

HOW TO DEVELOP INDICATORS BASED ON BEHAVIOURAL RESULTS¹

How do you know if your efforts in communicating to change behaviour and social mobilisation are actually making a difference in emergency situations?

This is an important question that highlights the value of well-planned monitoring and evaluation (M&E). Unfortunately, M&E is often an afterthought in emergency management planning. This trend tends to reduce the quality and cost-effectiveness of actual and future responses. Likewise, tracking and assessing communication activities during an emergency are often weak, which makes it difficult to report on results.

This tool shows you how to plan the monitoring and evaluation of behaviour change communication and social mobilisation in emergency situations. We look at participatory methods on how to develop indicators based on behavioural results in a participatory way. We consider some simple data collection methods that can be used to monitor and evaluate communication and mobilisation activities.

Let's begin by clarifying the basic terms:

What is an M&E system?

Monitoring provides insight into how well a response or planned set of activities is being implemented. It is part of the evaluation process. Evaluation is a continuous process, done periodically, i.e., at each stage of the programming cycle. It offers a comprehensive review of whether an emergency response is achieving its short-term results and longer-term goals. Continual and careful monitoring of relevant indicators and processes generates information for evaluation and, more importantly, for corrections that may be needed as an emergency response unfolds.

An M&E system refers to a textual, graphical and/or numerical data system used to measure, manage and communicate desired performance levels and emergency response achievements. M&E systems are often based on a combination of evaluation types (see Table 1 below).

| Type of evaluation | Broad purpose | Main questions answered |
|--|---|--|
| Baseline Analysis/ Formative Evaluation Research | Determines concept and design | Where are we now? Is an intervention needed? Who needs the intervention? How should the intervention be carried out? |
| Monitoring/Process Evaluation | Monitors inputs and outputs; assesses service quality | How are we doing? To what extent are planned activities actually realised? How well are the services provided? |
| Outcome/Effectiveness Evaluation | Assesses outcome and impact | How did we do? What outcomes are observed? What do the outcomes mean? Did the response make a difference? |
| Future Plans/Cost- Effectiveness Analysis | Value-for-resources committed including sustainability issues | What are our next steps and needed resources? Should response priorities be changed or expanded? To what extent should resources be reallocated? |

What is an indicator?

An indicator is information on a particular circumstance that is measurable in some form. Indicators are approximations of complex processes, events and trends. They can measure the tangible (e.g., service uptake), the intangible (e.g., community empowerment), and the unanticipated (e.g., results that were not planned). An indicator gives an idea of the magnitude and direction of change over time. But it cannot tell us everything we might want to know.

Indicators need not be perfect - only sufficiently relevant and accurate enough so that those interpreting the information can do so.

Indicators should be easily interpreted. It is very important, therefore, to carefully define any indicators and ensure that the way they are defined "travels accurately" back and forth between languages and cultures (including organisational cultures).

Indicators can also be "progress markers". It is clear that behaviour change communication and social mobilisation in emergency responses must demonstrate impact. Stakeholders - whether members of affected communities, programme managers, donors or policy makers - need immediate data that show the contribution your communication initiative has made. Because behaviour and social change often take time to happen, we sometimes need signpost indicators or progress markers - measures that do not necessarily tell us that the ultimate outcome or impact has been reached, but signals that we are on the right track. In communication programmes, for example, "intent to change" has been used as predictor of actual change.

Types of indicators

Indicators may be pictorial. For example, drawings and photographs that show the situation immediately after an emergency that are then compared with drawings and photographs produced some time after the emergency (e.g., 6 weeks, 3 months, etc.) can promote greater discussion and lead to a better understanding amongst both literate and non-literate stakeholders. We will look at examples of pictorial methods that can generate information for indicators in Table ** below.

Indicators may be in the form of stories. Qualitative approaches to monitoring and evaluation usually include the collection of "stories from the field". These stories often provide meaning to quantitative information or capture real "voices". A monitoring technique known as the Most Significant Change (MSC) has been developed that allows for the systematic collection and interpretation of stories. Please refer to Tool 3 for the MSC Technique.

How many indicators do we need?

In choosing indicators, it is important for you to *limit the number to a set of critical indicators*. A multitude of indicators will create problems when you attempt to interpret results. The challenge then lies in defining what is a *critical* indicator, while at the same time making each indicator comprehensible, measurable, comparable (to ascertain trends) and affordable.

