was not possible for it to be resolved at the ward level then it would be subsequently passed on to the district level for resolution. Due to the decentralization of some government functions, more powers devolved to the districts than previously had been the case. Funds were allocated directly by the MOEC to the district authorities in order for them to administer the programmes. Participation and commitment on the part of the local communities together with the strengthening of management capacities at both the ward and district levels were regarded as central issues (Interview data: MOEC officer M). On the other hand, the role of the MOEC was essentially to coordinate,
monitor and evaluate the ICBAE programmes and to formulate overall policies and directives (Mushi, Malekela, & Bhalalusesa, 2002).

A total of eight districts participated in the programme, where two wards in each district and five villages in each ward were included, that is to say a total of 80 villages (MOEC, 2000). The original intention had been to include all 120 districts on the Tanzanian mainland, which would have implied the participation of a total of 1200 villages. A number of problems were acknowledged by the government, such as insufficient training of staff, especially in respect of REFLECT methodology, inappropriate timing for the disbursement of financial resources, shortage of transportation to be able to carry out effective monitoring and follow-ups, shortcomings with regard to the availability of various facilities and learning materials (MOEC, 2002), all of which were subsequently confirmed by respondents from all the stakeholder groups in this study (interviews 2001; questionnaires 2003). Sustainability would also be difficult to attain should the programme be excessively reliant on external financial resources and facilities and where the government was not able to make appropriate budget allocations to support the programme. Although the adoption of the REFLECT approach can be regarded as relatively cost-effective, through utilizing learning materials that are available locally and so, any expansion of the programme on a larger scale would still demand a considerably higher level of resources from the national government and/or international community in support. The local communities in the pilot wards had depended on donor support to be able to implement activities in the ICBAE project and the ability of these communities to continue doing so would be severely curtailed should such support no longer be available (Mushi, Malekela, & Bhalalusesa, 2002). In developing the programme, sustainability, ownership, participation and empowerment had been regarded as key concepts, implying a need for new arrangements for power sharing at multiple levels, financial mobilization and management, and intensive capacity-strengthening in each community, and so on. The programme had been planned in such a manner that gradual expansion would subsequently be possible, beginning on a small scale while monitoring was in progress (Mnjagila, 1998 & Mbunda, 1996). Establishment of cooperation with NGOs concerning “soft aspects” of the programme such as training in REFLECT methodology and capacity strengthening at the village level were also being considered by the government (MOEC, 2002).

### 9.1.4 Pilot Project Sites

The questionnaire for this study was distributed to four wards, each of a different economic level and population size, which had been selected among the pilot project sites. These wards are described in Table 9.2.

**Table 9.2: Selected ICBAE pilot project sites**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Level of economy</th>
<th>Total Population (male/female)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kiroka</td>
<td>Morogoro</td>
<td>Less advanced</td>
<td>13777 (6511/7266)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kishinda</td>
<td>Mwanza</td>
<td>Less advanced</td>
<td>2968 (1474/1494)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sembeti</td>
<td>Kilimanjaro</td>
<td>More advanced</td>
<td>2014 (840/1174)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soni</td>
<td>Tanga</td>
<td>More advanced</td>
<td>10447 (4956/5491)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Mushi (1998)*
The Sembeti and Soni wards are more advanced economically than the Kiroka and Kishinda wards. The local economies in these wards are based on small-scale farming and businesses. Sensitization seminars, with the aim of creating awareness of participation and empowerment, had been conducted at the regional, district and ward levels. Adult literacy circles had been run by facilitators using participatory and the dialogue/discussion techniques of the methodology known as REFLECT.

9.2 Meta-evaluation

Two formative evaluations (Mbunda, 1996; Maiga, Taylor & Taylor, 1998) are analyzed in this chapter. These two evaluation reports were chosen, out of nine M&E reports, as material for the cases, because of 1) the comparability to Case A, both evaluating the whole intervention process while some other evaluations were thematic (e.g. gender focus, management aspect focus); and 2) the richness of the report content with its application of systematic evaluation methods, providing for sufficient relevant materials for the application of meta-evaluation in this study.

9.2.1 Purpose and Timing of Monitoring & Evaluation, and Role of Evaluators

Purpose of Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E): Monitoring is closely related to evaluation in this type of community-based participatory project. Therefore, in this section of this study, both evaluation and monitoring are subject to analysis. In this programme, evaluation is defined as “a periodic assessment of a program to assess progress towards achieving the pre-set objectives” whereas, monitoring is defined as “a process that involves continuous follow-up in accordance with program objectives” (MOEC, 1996). In other words, while monitoring is regarded as continuous “follow-up” in the light of the objectives of the programme, evaluation is regarded as an “assessment” of the progress towards attaining those objectives. The purpose of M&E is mainly operational (see Table 6.3), which aims to analyze and improve the intervention as well as to acquire new knowledge. The indicators used as a base for the M&E of the ICBAE programme are summarized in Table 9.3.

Table 9.3: Indicators in monitoring and evaluation of the ICBAE programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Mobilization</td>
<td>Enrollment rates and attendance for adult learners and facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Contributions made by NGOs, District Executive Director and financing partners; Number of project groups; Number of visits to project sites; Number of studies conducted; Number of libraries established and ward development organizations created</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td>Basic competency attained by adult learners; Number of inspections carried out at project sites; Record-keeping; Number of facilitators trained and their performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>Reading, life and survival skills acquired; Number of women participating in decision-making; Behavioral and attitudinal changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery</td>
<td>Services provided; Facilitator-adult learner ratio and availability of physical facilities necessary to sustain literacy skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mnjagila, 1997

Timing of M&E: Three types of evaluation had been planned: mid-term evaluation, annual evaluation, and summative evaluation. Regular monitoring of the projects had also been planned to be in the form of quarterly, biannual and annual reports from programme sites, the district level and the national level (MOEC, 1996). The case evaluations for this current study are mid-term evaluation, which is very close to annual monitoring. It has been pointed out in many of the responses to the questionnaires and interviews that actors in the communities (learners, teachers and facilitators) would have preferred the timing to have been set by themselves and more aligned with their daily activities and that the schedule for M&E had been pre-specified.

Roles and Quality of Evaluator(s): It is stated in one evaluation policy document that “M&E should not be directed towards fault-finding; rather, it should be a learning experience, i.e. done with the intention to learn, improve programs and achieve program goals” (MOEC, 1996). In line with the spirit of this statement, both internal evaluation which is conducted by community members as well as external evaluation which is conducted by local and international experts had been planned. Internal evaluation had been expected to encourage teamwork and to enhance accountability whereas external evaluation had been expected to deliver more technical knowledge and insights. The evaluator was to be seen more as a facilitator in advancing the multiple perspectives of the stakeholders.

As to the qualifications of the evaluators, the external evaluation conducted in 1996 was carried out by a Tanzanian consultant, whose field of specialty is adult education and non-formal education. The evaluation conducted in 1998 was conducted by an official from Tanzanian MOEC and two Canadian programme development officers attached to the MOEC. As to the selection of evaluators, this was to be in accordance with the criteria stipulated in the Terms of Reference, whereby the MOEC appointed a team comprised of national and international evaluators.
consultants with expertise in non-formal adult literacy as well as in participatory methodologies (MOEC, 1999; Interview data: MOEC officer M).

9.2.2 Monitoring and Evaluation Design and Methods
An analysis of the evaluation design and methods, according to the meta-evaluation criteria, are presented in Table 9.4. Each item is explained further after the Table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9.4: Monitoring and evaluation designs and methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996 Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time and human resource input</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder involvement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data collection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report clarity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project documentation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context analysis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dissemination of results (feedback)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy recommendations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: DEC = District Education Coordinator; WEC = Ward Education Coordinator*
**Evaluation objectives:** As indicated in Table 9.4, both of these evaluations, being formative in nature, had the aim of facilitating improvements to the project and of documenting project operations. They are both in accordance with the overall M&E purpose stated in Section 9.2.1 above, assessing the extent to which the project operations were in line with the goals of the project/programme goals, identifying potentials of, and constrains on, the project in light of the realities of the project, and generating practical suggestions for improvement of the project/programme in the future.

**Resource and Expenditure of Time:** About a month was spent on both evaluations, including report writing. For the 1996 evaluation, the one evaluator employed was sponsored by the GoT. For the 1998 evaluation, 1 MOEC official together with 2 Canadian programme development officers from the MOEC were employed, sponsored by the WUSC of Canada\(^\text{117}\) (Interview data, MOEC officer \(M\)).

**Data Collection/Information Scope and Selection:** Suggestions were made in a report from the MOEC (Mnjagila, 1998) that evaluators investigate outcomes and impacts, such as improved self confidence, self-esteem in participants; ability of a learning circle to resolve internal conflicts, the number of actions taken by the circles and the level of success of each such action, changes in community organizations as a result of literacy, changes and increases in local literacy, school enrolment of participants’ children, new areas of knowledge in the community, impact on participants’ income and control over income, the participation of women, resource management, health care, cost effectiveness and the impact of facilitators. The types of data actually collected and the data collection methods are presented in Table 9.4. Most of the issues proposed by the MOEC for evaluation were subsequently covered systematically, particularly in the 1998 evaluation.

**Stakeholder involvement:** At the earliest stage, the programme initiators from both the MOEC and the international agency, visited villages in order to identify the various problems and priorities in each community. All the key stakeholders were intended to be involved in the evaluation: village participants, facilitators, ward/district officers, the national government, ODC agencies and other ICBAE practitioners with experience of implementation in other countries (MOEC, 1999; Interview data: District officer, MOEC officer \(M\)). Intended involvement in monitoring and evaluation on the part of stakeholder groups is presented in Table 9.5.

Moreover, the Project Review Committee, consisting of members from SIAST, WUSC, University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM) and MOEC together with participant representatives at the project level, have met once a year in order to:

1. review the progress and the level of attainment with regard to the objectives of the programme and effectiveness in relation to the annual plan and budget,
2. assess management efficiency, quality and adequacy of the facilitators, and

---

\(^\text{117}\) World University Service of Canada (WUSC) is a national organization established in 1939 with the goal of fostering human development and global understanding through education and training.
3. assess programme implementation activities in the new districts and to make recommendations on possible improvements in programme design and strategies (Mushi, 1998).

Table 9.5: Involvement in monitoring and evaluation on the part of stakeholder groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Roles and responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village participants</td>
<td>To identify indicators which they can monitor themselves e.g. learning achievement, performance of facilitator, quality of discussions, costs, and income-generating projects; as well as to informally monitor/evaluate their own progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitators</td>
<td>To monitor attendance, quality of learning contents, participants’ literacy and numeracy skills, level of participation of each participant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Education Coordinator</td>
<td>To monitor frequency of meetings, quality of learning contents, facilitators remuneration, materials provision, attendance, revolving loan fund data, data on mini-projects, costs. To conduct M&amp;E with community members and facilitators and informal meetings either when working on the farms or during the class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Adult Education Coordinator</td>
<td>To assist Ward Education Coordinator; to collect and summarize data; to report to MOEC and Regional office; to offer support, communication, and transport if needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOEC</td>
<td>To coordinate and to manage data and reports submitted from the ward, district and regional levels; to visits project sites regularly for data collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODC agencies</td>
<td>Evaluate the allocation and utilization of financial, human and material resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Mnjagila (1998), MOEC (1999), and Ramadhani (2000)*

However, the evaluation reports of the cases for this current study collected data mainly at the village level, complemented with data from ward and district levels. Thorough systematic stakeholder involvement suggested in the above mentioned documents were not identified in this study. Although the detailed arrangements for involving all the stakeholder groups are in existence here, it is still nonetheless necessary for the means of identifying different information needs of the various stakeholder groups to be expressed with greater clarity in order for evaluation results to be more relevant and useful to the various stakeholder groups.

*Report Clarity:* There are differences in style and structure between these two reports. The 1996 report is written in a more informal manner which is more of a narrative, while the 1998 report contains richer information, displayed in a clear and systematic manner, following the programme monitoring form. On the other hand, the executive summary does not contain very much information, merely stating the objectives of the visits and information as to those who conducted the evaluation, when and where. In addition, in the 1998 evaluation, the terms “monitoring” and “evaluation” are used interchangeably, which indicates that in the community-based participatory approach, demarcation between these two may be unclear, as the activities overlap. For information management purposes, some degree of standardization is required for future evaluation reports.
**Project Documentation and Content of the Report:** The 1996 evaluation describes the actual project operations in detail, based on the documentation collected and interviews from the national to local levels. Discrepancies were identified in the report, between the intended plan for project operations and the actual operations, where practical suggestions were offered for all the stakeholder groups. The concerns and voices of the various stakeholder groups, especially of the communities are presented in the report. The evaluation revealed the lack of systematic documentation with regard to the monitoring reports, which subsequently had negatively affected the efficiency and effectiveness of evaluation.

The 1998 evaluation provides a systematic and clear summary, village by village, of the activities of the programme and the attainments of the learners. In addition, the socio-economic context of each village was analyzed. The methods employed were mainly the document collection, observations, and in-depth interviews. The many topics included in the in-depth discussions are enumerated in the report, concerning the content and operation of the project. Various types of problems at different levels are also reported, based on the observations and discussions, such as malnutrition; poor housing; and inadequate capital for the operation of the project. In both evaluation reports, the voices of stakeholders from various levels are represented and the issues dealt with in the reports in general are largely based on their views and the evaluators’ observations.

