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• ARCO is not only academic research but Action-Research

→ Policy-oriented research that it is conducted with local stakeholders and it is easily translated into action

  #Impactful  #Multidisciplinary  #Participatory

• Our theoretical background lies in Amartya Sen’s Capability Approach and the Sustainable Human Development paradigm

→ “Development lies in people's freedom to determine their own future”

ARCO supports public authorities, private organizations and civil society organizations in promoting local development and community empowerment

ARCO contributes to the global academic debate on sustainable human development and the capability approach
STRATEGIC UNITS

- LOCAL DEVELOPMENT UNIT
- GROUPS AT RISK AND INCLUSIVE DEVELOPMENT UNIT
- THIRD SECTOR & SOCIAL INNOVATION UNIT
- IMPACT EVALUATION UNIT
Investigation, experimentation and production of scientific evidence on local development processes, in order to promote the design and implementation of tailored place-based strategies for sustainable human development at local level.

Examples:
- ARCO conducted a research on international development cooperation at the local level funded by UNDP, aimed at comparing traditional aid policies with new international cooperation initiatives that aim to empower local development systems to adopt a Sustainable Human Development perspective.
- ARCO supported the association Prospettiva Casentino (composed by local entrepreneurs of Casentino Valley – Tuscany, Italy) on designing tailored and innovative project proposals for the development of the tourism sector in the valley with the final aim of increasing local well-being especially for young people.
- ARCO assessed the resilience of bergamot farmers in Reggio Calabria Province (Calabria, Italy), in order to evaluate the ability of the socio-economic system to maintain its functions when shocks and various disruptions occur constitute a very relevant asset.
- ARCO is supporting Oxfam in elaborating its Position Paper on “Local governance to face multidimensional poverty and inequality”.
Performing **policy relevant and rigorous evaluations**, relying on both quantitative and qualitative methods and using **multidimensional models** of impact analysis.

Examples:

- Impact evaluation of **value chain development** project by the Overseas Agronomic Institute in Bale, Ethiopia – 2013-15
- Evaluation of international cooperation project on **disability** by NGO Aifo in Mongolia - 2015
- Impact evaluation of **microcredit** scheme in Sardinia Region – 2014-15
- Qualitative impact evaluation of the **health services** provided by Zaporouka Foundation and Soleterre, Ukraine – 2013
- Impact Evaluation of **health programme by** WINFOCUS in Minas Gerais Region, Brazil – 2013-14
- Intermediate evaluation of the **UNDP/ART Global Initiative** – 2012
- Impact evaluation of **Community–Based Rehabilitation programs** for people with disabilities in Mandya District, Karnataka, India – 2009/2011
- Impact evaluation of Community–Based Rehabilitation programs in West-Nile, Uganda – 2011
- Impact evaluation of **rural cooperative enhancement** project by Oxfam Italy in Neyba, Dominican Republic – 2010
• Our action-research approach is based on **multi-disciplinary** analysis and cross-fertilizing theories, with an **integrated (top-down and bottom-up) and place-based perspective**

• Our research topics have to be **policy-relevant** and contribute to the well-being of the society

• We believe in our own continuous **upgrading and innovation in the methodological approach**, based on international cutting-edge research, as well of that of our partners

• We use a **participatory approach** in diagnostic studies and policy design, basing results and processes on local knowledge and **ownership** of development strategies

• Our studies and researches are **independent and transparent**
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1. Introduction

The international development arena is nowadays characterized by programs that can no longer be easily exemplified by the standard linear relation inputs-actions-outputs-outcomes.