Spending the time working out (and trialing) the few, critical measurements needed to tell your programme's essential story will undoubtedly save you the time (and frustration) later. Applying the Rapid Appraisal principle of **optimal ignorance** helps here. "Optimal ignorance" refers to *the importance of knowing what facts are not worth knowing*, thus enabling the cost-effective, timely collection and analysis of information.¹ Applying this principle avoids collection of irrelevant data but its application requires courage!

How to develop indicators

Each chapter in this Toolkit offers examples of possible indicators. Remember, these examples are intended to foster debate and negotiation about what should be measured amongst those planning and implementing emergency responses. You may end up with a range of locally created indicators that are supplemented by these examples.

Here we consider how to develop indicators based on your programme's intended behavioural results. The emphasis is on completing the bulk of this work before a disaster occurs - in other words, these steps should ideally be taken during disaster preparedness planning. We recognise, however, that much depends on the nature, scale and extent of a particular emergency. For this reason, we offer simple monitoring tools and indicators in the main chapters of this Toolkit that can be used to get a basic M&E system up and running during an emergency. The indicators and data collection methods presented below are likely to be more useful when time allows or when preparedness planning is conducted in a comprehensive manner.

Indicator development is best viewed as part of an M&E process. We can summarise the core steps or stages for this process as follows:

1. Assemble an M&E core team.
2. Clarify the question: who wants to know what and why?
3. Identify indicators that will provide the information needed.
4. Choose and adapt data collection methods.
5. Synthesise, verify data, and analyse contribution.
6. Use M&E results to re-develop future communication/social mobilisation activities.

With each step, we offer questions that you can discuss with relevant stakeholders. Between selected steps, we offer a checklist for you to complete before proceeding to the next step.

Step 1. Assemble an M&E core team

Who should, and wants to be involved in the monitoring and evaluation of a behaviour change communication effort in emergency responses? How should participants be identified and selected? What should participants' backgrounds and interests be? What constraints will they bring to the task (workload considerations, educational limitations, motivation)? What type of skills, knowledge, changes in behaviour and attitudes are required to effectively conduct M&E?

Minimal requirements for core team members are:

- Personal commitment to an interactive process and the principles of participatory monitoring and evaluation.
- Ability to work as a team.
- Competency in a wide variety of research techniques and methodologies, with emphasis on participatory methodologies.
- Group facilitation skills, understanding of group process, dealing with tensions and conflict, equalising participation, running participatory activities, summarising, and being an active listener.
- Ability to communicate with different stakeholders, such as members of affected communities, government representatives, and representatives of international donor and UN agencies.

Additional questions to ask at this step include: How is the training of participants in M&E to be accomplished? To what extent do cultural and linguistic differences impact training effectiveness? Can evaluators and other professionals assume the role of trainer or facilitator with relative ease? How does one listen for the voices that have not been heard yet? How can cultural, language, or racial barriers be addressed?

Step 2: Clarify the question: who wants to know what and why

Gather stakeholders together and pose the question: "Who wants to know what and why?" Responses to this question will help develop the behavioural results - statements of intent that begin with words such as: "To assess..." or "To measure..." or "To monitor..." or "To evaluate..."

Ensure that many stakeholders are involved in this planning step as possible. Different groups of stakeholders will have different interests, values, and information requirements. Excluding stakeholder groups from planning how the communication and social mobilisation will be monitored and evaluated may disenfranchise these groups.

Behavioural results should be derived and linked to what your team is aiming to achieve in relation to the promotion of hygiene, breastfeeding, immunization and vitamin A, safe motherhood, and child protection in emergency situations.

To help you discuss what people need to know and why, you could ask stakeholder groups the following questions:

- From your point of view, what difference will the communication strategy make? In what way will communication influence individual and group behaviour? How will we know?
- Will the communication strategy strengthen individual and affected community communication capacity, decision-making and action? If so, how will we know?
- Do you think the strategy takes into account obstacles to behaviour and social change? If so, how? If not, what could be done to consider these obstacles? How will we know when these obstacles have been overcome?
- In your opinion, will the proposed communication strategy enable previously powerless individuals and communities to take control of the means and content of communication, to achieve their own behaviour and social change goals? If so, how will we know?