As to policy recommendations, the 1996 report provides detailed practical suggestions, based on fieldwork, for all the key stakeholder groups. These suggestions include the organizing of village-centred workshops and seminars; the improvement of the monitoring system, particularly with regard to documentation and dissemination of information (feedback) and the gradual expansion of the programme. The 1998 report analyzes the strengths and problems confronting each ward, and concrete suggestions and recommendations are offered, based on their observations and interviews. Both reports provide long lists of recommendations based on their respective fieldwork. Systematic feedback systems are considered to be vital in order to reflect the results of the evaluation whereby the programme might subsequently be effectively improved.

**Context Analysis:** Both the 1996 and the 1998 evaluation reports contain somewhat brief but nonetheless holistic analysis of the socio-economic, geographic, demographic and organizational features of each village as contextual information. The stakeholders who have responded to the questionnaires and interviews in this study found no reason to argue against this context analysis in the evaluation reports. It would appear reasonable to suggest that this is because both evaluation teams included Tanzanian expertise, having specialist experience in non-formal adult education in Tanzania over several decades, together with team-members who were familiar with the ICBAE project, whereby as evaluators they were automatically legitimized in the eyes of the stakeholders as possessing the requisite empathetic understanding of both the project and its context.

**Dissemination of Results / Feedback:** With regard to the 1996 evaluation, the evaluation feedback session was organized by the MOEC, involving key
stakeholders, in order to disseminate the results of the evaluation. Both the 1996 and
the 1998 evaluation reports, written in English, were distributed to the regional,
district and ward levels. However, feedback to the village level required translation of
the report into Kiswahili, and the report was not systematically distributed, partly due
to the shortage of transport. Shortage of vehicles for transportation had prevented
ward and district officers from frequently visiting village in the interest of improved
communication, which subsequently resulted in a limitation on evaluation feedback in
a timely manner. (Interview data: District officer; MOEC officer N).

Value Description: Values constructed in the evaluation reports were very much
based on data obtained from observations, discussions and interviews with the
stakeholders. They are descriptive, reporting the various claims, concerns and issues
on the part of the stakeholders about the project that had been identified by the
stakeholders themselves through discussions with the evaluator(s). Thus, the
evaluation report is naturally built on the operational issues in the project and their
influence on stakeholders, representing those various values and needs that were the
direct interests of the stakeholders. Evaluation based on descriptive value theory (see
4.5.1 for theoretical discussion) has the potential to increase the utility of evaluation
results and process by the optimal of stakeholder groups.

Use of the Evaluation Results: The respondents from the villages reported in this
study view M&E positively since their views had been directly reflected in the report
and thus had provided opportunities for follow-ups by the relevant levels of
stakeholder groups, namely the ward, the district, and the Ministry as well as the
other development partners, the ODC agencies and NGOs.

On the other hand, the adoption of learner-centred participatory methods in
M&E, as well as in the other parts of the project cycle, had resulted in better process
use (see Section 4.5.1, use for theoretical understanding of the concept). The
evaluation process itself, not only the evaluation results, had influenced the
psychological aspects on the part of the village participants, creating shared
understandings and enhancing confidence, which had contributed to their
empowering themselves at individual and collective levels (see Section 9.3.1
Learner-Centred Participatory Approach and Formal Leadership for more
elaborated discussion).

9.3 Stakeholders Views on Monitoring and Evaluation

9.3.1 Potentials and Constraints of the Monitoring and Evaluation

In the previous section, the practices and results of M&E have been analyzed in the
light of both social programme evaluation theory and the meta-evaluation framework.
In this section, M&E are examined from the perspectives of the stakeholders. All the
issues taken up is this section emerged from the responses to the questionnaires and
interviews used in this study (see Chapter 5 for description of data collection and
analysis methods and see Appendix for the data collection instruments).
Consequently, the items in Figure 9.2, have also been developed from the data derived from the questionnaires and interviews, which is presented in order to identify the various issues raised by different groups of stakeholders concerning the strengths of the M&E approaches adopted for the programme. The next step has been to identify categories, the relations between which are also illustrated in the Figure 9.2. The combination of the following aspects (the top row in the figure) i.e. frequent monitoring, community participation, learner-centred approach, and formal leadership contributes to (indicated with the arrows) an increase and improvement in knowledge construction, programme development, teaching and learning practices, as well as empowerment, which all ultimately results in (indicated with arrows) programme improvement, capacity strengthening, and increased awareness of social problems.

In contrast, the various issues raised by all the stakeholder groups concerning constraints on the M&E of the ICBAE programme and their suggested solutions are summarized in Table 9.6, below. These constraints and solutions are classified into three categories, namely financial/technical resources, methodological approach, and socio-cultural issues. These issues will be discussed further in Section 9.3.2.

These categories emerged out of the data from the responses to questionnaires and interviews, but it is not claimed that these constitute the only possible categories. In fact, the demarcation of categories is not necessarily as clear-cut as it appears when illustrated in Figure 9.2, since a complex pattern of sub-categories and/or overlapping categories are apparent in reality, bearing in mind the various political, economic and
socio-cultural contexts at the level of the individual, the community level and the national level. Strictly speaking, Figure 9.2 should therefore be regarded as an outline summary of the researcher’s interpretation of the perspectives of stakeholders on these particular issues, as they emerge from the responses to the interviews and questionnaires. Some of the key issues presented in Figure 9.2 and Table 9.6 will be discussed in more detail after the Table 9.6.

Table 9.6: Constraints on M&E of the ICBAE programme and solutions proposed by stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraints</th>
<th>Methodological approach</th>
<th>Socio-cultural issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of funds, teaching materials, transportation</td>
<td>• Poor skills for M&amp;E</td>
<td>• Difficulty in mobilizing people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shortage of facilitators</td>
<td>• Poor understanding of programme itself</td>
<td>• Resistance to changing mentality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poor skills for M&amp;E</td>
<td>• Timing difficulties</td>
<td>• Poor understanding of M&amp;E purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poor understanding of programme itself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timing difficulties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timing difficulties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shortage of facilitators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poor understanding of programme itself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of funds, teaching materials, transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shortage of facilitators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Difficulty in mobilizing people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resistance to changing mentality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poor understanding of M&amp;E purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Difficulty in mobilizing people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resistance to changing mentality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poor understanding of M&amp;E purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timing difficulties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shortage of facilitators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Difficulty in mobilizing people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resistance to changing mentality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poor understanding of M&amp;E purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timing difficulties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shortage of facilitators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Difficulty in mobilizing people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resistance to changing mentality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poor understanding of M&amp;E purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timing difficulties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shortage of facilitators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Difficulty in mobilizing people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resistance to changing mentality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poor understanding of M&amp;E purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timing difficulties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shortage of facilitators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Difficulty in mobilizing people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resistance to changing mentality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poor understanding of M&amp;E purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timing difficulties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shortage of facilitators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Difficulty in mobilizing people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resistance to changing mentality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poor understanding of M&amp;E purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timing difficulties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shortage of facilitators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequent Monitoring: As reviewed in the previous sections, the programme is to be regularly monitored through quarterly, biannual and annual reports at the village, ward, district and national levels. Many of the respondents in the interviews and questionnaires point out that this frequent monitoring at the project sites had been one of the major strengths of the M&E, contributing to better understanding of the reality of the programme for all the stakeholders groups. This frequent monitoring not only had positive effects with regard to technical aspects of the programme, such as prompt and effective problem identification rooted in the reality of each community and thereby contributing to the improvement of the programme improvement, but also on the aspects concerning the socio-psychological status of the participants, such as increased interests and motivation, together with active interaction between learners and teachers/facilitators. However, shortcomings with regard to financial/physical resources are identified as major obstacle with regard to frequent monitoring. Particularly, transport difficulties for the District Adult Education Coordinators are reported to have been crucial since the shortage of vehicles meant that they had to place an inordinate amount of reliance on written reports, the content of which did not always accurately reflect realities in the local communities in a timely manner. This is described as having been a serious problem by respondents from both the village level and the district level (Questionnaire data 2003; MOEC, 2002).

Community Participation: Chambers (1994) claims that participation is important because people are not merely “objects” to be acted upon to bring about change but
rather active “subjects” who are able to transform themselves and their environment through effective participation. The expectation, when the REFLECT methodology had been adopted, had been that collective learning would thereby be facilitated among participants together with greater solidarity in order to attain the objectives of the programme. Various strategies had been introduced in order to enhance community participation in the programme (see details in Section 9.1.2). Community mobilization and sensitization efforts had been made, which is something that is appreciated by many community members (questionnaires, 2003). However, Ramadhani (2000), who conducted research on the management aspects of the ICBAE programme, has demonstrated that key stakeholders, such as community members, facilitators and group leaders, were not involved during the initiation stage of the programme. Difficulties with regard to realizing mobilization was repeatedly reported in the responses to the questionnaires, as people in communities, including those actually responsible for mobilizing the community, were at the same time fully occupied with their daily activities, including family life and agricultural work (Questionnaires data 2003: district, principals, facilitators). The issue of mobilization is related to the issue of “incentive,” which involves the interdependence of various factors, such as an economic factor (financial reward), a social factor (status and influence), and an ideological factor (personal and societal development), each of which must, to some extent, be taken into account. However, it should be noted that the lack of motivation among learners with regard to attendance in the project may not be caused only by those factors in which they are enveloped, but also by some facilitators not having been adequately qualified and from inappropriate methods of instruction (a technical factor) having been used. Many projects had not been run in the manner initially planned or had discontinued operations completely for various reasons, such as insufficient funds and facilities or affected by natural disasters (ibid.). Furthermore, as Fullan (1993) point out, it has to be recognized that a period of time must elapse in order for bottom-up participation in decision-making to be internalized in a society where “top-down” models of educational management have been institutionalized for decades.

Learner-centred Participatory Approach and Formal Leadership: The programme had adopted the learner-centred participatory method for M&E, which is appreciated by the village learners, for the following reasons:
1. it made it possible for the views of learners to be directly reflected in the report and thereby facilitated follow-ups by the appropriate levels of authority; and
2. learners have been empowered by being granted greater degrees of influence.

Empowerment can be observed at two levels: the individual level, where learners are more motivated by positive encouragement on the part of both teachers/facilitators and fellow learners; and the collective level: where participants have become more organized as a group, with the relationships among and between learners and teachers/facilitators clearly improved (Questionnaires data 2003; Interview data: MOEC officer, District officer, facilitator; and Field observation).

The respondents point out that formal leadership has been an asset in the application of non-traditional learner-centred participatory methods, whereby learners are expected to establish active interactions both with each other and with the
teachers. Village leaders have often been selected to be facilitators, as both their social position and their personal qualities for leadership roles have already been acknowledged in the community, which has been advantageous during the implementation stage of the programme as well as the institutionalization stage, as an effect of the programme.

Although quality and ability with regard to leadership have a considerable effect on the process of monitoring and evaluation, inadequate practical guidance and lack of skills in monitoring and evaluation are pointed out by the informants and respondents in the present research and they recommend further workshops and seminars. This issue is closely related to capacity strengthening, which is discussed in the following sub-section.

**Capacity strengthening**: As is illustrated in Figure 9.2, capacity strengthening is one of the key potentials in the use of the M&E approach in Case B. The adoption of the REFLECT methodology brings in greater local relevancy in the M&E process and outcomes, which subsequently enhances understanding of the reality of the programme on the part of all stakeholder groups (Questionnaires, 2003). Moreover, it facilitates empowerment at both the individual level and the collective level, as discussed previously. At the individual level, learners have acquired greater motivation through participating to the process. At the collective level, such effects as better group organization and improved relations among participants have been observed (Questionnaires, 2003). All these factors are to be regarded as assets for capacity strengthening, mainly at the community level.

Capacity strengthening of facilitators in using the REFLECT methodology is also raised as an issue by the informants and respondents. Two-week seminars on the use of the REFLECT methodology were held but this is regarded as having been too short to properly equip them with enough knowledge and skills on the principles of adult education and the means for empowering the community (Swai, 1999; Questionnaire, 2003). Many respondents suggested instead a month-long seminars/workshops for facilitators in order to improve the quality of M&E (Questionnaires, 2003).

Several studies have indicated that systematic M&E was not as yet sufficiently developed in order to assess the level of attainment of the objectives of the project (MOEC, 2000; Aoki, 2001; Questionnaires, 2003). Without adequate training being provided, the facilitators and learners had simply been left with the concept of participatory M&E (Questionnaires, 2003). Many respondents express concern that participants had been left on their own with lists of monitoring indicators, having been instructed that “participants should determine monitoring indicators themselves,” although without any clear explanation as to how they were to go about this. Since the ICBAE programme had adopted the REFLECT methodology, considerable creativity and ability on the part of the facilitators was also required. More concretely, in non-formal adult education, what may be more important for teachers/facilitators than merely an acquisition of technical skills of M&E is, as Carr-Hill, Kweka, Rusimbi, and Chengelele (1991) report, some specialized teaching, raising motivation of learners, and rewarding. Training in the areas of adult psychology and motivation is vital (ibid.). Although in theory this learner-centred
participatory approach is positive, in reality, there had been inadequate guidance and tools available for the facilitators to be able to lead M&E activities. Facilitators need more assistance and should be more adequately equipped with appropriate knowledge and tools for M&E. It has to be recognized that it is necessary for a M&E culture to be carefully and gradually developed, while strengthening the capacity of local participants. At the same time, appropriate guidelines on M&E, to facilitate the establishment of a network of clear communication from the community level through to the national level, should be considered. Capacity building or strengthening are required for all the various levels of stakeholders.

Financial support: Two different types of source of finance have been identified with regard to this programme: 1) internal sources, which come from the national government, district councils, and individual contributions from members of the community; and 2) external sources which are contributed from international agencies, such as CIDA, Sida, SIAST, and loans from ADB.

