

But how do we Know we are Making a Difference?

Issues relating to the evaluation of Christian development work

Brian E. Woolnough

Brian E. Woolnough is Emeritus Fellow of St Cross College, Oxford

Abstract

There has, over the last few decades, been a considerable growth in the development 'business' where, largely western, donors have sought to help the poorer nations develop. Much of this growth has been driven by Christian motivation. Increasingly such projects are being held accountable to try to ensure that the money and the effort being spent are being well spent. The question that is being asked of, and by, development workers is 'how do we know that we are making a difference?' and a range of practices have been developed to assess, to measure, to evaluate such effects. Terms like impact assessment, objectives, log-frames, objective verifiable indicators, baselines, clients, have become part of the language. In this paper the author raises various fundamental questions about this practice of evaluating development projects, and in so doing challenges the suitability of some of the current practices for development work.

Introduction: Background and Context

It might be useful to begin by outlining my own unusual background as this will illuminate the different perspectives that I bring to this question. It will illustrate both the strengths and the weaknesses that I bring to this analysis. I hope it will enable the reader to make allowances for my naivety and inexperience in some areas, and appreciate my readiness to 'leap in where angels fear to tread' in others! I started by academic training as a scientist, as a physicist, and then moved into the field of education, teaching in secondary schools and then in Oxford University's Department of Educational Studies. In this latter stage of my professional life I worked closely with teachers, in training and in practice, and did research into aspects of educational studies, moving from science to social science. In this area I engaged in the debate about how, most appropriately to evaluate educational projects. On retirement I had the privilege of working as a volunteer with Tearfund, a Christian relief and development organisational, for nearly six years. I was largely based with the international team and worked with, and experienced first hand, many of the Christian development workers working with the partner organisations in Africa and in Asia, especially India. This period introduced me to many quite remarkable development workers, doing some wonderful work among the poor, and also to the practice and evaluation of Christian development work of the highest quality at the professional level. Thus I bring to this question a mixture of perspectives, as a scientist, as an educationalist, as a social science researcher, and from the field of practicing development workers. (I

am also a practicing Christian seeking to know and do our Lord's will in all I do, with a commitment to seek to serve those living in poverty.)

Whilst working with Tearfund,¹ I was particularly struck by the parallels between the fields of development and of education. In each, practitioners and researchers work with people and communities, seeking to improve a highly complex and continually changing 'system'. The questions raised by those involved in development when trying to evaluate their projects were exactly parallel to those we grappled with in education. Some of the dangers I saw in certain approaches in the development field, I had earlier met in some of the more simplistic approaches I had met in education! Some of the pseudo scientific approaches I met in both fields failed to convince me, as a scientist, of their validity or usefulness.

Some Fundamental Questions

So, with this rather idiosyncratic background, let me look at a few questions and see how these highlight the fundamental issues facing our evaluations. Perhaps this is the scientist in me recognising that asking the right question is the essential pre-requisite for producing a meaningful solution. Forgive me if some of these questions seem self-evident.

Why Evaluate?

There are two main reasons why people seek to evaluate projects: either to *prove* or to *improve* them?² For some the main motivation is one of accountability, to prove, to justify to the donors that their money has been used effectively. For others, particularly the practitioners, the main motive is to improve their own work and make it better. Though some would argue that they seek to do both at the same time, the systems of evaluation set up are highly determined by one set of objectives, and are often counterproductive to the other. One problem with the systems that seek to prove the effectiveness of the project is that, by the time the project is completed it is too late to do anything about it – the money has been spent! A further reason for evaluation is that, by publicly sharing the insights and best practice we have gained from one project, others may also learn and save having to 're-invent their own wheel.' As Belshaw said,³ 'This information (about best practice) when shared will reduce the need for periodic 're-invention of the wheel' or unnecessary and often painful journeys down blind alleys.'

Who Evaluates?