*Quick checklist before you proceed to Step 3

| | | |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Have you assessed the link between project overall results, behavioural results and strategies? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Have you included individuals and organisations that will be affected by the emergency response in your monitoring activities? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Are participants involved in the monitoring trustworthy and competent? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Have they made an informed decision about where, when and how they want to be involved? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Have steps been taken to assure that all stakeholders and the population served will be respected, and their values honoured during the monitoring and evaluation? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Have conflicts of interest been discussed to ensure that the results or findings will not be compromised? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Have you described the purpose of your monitoring and evaluation in detail? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Is there a written or at least verbal understanding among stakeholders about the purpose of the monitoring and evaluation activities? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |

Step 3: Identify indicators that will provide the information needed

Identifying indicators is one of the most challenging tasks when setting up an M&E system. More so than any other step, identifying and agreeing on what indicators to use highlights the different information needs and expectations that the different stakeholders have of the monitoring work.

Identification of indicators is best started after a dialogue on the affected community's concerns, goals, issues and obstacles, and the vision of the change they seek. The indicator-specific discussion begins by asking stakeholders to reflect on their M&E results (what they want to know and why) and consider the information they are already collecting; and what methods of information exchange or reporting they are using that may be appropriate. One question you should ask stakeholders is: what behavioural information is needed early on, continuously or frequently to make sure this communication initiative is on track and achieving its results?

Several M&E processes and indicators set for measuring communication and social mobilisation have been created and offered in Tool 3 as useful guides

Step 4: Choose and adapt data collection methods.

M&E systems may use visual (maps, calendars, problem ranking, wealth-ranking, photonovella, pocket charts, story with a gap) and dramatic forms (story telling, songs, dances, sculptures, role plays) of data collection together with more standard methods such as interviewing, observation, focus group discussions, workshops, community meetings, questionnaires, and document analysis. A few of these methods are described in Table 2.

Table 2: Examples of M&E data collection methods

| TECHNIQUE | BRIEF DESCRIPTION |
|----------------|--|
| Mapping | Establishes connections and local insights into what is "useful" and "significant" in order to understand community perceptions of the local environment, natural and human resources, problems and resources for dealing with them. There are several different types of maps including: spatial maps; social maps (depicting social relationships); temporal maps (showing changes over time); aerial maps (aerial photographs or standard geographic maps); and organisational maps (venn diagrams depicting institutional arrangements or networks). |

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Seasonal calendars | <p>Ways of illustrating seasonal changes in subjects of interest - i.e. harvests, labour availability, fever, seasonal transmission of HIV and communication resources. Months, religious events, seasons and other local climatic events, for example, are used to illustrate time periods. Issues of interest are then discussed (sometimes using stones, sticks, or marks on paper in relation to these periods). Discussions usually highlight periods of maximum stress, constraints (no time or resources available), or the best time when new initiatives could be undertaken.</p> |
| Problem ranking/ sorting | <p>Cards with words or pictures are sorted into piles or ranked according to local criteria in order to understand how participants rank problems (e.g., communication obstacles) in terms of frequency, severity, and so on. Ranking provides a systematic analysis of local terms, perceptions or evaluations of local issues. Disadvantage is that ranking can force participants to structure their knowledge in artificial ways unless the ranking criteria are themselves developed through a participatory process. This exercise can be used in pre- and post-intervention evaluations to measure change in particular rankings.</p> |
| Well-being and wealth-ranking | <p>Uses perceptions of local inhabitants to rank households, families or agencies within a social network or village/neighbourhood according to wealth, well-being or social contacts. For example, names of household heads are written on cards. These cards are then sorted into piles by at least three M&E participants (ideally interviewed separately) according to criteria that they describe to the M&E team member. The resulting classifications are often at odds to conventional socio-economic surveys, revealing locally important well-being or wealth criteria that can be used to measure more subtle and usually important social changes than can be measured in quantitative methods.</p> |

