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## **ABSTRACT**

This study investigated factors influencing “evaluation use” by International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) in South Sudan. Ten INGOs with headquarters in Juba participated in the study instead of the planed 30 due to limited resources and time allocated for the study. The study was guided by three research questions, (a) Do evaluation characteristics affect evaluation use by INGOs in South Sudan?,(b)Do organizational characteristics affect evaluation use by INGOs in South Sudan?,(c) Do stakeholder participation affect evaluation use by INGOs in South Sudan?. The above research questions were investigated through questionnaires, key informant Interviews and documents review. Content analysis was used for analyzing qualitative data while SPSS was used for analyzing the quantitative data in this study.

The findings of this study revealed that evaluation characteristics and organizational characteristics affect evaluation use in INGOs in South Sudan. The sub factors influencing evaluation use under evaluation characteristics include; credibility of the consultant, carrying out evaluation at the right time, delivering reports in a timely manner, communicating evaluation in easy to understand language, clear recommendations, relevant findings and high quality of evaluation. Meanwhile under organizational characteristics, the sub factors include; evaluations are considered appropriate by organizations, organizations take evaluation very seriously, organizations need information to inform their programming, reporting and project execution, organizations have individuals in decision making positions that are committed to evaluation use, organizations promote an environment where evaluation information is critical in decision making, organizations are usually in search of new information and as such they use evaluation findings and organizations usually have resources for conducting evaluations and for implementation of its recommendations.

The study also revealed that stakeholders’ participation does not influence evaluation use in INGOs in South Sudan due to low level of literacy especially among the targeted communities as most of the INGOs deal with the poor, often voiceless people, illiterate who may even fear to ask questions. As a result, the chances they will use evaluation are very limited and involvement of stakeholders in all the stages of evaluation is not always a guarantee that they will use the evaluation result.

Based on these findings, the study recommended that, INGOs should plan evaluation early especially during project design and allocate enough fund for evaluation and implementing the recommendations, INGOs should hire external consultants with extensive experience in evaluations to carry out evaluations for them, INGOs should build the Capacity of internal evaluation staff, INGOs should start empowering stakeholders so that they are able to appreciate the findings of evaluation, use the results and own the projects and lastly external evaluators should be task to work hand in hand with internal evaluation staff throughout the evaluation process so that internal evaluation staff can learn from the external consultants.
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## **CHAPTER ONE**

## **INTRODUCTION**

## **Overview**

The study investigated factors that influence “evaluation use” by International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) in South Sudan. In the study, “evaluation use” was the dependent variable; and evaluation characteristics, organizational characteristics and stakeholder participation were the independent variables. This chapter presents the study background, the statement of the problem, study purpose and objectives, research questions, study hypotheses, the scope of the study and the rationale of the study.

## **1.1 Background to the Study**

International Non-Governmental Organizations receives huge funding from the donor community (governments, foundations and individuals) to support programs ranging from humanitarian emergencies to poverty eradication interventions and developmental programmes. According to UNOCHA Financial tracking service Report 2019, International Committee of the Red Cross alone received over US$32.9 million in 2019 to support people affected by violence with Agriculture, Food and Nutrition, Health, Protection and Human Rights, Shelter and Non-Food Items, Water Sanitation Hygiene (UNOCHA, 2019).

Other INGOs such as Norwegian Refugee Council, Danish Refugee Council, Nile Hope, International Medical Corps, Deutsche Welthungerhilfe e.V. (German Agro Action), Plan International, OXFAM, Mercy Corps and World Vision South Sudan are some of the big INGOs that are operational in South Sudan and like ICRC receive millions of dollars to support numerous interventions they have across the country.

The huge amount of resources being spent have prompted some commentators to suggest that NGOs should demonstrate accountability (Edwards, 2003; Zadek, 2003). Others raised concerns that NGOs might just be administrative inventions by some governments in order to obtain additional funds.

Because of the increasing demand for INGOs accountability, resources are being provided to support program monitoring and evaluation activities and INGO programs and projects have become some of the most evaluated interventions in the country. There are concerns whether these evaluations are used or treated just as any other project or program activity.

However, evaluations and how they are used affect lives of thousands if not millions of people,

(Patton, 2008).

## **1.1.1 Historical Background to the Study**

While evaluations have been informally used for thousands of years (Hogan R. L., 2007), evaluation use started becoming a topic of study since the 1970s as researchers grew increasingly frustrated with the perceived lack of attention to evaluation findings by decision makers (Fitzpatrick, Sanders, & Worthen, 2004) and (Patton, 2008).