Inadequate levels of funding are regarded as the most important aspect of the financial constraints on the programme as a whole and on M&E in particular, whereby there had been shortcomings in the payment of remunerations to facilitators, lack of teaching/learning materials, inadequate facilities and transport difficulties (Interview data: MOEC, district officer; Questionnaires 2003; Ramadhani, 2000; Aoki, 2001a). In particular, financial short-falls with regard to remunerations to the facilitators is an issue raised by many respondents in the questionnaires (Questionnaires, 2003). During the pilot phase of the programme, the plan had been for facilitators to be paid Tsh. 3,000 per month, but in the event most of them did not receive any remuneration (Aoki, 2001a; Questionnaires, 2003) which naturally has a considerable effect on their willingness to continue being actively involved. Moreover, the importance of revolving loan funds\textsuperscript{118} is stressed by respondents from the district level (Questionnaires, 2003). One solution suggested by respondents would be to increase funds to allow adequate allocations to be made as well as more funding from the development partners (ibid.).

Evaluation practice: Views with regard to evaluation practices on the part of those stakeholders providing the data for this study are categorized into four main issues: methodological approach, language used, timing, and feedback. Firstly, most of the respondents suggest that use of the REFLECT methodology be continued but with additional training for the facilitators. Secondly, as to language, the most common suggestion is that simple Kiswahili be used, while some others suggest elementary English as an alternative. Thirdly, timing of the M&E is indicated as an important issue, with many respondents suggesting that monthly monitoring would be ideal, even though there are shortcomings with regard to necessary transportation. Respondents at the village, ward and district levels suggest that the timing of monitoring should be determined in a flexible manner in line with the schedule of the learners and adequate advance notice should be given with regard to the timing of

\textsuperscript{118} Revolving loans are used for funding seed money provided to the learners as loans to enable them to carry out their income-generating activities.
evaluation in order for as many as possible to be able to make time available for participating in it. Finally, with regard to feedback from evaluation, most of the respondents at the national, district and ward levels state that they have had access to a few of the reports from previous evaluations. However, this is not the case for any of the respondents at the village level. An effective feedback system in monitoring and evaluation was desired (Interview data: principals, facilitators).

Socio-cultural issues: Most of M&E have been conducted by those who knew the program in depth, which ought to indicate higher internal validity, being embedded in the socio-cultural and political context in a manner which is not the case with regard to external evaluations. The language used was Kiswahili, which was appropriately adjusted to the learners. However, as was mentioned in the previous section on capacity strengthening, “a culture of M&E” had not necessarily become embedded in the existing local culture and a more substantial amount of time would have to be considered in order to localize it in that way. Some of the villagers had different expectations with regard to M&E, such as entertaining the hope that it might provide an opportunity for obtaining extra funds. It has still been possible to observe top-down relationships cross the various levels of stakeholders in the programme even though there had been much encouragement for, and an emphasis on, participatory and bottom-up approaches (Interview data: MOEC officer; Ramadhani, 2000).

Another issue raised by the informants is the sensitization and mobilization of the villagers even though they had been fully engaged in their own daily activities, particularly during harvesting. Village leaders nonetheless continue to have an influential role in sensitizing local people because villagers will listen more carefully to their village leaders than they will to any officials from the Ministry (Interview data: MOEC officer). In a traditional, closely-knit community, any existing and long-established power structure within that community is invaluable when new forms of learning are to be developed.

9.3.2 Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation by Stakeholder Groups

In Section 9.3.1, key issues concerning the stakeholders’ perspectives on M&E were discussed in a holistic manner, based on the data from the interviews and questionnaires and complimented by relevant data from documents. Assessments of the M&E approach on the part of various stakeholder groups are displayed in Table 9.7.

Table 9.7: Perspectives on/assessments of the M&E approach by different stakeholder groups

---

119 “ODC agencies” are not included in Table 9.7 because as to Case B, ODC agencies were remaining merely as co-financiers of the programme, and had very little involvement in the programme implementation processes including evaluation. The programme adopted a decentralized approach to management, and authority was delegated to the national government (Interview data: Sida HQ/Tanzania office; CIDA Tanzania office).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths/potentials of M&amp;E</th>
<th>Constraints on M&amp;E</th>
<th>Suggestions for improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective management: Cost effectiveness regarding resource allocation/utilization</td>
<td>Inadequate funding: Inadequate remunerations for facilitators and revolving funds; inadequate allocation of funds for M&amp;E</td>
<td>Financial support: Increased funding by development partners; adequate allocation of funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community participation: Effective identification of needs/situations of learners; positive socio-psychological effect on the community</td>
<td>Methodological weakness: Weak M&amp;E method/system</td>
<td>Methodological support: Provision of systematic M&amp;E tools, use of simple language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment: Participants select their own leaders</td>
<td>Lack of transportation: Shortage of transportation negatively affects frequency of monitoring</td>
<td>Facilitator qualifications: Training for facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership: Formal leadership activates group</td>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-up: Prompt follow up of M&amp;E results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Empowering participants: Capacity building, sensitizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent Monitoring: Proper understanding of the community situation; good communication with communities</td>
<td>Lack of funds and materials: Insufficient funds and materials for conducting appropriate M&amp;E</td>
<td>Financial support: Increased allocation of funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community participation: Prompt problem identification and solution that is relevant to community</td>
<td>Lack of transportation: Shortage of transport negatively affects frequency of monitoring</td>
<td>Methods issue: Continuous use of REFLECT method; use of simple language (Kiswahili or easy English); learner-centred timing of M&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner-centeredness: Active inter-learning among participants</td>
<td>Different expectations from community: Expectation of inordinate financial rewards</td>
<td>Capacity strengthening: Monthly seminar/workshop for facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-psychological: Good organization as a group; active inter-learning among participants; increased incentive and motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community mobilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility: Convenient location for participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective problem identification: Effective analysis/identification/solution of learners’ needs through interactive process</td>
<td>Lack of funds /materials: Inadequate funds/materials for M&amp;E decreases incentive</td>
<td>Financial support: Increased allocation of funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-psychological effects: Good organization as a group; active inter-learning among participants; sound relationships among participants; empowerment</td>
<td>Methodological weakness: Lack of trained teachers/facilitators results in poor group skills in M&amp;E</td>
<td>Issues in methods: Continuous use of REFLECT method; simple language; learner-centred timing of M&amp;E; use of encouraging and simple methods; monthly monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity strengthening: Increased motivation and ownership</td>
<td>Insufficient informing of program to community: Poor introduction of programme purpose</td>
<td>Capacity strengthening: Monthly seminar/workshop for facilitators to improve and facilitate their work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual learning: Participants at various levels learn from each other</td>
<td>Difficulty in mobilizing participants: Poor rate of participants’ attendance due to daily commitments</td>
<td>Localized content: Application of issues/materials which are in their local environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Case B 157**

**Local University**

- **Community participation**: Effective identification of community needs, people centered development
- **Capacity strengthening**: Increased sustainability
- **Lack of funds/materials**: Lack of funds/materials for conducting good M&E
- **Methodological weakness**: Lack of trained teachers/facilitators.
- **Weak system**: Irregular M&E affects quality control, accountability, and transparency.
- **Financial support**: Increased allocation of funds, linkage to other program(s)
- **Issues in methods**: Continuous use of REFLECT method; simple language; learner centred timing of M&E

**Strengthen M&E system**: Periodic review meeting

**Capacity strengthening**: Training of facilitators

**Collaboration with partners**: Sensitize communities together with e.g. NGO, to raise awareness and sense of ownership

---

**Note**: * Community includes facilitators, principal/vice principals, and learners.

**See Community Participation in Section 9.3.1 for various factors**

**Strengths and potential of M&E**: The potential of the M&E approaches that has been identified is similar across the different stakeholder groups, although some variations in the main tendencies have been noticed. Respondents at the national and district levels stress, from a macro perspective, the potential with regard to community. This community-based approach, using a learner-centred participatory methodology, is seen as having worked as a catalyst in enhancing community development. As is stated in Section 9.1.1, this approach is in line with the current educational policy of the government, where the importance of reflecting local community needs and interests in policy is emphasized.

Respondents from all groups of stakeholders recognize the potentials of M&E from the project management aspect, such as the community-centred participatory approach, the frequent and systematic monitoring, and effective problem identification.

The potential concerning the socio-psychological aspect is also reported by respondents from all the stakeholder groups, but particularly those from the community levels. A number of potentials identified by various stakeholder groups are also reported in various documents (Mbunda, 1996; Maiga, Taylor & Taylor, 1998; Katunzi, 2000; Mushi, Malekela, & Bhalalusesa, 2002; MOEC, 2002 b), which were similar to the ones from respondents in this study.

**Constraints on M&E and suggested solutions**: The constraints on M&E identified by stakeholders may be classified into three categories: financial/physical resources, methodological approach and socio-cultural issues (see Table 9.6). In Table 9.7, the various perceptions across stakeholder groups and their similarities are illustrated.

Firstly, inadequacies with regard to financial/physical resources are reported by respondents from all the stakeholder groups. Funding for the remuneration of facilitators and for the revolving fund, as well as shortcomings with regard to transport for monitoring purposes, are all identified as having been crucial problems. These financial difficulties have been repeatedly reported in various documents, such as evaluation reports and programme reports. As a solution, respondents from all stakeholder groups proposed that the allocation of funds by the government be increased. The Ministry had made efforts to raise funds from various agencies, as
well as attempting to carry out frequent follow-up visits to project sites. However, inadequate funds imposed limitation on the fulfilment of the plan. Thus communication between the Ministry and various levels of the administration had to be carried out through written reports, which had caused delays and an inadequate quality of monitoring and follow-up (Interview data: MOEC officer M; Ramadhani, 2000). Inadequate financial allocation was not entirely the fault of the Ministry. It is reported that some districts failed to provide sufficient funds to M&E and training for facilitators and for group leaders (Ramadhani, 2000). Management capacity strengthening at the district level should be considered, especially as a greater degree of authority had devolved to this level during the course of decentralization. Provision of adequate materials, such as practical M&E guidelines, are called for by respondents at the community, ward and district levels. Though the aim of the programme had been to promote a community-based approach for M&E, without comprehensive guidelines and guidance, it appears difficult for any community to participate meaningfully in M&E.

Secondly, concern about the inadequate levels of competence with regard to methodological knowledge and skills for M&E is expressed by respondents at the community level and the national level. The statements from the respondents at the community level on this issue are from a more micro perspective, such as the shortage of trained teachers/facilitators in M&E, whereas those from the government regard this issue from a more macro perspective, pointing out the insufficiencies with regard to the development of M&E methodology as well as the M&E system. As to the training of teachers/facilitators, monthly seminars/workshops are suggested by respondents at the community, ward and district levels. Respondents from the MOEC suggest para-professional teachers be hired as facilitators.

As to the strengthening of the M&E system, no particular solution is proposed by the respondents, except the continued application of those methods that are already in practice. It would appear that a critical review of those M&E methods and system already in practice is required.

Thirdly, regarding the socio-cultural aspect, difficulties in mobilizing villagers are taken up by respondents from the community and the ward levels. Problems regarding motivation are taken up by many respondents from the community level. Additionally, irrelevant expectations from members of the community are reported by respondents from the district and ward levels. The importance of capacity strengthening, confidence making and sensitizing at the community level are recognized by the respondents at the national level (Questionnaires, 2003; Interview data: MOEC officers N and B). This implies that more sensitization seminars would be desirable.

The programme is reported as having been well received by the members of the communities at the time that it was piloted, contributing to social and economic improvements, particularly with regard to the poorer communities (Mnjagila, 1998; Mushi, 1998; Aoiki, 2001; Interview data: MOEC officer M, B, and T). It appears that the sustainability of educational programmes is dependent on linkages between:

1) the programme in question and other programmes operating in the communities which have national or NGO support;

2) effective leadership;
3) appropriate utilization of resources;
4) capacity strengthening of stakeholder groups at every level;
5) frequent monitoring and evaluation; and
6) an effective communication system.

Mushi (1999) emphasized that the success of this programme depends largely on the ability of the Ministry and the district councils to facilitate the implementation of the planned interventions, a willingness on the part of the local communities to participate in the development of their own education, and the availability of counterparts’ support. Moreover, large scale sensitization as well as mobilization of the NGOs, local partners would be desirable, and finally appropriate coordination at community, district and national levels are imperative in order for this to be realized.

9.4 Concluding Remarks

This chapter presented the second project evaluation case analysis (Case B) using the meta-evaluation framework. Compared to Case A, presented in the Chapter 8, the approach in Case B is more community-based, and actively utilizes participatory methods.

It may be concluded, however, in Case B, that no basic disagreement or conflict have been identified with regard to the perspectives on, and assessment of, the M&E approach on the part of the various stakeholder groups. Although in practice, there are different concerns and problems in the various stakeholder groups, they nonetheless fall under the same broad macro issue, sharing the same direction towards the goal of the programme. It is repeated frequently by the respondents to the questionnaires and interviews, as well as in the relevant documentation, that the adoption of the community-oriented participatory approach in the programme would appear to have contributed to the emergence of a consensus during the project process, thereby having reduced unnecessary conflicts among stakeholders. Respondents from all the stakeholder groups found positive socio-psychological effects of this participatory approach in the community. Also, they have experienced improved communication and an increased collaborative atmosphere among stakeholders. Although the methods and content of the evaluation have been relatively simple, the results are perceived as having local relevancy by respondents from every stakeholder group.