→ **Complexity** (multidimensional focus, soft activities, processes and long-term impacts, evolving context, multi-level governance)

→ **Context-dependency** (shaped by the varied characteristics of the geographical, economic, social, institutional and cultural context of action)

→ Each process aimed at linking the analysis of reality (e.g. impact evaluation) to decision making cannot be neutral (Harriss, 2007)

i.e. Evaluation should not ignore its political dimension
The Standard Result Chain and theory of change

Gertler et al. (2011)
Challenges for evaluation

- Causality is often less clearly ordered
- **Feedback loops** can generate vicious or virtuous circles and synergies within dynamic processes of **multi-causality**
- **Processes and procedural aspects** characterising these programs appear as important as the outcomes at individual and community level

→ It is complicated to:
- isolate and disentangle attribution of (net) impacts to a single actor among many
- analyse intangible aspects
- build-up counterfactuals
- assess multidimensional development processes
Therefore...

In order to capture the complexity of community and/or territorial development programmes and their dynamic and evolutionary elements, a sound theoretical approach and mixed methods are both needed.

(Barahona and Levy, 2007; Stern et al., 2012)

Their consistent combination with multi-faced informational spaces can represent a crucial value-added for comprehensive evaluations.
2. Sound theoretical framework (1)

Although the **impact evaluation literature** has been really booming in the last ten years, **little has been done from a human development and capability approach perspective**

→ The CA – being an agency-oriented and opportunity-based theory – can **enrich the informational base** for multidimensional socio-economic assessments, moving beyond mainstream “project approach” informational space, design and tools

→ The CA shifts the primary attention of evaluations to **what people are able to do and to be** and have reason to value, including immaterial aspects of their life

→ The CA gives salience to processes and to the **individual’s and communities’ experiences, values and participation**
Most relevant consequences for the evaluation of complex development programs:

1. a **people-centred analysis** focused on beneficiaries’/stakeholders’ outcomes in terms of **expansion of capabilities**

2. the **multidimensionality of well-being** to be embraced and captured by the evaluation analysis

3. stakeholders’ wide **participation** to increase the **informational** space for the evaluation and to foster public deliberation, voicing power and democratic assessments;

4. the **integration among micro-meso-macro levels** to take into consideration the multilevel articulation of development initiatives influencing the evaluation domains.
The STEHD Framework
*Sustainable Territorial Evolution for Human Development*
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3. Use of mixed-methods (1)

→ Evaluations should be structured on two main parallel tracks:

1. to find methods to **synthesise the impact** of policy measure
2. to **understand the processes** (why and how) that lead a program to achieved certain results

   (Rao and Woolcock, 2004; Stern et al., 2012).

• The use of mixed methods as widely debated in the literature (Bardhan, 1989; Bourguignon, 2003; Chambers, 2003; Kanbur, 2003; Bardhan and Ray, 2006; Cosgel, 2006)

• A remarkable potentiality of mixed methods is the capacity of **explaining both outcomes and processes** by catching their complexity, especially regarding development programs

• This potent can be fully exploited only if there is no prejudice (e.g. against QUAL)
Use of mixed-methods (2)

There is not a single or right way to integrate quantitative and qualitative methodologies:
e.g. parallel, sequential and iterative integration.


- “Confirming/Reinforcing/Refuting” integration when qualitative methods are use to test econometric analysis findings
- “Enriching” integration when certain aspects of a phenomenon cannot be handled through quantitative instruments
- “Examining” integration to test qualitative methodologies-based knowledge through quantitative methods.
- “Explaining” integration to explain unexpected quantitative results in a qualitative way
- “Merging” when the same data are analyzed both through quantitative and qualitative methods

White (2008)
Integrated mixed-methods procedure

An example of a procedure in **8 steps:**

1) **Analysis of existing data and documents**
   - Desk review on the issue and the program
   - First field missions

2) **Theoretical framework**
   - Theoretical issues and theory of change

3) **Qualitative methods to explore the potential outcome variables and causes**
   - In-depth interviews
   - FGDs to prepare both studies ➔ including dimensions and outcome variables
   - Working group of experts
Integrated mixed-methods procedure
(...continued)

4) Tools design
- Questionnaire and structured FGDs, user manuals

5) Sampling Design (with comparison group)
- Sampling design for both qualitative and quantitative