The notion of “planful social evaluation” dates back to as early as 2200 B.C. when the Chinese used it for personnel selection, (Shadish, Cook, & Levition, 1991). This evidence shows that evaluation was first used for decision-making. However, according to Mouton (2010), systematic programme evaluation has its origin in the United States of America (US) after the

Second World War. This followed vast expenditure on the social sphere that required a more systematic and rigorous review of spending, suggesting that evaluation in the US was used for purposes of accountability for public expenditure. Other than for accountability, Mouton further noted that in the 1960s in the US, programme administrators used programme evaluation for planning and programming. Towards the late 1970s and 1980s (and this applied to the UK as well), programme evaluation became linked to policy-making and the budgetary process, Derlien (1990), cited in Mouton 2010), thus suggesting additional use of evaluation was for public sector decision making.

Unlike the US and the UK where public sector interventions have been the subject of evaluation use studies, evaluation use and factors that affect use in Africa and indeed evaluation in the

NGO sector remains largely unknown. A study by the World Bank (WB) and African

Development Bank (AfDB) concluded that there was lack of evaluation demand in Africa and that the lack of demand was rooted in the lack of a strong evaluation culture, which stemmed from absence of performance orientation in the public sector, (Kusek & Rist, 2004). The study by the WB and AfDB therefore suggests that very little if any is known about evaluation use, not only in the public sector but also in the private sector including the NGO sector.

Mouton’s study on evolution of evaluation in South Africa established that the first evidence of evaluation-like activities during the early years was found within the NGO sector (Mouton

2010). According to Mouton, it was mainly through the international donor community that programme evaluation found an entry point into South Africa. Mouton notes that as donors’ interest expanded, South Africa became more susceptible to “outside” movements and paradigms. In parallel, the rising global accountability movement further strengthened and advanced the monitoring and evaluation thrust in this sector. Although not explicitly stated,

Mouton’s assertions suggest that evaluation use in South Africa and indeed in Africa is donor driven particularly for purposes of NGO accountability.

INGOs in South Sudan are managing some of the most complex operations in humanitarian emergency and are contributing to social service provision in different sectors including water, education, health, agriculture and capacity development that have benefited millions of South Sudanese and Sudanese Refugees. Today, several INGOs are supporting child protection intervention, Education intervention, Health intervention, WASH, emergency shelters & NFIs, and activities related to reduction in gender based violence and women empowerment, livelihoods improvement for poor communities and Nutrition, in addition to numerous advocacy activities geared towards improvement in governance and democracy.

Despite all these, little or no documentation on the INGO evaluation use and factors influencing use is available. However, just like in South Africa, anecdotal information suggests that most of the evaluations by INGOs and indeed the entire NGO sector in South Sudan are still donor driven and are mainly used for fulfilling the donor accountability agenda.

## **1.1.2 Theoretical Background to the Study**

Evaluation use theory is rooted in social inquiry and accountability, (Alkin and Chritie 2006). Utilization-Focused Evaluation (U-FE) theory developed by Michael Quinn Patton uses an approach based on the principle that an evaluation is judged by its usefulness to its intended users (Patton, 2008; Kusek and Rist, 2004; and Rossi, Lipsey & Freeman, 2004).

The theory postulates that when evaluation is carried out in a participatory and collaborative manner, end users of the evaluation are more likely to take ownership of the results and would ultimately find greater application (Patton,2002). This theory therefore suggests a paradigm shift from the traditional use of findings, i.e. moving beyond the rendering judgement to one where learning can take place and accountability is based on the use of findings (Baughman

2010)

The U-FE theory is relevant and important to this study in that its central concern is about designing evaluations in a way that ensures that its findings and recommendations are used.

This study‘s core belief is that when evaluation are used, there is likely to be improvement in programme designs which will not only respond to the felt needs of target communities but will also lead to improved programme effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

## **1.1.3 Conceptual Background to the Study**

Evaluation has been variously defined. Fitzpatrick et al. (2004, p.5) defines evaluation as

“…the identification, clarification, and application of defensible criteria to determine an evaluation object’s value (worth or merit) in relation to those criteria”. Other recent definitions emphasize that evaluation is judging the worth or merit of something (Fitzpatrick et al, 2004;

Mark, Henry, & Julnes, 2000; Stufflebeam, 2001). The Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary

(2010) defines evaluation as “…to form an opinion of the amount, value, or quality of something after thinking about it carefully”. In line with these definitions, evaluation is mainly concerned with establishing value of a programme/activity/intervention. What all these mean is that evidence must be produced on which to determine the value, the worth or merit. The

Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary also defines the word “use” as doing something with a machine, method, an object, etc. for a particular purpose. Therefore, going by these definitions, “evaluation use” means putting the findings (evidence) of an evaluation to a certain purpose.