Is the evaluation done by the donor organisation, or by the practitioners. Many of the donor organisations now have set up, often laborious, systems of external evaluation to hold the practitioners accountable to them, reflecting an unfortunate power relationship. They also may appoint external, consultant evaluators. Many of the practitioner organisations have set up their own internal evaluation processes to help them get insights into what does and what does not work well. Much time and effort is spent by the practitioners in satisfying the donor's requirements for completing their evaluation systems. Some – but certainly not all – are found to be constructive. Though each system initially has benign intentions, in practice they are often frustrated. Though the log-frame approach⁴ intended that the process of the team developing it together would be the most constructive aspect, and that the product, the once written log-frame, should only be seen as a developmental structure throughout the project, in practice it is often developed by an individual burning the mid-night oil and remains in its original form on a shelf referred to only when the donor insists on the next stage of the evaluation being written up. Increasingly people are recognising the strength of the reflective prac-

titioner approach;⁵ the practitioners themselves are the experts, highly motivated seeking to do the best they can for the poor and for their Lord. They are also intelligent, local professionals who are the best placed to reflect on what is going on and how to modify their practice accordingly. Furthermore, self-evaluations done by reflective professionals give them a sense of ownership that external, donor driven evaluations can never do.

What is evaluated?

Self-evidently, what is to be evaluated relates directly to the aim and purpose of project. What the project sets out to do is what should be evaluated. Where this is as simple as providing water to a community this can be easily evaluated and measured. Where the aim is holistic transformation of the community, integral mission in all its Christian fullness,⁶ such changes though readily seen, are much more difficult to measure. Unfortunately, evaluators tend to measure those things which can be easily measured and ignore the more important factors that can not. Hence the aims of the project itself can get distorted. More fundamentally still is the question of what we mean by 'development'. In the excellent report of the Commission for Africa⁷ the authors asked 'what is development for?' They stressed that you would get different answers from those in Western countries who would talk about Africa 'catching up, with the developed world and would measure progress merely in material, economic terms, and the answers you would get in most African countries where you would be told something to do with well-being, happiness and membership of a community.' Are we aiming to increase wealth or well-being? In Christian development work especially, concerned with genuine integral mission, it is vital that we get clear about evaluating what we are really aiming to achieve. Note that aims imply values, and it is these values which need really rigorous discussion.

Who are we evaluating for?

Another simple but necessary question is 'who are the clients, who are we evaluating for?' Should it be the donor organisations themselves, or the supporters, those who give to fund these projects? Does the organisation really represent their supporters and seek to know what sort of evaluation they would like? Should we not be evaluating for the poor, those we seek to serve? How often do we listen to their voice? And, particularly for Christians working in development, are we not ultimately, and only, accountable to God? This raises the very real question about how we hear the voice of God, and how we react when the practitioner believes that God wants them to change the direction of their project whilst our funding organisation insists that the partner continues with the original log-framed plan. Whose voices do we listen to, whose voice is authentic? So often the voice of the poor is rarely heard, indeed so often the voice of the poor is not sought. But if we are to serve the poor it is unwise not to listen to the voice of the poor, both in our project planning and its evaluation. Two recent examples of a researcher who *was* explicitly concerned to find what the poor he was working really wanted, asked them. The response from folk living in a slum community in Kenya was 'security' rather than increased wealth, or even health. The response from folk in poor communities in Bangladesh 'give us prayer mats and we will sort out our problems ourselves.' Neither answers fit in easily with the millennium development goals.

When do we evaluate?

The question of when we evaluate is, of course, linked to the answer to the earlier

questions, especially 'who is doing the evaluating?' Donors want to evaluate at the end of the project, and sometimes at periodic 'check-up' points through the project. Practitioners would often want to run a regular on-going programme of review through out the project. For donors, sadly, projects have a beginning and a finite end, 2 or 3 years after starting. For them, who would also be seeking sustainability for their work, it would make sense to do an evaluation some years after the project is completed. Rarely, if ever, is that done. Where the practitioners are the local community or the local church the development work is on-going and never ends, which makes an ongoing, self-driven, reflective form of evaluation so much more appropriate. Retrospective, reflective evaluations, whether at the end or during the project, can have enormous value when the open-ended question is asked 'what changes have occurred since the project started, and why?'