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Photo-novella | Local people themselves produce visual images through the use of video or instamatic camera. The images then serve as a catalyst to depict, reflect on and discuss social conditions affecting their lives and future possibilities. |
| Pocket charts | Helps people to assess and analyse their situation in a new way using pictures and a "voting" process based on a simple grid-sheet with rows of pockets, pictures, and markers (clothes pegs, pebbles, etc.). Can be used in group or individual (confidential) situations. Dialogue members place their "vote" (pebble) in a pocket underneath or corresponding to picture they agree with or prefer. |
| Story with a gap | Engages people to define and classify goals, and to make sustainable plans by working on "before and after" scenarios. A variety of pictures depicting present problems and future possibilities are presented. Dialogue members consider possible reasons for differences in the contrasting pictures, create stories to explain the "gap" between pictures, and identify community solutions to local problems. Can be used in one-to-one interviews but best in group situations. |
| In-depth individual interview | A semi-structured interview using a flexible interview guide consisting mainly of open-ended questions (questions that cannot be answered with a "yes" or "no" or any other single word or number). The aim is to collect detailed information on the individual's beliefs and attitudes related to a particular topic. |
| Key informant interview | A "key informant" is someone who has extensive experience and knowledge on a topic of interest to the evaluation. Often key informants are community or organisation leaders. The interviewer must develop a relationship of confidence with the individual so that his/her experience and insights will be shared. |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Group interview | There are several different types of group interview such as consensus panels (local experts debate to reach a consensus on a series of issues), structured group interview (participants are asked the same questions as individuals), focus group discussions (a facilitator guides 10-15 participants through a series of issues, with the group interacting with each other rather than just with the facilitator - reaching consensus is not the main aim), community meetings (formal discussions organised by the local group or agency at which the M&E team or facilitator ask questions and/or make observations), spontaneous group discussions (everyday meetings e.g., a sports event, at which groups of people gather around to chat and in which the M&E team or facilitator participates). |
| Observation | While an activity is ongoing, an observer records what he/she sees either using a checklist or by taking descriptive notes. The observation can include information on: the setting (the actors, context, and surroundings); the actions and behaviour of the actors; and what people say - including direct quotations. |
| Analysis of secondary data | Reports and other written documents that provide information on the activities planned and carried out. |

When choosing the methods needed to collect information for each indicator, core M&E team members should facilitate discussion with stakeholders on:

- The indicator and the kind of data required.
- The technical difficulty and adaptability of the method to a particular level of expertise.
- Cultural appropriateness of the method - will it make people feel comfortable learning, communicating, and interacting?
- Facilitation of learning - does the method facilitate learning?
- Barriers to participation - e.g., levels of literacy, command of language used, social class, physical challenge, age, and time constraints.

You will also have to make decisions on the number and location of data collection sites, the sampling processes involved (random or deliberate), the

characteristics and sample size of people to be interviewed or invited to meetings, the selection of people or events to be observed, and the scheduling of data collection (e.g., the date and time for site visits, meetings, interviews).

Now in the following table (make a copy for each behavioural result):

- List the indicators you have decided to develop or use to monitor progress against each result.
- For each indicator, determine what method or methods will be used to collect information to inform the indicator/s.
- Work out what samples your behavioural indicators will require.
- Then give thought to who will collect the information (e.g., who will conduct the interviews, observations, focus groups, participatory methods, questionnaires).

Quick checklist before you proceed to Step 5

| | | |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Have you assessed the link between the behavioural results, indicators, methods, and samples? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Have you checked whether measuring the indicators is feasible in terms of how much information is required, how many methods, how much time, how many data collectors are needed, and their skill levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Will the methods and tools you have chosen require development, pre-testing and training of data collectors? If "Yes", make a note in the space below. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Have you made sure that information will be collected using more than one method (triangulation)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Have you determined the samples that you will require? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Have you identified who will be needed to collect the information? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |

Note here if any tool development, pre-testing or data collector training will be required for one or several of your measurement methods:

| BEHAVIOURAL RESULT 1 | BEHAVIOURAL INDICATOR/S | MEASUREMENT METHOD/S | SAMPLES | WHO WILL COLLECT INFORMATION AND WHEN |
|----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|---------|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | |

Step 5: Collect, synthesise, verify data, and analyse contribution

Data collection to monitor and evaluate communication in emergency responses is usually drawn out over a number of weeks or months. It is highly desirable that data synthesis and analysis occur **as** the data are collected. In other words, there should not be a distinct period of “data collection” followed by a distinct period of “data analysis” – analysis usually leads to new questions requiring further data collection, and so on.

“Data saturation” is often used as a sign that data collection can be reduced in intensity. **Data saturation** can be defined as the point at which no **new** answers to questions are being recorded and no **new** insights are being generated from the data analysis, which suggest the need for further periods of data collection for the time-being. It is important also to have regular reviews or reflections on the methods. Methods and questions may need to be adapted or modified on occasions.

Step 5 also involves processing and analysing data. Core M&E team members should organise meetings with relevant stakeholders and facilitate critical reflection on problems and successes, understanding the impacts of their efforts, and acting on what they have learned. Will there be a need for computer-based analysis? Is there a need for further training/reading for your team on qualitative and/or quantitative analysis? *What becomes critical is how stakeholders actually use information in making decisions and identifying future action.*

How will you ensure participants can provide feedback (verification) on the information that is collected? Analysis of data should include **data validation** among stakeholders. Data should be presented back to participants for verification and collective analysis. Ways to ensure that feedback and validation occurs can include workshops and meetings, distribution of reports (with follow-up interviews), transcripts of interviews returned to interviewees, and so on.