The initial thinking and the most widely held view is that evaluation is meant for decision-making and as such expected to produce findings that can influence what programme and policy people decide to do with that may entail extending it, modifying its activities, or changing certain aspects of the project. Again, it is expected that programme staff and policy makers can use what evaluators have found in order to make wiser decisions. This understanding of evaluation has since established to limit evaluation to one aspect of use.

Baughman (2010) contends that evaluation use is about what happens with the data generated after the evaluation is complete. This suggests that evaluation if probably used for many more purposes, other than decision-making. Literature identifies four main uses of evaluation, and these include instrumental use, when evaluation is used for decision-making; conceptual use, when evaluation is used to clarify the project to stakeholders, process use, when evaluation is used for learning purposes; and persuasive use, when evaluation is used to influence opinion for or against a programme or programme decisions (Baughman 2010). Therefore, for purposes of this study, factors affecting evaluation use will be measured in terms of how evaluation is used.

## **1.1.3 Contextual Background to the Study**

Today, South Sudan boasts of 330 registered NGOs according to NGO Forum (South Sudan), from fewer than 65 in 2007 and 228 in 2013,(Nick Helton & Ivor Morgan, 2013). Out of the 330 NGOs, 116 are registered as International/Foreign NGOs. International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) are defined as an non-profit voluntary organization formed by two or more persons, not being public bodies with the intension of undertaking voluntary or humanitarian projects (South Sudan NGO Act, 2016).

While it is not known, exactly how much the NGO sector receives in form of grants, nearly all

NGOs in South Sudan depend on donations from Europe, the European Union, North America, and Australia and annually receive millions of dollars to finance their programme activities in South Sudan.

In their study of East Africa, Semboja and Therkildsen (1995) found that much NGO funding comes from international donors. According to UNOCHA Financial tracking service Report 2019, South Sudan received a total funding of US$674.2m in 2019 compared to US$1.39bn in 2018 for humanitarian assistance with WFP getting a lion share of US$484m and US$319.5m in 2018 and 2019 respectively. In INGO sector, the biggest recipient of this funding was and is still ICRC with US$98.2m and US$32.9m in 2018 and 2019 respectively.

This was a huge amount of money, bigger than annual budgets of most Government ministries in South Sudan. Until recently, good intentions and values provided a sufficient basis for NGO legitimacy. However, with more resources flowing into the sector to finance different activities, there have been calls for NGOs to be more accountable. Cases of NGO misconduct in advocacy, fund use, management, and governance have been reported, questioning their very legitimacy and congruency with social values and expectations. For instance, the UN Non-Governmental Liaison Service (NGLS) Development Dossier tittle “Debating NGO Accountability” by Jem Bendel reported that despite the massive relief effort by non-governmental organizations (NGOs) after the 2004 Asian Tsunami, which was testimony to the skills and power of many NGOs, there were heightened concerns about opportunities for the misuse and abuse of humanitarian funds. It noted further that within months, there were protests in Sri Lanka against corrupt aid distribution. It further noted that in Indonesia, even the coordinator of an NGO tasked with challenging corruption in the relief effort, was arrested by police for alleged corruption, raising doubts about both NGOs and law enforcement authorities (Bendell, 2006).

The demand for more accountability came with the need to undertake financial audits, and programme reviews and evaluations to enable donors and grant making agencies provide accountability and demonstrate impact to their respective taxpayers and contributors, but also to give NGOs legitimacy.

With the increasing need for accountability, evaluations have become common practice in the

NGO sector. In practice, the numerous projects being implemented by INGOs either directly or through local partners have provided opportunity for several evaluations to be done. The demand has seen more resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation component in budget lines of many projects/programmes.

For many organizations, it would appear evaluation is just another activity among the many activities that they are mandated to undertake. Once evaluation results are produced, the evaluation process is considered finished. Yet evaluation can be used to make important decisions, make programme/project stakeholders get a better understanding of the intervention, used to demonstrate that decisions taken and strategies used have worked, and used to generate new ideas and knowledge among others. If evaluations are used well, they impact positively on those the intervention have targeted, and to the contrary limited evaluation use or failure to use evaluation implies that resources used to undertake evaluation are put to waste.

## **1.2 Statement of the Problem**

In South Sudan, INGOs play a very important role in many spheres of life of millions of vulnerable people through their numerous projects and programmes.