However, research has indicated that the systematic feed-back of the findings of the evaluation to the communities has been totally inadequate, as was found also in Case A. It has also been indicated that financial support for resources as well as for capacity strengthening at various levels must be regarded as critical in order for such community-based participatory evaluation to be sustained. Although many remaining challenges have been identified to which no solution has as yet been found, as discussed in this chapter, nonetheless these are issues which are recognized and spelled out by all stakeholders concerned.

In the following chapters, the two cases presented individually in Chapter 8 and Chapter 9 will be compared, examining their respective international macro context.
Chapter Ten

Meta-Evaluative Comparison Framework

Two cases have been presented in detail, one in Chapter 8 (Case A) and the other in Chapter 9 (Case B), using the meta-evaluation framework adopted for this study. Each case has been described in terms of their complexities and issues, which have been analyzed together with the perspectives of various stakeholder groups regarding the respective evaluation practices. This is now to be followed, in the present chapter, by the development of a comparative framework, whereby the two cases are placed in macro contexts. The purpose here is to facilitate further in-depth understanding of the cases in terms of their respective relationships with various general ODC approaches.

10.1 Contextual Framework

In Table 10.1, a somewhat simplified outline is developed as a first step in the construction of the analytical rationales for comparing these two evaluation cases. Although there is a danger here of oversimplification, the outline nonetheless facilitates some understanding and characterization of the cases in the light of their respective time-frames which have implications for the ODC policy and approach, together with the aims of projects and management approaches.

The major common denominator for the two cases is that they are both project evaluations of non-formal basic adult education in Tanzania.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approach to ODC and its implication to evaluation</td>
<td>Project-based Approach (PBA)</td>
<td>Sector Wide Approach (SWAp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implication for evaluation: ODC agency-driven evaluation e.g. accountability, operational efficiency, policy concern evaluation.</td>
<td>Implication for evaluation: Conduct of Joint evaluation derived from community-based monitoring data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative features</td>
<td>Swedish-Tanzanian Model: Bilateral partnership based on humanitarian moral duty and international solidarity</td>
<td>Community-based participatory approach: Decentralization of authority, reduced involvement of ODC agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stated aim of project</td>
<td>To promote democracy and vocational skills throughout rural areas</td>
<td>To support post-literacy initiatives through development of a learner-centred and community-based approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach to management</td>
<td>Top-down/consultative: Tanzanian ministries and Swedish management team play key role</td>
<td>Bottom-up: District level plays key role through communicating village level to the ministry level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

120 The cases having been placed in their context in a comparative manner, the comparative framework for the cases themselves are subsequently developed in Section 10.4.

121 See Section 10.3.2 for more details.
In short, Case A may be regarded as a typical donor evaluation through a structure using the Project-based approach (PBA), whereas Case B may be regarded as a project evaluation under the early implementation stage of the Sector Wide Approaches (SWAp).  

The project of Case A provides a good example for gaining more understanding of Swedish ODC policy, having a relatively long time-frame i.e. two decades, reflecting a certain type of ODC policy discussed above, in Section 3.2.3. Similarly, the evaluation forming Case A may be regarded as constituting a typical ODC evaluation under the PBA. In this structure, the ODC agency conducts evaluation in accordance with its own evaluation policy and guidelines, implying that one of the major purposes of evaluation is public accountability and lesson learning for the agency itself, whereas the project management aspect at the micro level is often overlooked (see Section 6.1.2 for details). Timing of evaluation is often set by the ODC agencies within their own project-cycle framework and evaluation Terms of Reference are established in accordance with the evaluation policy and guidelines of the agency concerned and, finally, evaluation teams are selected by the ODC agencies themselves. As to project management style, this may be characterized as top-down, where curriculums are drawn up centrally and administrative decisions are taken by the Ministry. The Swedish project management team had a consultative role, providing significant input in the area of capacity strengthening at various levels of the project, from the colleges to the Ministry.

On the other hand, the project, the evaluation of which is researched here as Case B, provides a good example for understanding the potential of, and constraints on, project evaluation under the SWAp. Compared to the PBA, here projects are less fragmented and more coordinated under programmes, which are carefully developed holistically in accordance with national development goals. Projects as well as programmes are managed increasingly by the national government, rather than by the ODC agencies, promoting decentralization. The national government has advocated use of a two way approach: top-down and bottom up (MOEC, 1999). Employing REFLECT methodology, the Case B project has been monitored continuously by the community with the support of ward and district officials, forming the basis of evaluations conducted by the Ministry together with international experts.

### 10.2 Case A: Typical ODC Evaluation Adopting Project-Based Approach (PBA)

#### 10.2.1 Swedish ODC in the middle of 1990s

The overall goal of Swedish development cooperation had been to raise the standard of living of the poor. Poverty reduction was seen holistically and multi-dimensionally with six objectives: economic growth, independence, equity, democracy, environmental protection and gender equity.

In the middle of 1990s, when the Case A took place, Swedish ODC was facing a critical turning point: 1) at the organizational level, major restructuring of the

---

122 See Section 10.3.1 for details.
organizational system was under way 2) at the national level, the level of the ODC budget was being significantly cut in order to recover from large public deficits; and 3) at the international level, new development modalities and approaches were developing which affected Swedish policies to some extent (OECD, 1996). Changes in policy took place, further, based on extensive evaluations and studies of the effects of the ODC programmes. OECD (1996) has started that few DAC members have invested as much energy and time into such evaluations as Sweden.

In terms of sectoral allocation, Sweden committed 15% of its ODC to basic social services in 1997-98, compared to the DAC average of 10% (UNCCD, 2000). Priority sectors were as follows:

- Social sectors: education, health care, water and sanitation, democracy and human rights, government and civil service reforms;
- Infrastructure, trade and industry: transport and communications, and energy, bank and financial sector, market support, industry, and trade;
- Humanitarian support;
- Economic reforms; and
- Environment and natural resources management.

As a pre-requisite for granting ODC, Sweden required two basic commitments from recipients: 1) to set in place conditions for sound economic management, and 2) to achieve their commitments and demonstrate a will to end dependency on ODC (UNCCD, 2000).

The major areas of Swedish support in education have been vocational training, adult education, and primary school support, which includes primary schoolbook production and teacher training. Most of the support to adult education was disbursed in the 1970s, while support to vocational training was dominant in the 1980s. Priority areas in the middle of 1990s had been two major components of basic education: Primary and Adult education, which accounted for 75 percent of the total of the disbursements made in the context of bilateral agreements (SASDA, 1994).

10.2.2 Project Based Approach: Potential and Constraints

The Project-based Approach (PBA) had been the dominant mode in development cooperation among all ODC agencies until the mid-1990s. Instances of the PBA, activities and outcomes have been pre-determined, with a well-defined geographical focus, often under the active leadership of ODC agencies whereby they are usually able to exercise some degree of influence on the priorities set by the national government. As to the implementation of the project, the ODC agencies are actively involved in management through granting approval to annual work plans and budgets, whereby funds are channelled to the specific projects that have been agreed upon (Jagannathan & Karikorpi, 2000). Although there may be some risk of overlapping efforts on the part of the various ODC agencies and the national government, projects are nonetheless run systematically and well managed, with a clear project-cycle plan (see Chapter 6 for detailed discussion). Fragmented resource utilization, inadequate coherence, poor national ownership, together with donor- and
supply-driven interventions (Sida, 1998c), are some of the main criticisms that have been levelled at the PBA, which has caused some ODC agencies to shift to SWAp.

10.2.3 Project-Based Approach: Implications for Evaluation

The concept of the project cycle was developed by Baum (1978), who demonstrated that every project process involves a sequence of stages, such as project identification, project preparation, project appraisal, implementation and evaluation, which form a circle. Evaluation can further be divided into sub-stages, namely baseline survey, midterm evaluation, terminal evaluation and ex-post evaluation. Evaluation strategies and methodologies have largely been developed by the ODC agencies, reflecting the common standards established by OECD DAC (see Section 6.2). Compared to evaluations in the SWAp, in the case of PBA, the purpose of evaluation is clearer. ODC agencies conduct evaluation in accordance with their own evaluation needs (see Table 6.3). However, because of the widespread but uncritical recognition that the “evaluation commissioner decides evaluation design,” it has also been commonly accepted that evaluation mainly serves the needs of ODC agencies. Therefore efforts to involve various stakeholders and to reach consensus are less pertinent, and consequently evaluation results are often mainly utilized by a single ODC agency. The evaluation processes used by different ODC agencies are similar, but secreting away similar findings each within their own organization, without there being any systematic mechanism for sharing knowledge about evaluation processes or results.

10.3: Case B - an Evaluation under an Early Stage of the Sector-Wide Approach (SWAp)

10.3.1 Sector-Wide Approach: Potential and Constraints

The Sector-Wide Approach (SWAp) has been developed in order to overcome the limitations faced by the traditional project-based approach to development, e.g. poor national ownership, excessive donor control, badly-coordinated and overlapping financial/technical input, etc. The concept of the SWAp has been developed in order for a range of changes in the practices of development cooperation to be incorporated. Collaborative, multi-donor cooperation efforts with shared objectives and basket funding\(^\text{123}\) are emphasized. The origin of SWAp may be traced back in time to when investment programmes for the education sector on the part of the World Bank were initiated (Buchert, 2000; Klees, 2002). There are six principles underlying SWAp:

- each programme is to be sector-wide in scope;
- the programme is to have a coherent sector policy framework;

\(^{123}\) Basket funding is joint funding by a number of ODC agencies for a set of activities (e.g. a sector or sub-sector) through a common account. The planning and other procedures for managing the basket fund are therefore common to all participating agencies, but they may be in compliance with the public expenditure management procedures of the recipient government. (MoFA, Denmark, 2006)
• local stakeholders are to take initiatives and to lead;
• all donors must act in accordance with the programme;
• common implementation arrangements must be developed; and
• a minimum of long-term financial and technical assistance must be ensured (Harrold et al. 1995).

The SWAp is often considered as offering an alternative to, or to supplement, the conventional project approach, and its adoption is expected to enhance a more holistic development of the national education system at the macro level and at the sector level, within a comprehensive policy framework developed by the national government, integrating support from multiple development partners e.g. ODC agencies, NGOs, and the private sector (Buchert, 2000; 2002). In other words, the SWAp is to be regarded as “a complex evolving process that depends on flexible and adaptable learning by all involved parties” (Buchert, 2000, p. 82).

One implication, in theory at least, is a consequent devolution of decision-making powers away from the macro-political level of the ODC agency and national government towards the level of programme administrators, local authorities and local groups. Based on a prior agreement with the national government, ODC agencies are technically expected to contribute to the basket funds of national governments to support the implementation of programmes. Such an arrangement implies a genuine concept of partnership, where mutual transparency and accountability are underlying conditions, for enhancing local ownership of policies and their implementation in a particular sector such as education. Consequently, it is expected, in theory, that the role of the national government is one of strong leadership, while the role of the ODC agencies is to be supportive with regard to the strategies adopted by the national government. However, as Samoff (1999) and Buchert (2002) point out, the actual policy process has, in reality, remained under the direction of the ODC agencies, with only limited participation on the part of national governments and very little sense of national ownership becoming apparent. Although a great number of rhetorical statements have been made on this issue, the institutional framework for ongoing dialogue between national governments, ODC agencies and researchers has not attained full fruition.

10.3.2 Sector Wide Approach: Implication for Evaluation

One of the implications of SWAp for evaluation practice is a shift away from separate, individual evaluation, on the part of various ODC agencies, towards joint evaluation, (OECD, 2000; Hassan, 2005). New development frameworks, such as MDGs, PRSPs, harmonization, and aid effectiveness (see Section 7.3) also provide firm foundations for joint evaluation (Breier, 2005).

Joint evaluation is evaluation in which different ODC agencies and/or partners participate. OECD (2002) points out that it is possible to conceive of various degrees of collaboration, depending on the extent to which individual partners cooperate in the evaluation process, merge their evaluation resources and combine their evaluation reporting. Breier (2005) proposes a typology for joint evaluation, based on the degree and mode of this collaboration:
Classic multi-partner evaluations - in which participation is open to all stakeholders and each participates on equal terms;

Qualified multi-partner evaluation - in which participation is open to a limited number of all potential partners; and

Hybrid multi-partner evaluations - in some range of different and more complex ways of working jointly are encompassed.  

Breier (2005) identified 53 cases of joint evaluation during the period from 1990 to 2005. In practice, however, there are only very few examples of “classic” multi-partner evaluation among these, most incidents of joint evaluation belonging either to the qualified multi-partner type or to one of the hybrid forms of partnership (ibid.).

Joint evaluation is to be regarded as an effective and necessary tool for developing partnerships for global programmes, within the framework of the Millennium Development Goals. It should not only reduce the excessive financial and administrative burden imposed by conducting separate evaluation missions, resulting in the duplication of work, but it should also promote collaboration among multiple ODC agencies and national governments. It offers an opportunity for ODC agencies to share knowledge and techniques with regard to the evaluation process, whereby wider ownership of findings would result, providing them with increased legitimacy and thus greater influence on subsequent decision-making. Various positive effects would be expected to emerge from processes of joint evaluation, such as the sharing of perspectives, development of evaluation capacity, increased credibility and greater mutual understanding of different mandates (OECD, 2000, 2002; Breier, 2005; Hassan, 2005).

Nonetheless, joint evaluation has not been very common in practice despite the potential benefits listed above. More effort is required in order to organize and coordinate it where many more ODC agencies are involved, whose overall policy, operational processes and organizational cultures differ to varying extents. These differences in overall policies, administrative procedures and evaluation priorities, schedules and issues under restriction with regard to time and resources available make joint evaluation more difficult than simply conducting own individual evaluations according to own criteria. Attaining consensus and agreement between partners can be both expensive and time-consuming (ibid.).