6) Training and Tools testing
- Training of persons, manual checking, tools pilot

7) Data production
- Quantitative survey
- Qualitative analysis → through structured FGDs
- Data entry and management

8) Data Analysis and triangulation
(including further investigation if necessary)
   ... follows report/paper writings
4. Innovative qualitative tools for comparative analysis and evaluations

1. Structured Focus Group Discussion (SFGD) with a Matrix Score

   Biggeri and Ferrannini (2014b, JHDC)

- It aims at collecting reliable information for project evaluations, contributing also to the communities’ empowerment and stakeholders agency because of its participatory nature.

- This tool is defined “structured” since, once completed, the steps are clearly defined (sequence of actions and sequence of questions) and thus replicable for comparability.

- The tool is quite flexible and adaptable to the type, characteristics and complexity of development programs and eventually to the different stakeholders involved.

→ SFGDs can complement quantitative data, or in its absence can constitute a valuable qualitative method by itself.
1. In-depth analysis on the achieved functionings within the communities of interest

2. Appropriate identification of the dimensions and sub-dimensions of analysis (through accurate desk review, surveys, in depth interviews and/or FGDs with privileged observers)

→ Letting local actors identifying the most relevant dimensions of analysis, reducing prescriptive lists or value judgements by external researchers
Structured Focus Group Discussions with Matrix score

- A matrix of data to collect the answers of a *group questionnaire* is constructed, composed by a number of questions (rows x columns) with a score for each answer.
- **Rows** represent the *dimensions of analysis* identified in the first phase, while **columns** refer to either:
  A) **different beneficiaries** (e.g. varying statuses in terms of conversion factors)
     → The score in each cell of the matrix refers to the *level of opportunity* \( x \) held in the status \( y \)

  OR

  B) different project stakeholders
     → The score in each cell of the matrix refers to the *contribution by stakeholder* \( y \) to the actual *level of opportunity* \( x \)
Structured Focus Group Discussions with Matrix score

• The scoring method usually relies on a **0-10 scale**: 0 indicates complete lack of opportunity/capability, 10 corresponds to the highest level of opportunity.

• The identification of a certain score and assessment for each point is thus based on **collective discussion and group answers**, rather than on individual answers.

• The **methodological procedure is structured** to be conducted exactly in the same manner in every group activity with different stakeholders, reducing the ambiguities and bias attributed to standard FGD.
A) With baseline and comparison groups

i) Familiarize the participant with the dimensions
ii) Familiarize with marking
iii) Validate the dimensions using a benchmark (column)
iv) Partial ranking of the dimensions (three most relevant)
v) Assess different opportunities for different characters
vi) Significance/attribution to the program by dimensions and by characters
vii) Validate the whole the exercise by commenting it

At least three persons are necessary:
One lead facilitator, One assistant, One note takers

Time: from 2 to 4 hours depending on the number of dimensions
### Figure: SCORE MATRIX FOR Structured focus group discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES - DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>RELEVANCE OF DIMENSION</th>
<th>LEVEL OF OPPORTUNITY (TODAY)</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTION TO THE LEVEL OF OPPORTUNITY by CBR program</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTION TO THE LEVEL OF OPPORTUNITY by STATE GOVERNMENT</th>
<th>LEVEL OF OPPORTUNITY (TODAY) WITHOUT CBR programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) To get a job</td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 1/10</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) To feel respected in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the community</td>
<td>(2a)</td>
<td>Level 1/10</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) To express own views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and participate in the</td>
<td>(3a)</td>
<td>Level 1/10</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) To be able to keep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>himself/herself clean and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tidy</td>
<td>(4a)</td>
<td>Level 1/10</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) To spend leisure time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) To access health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
<td>Level 1/10 seeds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE 1)** that Every character is aged 25-45 with average income and average caste, living in the community; **NOTE 2)** the person with disabilities has been participating actively in CBR program since 4 years.
B) Without baseline and without comparison group

i) Familiarize the participant with the dimensions
ii) Familiarize with marking
iii) Validate the dimensions using an ideal benchmark (column)
iv) Partial ranking of the dimensions (three most relevant)
v) Assess different functioning level for the community/persons now and before the program started (retrospective analysis)
vi) Significance/attribution to the program change to different actors by dimensions (three questions each)

vii) IE exercise (the functioning level without)
viii) Validate the whole the exercise by commenting it