As part of accountability for resources they obtain from donors, numerous evaluations are carried each year because of the several projects that they implement, either directly or indirectly through local partners. Hundreds of thousands of dollars are expended annually on these evaluations. While attempts have been made to study evaluation use in general and factors that influence use in particular, most evaluation use researches have focused on the fields of formal education and government programs, Baughman (2010). Very little is known about evaluation use in the NGO sector. Understanding evaluation use can lead to better evaluation designs that increase use and improve programme designs/relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. This leads to better programme outcomes and more benefits to the target communities. Patton (2008) observes that use and the manner in which it is used affects millions of people that depend on resources that are provided by NGO sector.

## **1.3 Main Research Objective**

The purpose of this study was to establish factors that influence evaluation use by INGO in

South Sudan.

## **1.4 Specific Objectives of the Study**

1. To find out whether evaluation characteristics affect use of evaluation by INGOs in

South Sudan.

2. To establish whether organizational characteristics affect use of evaluation by INGOs in South Sudan, and

3. To examine whether stakeholder participation influence use of evaluation in INGOs in

South Sudan.

## **1.5 Research Questions**

1. Do evaluation characteristics affect evaluation use by INGOs in South Sudan?

2. Do organizational characteristics affect evaluation use by INGOs in South Sudan?

3. Does stakeholder participation affect evaluation use by INGOs in South Sudan?

## **1.6 Research Hypotheses**

1. Evaluation characteristics influence evaluation use by INGOs in South Sudan

2. Organizational characteristics influence evaluation use by INGOs in South Sudan

3. Stakeholder involvement is significant in evaluation use by INGOs in South Sudan

## **1.7 Justification of the study**

The study was carried out to contribute towards filling the gap in knowledge on evaluation use by the NGO sector, but more specifically the knowledge gap on evaluation use by INGO in Africa as a whole and in South Sudan in particular. INGOs contribute significantly to socio economic development, particularly of developing countries of which South Sudan is one through the various programmes. Increased knowledge of INGOs evaluation use will contribute to better evaluation designs that in turn contribute to better programmes that impact on millions of people who benefit from such programmes.

## **1.8 Rationale of the Study**

This study aimed to get an in-depth appreciation and use of evaluation results by INGOs in South Sudan. As INGOs are receiving millions of dollars to finance different activities, funders expect them to be more accountable. Therefore, this study will directly benefit hundreds of thousands or millions of South Sudanese, Sudanese Refugees in South Sudan and other nationalities across the globe that are supported by INGO programme activities through improved evaluation use, hence better programme designs and improved programme impact.

Secondly, it will benefit programme evaluators in that it will help them design better evaluations. Thirdly, it will benefit INGOs, as improved programme designs by INGOs will lead to improved programme performance that will raise their credibility profile hence the possibility of attracting more resources for sustaining their activities. Lastly, it will benefit evaluation use researchers by brining better understanding for evaluation use in the NGO sector.

## **1.9 Scope of the study and Limitation**

## **1.9.1 Geographical Scope**

Whereas INGOs have programme activities across the country, and indeed some of them have their headquarters as part of their field offices, most INGOs South Sudan have their headquarters in Juba, the capital city of South Sudan. In light of this and in the interest of time, resources available to the researcher and taking into consideration accessibility, the study was carried out in Juba.

## **1.9.2 Respondent scope**

The study was conducted among INGOs that have their headquarters in Juba and are registered with NGO Forum South Sudan. According to NGO forum, only 116 INGOs have been registered as international/foreign NGOs in South Sudan up to date.

## **1.9.3 Content Scope**

The focus of the study was on confirming whether factors that influence evaluation use as well as the uses of evaluation in the public sector are also applicable in the NGO sector. The study therefore was limited to evaluation use in the context INGOs.

## **1.9.4 Time scope**

The study only covered INGO evaluations that were carried out in the past two years. This was intended to focus on evaluations that can be easily recalled and with the assumption that staff responsible are likely not to have left the organizations. In addition, the study was conducted in a space of one month.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

## **Overview**

This chapter presents a review of relevant literature related to the use of evaluation. Literature review is organized according to the objectives of the study. It describes and discusses the magnitude of use of evaluation results and factors that influence use. Gaps in literature form the basis for which the researcher will carry out this study.

## **2.1 Theoretical Review**

This study draws upon literature in evaluation use. Theories of evaluation use are rooted in accountability and control, and focus on how information will be used and by whom evaluation results will be used (Christie & Alkin, 2008; Alkin, 2004). Alkin (2004) traces the roots of evaluation theories to three major branches, “use,” “methods,” and “valuing.”

The “Use” branch collectively refers to all theorists with interest for the use of evaluation results. According to Alkin and Christie (2006), the “use” theorists also called “decision oriented” theorists primarily focus on designing evaluations that will inform decision-making (Baughman 2010). However, evaluation use is more than for decision-making.