What model for evaluation?

Over the years different types of, different models for, evaluation have been tried, based on the scientific, the social sciences, the economic or the managerial paradigms. Many have built their evaluations on a scientific model, with its baselines, its inputs, its outputs, its measurements of changes in the system, with its 'black box', its controlled experiment type of approach. Unfortunately, such approaches are rarely scientifically valid and are often unhelpful. Rarely will the experiment be 'controlled', there will be too many variables which interact with the system and can not be predicted or measured. Changes can rarely be attributed just to the project input itself. And because of the 'black box' approach little can be deduced about the causes of the changes which did or did not occur. As a scientist I find many evaluations based on such a scientific model quite invalid and a spurious waste of time! Good science it is not, pseudo science perhaps. Economists often tend to use such an unhelpful approach. Social science models recognise much more the complexity of human interactions and bring a range of strategies, from the pseudo-scientific approach, through case studies, surveys, interviews, reflective practitioners, and focus group discussions, to story telling. Social studies seek to get insights into the causes of change and thus can be more useful to those who want evaluation to be a means to improvement. Perhaps the dominant model that is currently being used for evaluations is based on management traditions.⁸ This is very largely driven by principles of accountability. It is often run by, certainly for, accountants. With their project cycle management and their logical framework they emphasise objective and verifiable indicators. This certainly forces people to think hard not only about what they are doing but what they hope to achieve. The objectives are expected to be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Timebound). Chris Roche, in his excellent book *Impact Assessment for Development Agencies*,⁹ suggests that another type of objective is more appropriate in development work, the SPICED objectives (Subjective, Participatory, Interpreted, Cross-checked, Empowering and Diverse).

Each of these models has their strengths and weaknesses, but there is one important distinction between the Scientific and the Managerial approaches on the one side and the better Social Science approaches on the other. In many ways the situation in social sciences, in development or in education, is much more complicated and more difficult than in science – because we are dealing with highly complex, individualist, often irrational human individuals and communities. But in one way it is far easier because the 'objects' we are interested in and are researching are not inanimate, like atoms or peas, but are intelligent, articulate

people who can talk to us and tell us what they think and why they behaved as they did. This enormous strength is often ignored in the scientific and managerial approaches, let us not overlook it in our work of evaluation but incorporate it with reflective practitioners and articulate poor.

What type of data?

The next question relates to the type of data that we want to collect: quantitative or qualitative, or a mixture of the two? Which type of data is more appropriate, more valid, more reliable, and more authoritative? There is a considerable debate around this question, and this is not the place to discuss in full the strengths and weaknesses of the two approaches in evaluating or making an impact assessment. I would refer the reader to the references below for good, useful comparisons.¹⁰ There are however a few points I would make here.

There are those, taking a scientific (a pseudo-scientific!) or a managerial approach who want to measure everything, and for whom quantitative measures are the only really tough, hard, reliable indicators of impact. They have a low regard for qualitative stories, which they call soft and subjective. They fail to appreciate that what they measure may not be valid, significant, or a measure of what the project aims to deliver. They rarely appreciate the uncertainty of many, most, human and societal measures and have a very unscientific appreciation of the meaning of measurements. Albert Einstein summed up the dilemma well when he said *'Not all that counts can be measured, not all that can be measured counts.'* It is easy to confuse reliability with validity. Reliability is a measure of how different people measuring the same thing get the same result, validity is a measure of whether what is measured is a valid measure of the intended outcome. In a Christian context, when we hope to develop holistic transformation for an individual and a community, making a valid measure of such transformation is not merely difficult it is impossible.

