*To make the cards, cut along the dotted lines, then fold on the middle line.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Short Questionnaire Survey**A rapid way of getting responses from a larger group. It involves creating a series of multiple choice or short-answer questions and asking groups of people to fill them out.

|  |
| --- |
| Approach: mainly quantitative  |
| Source types: Individuals |
| Time & resources: **1** 2 3 |
| Difficulty: 1 **2** 3 |

**Strengths:** * Questionnaires can provide some simple and quick answers to some basic questions from a group of people
* They can provide a quantitative overview (e.g. you can find interesting patterns across a larger number of people).
* Can be used to see if something you have found with your smaller group of participants is more widespread across the community

**Considerations:*** Large surveys are very time consuming and often require careful sampling. Unless you have the skills and resources in your team already, surveys should be limited to short questionnaire surveys
* Depends on very clear questions. Doing some pre-tests or ‘pilots’ is recommended
* Does not provide in-depth information
 | **Examples of using Short Questionnaire Surveys in C4D evaluation include:**Capacity Building* ask training participants to fill in a questionnaire directly after training to evaluate the quality of training.
* follow up with a questionnaire to participants some time (usually months) after the capacity building activity (training, mentoring, etc.) to find out how they have used their skills.

Content:* ask audience members/users to fill in a questionnaire to find out responses to the content
* asking viewers/users to fill in a questionnaire before and after viewing/using the content to find out whether audiences have gained new knowledge or changed their attitudes

|  |
| --- |
| Guides: Short questionnaire based surveys in the EAR Toolbox: <http://ear.findingavoice.org/toolbox/5-0.html>Questionnaires (and Surveys) on BetterEvaluation <http://betterevaluation.org/evaluation-options/survey>  |

 |
| **Photovoice**Using participatory photography as a tool for evaluation-based storytelling and to engage participants in a focused discussion. Participants use cameras to capture images as a response to topics or questions, then discuss them in a group. Narratives to accompany the photograph can be added.

|  |
| --- |
| Approaches: visual, qualitative, story based, participatory |
| Source types: individuals within groups |
| Time & resources: 1 2 **3** |
| Difficulty: 1 2 **3** |

**Strengths*** An accessible, participatory technique that elicits rich data
* Can be empowering for participants to be able to participate in evaluations
* is a good way to capture stories and ideas that are hard to write in text.

**Considerations*** The purpose and topic or questions need to be clear so that the photographs are helpful for the evaluation
* requires a skilled facilitator
* Depends on access to cameras
 | **Examples of using Photovoice in C4D evaluation:**Infrastructure:* ask people in the network to take and share photos of how the new information and communication flows have changed their practices

Dialogue* ask people involved in dialogue activities to take and share photos of the process and changes since the dialogue activity

|  |
| --- |
| Guides (note, most resources discuss photovoice in general terms, not just as an evaluation method):Photovoice description on BetterEvaluation <http://betterevaluation.org/evaluation-options/photovoice> Detailed Photovoice Manual: <http://www.photovoice.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/PV_Manual.pdf> Practical Guide: <http://www.theinnovationcenter.org/files/doc/D5/CLW%20pp%20164%20Photovoices.pdf> Overview video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xyXnnOlvqOM>  |

 |
| **Interviews**A researcher asks a series of questions to a participant.

|  |
| --- |
| Approaches: qualitative |
| Source types: individuals |
| Time & resources: 1 **2** 3 |
| Difficulty: **1** 2 3  |

**Strengths*** Can be used to get personal and in-depth information
* Can lead to surprising and unexpected insights

**Considerations*** Transcribing interviews can be very time consuming
* Analyzing and processing large amounts of interview data requires some skills in qualitative analysis
 | **Examples of using Interviews in C4D evaluation:**Capacity building:* interview trainers/mentors, participants, and/or managers/employers of participants about changes in skills and capacity

Content:* interview content producers to find out about the process of production
* interview with audiences about their responses