At the heart of U-FE, theory is the “personal factor.” The personal factor is the presence of a particular person or group in the organization that is invested in and engaged in the evaluation process and the evaluation findings, Baughman (2010). Other researchers have also found the presence of at least one caring, committed individual to be a key factor in influencing use

(Hofstetter & Alkin, 2003; Weiss, 1990). A U-FE approach includes a commitment to use by identifying potential users (stakeholders) and engaging them in the evaluation process from design through interpretation and decision-making (Patton, 2008). However, these, assertions assume there is no policy for evaluation use. In the NGO world, dependence on donor resources gives donors advantage to dictate use of evaluation results. It is therefore preposterous to generalize “personality factor” for use of evaluation.

The conceptual framework for this study draws on the work of Patton and other evaluation use researchers to explore how INGOs use the results of evaluation findings and what characteristics or factors influence their use. However, Patton U-FE theory has been criticized for ignoring objectivity. This conceptual framework seeks to determine whether evaluation characteristics, organizational characteristics and stakeholder involvement influence evaluation use by NGOs in South Sudan.

Influencers (Independent Variables)

Evaluation characteristics

* Relevance of the evaluation
* Credibility of evaluators
* Quality of evaluation
* Findings of the evaluation
* Communication of evaluation
* Timeliness of the evaluation

Use (Dependent Variable)

Organizational characteristics

* Commitment of the organization
* Information needs of organization
* Characteristics of decision makers
* Decision making climate
* Financial climate

Evaluation use

* Instrumental use
* Conceptual use
* Process use
* Persuasive use

Stakeholder participation

* Involvement in planning
* Involvement in data collection
* Involvement in data analysis
* Involvement in communicating results

## **2.1.1 Evaluation Use**

Baughman (2010) refers to evaluation “use” as what happens with data generated in the form of findings and recommendations of an evaluation. Other definitions of use tend to focus on the types of use, (Fleischer & Christie, 2009). This study adopted Baughman’s definition but explained use in terms of types to which evaluation is put.

## **2.1.2 Types of evaluation use**

A number of studies on evaluation have identified several uses. McCormick (1997) in (Baughman, 2010) examined three types of use based on the work of Leviton and Hughes in the early 1980s. These include instrumental use when evaluation is used for decision-making, “Conceptual use” when evaluation is used to throw more light on the evaluand, and “persuasive use” when evaluation is used to influence decision for or against and intervention. Preskill and Caracelli’s (1997) follow-up study identified five types of uses from the literature,

Fleischer and Christie (2009). These in addition to instrumental, conceptual, and persuasive uses, also include “enlightenment”, when the evaluation findings add knowledge to the field and thus may be used by anyone, not just those involved with the programme or evaluation of the programme Weiss, 1979 (cited in Baughman, 2010). It also includes process use which

Fleischer and Christie, (2009), Patton (1997a, 2003 p.230) describe as “….cognitive, behavioral, programme and organizational changes resulting from engagement in the evaluation process and learning to think evaluatively”.

However, there is lack of consensus on persuasive use. According to Fleischer and Christie, the disagreement arises from the fact that evaluation can be put to negative use, for example when it’s used for merely endorsing a decision that has already been taken. In this study, persuasive use will imply using evaluation to rally support for or against a programme or programme decisions.

## **2.3 Factors influencing use**

An early study of use by Patton et al. (1977) examined eleven factors of influence and concluded that the two most influential were “political” and “personal.” Alkin (1985) developed three categories of factors, which he called: human element, the context of the evaluation and characteristics of evaluation itself. Based on Penney’s draft doctoral research proposal (2008), (Bayley, 2009)observes that literature identifies six factors of which four relate to the evaluation itself, namely: relevance of the evaluation, credibility of evaluators, timeliness of the evaluation, quality of the findings, and communication practices of the evaluators. Leviton and Hughes (1981), point out five major clusters of variables that are consistently related to utilization and they include communication between evaluators and users, information processing by users, credibility of evaluations, and user involvement.

Evaluation scholars have grouped all these variables into three major categories, namely: evaluation characteristics, organizational characteristics, and stakeholder participation. Under each of these thematic areas (major factors) are several sub factors that different evaluation scholars have identified, and have been reviewed in detail in the sections below.

## **2.3.1 Evaluation characteristics and evaluation use**

According to Alkin, human factor measures the personal characteristics of the evaluator, such as communication skills and competence. Credibility of the evaluator and communication with stakeholders have been demonstrated to affect evaluation use (Cousins & Leithwood, 1986). Then there are evaluation-specific factors that include how the evaluation was conducted and can range from the choice of data collection to the scientific validity of the evaluation report.