Another implication of SWAp for evaluation practice is that participatory methodology would be adopted more often, as the approach aims at enhancing empowerment at the local level through decentralization. Increased ownership and a strengthening of capacity at every level in the partner country constitute both the process and a goal of SWAp and of participatory development.

\(^{124}\) According to Breier (2005), this type includes a wide range of more complex ways of joint working e.g. a) work and responsibility may be delegated to a core agency while other actors adopt a “silent partnership” role; b) some parts of an evaluation may be undertaken jointly while other parts are delivered separately; c) various levels of linkage may be established between separate but parallel and inter-related evaluations; and d) the joint activities focus on agreeing a common framework but responsibility for implementation of the evaluation is devolved to different partners.
10.4 Comparative Framework for the Cases

The macro contextual framework was presented in detail, in Sections 10.1, 10.2 and 10.3. In this present section, a comparative framework is proposed for the two cases previously described, applying the analytical framework presented in Section 2.1, together with the theoretical frameworks presented in Chapter 4. The comparative framework is composed of the following features: Evaluation approach; Purpose; Evaluation objectives; Timing; Role of Evaluator(s); Qualifications of Evaluator(s); Time and resource input; Data collection; Project documentation; Report content and context analysis; Knowledge Construction; Values; Dissemination; and Use of evaluation results.

The intention here has been to provide a holistic comparison of Case A and Case B within this framework, highlighting similarities and differences, with regard to the strengths of, and the constraints on, each as well as those particular features which have been conditioned by the contextual factors for each.

The perspectives and assessment of evaluation practices on the part of stakeholder groups will be incorporated into the above framework where appropriate. Also, a comparison will be attempted between the meta-evaluation of the two cases by stakeholder groups, in order to explore possible differences across these groups in both cases.

10.5 Concluding Remarks

In the present study, Case A has been characterized as a typical ODC evaluation adopting the Project-based approach (PBA), which was the dominant approach for ODC until the Sector-Wide Approach (SWAp) was introduced in the mid-1990s. The PBA type of evaluation has typically been the “conventional donor’s evaluation” where the focus of implementation has been to respond to the strategic needs of ODC agencies.

Case B, on the other hand, has here been regarded as a project evaluation under an early stage of the SWAp (late 1990s), employing thereby a more decentralized and “bottom-up” approach to the entire process of the project, including evaluation, with the aim of enhancing empowerment at the local level in order to subsequently realize sustainable development through capacity strengthening at various levels, from the local community to the national level. As was discussed above, SWAp is a complex evolving process, and has developed significantly since this study took place. Case B in this study took place at an early stage of the implementation of the SWAp, therefore only limited structural influence on evaluation was observed, compared to “joint evaluations”, which are currently evolving.

In this chapter, the importance of understanding evaluation “contexts” has been emphasized when analyzing and gaining deeper understanding of evaluation. Based on the comparative framework presented in this chapter, the evaluation Case A and Case B are systematically compared in Chapter 11, in pursuit of deeper insights both with regard to the cases themselves and ODC evaluation in general.
Chapter Eleven

Meta-Evaluative Comparison of the Cases

The essential features of the two cases of evaluation analyzed earlier, in Chapter 8 and Chapter 9 respectively, are compared in this chapter, in line with the meta-evaluative comparison framework presented in Chapter 10. The strength of the comparison made here is that it affords the opportunity to provide at least some additional and deeper insights in order to further understanding of the complexities and dynamics of evaluation practices and strategies under different macro contexts, that is to say, the time framework and policy framework.

11.1 Comparison of Meta-evaluation

In order to proceed further with the identification and analysis of the issues regarding ODC evaluation practices, Table 11.1, has been constructed. Here the essential features of meta-evaluation of Case A and Case B are summarized based on analysis given in Sections 8.2 and 9.2 respectively. A comparison of the meta-evaluation of the two cases according to the various stakeholder groups is subsequently presented separately in Table 11.2.

| Table 11.1: Meta-evaluative comparison of case A and case B |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| **Case A**                      | **Case B**                      |
| **Evaluation approach**         | Consultative evaluation, ODC-agency driven | Top-down participatory evaluation, national-government driven |
| **Evaluation purpose**          | Accountability/strategy/policy focus | Project improvement focus |
| **Evaluation objectives**       | Assessment of project goal attainment | Project improvement |
|                                 | Assessment of project impact and sustainability | Provision of project information |
|                                 | Provision of holistic project information | |
| **Timing**                     | Summative | Formative |
|                                 | Set by ODC agency | Set by the National-government |
| **Role of evaluator(s)**       | Analytical and judgmental | Descriptive and facilitative |
### Project Evaluation in Development Cooperation

#### Qualifications of evaluator(s)
- Team of international and local academics with specialization in relevant fields including evaluation
- International and/or local evaluators familiar with the project

#### Resource input
- 4 international experts and 2 local consultants
- 5 weeks in Sweden, 17 weeks in Tanzania (16 months of report work)
- B1: 1 local consultant for 6 weeks including report writing
- B2: 3 MOEC officials for 4 weeks including report writing

#### Methods
- Analysis of extensive documentation covering 20 years
- 11 out of 52 colleges visited twice for interviews and questionnaires
- B1: 2 out of 4 pilot wards, within which, 6 out of 15 villages (=25 literacy circles) visited once for in-depth discussion
- B2: 29 literacy circles from 4 pilot project sites visited for in-depth discussion

#### Knowledge construction
- Explicit presentation of methodological and epistemological considerations
- Theory-grounded analysis
- Implicit presentation of methodological considerations

#### Project documentation report content, and context analysis
- Macro and micro issues covered
- Analysis of changes in national political context, organizational context, underlining ideology of project as well as project effects against project objectives
- Insufficient coverage of socio-cultural conditions of communities
- Micro issues oriented
- Analysis of project effects on learners
- Description of socio-cultural conditions of respective villages

#### Values
- Prescriptive, advocating the primacy of particular value
- Descriptive, describing various values according to stakeholders subjective value system

#### Dissemination of results
- Public and academia
- Insufficient feedback
- Public and stakeholders
- Insufficient feedback at village level

#### Use of evaluation results
- Instrumental use by ODC agency
- No use by project insiders
- Instrumental use at national, district, and ward level
- Desired but limited use by villages

---

**Note:** B1 = 1996 evaluation, B2 = 1998 evaluation

### 11.1.1 Evaluation Approach and Purpose

In Chapter 10, Case A has been characterized as a typical ODC summative project evaluation adopting the structure of the Project-based approach. The ODC agency conducts evaluation for its own strategic purposes, commissioning external consultant team(s). Case A, being a summative evaluation, may be regarded as an instrument for legitimatizing public accountability and as a strategic tool for lesson learning on the
part of an ODC agency from a cross-sector and a cross-country perspective. Although, in Case A, project effects are thoroughly analyzed and assessed against project objectives along various dimensions, its approach may be regarded as consultative.

On the other hand, Case B has been characterized here as an example of formative participatory evaluation adopting the structure of the Sector-Wide Approach. Since this has implied a shift of authority to national government, toning down control on the part of ODC agencies, one of the potential strengths is that it is possible for evaluation knowledge to be constructed at local levels, resulting in greater internal validity and utility of the evaluation findings. Such evaluation should subsequently contribute to grow a sense of “ownership” at various levels. The purpose of evaluations here is clearly project improvement. Efforts are also made to reflect the multiple views of various stakeholders with regard to the evaluation results.

11.1.2 Timing
Timing of evaluation, especially of education project, is a difficult issue as discussed in Section 4.1.4. Timing of evaluation (formative or summative) should be carefully planned in order to capture the maximum impact of the project in an appropriate manner. Regarding Case A, the timing of evaluation had been determined by the ODC agency, in accordance with its project management cycle, which has most often be the case with evaluations conducted by the ODC agencies. Although information about the timing had been passed on to the partner government well in advance of implementation of evaluation, it had not been communicated to the college levels thereby causing no little confusion at the colleges. Therefore, from the perspective of the ODC agency, the timing had been appropriate, from the perspective of the project, evaluation is perceived to have been conducted too early for the full outcomes of the project to be taken into consideration.

As to Case B, the timing of evaluation had been determined by the national government in accordance with their project management cycle. However, it had not been specified in advance to the village level at the initial stage of the project and, in the responses collected in the present study, learners in a village expressed a preference for the timing of evaluation to be determined on the basis of their schedules (group interview data, 2001, village K). “Timing of evaluation” tends to be mainly determined according to organizational standards of the evaluation commissionaire, but this study reports the community needs that it should rather be carefully planned according to the conditions and/or situation of each particular project.

11.1.3 Role and Qualification of Evaluator(s)
It is possible to establish the credentials, including the qualifications, of evaluators from the criteria specified in the Terms of Reference for each evaluation. Evaluation in Case A was carried out by a team of four international researchers with specialized experience and knowledge in their respective fields, together with two local researchers. The specialization of each member is given in the report. Although the
evaluators possess high qualifications in relevant fields, there were both advantages and disadvantages throughout the evaluation process in the fact that they were “external” to the project. The advantages fell mainly to Sida and, possibly, to some extent, to the general public in terms of knowledge acquisition. The evaluation report provides new insights with regard to long-term cooperation, and presents challenges to some of the underlying ideology – “cultural transfer in education” in Case A. The disadvantage was the difficulty in gaining an empathetic understanding both of the socio-cultural context, and the content, of the project, and in establishing credibility in the eyes of key stakeholders at the project level, regarding the value that the evaluation team expressed. Effective communication and the establishment of trust between the evaluators and stakeholder groups appear to be a critical issue.225

As to Case B, the evaluation team members had been appointed by the GoT. Their professional background is not specified in the report, but they had been expected to adopt the role of evaluator that was to be “collaborative and facilitative” (MOEC, 1996) rather than “judgmental.” This corresponds to the role of evaluator that is recommended for responsive-constructive evaluation,226 in order to be able to enhance and facilitate the establishment of collaborative and open environments and the management of dynamic discussion among stakeholder groups. However, the strengthening of the capacity of evaluators remains an urgent issue. The manner in which a participatory approach is most appropriately to be applied in practice to evaluation requires further clarification, not only on the part of evaluators but also for stakeholder groups at all levels.

It is apparent from the results of the analysis of these two cases of evaluation that there is somewhat of a dilemma with regard to the role of internal evaluators and the role of external evaluators. Whereas external evaluators, who are often from international backgrounds and equipped with scientific knowledge, on the one hand conduct evaluation with what is claimed to be objectivity in order to produce new perspectives from a particular project evaluation, that are subsequently “generalizable,” internal evaluators, on the other hand, often possess more empathic perspectives with regard to the project and they therefore are able to construct more meaningful and useful evaluation content from the point of view of local stakeholders. Although there is potential tension here between the role of evaluator as engaging in “documenting and judging outcome” versus “facilitating and improving project,” this should not prevent efforts being made to find some sort of balance between the two.

11.1.4 Time and Resource Input
The length of time devoted to evaluation in these two cases is very different. With regard to Case A, an international evaluation team composed of 6 members (4 international evaluators and 2 local consultants) spent 5 weeks in Sweden and 17 weeks in Tanzania working on the evaluation, including report writing. In total, the team dedicated more than a year to the work (16 months). This is an unusually generous but commendable amount of time for an evaluation for an ODC agency.

225 This point is thoroughly promoted by Stufflebeam (1999) and Patton (1987).
226 See Section 4.6.4
This generosity was the result of the stipulation in the Terms of Reference for the evaluation that the evaluators were to employ ethnographic approaches, which require such extensive amounts of time as this. Thus, the input of time and human resources in Case A is considered to have been advantageous when compared to typical ODC evaluation.

On the other hand, the input of time and human resources allocated to evaluation in Case B is to be regarded as having been more or less of average extent: 1-3 team members dedicated 4 to 6 weeks, including report writing. This significant difference in input between the two cases is perhaps not very surprising considering that Case A constitutes a summative evaluation of a project which has as base the 20 years of a longer programme, while Case B constitutes a formative evaluation of a more recent project. The significant difference with regard to input is naturally also reflected in the extent and depth of coverage in the respective evaluation reports. Issues of “what knowledge is constructed and how” and the effect of these on the use of the knowledge by various stakeholders is discussed in the next sections.

11.1.5 Methodological Issues

As has been pointed out above, compared to standard ODC evaluation, the evaluation in Case A has been carried out in a considerable degree of depth over a relatively long period of time. Nonetheless this particular evaluation did not fully live up to the expectations of the key insiders of the project concerned, that is to say, learners, teachers, principals of colleges and project management, who believed that evaluation should also be an instrument for the improvement and sustainability of the project. They would also have preferred the evaluators to have listened more to their voices and to have taken more care to include the project “process” and “context” into account. The issue of stakeholder involvement is raised many times in the questionnaires and interviews carried out for the present study. Although the evaluation team had doubled the sample size, visiting far more colleges than had been specified in the Terms of Reference for the evaluation, in the view of the stakeholders, this was still not a sufficient number. Since there are considerable differences between all the communities included in the project, the insiders would have preferred the evaluation teams to have taken the context of each individual community into consideration. Here, there is a clear example of the dilemma with regard to the “scientific validity” contra the “pragmatic validity” in a project which is often confronted in this type of evaluation.