There is good quantitative research and bad, similarly there is good qualitative research and bad. The use of statistics can be very helpful in evaluations, as long as they are used wisely. There are however many examples of GIGO when using statistics inappropriately.¹¹ GIGO? Garbage In, Garbage Out. Perhaps the greatest danger comes when one uses the statistics not only descriptively but inferentially. Trying to infer causations from correlations without having insights about the causal links is highly misleading. The fact that the incidence of HIV/AIDS in many African and Asian cities is still rising can not be linked to the many excellent new projects trying to counter that, correlations do not prove causations.

Perhaps it is merely in the Western scientific traditions that we put so much value onto measurement rather than in more human accounts. One of the most interesting new methods being devised recently to evaluate development projects is called the Most Significant Change method (MSC).¹² On the first page of this project's website is a splendid cartoon which highlights this tension. There are two people addressing each other, a western man with a measuring stick and an African woman with a child. The man says 'I have an instrument for measuring', the woman says 'Let me tell you a story!' Which approach is the more appropriate in evaluating a project?

There are other methods of evaluation which are being developed, most of which are participatory and developmental, and involve the practitioner and other boundary partners and all of which seek to find out what is going on, to get insights into the processes and the values involved, and to emphasise the improv-

ing, rather than the proving, aspects of evaluation. We have mentioned the Most Significant Change approach, in which the participants tell stories about the most significant change that they see occurring. Another approach is called Outcome Mapping¹³ and again asks the various clients and beneficiaries how they feel things are developing; this is being used by a wide network of NGOs around the world. A different approach is that of Appreciative Inquiry,¹⁴ where the participants draw out those things that seem to be going really well, a nice change from the deficit model inherent in so many evaluation practices which tend to concentrate on the things that are not being achieved. There are a set of methodologies too which focus quite explicitly on Listening to the Voices of the Poor,¹⁵ where the concept of well-being as seen by the poor themselves often differs widely from that seen by the donor organisation. All of these methods have much to commend them and merit further study.

Is one type of evaluation appropriate for every project?

The above sections have summarised some of the strengths and weaknesses of various methodologies, it might be inferred that one method is best for the evaluation of all projects. But this can not be, and it would be a rash organisation that sought to introduce a single pattern of evaluation. No, different types of projects, with different aims, should seek the most appropriate methodologies to that project. I would suggest that it is best to start with fundamental questions such as those above, to think hard about which questions your evaluation is really seeking to assess and then to use whatever tools are the best for answering that question.

What would we consider a satisfactory evaluation?

Before setting out on evaluations it is important to be clear about what will happen afterwards and what we would consider a satisfactory outcome. Will the evaluation report just sit on a shelf and gather dust?! Will it be acted upon? What effect will the result, and the process, have on the participants themselves? the donors? the practitioners? the poor? Will we only consider a project a success if it has positive outcomes? There is a danger that too much reliance on evaluation and accountability criteria will make us risk averse, only supporting safe, well tried programmes. I sometimes wonder what some of our current evaluation processes would conclude if applied to the life and ministry of Jesus! As Christians, we are called to be obedient and faithful, not to be successful. Material success is very much a worldly concept in our success orientated society. Gandhi was wise when he said that we should have a 'non-attachment to results as essential for the uphill struggle against entrenched evils; we must leave the outcomes in the hands of God.'

We also know that the history of mission and of the church itself is full of stories which start highly unsuccessfully and yet which have, in the long term, been clearly in God's will. The application of a short term evaluation at an early stage could have been disastrous. On a personal note, I grew up at the time when a group of missionaries in South America had just been massacred by the local population, but the story of these 'mid-century martyrs'¹⁶ proved a real inspiration to me and generations of other Christians. Indeed, as a Christian seeking to follow Christ, I suspect we are more persuaded by Wordsworth's words 'Give all thou canst. All heaven and earth abhor the nicely calculated less or more' than many evaluation reports when planning both our professional and our personal lives.

How much time, effort, and money should we spend on evaluation?