Cousins and Leithwood (1986) note the importance of a sound methodology and useful data in utilization, while Oman and Chitwood (1984) demonstrate that qualitative, descriptive evaluations are used more than quantitative, statistic-heavy results. Both the role of the human factors and the evaluation characteristics contribute to the idea of evaluation as organizational change (Torres & Preskill, 2001). In fact, the concept organizational change presents a new, more integrated approach to evaluation that promotes use. In this case, change in the way NGO sector players organize service delivery including change in organizational culture, values, principles, and even vision and mission would be indicators of effective use of evaluation.

Different scholars have examined individual sub factors and how they influence use. Bayley

(2009) notes that the potential utility of an evaluation involves the relevance of the findings to the issues of concern in policy and programme (Hurron Institute, 1997; Lynn, 1978; and

Schmidt el al., 1977) in Leviton and Hughes, (1981). Like Bayley, Leviton and Hughes hold relevance of the evaluation as one of the key sub categories of evaluation characteristics affecting evaluation use. This presupposes that evaluations must produce relevant findings that are consistent with the previously held beliefs and expectations of the stakeholders (Christie 2009). According to Leviton and Hughes, several studies relate clients’ needs to utilization. However, relevance as it relates to findings puts focus on results rather the uses that come before results are produced and as such tend to be limiting the concept of use.

Some scholars have argued that having relevant evaluation does not necessarily guarantee evaluation use unless other factors are taken into account, for instance, timeliness in conducting evaluation and the timeliness of delivery of results. Weiss and Bacuvalas, 1977 (in Leviton and

Hughes, 1981) argued that timeliness alone was not consistent in having results used. Patton et al. (1977) also observed that timely delivery of results did not necessarily translate into use.

Other sub factors that either on their own or in combination were noted to influence use include the following: communication during evaluation and communicating evaluation results have been identified as critical in enhancing use of evaluation results (Windle and Bates, 1974; and

Blaser and Taylor 1975). For instance, studies have established that close and frequent communication between evaluators and evaluation users was necessary for evaluation to be used (Leviton and Hughes, 1981). However, effectiveness of communication in influencing evaluation use was noted to depend on how it is packaged, being delivered to the right audience and the way it is presented to users (Leviton and Hughes, 1981). For instance, clarity of presentation and style of presentation affects use.

In addition, cardinal to evaluation use is the credibility factor. Credibility refers to the faith potential users have in the results of an evaluation or the findings that an evaluation has put forth. Likewise, credibility of Credibility comes from comparison of evaluation results with other information; preconceptions of users; credibility of evaluation producer, and quality of the evaluation, Leviton and Hughes (1981).

Because they are under strict donor scrutiny and must deliver certain things as their donors want, and within a specific period, INGOs sometimes are compelled to implement evaluation recommendations whether they like it or not as their next funding may depend on the extent to which they have used the recommendations of an evaluation. Therefore, it is not entirely correct to assume that it is only the manner in which evaluation is carried that will determine the extent to which evaluation is used. In other words, sometimes donors dictate what INGOs must do or do irrespective of the manner in which evaluation is carried out.

## **2.3.2 Organizational characteristics and evaluation use**

According to (Peck & Gorzalski, 2009), contextual factors represent the environment in which the evaluation is conducted. Conditions such as the political climate or the administrative mood fall into the contextual factor category and can heavily influence how an evaluation is received (Chelimsky, 1986). The political context of an evaluation dictates whether or not recommendations will be used or any changes will be made to the existing program.

Characteristics of the organizational setting in which the evaluation is done has a major impact on the extent to which evaluation findings are used in conceptual or instrumental ways. Again six factors are identified based on the works of Cousins and Leithwood (1986), and Hudson Mabbs (1993), and these include “commitment” (audience participation and attitudes towards role of evaluation and this relates to stakeholder participation). According to Bayley J.S, (2009) commitment refers to issues such as audience participation and attitudes towards the role of evaluation in programme and policy change.

Weiss (1998) found that the more an organization adopts a ‘climate of rationality’ and looks externally for new knowledge, the more likely it will turn to evaluation and use evaluation findings. Weiss noted that in conceptual use, even when stakeholders are blocked from applying findings to decisions at the time the study is reported, the findings can change the understanding of what the programme is and does, they gain new ideas and insights. According to Bayley (2009), evaluations are only one of many potential sources of information that influence decisions about a programme, i.e. the availability and perceived credibility of competing information significantly affect utilization of evaluation studies.