In Case B, shortcomings with regard to evaluation methodology have been one of the main constraints. In the questionnaires and interviews carried out for this research, both facilitators and learners at the village level express their frustrations regarding inadequate guidance regarding the use of REFLECT methodology for monitoring and evaluation. Although they suggest more seminars and workshops, financial constraints with regard to the national government would seem to reduce the possibility of this being realized. In a participatory evaluation, it is vital to involve

---

127 In the interest of conducting a holistic discussion, key issues regarding data collection and stakeholder involvement in Chapters 8 and 9 are contained in the portmanteau term methodological issues.
identified key stakeholders from the initial stage of the evaluation process and onwards. Stipulations with regard to roles and responsibilities to be performed by different stakeholder groups in evaluation (see Table 9.5 in Chapter 9) exist already. These roles and responsibilities should be subsequently reflected systematically in evaluation practices, including more detailed and concrete methodological guidance.

It is important that the culture of participatory evaluation be developed at every level, but this requires sufficient time and continuous support for the necessary changes to take place. This requirement has to be fully understood, not only at the national level but also at the village level. While a top-down participatory approach may not be sustainable and there is the danger that a bottom-up participatory approach receives insufficient support from the national level. Therefore a two-way (top-down and bottom-up) participatory approach may be desirable.

11.1.6 Knowledge Construction

The epistemological and methodological considerations, with regard to evaluation in Case A, are described relatively explicitly in the evaluation report, whereas in Case B, they are more implicitly expressed in the evaluation report. According to social programme evaluation theory, it is considered to be desirable to clarify and justify the various reasons for the adoption of any particular method, based on the ontological and epistemological perspectives of the evaluator(s) and to preferably explicitly acknowledge any possible discrepancies between the level of knowledge of the evaluator(s) relative to that of the stakeholders (Shadish, Cook, & Leviton, 1991). However, this is often only implicit, or even completely overlooked, in ODC evaluations. The purpose and objectives of ODC evaluation are usually already stipulated prior to the initiation of the evaluation exercise in the Terms of Reference. It is not certain if any attention is paid to the value pluralism that exists in social reality, which makes it difficult for evaluators to subsequently take into consideration variations with regard to the definition of acceptable knowledge on the part of different stakeholders.

11.1.7 Project Documentation, Report Content, and Context Analysis

With regard to Case A, the evaluation report contains a comprehensive history of the project as well as an analysis of predicted impacts on stakeholders at various levels, in accordance with the stipulated objectives of the evaluation. This report also contains an assessment of the success and limitations of the project as well as its sustainability. Recommendations and suggestions are also offered to various stakeholder groups. In addition to this assessment of the impact of the project in terms of level of attainment of the objectives, this report also provides an analysis of macro issues, such as shifts in the national political context, that have to some extent affected the project and a re-examination of the ideology and policy behind the entire cooperation. However, this re-examination proved to be a controversial issue between the evaluators and many of the stakeholder groups. The knowledge generated from this evaluation has undoubtedly had some effect on the general public as well as on

---

128 For definition, see Knowledge Construction in Section 4.5.1.
academics, through the publication of the findings from the evaluation. However, one shortcoming constraining the use of the report, as noted by various stakeholders, is the omission of an adequate description of the socio-cultural context of each college’s community.

Compared to the Case A, the evaluation report in Case B is much simpler in design and scope. However, the concerns and voices of various stakeholder groups, especially of that of local communities are synthesized in the reports, followed by policy recommendations and suggestions to various stakeholder groups.

11.1.8 Value

In Case A, evaluators expressed value, based mainly on their profound experiential knowledge and extensive documentation. Although, descriptively, this was a successful means of documenting the context and content of the project, it nonetheless gave prominence to values entertained by only some stakeholders but was unsuccessful in capturing the pluralistic values of the full range of different stakeholders (interview data: MCDWAC officer M; Principal D). In this sense, a prescriptive approach has been adopted in the report, through giving primacy to a particular value, which is also perhaps similar to their own values. Shadish, Cook and Leviton (ibid.) point out that if the values of a particular stakeholder group are not reflected in the evaluation process, that group may feel morally and politically slighted and may subsequently be less cooperative in, and critical of, the evaluation process (p. 52).

The evaluation report in Case B, on the other hand, succeeds in describing the various contrasting values entertained by different groups of stakeholders as well as in recommending further actions for each of them.

The “value” as dealt with in the evaluation process influences the subsequent use of evaluation results and process. If the value of a particular group of stakeholders is taken up in the evaluation process, it is likely that those stakeholders will find the evaluation results more meaningful.

11.1.9 Dissemination and Use of Evaluation Results

With regard to Case A, the ODC agency published it as an evaluation report, and made it available to the public. Its summary was also made available in its internal newsletter. The evaluation team also made it public by publishing a journal article based on the findings of the evaluation.

The evaluation results have been of instrumental use to the ODC agency, regarding them as input for subsequent decision-making. The evaluation results have also been of conceptual use both to interested parties at the ODC agency and to academics as they provided a deeper understanding of social interventions of this kind. However, the evaluation results were not used strategically at the project level. Although some recommendations had been offered in the evaluation report, there was insufficient responsibility exercised for ensuring appropriate dissemination at the project level. Finally, the Tanzanian Ministry found very little use for the evaluation results as the evaluation had been conducted to meet the formal requirements of the ODC agency rather any needs on the part of the Ministry.
With regard to the dissemination of the report in Case B, there were appropriate efforts at the national, district and ward levels, and thus they were able to make instrumental use of the results at these levels. Nonetheless such use of the evaluation results at the village level was very unsatisfactory as shortage of transport meant very little feedback reached the communities.

The conclusion drawn here is that in both cases, there were serious setbacks to the adequate dissemination of evaluation results as feedback at the project level. This is a point that distinguishes evaluation from pure research: recognition of the significance of the utility aspect of findings. An insufficient awareness of the potential use of evaluation results would most likely lead to the dysfunctional consequence of “piling another evaluation report on the shelf” (interview data: MCDWAC officer N) which has often been the case for ODC evaluation, thereby confining evaluation to being merely a bureaucratic routine or ritual.

11.2 Comparison of Perspectives on Evaluation of Various Stakeholders

Key features of the perspectives of various stakeholder groups with regard to the two respective evaluations, derived from the data generated by the questionnaires and interviews, as well as the analysis of documentation, in the present study, are presented in Table 11.2. Stakeholder groups researched in this study entertain diverse values, having a variety of socio-cultural backgrounds and roles in the projects evaluated and thereby a range of different expectations with regard to the evaluation and evaluation results.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case A</th>
<th>Case B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+) lesson learning</td>
<td>Not involved in the evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+) accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+) decision-making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-) inadequate dissemination of the report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+) good documentation</td>
<td>+) effective management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-) too critical and lack of context</td>
<td>+) positive socio-psychological effects on community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-) insufficient stakeholder involvement</td>
<td>(empowerment, leadership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-) inadequate dissemination of the report</td>
<td>-) inadequate financial and physical resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-) insufficient capacity-strengthening for M&amp;E at various levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+) good documentation</td>
<td>+) greater local relevance (community-based participatory M&amp;E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-) lack of project process and context</td>
<td>+) positive socio-psychological effects on community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-) insufficient stakeholder involvement</td>
<td>(empowerment, leadership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-) inadequate financial and physical resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-) inadequate M&amp;E due to physical constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-) insufficient stakeholder involvement</td>
<td>+) effective needs/problem identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-) low local relevance</td>
<td>+) positive socio-psychological effects on community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(empowerment, leadership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+) increased motivation and ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+) mutual learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-) inadequate financial and physical resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-) insufficient qualified facilitators/teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+) good documentation</td>
<td>+) greater local relevance (community-based participatory M&amp;E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+) re-examination of ideology behind entire cooperation</td>
<td>+) positive socio-psychological effects on community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(empowerment, leadership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-) inadequate coverage of project context (community)</td>
<td>-) inadequate financial and physical resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-) insufficient qualified facilitators/teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-) too critical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** +) in the column indicates positive perspectives, and -) indicates negative ones.

With regard to the perspective on the evaluations at the level of the **ODC agency**, in Case A, Sida found that the evaluation results have been very useful in a number of different respects, such as lesson learning, accountability, and decision-making, as discussed in detail in Section 8.3.1. On the other hand, there is no data available on this issue for Case B, as there was very little involvement in the evaluation on the part of the ODC agencies concerned. Here the project process had been entirely localized in order to facilitate a sense of ownership on the Tanzanian side (interview data: Sida Tanzania, CIDA Tanzania).

Moving on to the level of **Ministry** and at the level of **project management** (termed project management in Case A, and district/ward office in Case B), there are

Footnote: The term, local beneficiaries, refers to teachers and principals of colleges (Case A), and facilitators, head/assistant teachers and learners in learning circles in each villages (Case B), who have participated in the research for the present study.
considerable differences in their perspectives on the respective evaluations across the two cases. As for Case A, questions on the validity of the evaluation are raised because of perceived insufficient involvement on the part of stakeholders. The importance of analyzing varying contexts and situations for each college is emphasized by almost all groups of stakeholders, except those from the ODC agency. Likewise, shortcomings in the evaluation report with regard to insufficient coverage of project process and context are identified by stakeholders in Case A. However, the potential and constraints with regard to evaluation that are identified by stakeholders in Case B are somewhat different from those for Case A. In Case B, the Ministry and the district/ward levels report the evaluation as being of great local relevancy, which would seem a natural outcome because, for this particular evaluation, learner-centred and community-based participatory M&E had been adopted as methods. They also report that it is considered that positive socio-psychological effects could be identified in the communities (see Section 9.3.1, for discussion). The perceived constraints identified in Case B are reported to be related rather to their own capacities, for example inadequate financial and physical resources and insufficient development of capacity in the use of M&E on the part of stakeholders at various levels. Such inadequate capacities are reported to be identifiable with regard to stakeholders at every level (interview data; questionnaires; Mnjagila, 1998; Ramadhani, 2000).

With regards to perspectives on the respective evaluations on the part of stakeholders at the level of local beneficiaries, significant differences have been identified between those from Case A and those from Case B. Whereas the stakeholders in Case A claim a low level of local relevancy with regard to the findings, mainly as a consequence of perceived insufficient stakeholder involvement and inadequacy of feedback of the evaluation results; for Case B, these stakeholders claim greater local relevancy being perceived. For Case B, these stakeholders consider that the perception had been that their specific needs and problems had been effectively identified and that there had been positive socio-psychological effects in their communities. They suggest that M&E enhances mutual learning among stakeholders. The implication here is that the result of adopting a learner-centred community-based participatory approach not only increased the validity of the evaluation but also in real socio-psychological effects for the local beneficiaries.

Some of the staff at the local university who had many years of extensive experience and knowledge concerning the project evaluations constituting Case A and Case B have also been interviewed in this study and they provided relevant reports which have also been reviewed here. They characterize Case A as “top-down ODC agency evaluation” and Case B as “bottom-up community evaluation.” Evaluation in Case A is regarded as having documented the history of the programme relatively adequately, providing new perspectives on the entire cooperation by re-examining the ideology behind it. They were basically of the same opinion as other stakeholders (see Table 11.2). They have emphasized the importance of evaluation capturing each community’s context, as well as evaluation being a synthesis of the voices of various stakeholders.
11.3 ODC Evaluation: Knowledge Construction by Multiple Levels of Agencies in A Power Structure

The present study has been exploring not only methodological aspects of ODC evaluation but also their structural complexity. Borrowing the framework of Foucault (1980 a) it has been possible to identify the structural and political relationships between knowledge and power in ODC evaluation practices. Power relations influence evaluation processes from the level of the individual to the level of the organization. Furthermore, it is possible for power to be exercised through the “formation of knowledge,” in other words, through the composition of an evaluation report. Thus, evaluation may be regarded as a process of constructing, for certain purposes, particular kinds of knowledge by adding “values” within “power structures”, as was shown in Section 8.2 and 9.2. The actor-oriented approach to development (see Section 3.1.4) also investigates the extent to which certain knowledge is shaped by power and social relations. Evaluation practices are to be regarded as processes which take place within networks of relations, shaped both by routine and by explorative practices, and are influenced by certain organizational conventions, values and power relations. Where power relations between stakeholder groups are hierarchical or if the relations are antagonistic, the knowledge constructed will be aimed in a certain direction, as can be assumed in Case A. However, where power relations between stakeholder groups are collaborative or empathetic, the knowledge constructed will probably be aimed at more stakeholder groups and be used more widely, which can be assumed in Case B.

Any particular group of stakeholders (as agency) acts within its respective socio-organizational structures, representing a certain power and certain values. This power is attached to the agency, and forms power relations within the structure. Various stakeholder groups have been identified in this study (see Section 2.2) at three levels, namely the international, national, and local. Each of the identified group of stakeholders is influenced by its specific structural conditions, which are social, political, economic and cultural in nature. There are complex power relations between these structures, which is evolving constantly influenced by international discourse, e.g. Partnership. As may be observed with regard to Case B, the current policy movement in development towards partnership may result in significant impacts bringing change to these more traditional power relations.

Evaluation can create knowledge for certain desired purposes. The more the purpose is to place value on knowledge at local level, the more useful and appropriate the knowledge created will be for the local people, who have been regarded in the present study as constituting the most important stakeholders in development cooperation. However, it should also be noted that the intention is not to detract from the importance of knowledge from evaluation with regard to organizational use on the part of ODC agencies. What is to be pointed out here is that disproportional weight is given to the knowledge from evaluation for organizational use by the ODC agencies to the detriment of local communities.

130 For a detailed discussion on value, see Section 11.1.8.
The processes of ODC evaluation imply aspects of power, authority and legitimization. Different kinds of power structure, authority and legitimization have been identified in this study with regard to Case A and Case B, respectively. As to Case A, evaluation has been identified as reflecting cultural differences and value conflicts between different stakeholder groups, whereas the evaluation in Case B reflects a more consensus-oriented, value-pluralistic approach.