Dialogue* interview participants in the dialogue/discussion about their experiences

|  |
| --- |
| Guides:Interviews in the EAR toolbox: <http://ear.findingavoice.org/toolbox/3-1.html>Interviews overview on Better Evaluation <http://betterevaluation.org/evaluation-options/interviews>  |

  |
| **Group interviews/focus groups**Involving more than one interviewee (often approximately 6-10) to explore attitudes and generate discussion among the interviewees on a certain topic.

|  |
| --- |
| Approaches: qualitative |
| Source type: groups |
| Time & resources: 1 **2** 3 |
| Difficulty: 1 **2** 3 |

**Strengths:*** Discussion among participants can show areas of similarities and differences
* issues can sometimes emerge through group discussion that might not arise individually

**Considerations*** It is common to separate people by gender, age, and social status to get deeper discussions
* Requires a strong facilitator to ask open-ended questions and manage group dynamics
 | **Examples of using Group interviews/focus groups in C4D evaluation:**Content* interview different groups (for example, women, young people, elders) to find out how different kinds of audience members respond to the content

Dialogue* interview different groups (for example, women, young people, elders, politicians) to find out how different groups involved in the dialogue/discussions responded and engaged in discussions

Infrastructure* interview groups of practitioners to find out the awareness and use of new policies and legislation among different groups

|  |
| --- |
| Guides:Focus Groups on Better Evaluation <http://betterevaluation.org/evaluation-options/FocusGroups> Group interviews in the EAR Toolbox<http://ear.findingavoice.org/toolbox/3-2.html>  |

  |
| **Critical Listening/Viewing and Feedback Sessions**To get instant feedback on content so that it can be improved. It involves gathering a group (perhaps the producers or representatives from the target audience), critically listening or watching the content thinking about strengths and areas for improvement, followed by a group discussion.

|  |
| --- |
| Approaches: qualitative, participatory |
| Source type: group |
| Time & Resources: 1 **2** 3 |
| Difficulty: 1 2 **3** |

**Strengths:*** Useful for identifying the relevance and quality of the content as judged by producers, peers or target audiences.
* Useful for reflecting on and improving content

**Considerations*** Using this method on its own won’t tell you much about changes as a result of the content, or how many people are accessing the content.
 | **Examples of using Critical Listening/Viewing and Feedback Sessions in C4D evaluation:**Content* hear reflections from a range of people involved in making the content (producers) on its effectiveness and how it could be improved
* hear reflections from groups of audiences on the relevance of the content and how it could be improved

|  |
| --- |
| Guides:Equal Access Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Toolkit (developed here for radio content, but can be used for other content types) <http://betterevaluation.org/sites/default/files/EA_PM%26E_toolkit_module_4_CLFS_for_publication.pdf>  |

 |
| **Observation**Gathering information by observing people, places and/ or processes.

|  |
| --- |
| Approaches: qualitative and/or quantitative |
| Source type: groups and places |
| Time & resources: **1** 2 3 |
| Difficulty: **1** 2 3  |

**Strengths*** Sometimes it’s hard to get a full understanding of what is happening unless you go and see it for yourself.
* Sometimes people don’t tell you the whole story in interviews, so observation can help fill in the gaps.
* Observation is a flexible method

**Considerations*** People might behave differently when they know you are there.
* You need to spend some time preparing forms and other tools for documenting the observation.
 | **Examples of using Observation in C4D evaluation:**Infrastructure:* observe people to find out how they are using the new networks, or equipment. (How often? What for?)

Dialogue:* observe and take notes of dialogue activities to find out what kind of group dynamic was created during the activity.

|  |
| --- |
| Guides:Participant Observation in the EAR Toolbox <http://ear.findingavoice.org/toolbox/2-0.html> Non-Participant Observation on Better Evaluation <http://betterevaluation.org/evaluation-options/nonparticipantobservation> Participant Observation on Better Evaluation: <http://betterevaluation.org/evaluation-options/participantobservation>  |

 |
| **Documentation using Photography & Video**Discerning changes that have taken place in the environment or activities of a community through the use of images taken over a period of time.