At least three persons are necessary:
One lead facilitator, One assistant, One note takers

Time: from 2 to 4 hours depending on the number of dimensions
## Example: UNDP ART in Colombia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Ability to elaborate a strategic and shared vision of local economic development</td>
<td>(1–10)</td>
<td>(1–10)</td>
<td>(1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(1–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Access to economic opportunities for marginal groups</td>
<td>(1–10)</td>
<td>(1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(1–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Joint involvement of public and private actors in local development programs</td>
<td>(1–10)</td>
<td>(1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(1–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Capacity to coordinate the action of international donors (including decentralized cooperation), local actors and national government</td>
<td>(1–10)</td>
<td>(1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(yes, no); (+, −); (1–10)</td>
<td>(1–10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. O-Gap Walk

Objective to assess the opportunity gaps within communities among people with different personal or group conversion factors

- It is structured as a contemporaneous mental and physical exercise, providing an intuitive portrayal of differences in capabilities freedom and discrimination in a community context
- It proposes an advancement of the Power Walk method elaborated by UNICEF, linking it to the capability approach, widening its scope of application and providing possible quantitative analyses of the findings
O-Gap Walk (1)

1. Secret and random assignation to each participant of a role card, each representing various typical characters within a certain community, whose capabilities freedom is assessed throughout the exercise.

2. Participants are invited to join at an open space, taking position standing in a row below a line.

3. Participants are asked to react to one-by-one opportunity statements by indicating the capability freedom enjoyed by the individual character they represent, i.e. number of steps $0 \leq z \leq 3$, where 0 corresponds to “impossibility” and 3 to “full opportunity”.
4. At the end of the exercise, when the reaction to each statement has been summed up and each individual has reached his/her own **final position**, an **intuitive assessment of the opportunity gap** and a measure of the **inequality of capabilities** is obtained.

5. To conclude, participants are first invited to **reveal** their secret character/role and then to **collectively evaluate both the opportunity gap** and the lesson drawn from the activity itself.
Methodological advantages

• Provision of **valuable information** to be immediately and easily translated into quantitative terms in terms of participatory statistics

• Wide range of application and its adaptability to the contexts and objects of analysis

• Both *cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses can be conducted*, either comparing the actual situation in different communities (e.g. treatment or control groups) or monitoring and evaluating the impact of a certain program by repeating the exercise in the same community before, during and after the implementation

+ Retrospective analyses
Potential issues for these tools

1. Subjective perceptions and adaptive preferences

   → To reduce the personalisation of opinions through reflective reasoning, helping participants to partially to detach their preferences from their life experiences in order to become a “quasi- impartial spectator” (Sen, 2006; Biggeri and Libanora, 2011)

2. The “potential capability set” might be neglected by part of the considered community, e.g. if a minority group is totally deprived in a certain dimension

   → To consult a “representative” sample of the population and to include basic capabilities in the potential capability set
5. Final remarks

To evaluate complex development programs...

• It is crucial to rely on a sound theoretical framework to examine multi-causality and on complex mixed methods evaluation strategies to comprehensively assess development processes
• We propose a procedure based on a CA-enhanced conceptual framework
• Increasing stakeholders’ voicing power and placing central emphasis on local stakeholders’ knowledge of the contextual dynamics by letting them to participate in impact assessment
• Creating the ground for a systematic integration between quantitative and qualitative methodologies
• Valorising the political dimension of the evaluation itself, contributing to the expansion of participation, empowerment and agency within local societies
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