Each stakeholder possesses his or her own “regime of truth.” As is emphasized throughout this section, ODC evaluation takes place in a context of particular power relations that may be viewed and used politically. Actual processes of evaluation have probably been influenced to some degree by the particular power structures of each group of stakeholders, including the evaluator’s own interests and relations to the power structure.

11.4 Concluding Remarks

Significant and central features of two particular evaluations have been compared in this chapter through detailed analysis in the light of the theoretical and methodological framework used in this study, in order to gain a deeper understanding of the complexities and dynamics of evaluation practices and strategies under different macro contexts.

In the first part of the chapter, meta-evaluative comparison of the two cases have been presented, focusing on thirteen specific aspects of evaluation, namely evaluation approach, evaluation purpose, evaluation objectives, timing, role of evaluator(s), qualifications of evaluator(s), time and resource inputs, methods, knowledge construction, project documentation, report content, context analysis, values, dissemination of results and use of evaluation results. The perspectives of various groups of stakeholders were elaborated in terms of these thirteen aspects, where appropriate.

In the second part of the chapter, the structural complexities of ODC evaluation were tentatively investigated, where the influence of multiple power structures on evaluation as processes of knowledge construction are considered. Stakeholders are here regarded as constituting multiple levels of “agency” within their respective socio-organizational structures, where certain power and values are represented. Some remarks have been made with regard to the possibilities concerning the extent of the influence of the power structure of the stakeholder groups concerned, including the evaluator’s own interests and relations to the power structure, on evaluation. These insights lead to an understanding that would necessitate efforts being made to clarify the process of selection of methodology in evaluation in order to reduce such influence of the power structure on subsequent knowledge construction.

In Chapter 12, the essential findings in this research are presented, followed by discussions and recommendations for both policy and research.
Chapter Twelve

Conclusion and Perspectives

In this, the final chapter of the study, the research problem is restated and the major approach and methods used are reviewed. In addition, the central research findings are presented which portray the changing nature of the structures of ODC evaluation and the implications of this.

12.1 Summary of the Research

The research reported here is a meta-evaluative case study of educational project evaluation in the context of Official Development Cooperation in Tanzania. For the purpose of this research, perspectives have been adopted from the constructivist paradigm (see Section 2.1), implying a relativist ontology, a subjectivist epistemology, and a naturalistic interpretive methodology. These perspectives have been adopted in order to facilitate the holistic investigation of ODC evaluation, capturing the relative values attached to evaluation by various groups of stakeholders and to foreground the perspectives of local actors with regard to the enhancement of the sustainability of development (see Section 5.3). The data for this case study has mainly been collected through questionnaires, interviews, document analysis, and a meta-evaluative framework drawn from the relevant literature (see Table 5.1 for details of data collected).

In order to investigate evaluations in a meta-evaluative manner, an epistemological, theoretical and methodological foundation has been developed from a comprehensive review of evaluation as a discipline and a meta-theory of social programme evaluation (see Chapter 4). Subsequently, the focus of the study has shifted to a more technical-operational perspective where several typologies of ODC evaluations have been identified (see Section 6.1.2), followed by an analysis of the evaluation systems and strategies of some of the major ODC agencies. It consequently became evident that various types of ODC evaluation contain strategically different functions and purposes.

The meta-evaluative comparative analysis of the two cases revealed the strengths of, and constraints on, each case which were to some extent influenced by their respective time-frames. The evaluation in Case A, a typical ODC project evaluation, functioned in the manner which met the organizational needs of the ODC agency: reassured accountability, lesson learning (knowledge acquisition), and legitimization of political decisions. The theory-grounded content of the evaluation report in Case A is outstanding when compared with similar types of evaluation reports, supported as it is by data collected over a period of one year by six development professionals. Nonetheless, the evaluation results did not find support among many of the local stakeholder groups that have subsequently been interviewed for the present research, partly as a consequence of insufficient involvement of local stakeholders in the evaluation process.
Case B, on the other hand, which is regarded as a project evaluation carried out during an early stage of Sector Wide Approach (SWAp) implementation, employed a community-based participatory approach. This approach has had positive socio-psychological effects on the community. As it is a formative evaluation, there is a focus on bringing to light the perspective of the communities as part of project improvement. Nonetheless, the present study has also revealed constraints on Case B, namely inadequate allocation of financial and physical resources and insufficient capacity development for M&E, where it is necessary to develop a “culture of M&E” at both the personal and at the institutional levels.

Although an ODC evaluation is rarely the most important influence on decision-making, it can serve as an essential tool for managing the projects and promoting transparency and accountability in decision-making and in governance processes, as well as enhancing the provision of new knowledge. ODC evaluation has potential to benefit not only the stakeholders at the international level (e.g., ODC agencies, academia) but also at the national and local level (e.g., project, village, community). The underlining question in the present research has been to explore how to make any knowledge constructed through the evaluation more relevant and useful at the local level. To quote Long (2001) again, unless local knowledge and values are taken as a point of departure, power structures will more than likely reflect and intensify any conflicts between various stakeholder groups rather than facilitate the establishment of those consensus values that are based on a synthesis of multiple perspectives.

12.2 Discussion of the Results

12.2.1 Structural Complexity of the ODC Evaluation

Almost a decade has now passed since the Sector Wide Approach (SWAp) was launched in the middle of 1990s, eventually to gradually replace the Project Based Approach (PBA). The two cases described in the present study are to be regarded as ODC project evaluations carried out during this transitional period. ODC project evaluations, which had been ODC agency-driven, have been increasingly replaced by evaluations conducted by the national government thus moving further towards “joint evaluations” where multiple parties jointly conduct the evaluation based on the sector priorities under SWAp framework (see Section 10.3.2).

Stakeholder groups act upon, and function within, multiple layers of structures, namely the organizational, pan-organizational, local, national, and international, as illustrated in Figure 2.3. They act reflexively in relation to the power existing within the structure, as well as structural conditions - social, political, economic and/or cultural (see Section 2.4). The structure is reproduced in the relations between stakeholder groups, which it is possible to change inclemently if the principle idea changes. In the context of the present study, the idea of “partnership” does not only remain at the level of the rhetoric but influences the asymmetrical power structure concerning ODC activities as is demonstrated in the devolution of decision-making powers away from the ODC agency and towards the national government, with the eventual aim of decentralizing power even further towards the level of local
authorities. In reality, however, such changes do not always easily fit in with the national culture on the LDC side. For example, Tanzanian structures are traditionally hierarchical and therefore not immediately amenable to “bottom-up” approaches to community development programmes (Mushi, 1998). Similarly, it is not a straightforward matter for decision-makers on the ODC agency side to make changes based on evaluation findings. Constraints are imposed upon them through past decisions and current fiscal realities and by the political realities of social programming (Shadish, Cook, & Leviton, p. 55). All these aspects of structural complexity affect evaluation processes and their implementation.

Changes in the power structure of ODC take place gradually, closely and carefully reflecting new ODC modalities. Institutional arrangements for constant dialogue among key stakeholders ought to be developed through reflecting the spirit of partnership (see Section 10.3.1). As pointed out by Edwards (1994), linking the micro level (site-specific details of cases) to the macro level (wider economic and political frameworks), that is, structural change at every level, but particularly at the national level, is a vital precondition for successful development cooperation.

12.2.2 Findings from Application of Constructivist Paradigm

As discussed in Section 10.2.3, there has been an uncritical acceptance that evaluation is designed according to the needs of those who commissioned the evaluation. The findings in this study indicate that no great systematic effort has been made by ODC agencies to incorporate and synthesize the perspectives of various stakeholders, especially the key “beneficiaries.”

This silence of the key “beneficiaries” in the evaluation process, as well as in development cooperation per se, was questioned as early as in the conception stage of this study and subsequently led to the choice of perspectives adopted for the study.

This research had been implicitly underlined by a spirit to explore the possibility of incorporating the aspiration of the key beneficiaries to evaluation. Based on this spirit, in order to investigate one of the research questions “who are constructing what kind of information/knowledge, how, to whom, for what purpose and to what effect?”, as well as to analyzed multiple stakeholders’ interests and perspectives of case evaluations, constructivist paradigm (Section 2.1) was applied. More concretely, actor-oriented approach to development (Section 3.1.4), participatory M&E (Section 4.6.1), case study evaluation (Section 4.6.2), utilization-focused evaluation (Section 4.6.3), and responsive-constructivist evaluation (Section 4.6.4) which tone with constructivist paradigm were used as theoretical perspectives to analyze various aspects of evaluations in a meta-evaluative way.

Through the adoption of the actor-oriented approach, the existence of “multiple social realities” is acknowledged. Hence, it is possible for this approach to conceptualize evaluation as a tool for understanding the world, based on social, cultural, institutional and situational factors in a complex interplay which is context-specific. This study has found that ODC evaluation may constitute a powerful tool for disclosing the multiple values and needs of various stakeholder groups, for

---

131 See Section 2.3 for the definition of the term beneficiaries used in this study.
facilitating the empowerment of grass-root stakeholders and for ensuring that the project will be more useful to them.

This study indicates that some of the potentials that may be realized through the application of combinations of the evaluation approaches listed above include:

- developing responsibility of the project process on the part of key stakeholder group;
- broadening consensus among stakeholder groups as well as increasing the credibility of evidence derived from multiple perspectives on data;
- greater local relevancy and usefulness of evaluation results for a wider number of stakeholder groups; and
- positive socio-psychological effects on the community e.g. empowerment, ownership, increased awareness of their situations

Constraints, on the other hand, include:
- time consuming and complex nature of the evaluation process;
- problems concerning capacity-strengthening of evaluation techniques at various levels; and
- difficulties involved in the allocation of a sufficient number of qualified facilitators.

It should be emphasized here that these approaches do not contradict the principle idea of the SWAp and Partnership but are to be regarded rather as compliments. Nonetheless, considerable room for improvement remains with regard to ODC evaluation.

12.2.3 Lessons from Meta-Evaluation - Bridging the Gap between Theory and Practice

The meta-evaluative criteria used in this study are here reviewed in order to examine the lessons to be drawn from combining theories and practices.

Evaluation approach Evaluation approaches are often influenced by the macro developmental approach or strategy, which is time-specific, i.e. following the particular trend in the development discourse during a certain epoch.

Evaluation purpose Purposes of ODC evaluation have here classified into three types, namely accountability, operational efficiency, and sectoral/thematic consistency. While the distinctive features of each should be recognized there is reason for some degree of overlap across them to be tolerated and promoted because it is not possible for the interests of various stakeholder groups to be captured by any one particular evaluation purpose alone.

Evaluation objectives Evaluation objectives are often defined in the Terms of Reference prior to the implementation of evaluation. In order to increase the relevance of evaluation to a wider number of stakeholder groups, evaluation objectives should be carefully formulated, based on a needs assessment with regard to the various stakeholder groups.
Conclusion and Perspectives

Timing of evaluation  Although the timing of evaluation tends to be determined largely according to the organizational standard of those commissioning the evaluation, it should rather be carefully planned according to the conditions and/or situation of each particular project.

Roles and qualifications of evaluator(s)  Socio-cultural differences, asymmetries of power, and divergent views concerning evaluations may greatly influence the process and outcomes of evaluation (see Section 4.1.3). Roles of evaluators can vary from objective-judgmental to empathetic-facilitative. In order to maintain the credibility and perceived independence of evaluators, efforts should be made to find a balance between the two. From a constructivist perspective, evaluation should be conducted jointly through “negotiation” in a spirit of mutual trust and respect on the part of various stakeholders. In addition to the use of professional techniques in a contextualized manner, evaluators ought to be able to use their “interpersonal and group dynamic skills” in order to maintain collaborative relationships with various stakeholders (Fetterman, 2001; Patton, 1987).

Time and resource input  The limiting factors on ODC evaluation appear to be the cost and time-consuming aspects of evaluation, as well as the theoretical and methodological complexity involved, which requires a certain degree of disciplinary knowledge of various disciplines (Rebien, 1996; Cracknell, 2000). More systematic theorization of the methodology of ODC evaluation ought to be of assistance in attaining more effective time and resource input.

Evaluation methods  Based on the meta-theory of evaluation, presented in Section 4.5, there is clearly considerable room for improvement with regard to various methodological aspects of ODC evaluation. From the perspective of the local community, it became evident that the use of participatory method was greatly appreciated as was the involvement of every project site in the evaluation process. Each evaluation should be custom-designed in accordance with its socio-cultural, economic, political, and ideological context, and ought to combine appropriate evaluation methods. More efforts should be made with regard to appropriate stakeholder involvement.

Knowledge Construction  Increased efforts should be made in ODC evaluation to clarify and justify the rationale for selecting particular methodologies on the basis of ontological and epistemological perspectives. Moreover, evaluation should be designed in manner that is able to deal with the value pluralism which exists in social reality as well as the variations in what is regarded as acceptable knowledge on the part of different stakeholders prior to the evaluation exercise.

Project documentation, report content, and context analysis  The various aspects to which the “ideal” evaluation would conform are listed in Table 4.1. The finding in the present study is that, from the perspectives of local stakeholder groups, it is most crucial that evaluation includes the project process as well as the individual context of each community.
Value Although evaluation is about valuations, it has to be acknowledged that there are significant difficulties involved in establishing valuation of actual evaluations. Various types of value have been presented above, in Section 4.5.1, based on the work of Shadish, Cook and Leviton (1991), namely, descriptive theory, prescriptive theory and meta-theory of valuing. According to these authors, it is desirable to clarify how and why value statements have been constructed and that prescriptive theory and descriptive theory of valuing be combined.

