



**Universiteit
Leiden**
The Netherlands

Impact evaluations for NGOs: recent developments, possible collaboration SNV and AIID

Dietz, A.J.; Pradhan, M.

Citation

Dietz, A. J., & Pradhan, M. (2009). Impact evaluations for NGOs: recent developments, possible collaboration SNV and AIID. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/15383>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License:

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/15383>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Impact evaluation for NGOs (Presentation for SNV, Dirk Elsen & Jessie Bokhoven; Jan 8, 2009)

Recent Developments

Possible collaboration SNV – AIID
(Amsterdam Institute for International
Development; UvA & VU: Ton Dietz and
Menno Pradhan)

Why is impact evaluation so rare?

- Bad results could give ammunition to those who do not support the project
 - Project managers may be better off to keep results ambiguous
- It does not provide the answers needed to make policy decisions
- It is expensive


But the wind is changing...

- Aid effectiveness drive has increased demands of funders for impact evaluations.
- With several good examples around, demands for quality impact evaluations is rising.
- NGO project evaluations leading the way

Outline of this presentation


- What is impact ?
- Qualitative and quantitative evaluations methods
- Common pitfalls
- How to strategize impact evaluations?
- Possible collaboration SNV - AIID

From inputs to impact




Source: SNV Managing for Results 2007-2015

From inputs to impact



Behavior of beneficiaries

From inputs to impact



Behavior of beneficiaries

Impact:

What would have been the condition of the beneficiaries if there had been no project?

Qualitative

- Strengths
 - Generate hypothesis / research questions
 - Provide context/depth to analysis
 - Can consider difficult to quantify dimensions
- Weaknesses
 - Small sample size yields anecdotal evidence
 - Interviewer bias

Quantitative

- Strengths
 - Test hypothesis
 - Quantify results
- Weaknesses
 - Cost of surveys with sufficient sample
 - Needs control group
 - Difficult to deviate from research design

Qualitative methods

- Often focused on perceptions among stakeholders about:
 - changes in society (from a reconstructed baseline moment until 'today')
 - results of one or more 'interventions'
 - relationship between overall change and interventions

Qualitative methods

- Often small scale: geographical case (a village, a micro region, a town section) or an anthropological case (a certain group, ethnic or otherwise)
- Often in-depth; flexible design
- Often with the intention to be 'holistic' (e.g. combining the 'capitals/capabilities' of the livelihood approach)
- Often with the intention to be participatory

Qualitative methods

- Can address issues that are hard to quantify

	qualitative	quantitative
- Direct poverty alleviation	✓	✓
- Service improvement	✓	✓
- Peace and stability	✓	
- Capacity development	✓	
- Institutional change	✓	
- Policy change	✓	
- Changing public opinion	✓	✓
- Changing people's behavior	✓	✓

Qualitative methods

- Can generate ex-ante hypothesis on expected outcomes
- But be explicit about:
 - Depth: chain of results; time factor – sustainability, but how long?
 - Width (leakage effects beyond the micro region; and - the other way around - overall ‘macro’ changes and their ‘trickling down’)

Example of a qualitative evaluation design, with quantitative elements of analysis: basis for formulation of hypotheses

- **Tracking local development: AMIDSt/Tamale University Ghana for ICCO, Woord en Daad and Prisma; 2007-2010**
- 12 micro-regional studies in Northern Ghana and Southern Burkina Faso to reconstruct the impact of (all) interventions on (all aspects of) change over 30 years: holistic; participatory (n = 12 x 60 people, with focus groups, individual life histories, project inventories; (perceived) project impact assessments)
- Scale makes it possible to quantify qualitative data, and compare these between the micro regions and between areas with recent, 'old', and minimal external interventions

Quantitative methods

- Step 1: carefully defined hypothesis:
 - Did providing remedial teaching to children increase their test scores after one year?
 - Did the sanitation project lead to a sustainable reduction in diarrhea?
 - Does two months of training provide better job prospects (expected income) than one month of training?
 - What is the impact of the exit strategy on the results?