A very pragmatic question but one which we should, as stewards of God's time and money, take seriously. When a system of project evaluation takes something like 20% or more of the time and money devoted to a project, we might well ask whether that is a good use of the resources so sacrificially given by many well meaning supporters. It is worth noting that the heavy formal evaluations which might be appropriate for national initiatives or for projects costing tens of millions of pounds are likely to be quite inappropriate for smaller projects costing tens of thousands of pounds.

What, if anything, is distinctive about Christian evaluation?

Perhaps this is the most important question of all. What, if anything, is distinctive about our evaluations, about our service to the poor, which is distinctive because we are Christians. Most of what has been discussed above would be equally appropriate to a secular development worker. The haunting voice at the back of my mind is 'Be ye not conformed to this world'. (Rom. 12:1, 2)

We do have different goals, we do have a different example to follow, we have different attitudes to our work. Yes, we should be *as wise as serpents*, we should pursue 'professional excellence' but primarily we have only one master to serve and seek to be guided by His Holy Spirit, to humbly, and prayerfully to recognise that 'unless the Lord build the house they labour in vain that build it.' We need to show servant leadership (Phil. 2:7) and so, as Jesus did, seek always to serve the poor (Matt. 25:40), and thus to listen to the poor.

Specifically, Christian development work differs from secular work on several aspects. i) Primarily, our aim will be for holistic transformation of individuals and communities, we are concerned for spiritual transformation as well as physical, emotional and economic change. ii) We are likely to be working with the local church, with fellow Christians, our brothers and sisters in Christ, with whom we have the privilege of sharing in partnership in serving the poor; together answerable and accountable to our Lord. iii) We recognise that our battles are spiritual battles; *we wrestle not against flesh and blood*, and thus seek to be led, prayerfully, by the Holy Spirit. iv) As we are called to serve the poor we will *listen* to the poor. Christian evaluations should similarly match these distinctives of Christian development work.

Conclusions and Recommendations

I am conscious that I have above raised more questions than answers. That is deliberate, there is no one right answer, no single pattern that is transferable to every situation. But I do believe that if we ask the right questions, prayerfully, we will come up with the right (the most appropriate) answer.

However, having come so far, it might not be inappropriate to make a few recommendations to the two main groups involved in evaluating.

Recommendations to donor organisations

i) Remember that the partner organisations you are funding are fellow Christians, highly committed, well motivated professionals,¹⁷ who are doing their best to serve the poor in their locality in ways, and in a context, which they understand better than you! It is a privilege to walk alongside them in partnership, and to serve them.

ii) Remember too that you have a responsibility to see that the money entrusted to you by supporters is spent as wisely as possible. This does not mean that

there will be no risk or that you can guarantee that no money is ever misused. It means that you will be walking alongside partner organisations that you trust, and support them in their strengths and their weaknesses. This trust can not be engendered by mechanistic systems alone, indeed such systems can be misleading and counter-productive, but will be built upon personal relationships. Good personal relationships between staff at the donor and the partner organisations will depend on shared visions, regular first hand contact, mutual respect and personal experience.

iii) Procedures to check the financial viability of partner organisations should be applied, but kept as light as possible and sensitive both to international and local traditions.

iv) Procedures to evaluate the individual projects being funded should also be kept as light as possible, with the emphasis being on helping the partner to *improve* their work rather than making the partner *prove* their success to you. Partners should be encouraged to develop their own systems of self-evaluation, if they are not already doing so, and donor organisations should build on and incorporate the partner's own patterns of evaluation into their own. The evaluation should be appropriate to the project and the local context, it is very unlikely that any single form of evaluation would be appropriate to every project and country. Evaluations should be participatory (involving the staff, the poor, and other local beneficiaries), they should be developmental (modifying the plans and procedures as necessary through out the project), and based on appropriate reflective, research strategies. Such evaluations should be owned by the partner organisation and be seen as an integral part of their project planning and practice.

v) Donor organisations should ensure that their evaluations reflects fully the holistic aims of the projects, and are not dominated by financial and material outputs.

vi) The phrase 'measurement of impact' should always be replaced by 'assessment of impact' as, though some forms of impact can be measured many others, often the most important ones, can not. Due weight should be given to qualitative as well as quantitative indicators.