Dissemination and use of evaluation results Although evaluation may have a catalytic function in providing an opportunity for various stakeholder groups to gather and discuss various issue (World Bank, 2005), the finding in the present study is that in practice many stakeholders are not in a position to have access to or use the evaluation findings and recommendations. Systematic feedback of the evaluation results to the communities has been poor in both cases. Many stakeholder groups in this study state that they would have found it desirable for timely feedback of evaluation results to key stakeholder groups to be ensured, together with informal communication of the results before completion of the final report. For this to be possible, a strategy should be considered for the use of evaluation by various stakeholders throughout the evaluation process, as well as the establishment of various means of dissemination for various stakeholder groups.

Strengthening Institutional Capacity: Institutionalization of Evaluation Evaluation may well be an integral part of the daily operations of an organization. Then data will be systematically and routinely used for various purposes e.g. decision-making, record-keeping, accountability as well as a tool for personal and organizational learning (Fetterman, 2001; Worthen & Dusen, 1998). Diversification of evaluation tasks to appropriate organizational levels would be of assistance in the development of an evaluation culture at various organizational levels (Rebien, 1996). In order for such a development of evaluation culture to be brought about at every level, sufficient time and continuous support should be provided for the necessary changes to take place. While there is a risk that a top-down participatory approach may not be sustainable, there is also the danger that a bottom-up participatory approach may receive insufficient support from the national level. Therefore a two-way (top-down and bottom-up) approach might be considered to be most appropriate.

12.3 Perspectives and Recommendations for Future Research

12.3.1 From Single Value Prescription to Pluralistic Value Synthesis
As has been discussed throughout this study, evaluation may be considered as series of processes for constructing, for certain purposes, particular kinds of knowledge by adding value within power structures in the wider social, economic, cultural, and political context.

Carlsson (1999) also demonstrated this point in his study.
That which is valued differs from one stakeholder to another depending on their contextual position, as described above. Riddell (1999) has raised a similar point when stating that evaluation in which those different needs and values are not acknowledged is unlikely to be utilized appropriately for policy implementation by those who are excluded from the process. It is necessary for the content of the evaluation to be grounded in the realities and values of those who are affected by the social intervention in question. Multiplicity and complementability of values should be acknowledged since, as Chambers (1997 p. 229) argues, “realities are multiple and socially constructed, and personal, local, complex, diverse, dynamic and unpredictable.”

Limitations with regard to a single evaluation of a complex social reality; conducted alone by ODC agencies, local partner governments, or other institutions has been recognized (World Bank, 2000). Instead, there is a call for “joint learning,” where the emphasis is shifted from evaluating others towards learning from, and together with, each other, based on new forms of partnerships where all key stakeholder groups are involved throughout the evaluation process and utilize decentralized, community-based monitoring.

Dialogue among key stakeholder groups is a very significant feature of such joint learning which should be initiated from the very conception of the process of evaluation. Although such a “consensus approach” may require more time than the conventional “top-down approach, compared to the conventional “top-down approach”, the consequences of the consensus approach is likely to be far more useful for the “ultimate beneficiaries” of a social intervention; the local people who are there learning, rather than the international agencies. The significance of stakeholder involvement is promoted in a thorough method in Responsive-Constructivist evaluation (Lincoln & Guba, 1989), which suggests that stakeholders should become involved through a process of negotiation whereby the plurality of value systems is respected. In event of difficulties arising in reaching a consensus among stakeholder groups, it is still appropriate for the various views that have been expressed by the stakeholders to be recorded and discussed in the evaluation report (Cracknell, 2000) together with the reasons for the diversity of these irreconcilable perspectives.

A significant gap between theory and practice in ODC evaluation still exists. By incorporating more alternative knowledge from the theory, the local relevance of practice may be increased.

### 12.3.2 Suggestions for Additional Research

**Use of Responsive-Constructive Evaluation to ODC evaluation**

In this study, an actor-oriented approach (see Section 3.1.4) has been adopted as a source of inspiration. One methodological application of this approach may be seen in Responsive-Constructive Evaluation (see Section 4.6.4), where the value pluralism of social reality is accommodated, following a constructivist perspective. This methodology complements, rather than contradict, underlying principle values of partnership discourse, where their implication for evaluation can be seen in joint evaluation. It would be valuable to test Responsive-Constructive Evaluation in ODC context, combining it with the other alternative evaluation methods presented in Section 4.6 of this study, in order to explore its potentials and constraints.
Dissemination Strategy for the Evaluation Results
An evaluation is rarely the only or even the most important, source of information or influence on decision-makers. Consequently, a successful evaluation strategy should recognize and adapt to the particular context within which it will be implemented and discussed (World Bank, 2005). Lack of a systematic and effective dissemination system for the evaluation results has also been pointed out here as being critical in both Case A and Case B in this study.

A successful evaluation strategy also requires an effective dissemination strategy. Applying theoretical knowledge from, for example, utilization-focused evaluation where the strategy for the use of evaluation is present from the conception stage of the evaluation, more advanced dissemination methods to each various key stakeholders should be investigated. This ought to include strategies for promoting transparency and dialogue among multiple stakeholder groups.

Implications of current ODC modality to evaluation policy/strategy
Dynamic development, as discussed in Section 10.3, has been observed in the area of joint evaluation. It would be a useful area of research in the future to investigate the implications of the current ODC modalities, i.e. Sector Wide Approaches, Partnership, Donor Coordination and Harmonization, Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, and Millennium Development Goals, in regard to ODC evaluation policy and strategies.

The conventional project evaluation, under the previous ODC modality, namely the project-based approach, had a clearer strategic picture of the owner of the evaluation, thus the evaluation strategies were more straightforward. What are the implications of the current ODC modalities to ODC evaluation in the education sector? Would this lead to community-based bottom-up evaluation with increased local relevancy? Or would this rather increase symbolic use of evaluation by the national government in order to satisfy the “pre-conditions of partnership” stipulated by Northern partners?

12.3.3 Final Remarks
It should be recalled that it is not possible for any single evaluation approach or method to be simply adapted to different political and socio-cultural environments. Each case requires to be evaluated according to its own particular context because it is not possible for the complex realities of development to be resolved through any simplified solution derived from abstract theories. As Stokke (1991) points out, evaluations do not possess “cross-cultural generality, nor are they politically and ideologically neutral and theoretically definite” but they may reflect “different concerns, values and perceptions of what matters in life” (p.4).

The practice of ODC evaluation has been facing dynamic changes during recent decades, influenced by macro contextual changes (new ODC modalities). Greater sophistication and increasing numbers of cases of Joint-Evaluation have been observed as an outcome of this change. The evaluation community ought to become more proactive, more responsive to new modalities in ODC, employing the participatory approach further and synthesizing pluralistic values held by various
stakeholder groups. As Chambers (1997) points out, relationships between the powerful and the powerless are sensitive to the behaviour and attitudes of the powerful side.

Using evaluation as a powerful tool, it is hoped that the value, needs, and aspirations of various stakeholder groups, especially within local communities, will increasingly be reflected in ODC programmes and projects in the education sector.
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Appendix 1

No._______

Questionnaires to Principals of Colleges
(Case A)

Dear Sir, Madam

This questionnaire is part of a project, which intends to follow-up the final evaluation of FDC project in 1997. Your cooperation in answering this questionnaire is hoped to help generating concrete support to your college in the future. The information you give will be kept in strict confidence. The questionnaires should be kindly return by 31 of May to Forum Syd office in Dar es Salaam. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

1. District:
2. Name of College:
3. Contact address:
Your name and telephone number if it is possible:

Since when are you the principal to the FDC?
(year)___________(month)

Do you know about the final evaluation of FDC project in 1997?
Yes No (Why not?________________________)

If your answer is Yes, please continue. If your answer is No, this is the end of the questionnaire. Thank you.

Were you involved in the final evaluation? If yes, how? (ex. Interviewed how many times? Answering questionnaire?)

Were you informed about the result of evaluation? If yes, by whom and how?

Have you read the evaluation report?
Yes No (Why not?________________________)

If your answer is Yes, how do you assess its quality in terms of:
(Please check one of each according to 1: Very poor, 2: Poor, 3: Average, 4: Good, 5: Very good)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods and data sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical usefulness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of new ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you see any change in FDC after the 1997 evaluation?

What in your view has happened after the evaluation **as a result of the evaluation**?

What are the main/urgent problems that your college is facing now?

What could be the solutions in your opinion?

What do you suggest as follow-up of the FDC project?

Any comment?

This is the end of the questionnaire. Thank you very much for your generous cooperation and if you have any questions, please feel free to contact me!

Mikiko Cars  (Ph.D. Student)
Institute of International Education (IIE)
Stockholm University
Address (home):
Tel/fax (home):
E-mail:
Appendix 2

2001 March 2

Interview Guide with Project Management
(Case A)

Outset: self introduction, purpose, motives, intentions, and confidentiality

Involvement to the evaluation
1. How were you involved in the project and in the evaluation?
2. Who were involved in the evaluation? How?
3. In your view, how did various stakeholders influence evaluation?

Assessment of the evaluation
- Did you read evaluation report? Whole or partly? Where did you read? Do you think that all the stakeholders read the report?
- What is your assessment of evaluation process/ evaluation report? What is the strong/weak points of evaluation?
- Do you think that the evaluation design and questions address the needs and priorities of all stakeholders?
- Do you know if stakeholders aware of evaluation? How were they informed about evaluation results?
- To whom and how were the evaluation results distributed?
- Do you think that the recommendations and lessons in the report were useful for different stakeholders to act upon?
- What were the follow-ups after the evaluation?
- What in your view has happened after the evaluation?
- If you were to conduct the evaluation, what would you have done differently?
Appendix 3

Interview Guide to
International Agency / National Government /School
(Case A)

Outset: self introduction, purpose, motives, intentions, and confidentiality

The purpose of this interview is to investigate the impact of evaluations on various stakeholders with special focus on how they used evaluation. (relations between ‘degree and type of participation to evaluation process by different stakeholders’ and ‘usefulness by different stakeholders’ are to be analyzed.)

As the interview method being semi-structured, interview questions were selected and modified from core questions below, according to the stakeholder groups.

Involvement to the Evaluation
1. How were you involved in the evaluation?
2. In your view, how did various stakeholders influence evaluation?

Assessment of the Evaluation
1. Did you read evaluation report? Whole or partly? Where did you read? Do you think that all the stakeholders read the report?
2. What is your assessment of evaluation process/evaluation report? What is the strong/weak points of evaluation?
3. Did you find the report language appropriate to be useful for all involved?
4. Do you think that the evaluation design and questions address the needs and priorities of all stakeholders?
5. Did you find evaluation useful in anyway? In which way?
6. Did recommendations result in concrete action? If yes, how? If not, why?
7. Do you think that the timing of evaluation was appropriate?
8. What were the follow-ups after the evaluation?
9. What in your view has happened after the evaluation?
10. If you were to conduct the evaluation, what would you have done differently?
Appendix 4

Questionnaire regarding Evaluation method of ICBAE program
(case B)

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect data for analyzing various views/assessment of monitoring/evaluation methods used in ICBAE program. All information you provide will be treated anonymously. Your contribution is highly valuable.

Your name ________________________________
Position and organization ________________________________
Contact address (voluntary) ________________________________

1) How are you involved in the ICBAE program?

2) Are you in anyway involved in monitoring/evaluating ICBAE program? If “Yes”, could you explain in detail of your involvement?

___________________________________________________________________________

3) In your opinion, what is the strength/advantage and weakness/problem in monitoring/evaluating the program?
   a) strengths/advantages:_____________________________________________________

   b) weaknesses/problems:___________________________________________________

4) If you are to improve the actual monitoring/evaluation exercise, what do you suggest? (in relation to methods, language, timing, etc.)

___________________________________________________________________________

5) Have you seen the evaluation report of the ICBAE program? If yes, which one (year) and how do you assess its quality (clarity, methods and data sources, usefulness, etc.)?

___________________________________________________________________________

6) Any other comments?

___________________________________________________________________________

Thank you very much for sharing your views, wisdom and experience!

Mikiko Cars (Ph.D. Student)
Institute of International Education (IIE)
Stockholm University
Address (home): ....................................................
E-mail: ..........................................................
Appendix 5

Interview Guide to
International Agency / National and Local Governments / School
(Case B)

Outset: self introduction, purpose, motives, intentions, and confidentiality

The purpose of this interview is to investigate the impact of evaluations on various stakeholders with special focus on how they used evaluation. (relations between ‘degree and type of participation to evaluation process by different stakeholders’ and ‘usefulness by different stakeholders’ are to be analyzed.)

As the interview method being semi-structured, interview questions were selected and modified from core questions below, according to the stakeholder groups.

Involvement to the Evaluation
1. How were you involved in the evaluation?
2. In your view, how did various stakeholders influence evaluation?

Assessment of the Evaluation
1. Did you read evaluation report? Whole or partly? Where did you read? Do you think that all the stakeholders read the report?
2. What is your assessment of evaluation process/ evaluation report? What is the strong/weak points of evaluation?
3. What in your view were the good points about using REFLECT methods in monitoring and evaluation? What were the difficulties?
4. Did you find the report language appropriate to be useful for all involved?
5. Do you think that the evaluation design and questions address the needs and priorities of all stakeholders?
6. Did you find evaluation useful in anyway? In which way?
7. Did recommendations result in concrete action? If yes, how? If not, why?
8. Do you think that the timing of evaluation was appropriate?
9. What were the follow-ups after the evaluation?
10. What in your view has happened after the evaluation?
11. If you were to conduct the evaluation, what would you have done differently?
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