|  |
| --- |
| Approaches: qualitative |
| Source Type: individuals, groups, places,  |
| Time and Resources: 1 **2** 3 |
| Difficulty: 1 **2** 3 |

**Strengths*** visual evidence of change is very powerful
* where this is used for interviews, it enables interviewees to provide compelling narratives in their own words
* it is useful where you are hoping that noticeable visual changes will occur as a result of your program

**Considerations*** It depends on access to equipment (cameras, may use phone cameras). Some editing skills and resources may be required for video.
* still photos are less effective when trying to capture intangible changes. In this case consider using participatory video or photo voice, where participants take photos to represent changes they see.
 | **Examples of using Documentation using Photograph & Video in C4D evaluation:**Content:* take photographs showing the number of people at screenings
* take photographs of people accessing services or implementing practices encouraged through the content. Could include ‘before and after’.

Infrastructure* take photographs or video of the new equipment being used. Can be ‘before and after’

Capacity building* take before and after videos or photographs of practitioners in their workplace to show changes in practice.

Dialogue* video of the dialogue event
* video record interviews with people after the event

|  |
| --- |
| Guide:Guide on Better Evaluation <http://betterevaluation.org/evaluation-options/photographyvideorecording>  |

  |
| **Diaries/journals**Monitoring tool to keep accurate records and documentation of activities. Diaries can be kept individually by project team members, collectively by the project team, or by participants.

|  |
| --- |
| Approach: qualitative |
| Source Type: individual |
| Time & resources: **1** 2 3 |
| Difficulty **1** 2 3 |

**Strengths*** relatively cheap and simple way to keep track of events, activities, observations, questions, changes, stories, problems etc.
* helps when it comes time to reflect

**Considerations*** can sometimes lead to a lot of data that can be challenging to manage and analyse
 | **Examples of using Diaries/Journals in C4D evaluation:**Content* track and observe the process of the content production

Dialogue* track and observe the instances of dialogue and outcomes emerging

|  |
| --- |
| Guides:Diaries, Feedback and self evaluation on EAR <http://ear.findingavoice.org/toolbox/6-0.html>Logs and Diaries on Better Evaluation <http://betterevaluation.org/evaluation-options/logsanddiaries>  |

 |
| **Sketch Mapping**Creating visual representations (‘map’) of a geographically based or defined issue. Sketch Mapping can be repeated to gauge changes over time.

|  |
| --- |
| Approaches: participatory, qualitative and/or quantitative |
| Source types: groups, communities |
| Time & resources: 1 **2** 3  |
| Difficulty: 1 **2** 3  |

**Strengths*** Participatory technique to capture local knowledge
* Useful for informing projects and understanding needs
* Can collect physical information and social information (ownership, gender)

**Considerations*** Mainly useful when geography and locations are important
* Depends on have a skilled facilitator
 | **Examples of using Sketch Mapping in C4D evaluation:**Infrastructure* ask small groups or communities to map the information sources and infrastructures (for example, where are the wifi hotspots? where are the village cinemas? where do people in the community go to get information on health?).

Content* ask small groups or communities to map where the content been distributed (useful if this is local knowledge).

Capacity Building* ask groups of practitioners to map the location of people with high capacity/low capacity, and how they are connected. Repeat the mapping to find out how this changes over time.

|  |
| --- |
| Guides:Sketch Mapping on Better Evaluation <http://betterevaluation.org/evaluation-options/sketchmapping>Resouce mapping <http://www.iapad.org/resource_mapping.htm> <http://www.ifad.org/evaluation/guide/annexd/Annex_D-3DEF.pdf>  |

 |
| **Ideas rating**Collecting ideas and finding out the level of agreement with the ideas among a large number of people.

|  |
| --- |
| Approaches: participatory, quantitative  |
| Source types: groups |
| Time and resources: **1** 2 3 |
| Difficulty: 1 **2** 3 |

**Strengths:*** generates quantitative data (numbers) from participatory processes
* identifies ideas and preferences among a large group, building consensus.
* Can be used to get answers to evaluation questions such as ‘how can this be improved’, ‘what were the highlights’.
* It could be used as a group analysis tool in conjunction with story-based methods

**Considerations*** It requires a good facilitator
* Because it’s based on consensus, it doesn’t necessarily show areas of disagreement or difference.
* It doesn’t necessarily give evidence for change, only a group consensus on particular questions.
 | **Examples of using Ideas rating in C4D Evaluation**Dialogue* ask a group of people to write the most significant part of the discussion on an ideas rating sheet, then ask the group members to indicate the degree to which they agree.