Recommendations to practitioner organisations

i) Practitioner organisations should see evaluation of their work as an integral part of their planning and practice. They should take ownership of their evaluations which should be seen primarily as a way of developing and improving practice.

ii) The first principle for evaluation is to be clear about the aims and objectives of the project and then the methods to evaluate the project should be directed quite explicitly to those aims and objectives. Where the aims are for holistic transformation, the evaluation should gain insights into that, and not be dominated by more readily assessed economic and material indicators.

iii) The evaluation should be appropriate to the project and the local context, it is very unlikely that any single form of evaluation would be appropriate to every project and country. Evaluations should be participatory (involving the staff, the poor, and other local beneficiaries), they should be developmental (modifying the plans and procedures as necessary through out the project), and based on appropriate reflective, research strategies. Consideration should be given to the variety of evaluation strategies, (see above) taking due account of what is practical and viable within the projects resources. It is better to do a simple, illuminative research survey well than an over-ambitious approach badly. The reflective

practitioner approach builds on the natural strengths and motivations of the practitioners.

iv) When evaluating projects, the voice of the poor as well as those of other boundary beneficiaries should be considered.

v) When faced with an external evaluation from the donor organisation engage with it constructively, from the beginning and through out the project, to ensure that due emphasis is being given to your aims and objectives, and that it builds upon, rather than undermines, your own self-evaluation.

Endpiece

We asked as our starting question, 'how do we know that we have made a difference?' and I hope that my questions have lead us some way towards doing that meaningfully. However, in real terms, in God's world, the answer may be 'we do not know, we can not.' In some cases, we may pride ourselves that we have made some differences but which, in God's world, have little value. In others, we will make some differences we know not of. Recently I had the pleasure of hearing a leader of a wonderful NGO in Uganda. She started her talk by thanking God for a couple, who were also at that meeting, who had given her her Christian foundations when she was a girl in a school where they had been teaching. They never knew what difference they had made when they had been teaching that young girl over forty years ago. It is our duty to do our best, it is God's responsibility to bring about His will.

We are called to give *unconditional* love, both in our personal and our professional lives. In so much of our modern lives we want to be accountable, we want to give our love and our aid under certain conditions. It may be successful developmental work, it may be that lives are healed and transformed both spiritually and physically. We want our practical outworking of God's love to be successful. But, I learnt from an Indian leader of a Christian NGO, and his wife, that we are called, ultimately, to share God's *unconditional* love – in spite of what our evaluations may say!

Notes

- 1 Whilst I worked, as a volunteer, with Tearfund (UK) I should stress that the opinions I express here are mine alone, and should not in any way be considered to represent the official view of Tearfund.
- 2 The Kellogg Foundation, for instance, in their Evaluation Handbook speak of evaluations as 'A participatory, multidisciplinary process, not just about outcomes but also building capacity. "Project evaluation should not be conducted simply to prove that a project worked, but also to improve the way it works."
- 3 See Belshaw, D.'s important editorial in *Transformation*, Vol 19.2, 2002, p 89
- 4 The following web site, <http://www.mande.co.uk/logframe.htm>, by Rick Davies gives an excellent summary and discussion of the Logical Framework Approach (LFA).
- 5 Schon, D.A. *Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. (Basic Books. USA. 1983). See also Jarvis, P. *The Practitioner-Researcher: Developing theory from practice* (Jossey-Bass, San Fransisco. 1999)
- 6 The Micah Declaration on Integral Mission (2001) describes the aspiration of many Christian development organisations thus 'Integral mission or holistic transformation is the proclamation and demonstration of the gospel. It is not simply that evangelism and social involvement are to be done alongside each other. Rather, in integral mission our proclamation has social consequences as we call people to love and repentance in all areas of life. And our social involvement has evangelistic consequences as we bear witness to the transforming grace of Jesus Christ. If

we ignore the world we betray the word of God which sends us out to serve the world. If we ignore the word of God we have nothing to bring to the world. Justice and justification by faith, worship and political action, the spiritual and the material, personal change and structural change belong together. As in the life of Jesus, being, doing and saying are at the heart of our integral task.'