On the other hand, personal characteristics were found to influence evaluation use in organizations. Patton (1977) identified the role of significant individuals in influencing the application of evaluation findings. The characteristics of such individuals include leadership, interest, enthusiasm, determination, aggressiveness, and access to power. Chelimsky (1977) states that the most important factor in assuring use of evaluation findings was not the quality of evaluation but the existence of a decision maker who wants and needs an evaluation and has commitment himself to implementing findings. Chelimsky’s account however does not take into account the importance of taking right decisions based on the quality of evaluation.

Besides, others studies suggest use based on perceived quality of evaluation.

Cousins and Leithwood (1986) discovered that decision-making climate was an important factor affecting evaluation utilization. The decisions can be classified as retrospective or prospective, with retrospective decisions being for justification and accountability reasons while prospective decisions are for the future, for example to develop or improve a programme.

On the other hand, political orientation of the organization and the existing support of the programme was also found to influence use. Research states that if the findings of an evaluation is consistent with the organization’s internal and external political climate, utilization is more likely, particularly so for instrumental use, (Weiss 1998). However, Weiss’ argument are for instrumental purposes and does not take into account other uses.

Lastly, evaluation use was also found to be influenced by organizational financial climate, where financial climate represents economic consequences of any change to the programme arising from the evaluation, Bayley (2009). For example, if evaluation findings suggest programme changes that require only limited additional expenditure, then the findings are more likely to be accepted and used. In contrast, evaluation use would be limited where there are enormous financial implementations. However, this assertion ignores the fact that use of evaluation does not require budgets especially when evaluation is being used for enlightenment, process use and conceptual purposes.

While all the arguments advanced by the different evaluation use scholars on organizational characteristics are true, they appear to suggest that evaluation use as such is at the whims of individuals within an organization and that without abundance of resources, evaluations are likely not to be used. Such arguments ignore the fact that unlike the public sector, individuals within the INGOs have very limited autonomy in the decisions they make except those strictly sanctioned by organizational policies. Likewise, the NGO world is world of sacrifice to the extent that organization staff do not necessarily have to have huge finances to implement certain recommendations. Therefore, while individuals have a role to play to ensure that evaluations are used and that there must be resources to implement certain evaluation recommendations, it is important to take into account the fact that most INGOs have policies.

Some of these policies emphasize use of evaluation and as such will ensure that evaluation is used irrespective of whether there are no personalities in the organization that have a passion for evaluation use or whether there are finances or not. This is because use of evaluation as noted earlier plays a key role in determining the fate of an organization.

## **2.3.3 Stakeholder involvement and evaluation uses**

According to Peck and Domrzalski (2009), stakeholder involvement is an important aspect of participatory and collaborative evaluation approaches. Taut (2008) defines a stakeholder as any person who has an interest in a program. In which case, this would comprise of donors, programme staff, target communities, government, etc. However, the involvement of stakeholders extends beyond the aforementioned approaches; indeed, it is accepted more generally that stakeholder involvement increases evaluation use (Christie, 2003; Greene, 1988;

Turnbull, 1999). Reineke (1991) suggests that quality involvement is a result of the evaluator identifying the stakeholders early on and then continuously engaging them, while establishing a structure for dialogue.

Stakeholder involvement has become a mainstream concept in evaluation as is evident in its role within most evaluation approaches. However, there is a relative dearth of empirical research on this topic, as compared with the theoretical or applied writings on the subject.

Stakeholder participation in INGO sector evaluation is not compulsory and their participation in INGO is not a guarantee that evaluation will be used. The low level of literacy especially among target communities casts doubts on their ability to use evaluations.

Overall, sources rarely conflicted with the evaluation findings (Cousins & Leithwood, 1986).

However, most if not all of these studies on stakeholder involvement do not point out the disadvantage of stakeholder participation, as stakeholders are likely to have different interest.

Secondly, the INGOs and the NGO sector as a whole deal with the poor, often voiceless people, illiterate who may even fear to ask questions. The chances that such stakeholders will use evaluation are very limited. Thirdly, the underlying assumption in stakeholder participation is that through involvement in the negotiation and planning stages of the evaluation, the commitment of the audience can be developed or enhanced. However, commitment aside, the

INGOs and the NGO sector have a lot of movement of labor that a committed staff in an organization today may be a staff in another organization tomorrow. Therefore, institutionalization of evaluation use or use of evaluation as part of the organization culture may be the only guarantee for use of evaluation.

## **2.4 Summary of literature review**

This chapter presented review of literature based on evaluation use theory, types of use and potential factors that affect use. Literature revealed that several years of evaluation use studies have led to consensus on four “types” of evaluation use, instrumental, conceptual, persuasive and process. Literature also identified three factors that influence use and these include evaluation characteristics, organization characteristics, and stakeholder participation. Recent studies have also proposed that rewards/motivation is also a factor that needs to be studied.