Capacity Development* ask a group of people to write the most valuable skill or outcome they have gained on ideas sheets, then ask group members to indicate the degree to which they agree

Infrastructure* ask a group of people to write the useful improvements to the system on ideas sheets, then ask the group members to indicate the degree to which they agree.

|  |
| --- |
| Guides:Ideas Rating Sheets <http://www.idearatingsheets.org/> Downloadable and printable Idea Rating Sheets<http://www.idearatingsheets.org/download> Dotmocracy on Better Evaluation <http://betterevaluation.org/evaluation-options/Dotmocracy>  |

 |
| **Proportional Piling**Generates estimates of proportions from participants in a visual and accessible way. Participants use 50 or 100 seeds, stones, or other local materials to show proportions.

|  |
| --- |
| Approaches: participatory, quantitative |
| Source type: individuals or small groups |
| Time and Resources: **1** 2 3  |
| Difficulty: **1** 2 3 |

 **Strengths*** draws on local knowledge
* does not depend on literacy of participants
* generates quantitative data which is often preferred by donors
* can be repeated with many people to generate very trustworthy data

**Considerations*** the questions must be very clear
* it might be necessary to combine this method with interviews or other qualitative method to get more details
 | **Examples of using Proportional Piling in C4D**Infrastructure* ask individuals to separate the seeds into piles that represent the proportion of time or money used to achieve a certain outcome. Do this before and after the infrastructure initiative to see if there are changes.

Content* ask small groups to separate the seeds into piles that represent the proportion of the community who accessed the content.

|  |
| --- |
| Guides:<http://www.sswm.info/sites/default/files/reference_attachments/ADEBO%202000%20Training%20Manual%20on%20Participatory%20Rural%20Appraisal.pdf> (page 26) |

  |
| **Content Analysis**Collecting, archiving and analysing newspapers, radio and other news outlets for coverage and treatment of specific topics.

|  |
| --- |
| Approaches: qualitative and/or quantitative |
| Source type: non-human |
| Time & resources: 1 **2** 3 |
| Difficulty: **1** 2 3 |

**Strengths*** non-invasive way of collecting information
* can be quantitative (number of articles, number of lines/minutes per story, number of sources, prominence), or qualitative (depth, accuracy, message, quality)
* can be made to be quite systematic through choosing specific criteria (such as times of day for radio or TV, specific weeks or number of editions per week)

**Considerations*** To make before and after comparisons you need access to a sample before the activity started.
* Can be quite time consuming if the criteria is very broad.
* Can require some skills in identifying ‘codes’ for analysis
 | **Examples of using Content Analysis in C4D Evaluation**Capacity Building* undertake an analysis the stories produced by participants according to criteria relating to accuracy and depth of coverage on a specific topic before the capacity building activity, and again afterwards to find out if there has been improvement
* use before and after content analysis using criteria relevant to the capacity building goals (such as diversity of sources, comprehensiveness) to find out if the journalists/content producers’ skills have improved

Content* use ongoing quantitative content analysis to find out if there has been an increase in the number of stories, prominence of stories (first page, second page) or length of stories (1 minute, 10 lines) about a specific topic (for example, health, climate change) during a campaign.

|  |
| --- |
| Guides:Content analysis on Better Evaluation <http://betterevaluation.org/evaluation-options/content_analysis> Methods for Evaluating Media Interventions in Conflict Countries: <http://www.global.asc.upenn.edu/fileLibrary/PDFs/taylorcaux2.pdf> (page 3-4) |

 |