Quantitative methods

- Step 2: Define a control group
 - Randomization preferred method
 - Unbiased results, small sample size required
- Randomization, and exclusion
 - Budgets often cannot reach all. After some point randomization becomes the fairest method
 - Phased project implementation can be used to randomize


Quantitative methods

- Step 3: Field baseline and follow up survey
 - Impact obtained by difference in difference


We observe an outcome indicator,




***and its value rises after
the program:***



***However, we need to
identify the
counterfactual...***



***... since only then can we
determine the impact of
the intervention***



Deworming in schools in Kenya

- Primary School Deworming Project (PSDP), carried out by Internationaal Christelijk Steunfonds
- 75 schools randomly assigned in 3 groups: Last batch received project 2 years later than first group
- If threshold was passed, all children in school received treatment
- Impact:
 - reduced school absenteeism by one quarter
 - No impact on test scores
- Cost effective: the cost per additional year of school participation is only \$3.50

Source: 'Worms: Identifying Impacts on Education and Health in the Presence of Treatment Externalities', Edward Miguel Michael Kremer, *Econometrica*, Volume 72 Issue 1, Pages 159 – 217

Corruption in Indonesia

- Kecamatan Development Project: Large rural World Bank financed CDD project in Indonesia
- Qualitative studies indicated that corruption was most prevalent at village level
- Study tested two alternative ways of reducing corruption
 - Increase community oversight
 - Increase supervision
- On corruption measured by quality of road.
- Impact:
 - Increasing government audits from 4 percent of projects to 100 percent reduced missing expenditures, as measured by discrepancies between official project costs and an independent engineers' estimate of costs, by eight percentage points.
 - No impact of increased community oversight

Source: 'Monitoring Corruption: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Indonesia' Olken, Benjamin A. Journal of Political Economy 115, vol 2, 2007

Integrating qualitative and quantitative

- Qualitative studies can be designed in such a way that some quantification of results can be attempted for more robust hypotheses
- An 'ideal' sequence is:
 - 1. Qualitative (formulation of hypotheses)
 - 2. Testing hypotheses with quantitative, comparative design
 - 3. Followed by in-depth qualitative 'further studies' on outliers, details, unexpected outcomes

Common pitfalls

- Impact evaluations are often too disconnected from project
- Bad implementation of study, insufficient supervision
- No baseline, Non comparable control group
- Lack of involvement from local stakeholders
- Measurability dominates research design

How to strategize impact evaluations

- New programs / Pilot programs for which outcomes are unknown
 - New methods
 - New target groups
- Alternative project designs
- Plan towards next programming decisions

Possible collaboration SNV - AIID

- AIID could help:
 - Develop research strategy and focus.
 - Advice on hiring of key SNV staff
 - Provide technical inputs and analysis for impact evaluations
- SNV could
 - The above
 - Organize implementation of studies

Beyond impact assessments as such

- For an organization such as SNV the results of impact assessments should play a key role in its overall knowledge strategy: creating a chain of learning loops:
 - a) for the local partner organizations and their 'clientele';
 - b) for local knowledge centers;
 - c) for the regional SNV offices;
 - d) for SNV as a whole;
 - e) for the knowledge sector as a whole (and in the Netherlands)

Feeding a knowledge network

- Accessible results via web-based communication, with possibilities for
 - Raw data storage
 - Results of Primary analyses
 - Results of Comparative analyses (matrix connections)
 - Results of Meta analyses
 - Response mechanisms between participants, and among users

Commitment to Learning hubs

- Create long-term (>15 year) data-collection hubs, together with local knowledge centers, in key regions of long-term project presence.
- Build local knowledge centers
 - Make sure that the knowledge that is generated is also validated and owned by 'formal academia' (next to policy, peer and public validation):
 - create conditions for 'practitioner's PhDs' of a selection of SNV employees
 - co-author scientific publications for refereed academic journals (and create conditions to do so).