- 7 'Our Common Interest.' Report of the Commission for Africa. 2005. Available on www.commissionforafrica.org
- 8 Note especially PCM, Project Cycle Management, at www.fno.org/sd/seaga/downloads/En/projector.pdf or www.ec.europa.eu/europeaid/reports/pan_guidelines_2004-en.pdf
- 9 Roche, C. *Impact Assessment for Development Agencies: Learning to value change.* (Oxfam UK, Oxford, 2004)
- 10 There are various good analyses of different research methodologies for evaluation of development work, ones that I have found particularly helpful include; Roche, C. *Impact Assessment for Development Agencies: Learning to value change.* (Oxfam UK, Oxford, 2004). Hulme, D. 'Impact Assessment Methodologies for Microfinance: a review.' ODI. 'Approaches to analysing the impact of humanitarian assistance: a resource guide', available on www.odi.org.uk/hpg/measuring_impact_resource.htm. INTRAC. Improving Evaluation and Impact Assessment. Available on www.intrac.org/wiki/pmwiki.php/Main/ImprovingEvaluationAndImpactAssessment
- 11 Example of GIGO: A recent proposal for evaluating an NGO's HIV/AIDS programme in Mumbai suggested taking the baseline figure for HIV/AIDS in India, pursuing the projects in the programme and then measuring the figure for HIV/AIDS in India three years later at the end of the project. When asked how the figure for HIV/AIDS in India had been measured and what degree of uncertainty it contained, and how much they anticipated that such a small project would affect even the total population of Mumbai in such a short time, they had the grace to realise the foolishness of relying on such 'garbage' figures. The unreliability of such 'baseline' figures is emphasised when recently (Nov. 2007) UNAids reduced its estimate of the number living with HIV from 40 million to 33 million, at a stroke. Not that 7 million people had been cured but that a new method of 'estimating' the figure had been accepted!
- 12 Davies, R. and Dart, J. 'The Most Significant Change Technique: a guide to its use.' See www.mande.co.uk/docs/MSC_Guide.pdf.
- 13 Earl S., Carden, F., Smutylo, T. *Outcome Mapping, Building Learning and Reflection into Development Programs.* (IRDC, Canada. 2001)
- 14 Cooperrider, D., Whitney, D. *Appreciative Inquiry: A positive revolution in change.* (BK publishers, San Fransisco. 2005). See also www.appreciative-inquiry.org
- 15 The World Bank has done some important work specifically listening to the voices of the poor, in 50 countries engaging over 60,000 poor women and men. This work, lead by Deepa Narayan, has been written up in three reports under the titles 'Voices of the Poor and incorporated in the World Development Report 2000/01' (see www1.worldbank.org/prem/voices/study.htm and www1.worldbank.org/prem/voices/reports.htm // methodology). Their discussion of the methodologies around listening to the poor are also useful.
- 16 Elliott, E. *Through Gates of Splendour.* (Tyndale House Publishers, 1956). See the web for subsequent descriptions of longer term developments, and how God has worked in the lives of those involved.
- 17 Note McGregor's XY theory of motivation in which Theory X, the authoritarian management style, assumes that all the workers do not like work and will attempt to avoid it, whereas Theory Y, the participative management style, starts with the assumption that the average employee likes work and is self motivated. X and Y management styles treat their employees accordingly. Christian development workers certainly deserve Theory Y management from their donor organisations when deciding on ways of evaluation.