We asked at the beginning of this tool how do you know if behaviour change communication and social mobilisation are actually making a difference in emergency situations?

How much of the success (or failure) in an emergency response can we associate with communication for behaviour change and social mobilisation? Was the contribution worth the investment? *Perhaps without communication and social mobilisation, the observed changes would have occurred anyway, or would have occurred at a lower level or at a slower pace.*

To *definitively prove* behaviour change communication and social mobilisation is making a contribution, we would need “controlled comparisons” (intervention versus non-intervention) to estimate what happens with communication is in place, versus what would happen without it. But such evaluation designs have ethical and resource implications, especially for emergency response situations.

So the question remains: in the absence of a complex evaluation study, how do we measure contribution?

The first key is to recognise the *limits of measurement*. Definitively determining the extent to which communication contributes to any particular behavioural or social change is usually not possible (even with a meticulously designed evaluation). At best, we should be *satisfied with a reasonable estimate of the magnitude of impact*. Let's focus less on decimal points and more on what Rapid Appraisal practitioners describe as **appropriate imprecision** – not measuring more accurately than is necessary for practical purposes.¹ It is perhaps more useful to measure trends and directions of change, rather than absolute numbers.

When M&E resources are scarce, our second interest should be in *increasing understanding and knowledge rather than worrying about scientific certainty*. We should embrace uncertainty because we will never eliminate it.² If you must know with a high degree of certainty what communication's contribution is then you will need a carefully designed evaluation study (and probably a lot of money).

The third key is to acknowledge that *there is a problem of linking outputs directly to outcomes*. Many factors are at play beyond specific communication and mobilisation activities. We need to be realistic about the outcomes we are trying to influence and acknowledge many potential influences are beyond the control of strategic communication.³

Any reasonable attempt to measure the contribution of communication in an emergency response would accomplish at least three things during the planning stage:

- (1) Intelligently map intended behavioural outcomes related to hygiene, breastfeeding, immunization, vitamin A, safe motherhood, and child protection.
- (2) Develop key indicators that either directly measure these outcomes or can serve as proxies or progress markers towards these outcomes.
- (3) Recognise or list those factors communication has no control over.

Collecting information from this point on might therefore show:

- Outcomes appeared at an appropriate time after your efforts began.
- Outcomes faded when your efforts stopped.
- Only outcomes appeared that you should have affected.
- Outcomes appeared only where or when communication activities were implemented.
- The biggest outcomes appeared where or when you did the most.

The analytical job is then to explore and discuss (and hopefully discount) plausible alternatives that might explain these relationships between effort/time/place and associated outcomes. Identifying what these alternative explanations might be is usually straight-forward. The core M&E team's job is to provide further evidence that discounts these alternatives. If there is little evidence that counters other plausible explanations, then you can possibly conclude that you cannot be sure what the contribution of communication has been. This unfortunate conclusion, however, is not usually arrived at if you have gathered additional, relevant evidence. For example, your communication might have been based on a previously proven theory and/or field experiences elsewhere, in which case, the associations between the communication and outcomes are supported by other examples. Other supporting evidence may be found, not from specific indicators, but from programme reports, meeting minutes, national surveys, or stories from the field.

Step 6: Use M&E results to re-develop future communication/ social mobilisation activities

How is the data being used and for whose benefit? This step serves as an important means of disseminating findings and learning from others' experiences. Core M&E team members should seek agreement with stakeholders (through meetings) on how findings should be used, and by whom. Several versions of M&E reports may be required, each tailored to different requirements and capacities of different stakeholders. Possible areas of future work should be discussed for follow-up. At this key moment, core M&E team members should also clarify with stakeholders if the M&E system needs to be sustained, and if so, how. The M&E system may need to be adjusted accordingly.

Resource bank

Further reading

Participatory M&E

1. Aubel, J., Participatory Program Evaluation Manual: Involving program stakeholders in the evaluation process, Catholic Relief Services, Dakar, 1999.
2. Estrella, M., with Blauert, J., Campilan, D., Gaventa, J. et al., Learning from Change: Issues and experiences in participatory monitoring and evaluation, Intermediate Technology Publications Ltd., London.
3. Feuerstein, M.T., Partners in Evaluation: Evaluating development and community programmes with participants, MacMillan, London, 1986.
4. Parks, W. with Grey-Felder, D., Hunt, J. and Byrne, A., Who Measures Change? An Introduction to Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation of Communication for Social Change. Communication for Social Change Consortium, South Orange, 2005. <http://www.communicationforsocialchange.org>.
5. Whitmore, E., 'Understanding and Practicing Participatory Evaluation', New Directions for Evaluation, No. 80, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, 1998.

Data collection methods for M&E

6. Deepa, N., and Srinivasan, L., Participatory Development Tool Kit, The World Bank, Washington, D.C, 1994.
7. Gosling, L., Toolkits: A practical guide to monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment, New Edition, Save the Children Fund UK, London, 2003.
8. Grandin, B.E., Wealth Ranking in Smallholder Communities: A field manual, Intermediate Technology Publications, London, 1988.
9. Patton, M.Q., Participatory Learning and Action (PLA) Notes and Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA) Notes: Qualitative evaluation and research methods, Second Edition, Sage Publications, Newbury Park, 1990.
10. Pretty, J., Guijt, I., Scoones, I., and Thompson, J. A., Trainer's Guide for Participatory Learning and Action, IIED, London, 1995.

11. Scrimshaw, N.S., and Gleason, G.R., Rapid Assessment Procedures: Qualitative Methodologies for Planning and Evaluation of Health Related Programmes, International Foundation for Developing Countries, Boston, 1992.
12. Srinivasan, L., Tools for Community Participation: A manual for training trainers in participatory techniques, PROWESS/UNDP-World Bank Water and Sanitation Program, Washington, D.C., 1993.
13. Wang, C., Burris, M. A. and Ping, X. Y., 'Chinese village women as visual anthropologists: A participatory approach to reaching policymakers.' *Social Science & Medicine*, 42 (10), 1996, pp. 1391-1400.
14. World Bank, Monitoring & Evaluation: Some tools, methods & approaches, World Bank, Washington, D.C., 2002.

Web sites

Communication for Social Change Consortium
<http://www.communicationforsocialchange.org>

Footnotes:

- 1 *Source: Parks, W.*
- 2 *Rehle, T., Saidel, T., Mills, S. and Magnani, R., Evaluating Programs for HIV/AIDS Prevention and Care in Developing Countries: A handbook for program managers and design makers, Family Health International, Arlington, p. 11.*
- 3 *Hamilton, C., Kumar Rai, R., Shestra, R.B. et al (2000) 'Exploring Visions: Self-monitoring and evaluation processes within the Nepal-UK Community Forestry Project.' In Estrella, M. with Blauert, J., Campilan, D., Gavena, J. et al (eds) Learning from Change: Issues and experiences in participatory monitoring and evaluation. London: Intermediate Technology Publications Ltd. Pp.15-31. (P.29).*
- 4 *Davies, R. and Dart, J. (2005) The Most Significant Change 'MSC' Technique: A Guide to Its Use. <http://www.mande.co.uk/docs/MSCGuide.pdf>.*
- 5 *Scrimshaw, N.S and Gleason, G.R. Eds. (1992) Rapid Assessment Procedures: Qualitative Methodologies for Planning and Evaluation of Health Related Programmes. Boston, MA: International Foundation for Developing Countries.*
- 6 *Aubel (1999) describes 7 phases and 20 steps for participatory evaluation. See Aubel, J. (1999) Participatory Program Evaluation Manual: Involving Program Stakeholders in the Evaluation Process. Dakar: Catholic Relief Services.*

- 7 Guijt, I. (2000) 'Methodological Issues in Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation.' In Estrella, M. with Blauert, J., Campilan, D., Gaventá, J. et al (eds) *Learning from Change: Issues and experiences in participatory monitoring and evaluation*. London: Intermediate Technology Publications Ltd. Pp.201-216 (p.204).
- 8 Scrimshaw, N.S and Gleason, G.R. Eds. (1992) *Rapid Assessment Procedures: Qualitative Methodologies for Planning and Evaluation of Health Related Programmes*. Boston, MA: International Foundation for Developing Countries.
- 9 Mayne, J. (1999) *Addressing Attribution through Contribution Analysis: Using Performance Measures Sensibly*. Office of the Auditor General, Canada.
- 10 Information on Outcome Mapping is drawn from: Earl, S., Carden, F. and Smutylo, T. (not dated) *Brochure on Outcome Mapping: The Challenges of Assessing Development Impacts*. http://web.idrc.ca/en/ev-26979-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html