The gap in the available literature is not only is the absence of research on evaluation use by

INGOs, but also glaringly lacking is research on evaluation use in South Sudan let alone evaluation use in Africa. Most of the available literature on evaluation use are from the United States. Nevertheless, the findings provided a theoretical framework that can guide the current study on use of evaluation by INGOs particularly the possible variables that can be confirmed and measured in as far as they relate to evaluation use in the NGO sector in South Sudan.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

## **METHODOLOGY**

## **Overview**

This chapter presents the research design used, the study population on whom the study was carried out, the sample size determination and sampling procedure. In addition, data collection and analysis methods are described.

## **3.1 Study Design**

A cross-sectional survey design was used in this study. The choice of this design was influenced by Bryman (2008). Bryman refers to cross-sectional survey design as “…entail the collection of data on more than one case in a single point in time in order to collect a body of quantitative or quantifiable data in connection with two or more variables (usually many more than two), which are then examined to detect patterns of association”. In terms of time, Cohen, et al (2007) assert that a cross-sectional study is one that produces a “snapshot” of a population at a particular time, support Bryman.

The study used a mixed research approach that crosses the two strategies (combines both quantitative and qualitative approaches). Both quantitative and qualitative data were handled using this approach. According to Bryman, mixed methods research is preferred because it involves a mixing of research methods involved and not just using them in tandem. To that effect, there will be complementarity between the two approaches.

## **3.2 Study site**

The study was carried out in Juba targeting INGOs with headquarters in Juba the capital city of South Sudan as most of the INGOs have their headquarters in Juba.



*Fig.1.* ***Location of Juba in the Republic of South Sudan***

## **3.3 Data needs types and sources**:

Both primary and secondary data were needed. Primary data was gathered using two methods, namely: questionnaire method and interview method. Questionnaires are forms, which have questions that are organized according to the objectives of study to be filled in by respondents. Questionnaire was used because it enables the researcher to gain first-hand information and more experience over a short period of time (Creswell, 2003). The other advantages it has are that it is practical and a large amount of information can be collected from a large number of people in a short period; besides it is cheap and fast to administer. In addition, questionnaire survey as a method increases the degree of reliability and enhances the chances of getting valid data, (Amin, 2005).

The second method was an interview method. In-depth interview (sometimes referred to as qualitative interview) was used. According to Bryman (2008), qualitative interview, which denote unstructured interview, is a general term that embraces interviews of both semi structured and unstructured kind (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). On the other hand, in-depth interview like the term qualitative interview refers to an unstructured interview but more often refers to both semi structured and unstructured interviewing (Bryman 2008). The in-depth/qualitative interviews with key informants took the form of open interviews.

Secondary data was gathered using documents review. Amin (2005) maintains that secondary data can be helpful in the research design of subsequent primary research and can provide a baseline with which the collected primary data results can be compared to other methods. Secondary data refer to information that is available in the form of written or printed materials that are relevant to the topic of study. Therefore, documents review refers to using documents as sources of data, Bryman (2008). According to Bryman, the type of document to be reviewed in the case of private sector is referred to as official documents derived from private sources. In which case, these are organizational documents. Some of these documents are in the public domain and may include annual reports, advertisements, and public relations materials in printed forms and on the World Wide Web. Other documents are not in the public domain and can include policy documents, minutes of meetings and memos, organizational charts, etc. In this case, the researcher searched and requested for organizational documents that are relevant to evaluation such as policy documents.

## **3.4 Population, Sampling procedure and Data collection**

## **3.4.1 Study population**

The study population comprised of Registered INGOs that are operational in South Sudan. According to NGO Forum, there are 116 are registered INGOs in South Sudan. Although not explicit, information obtained from UNOCHA Financial tracking service 2019 on funding sectors in South Sudan are categorized into the following

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S/No | Sector/Sub Sector | S/No | Sector/Sub Sector |
| 1 | Camp Coordination / Management | 7 | Logistics |
| 2 | Coordination and support services | 8 | Mine Action |
| 3 | Education | 9 | Nutrition |
| 4 | Emergency Shelter and NFI | 10 | Protection |
| 5 | Food Security | 11 | Water Sanitation Hygiene |
| 6 | Gender Based Violence | 12 | Health |

## **3.4.2 Sample size and selection**

Bryman (2008) argues that the decision about sample size depends on a number of considerations because it is affected by time and cost. He therefore recommends that the sample size should be a compromise between constraints of time and cost, the need for precision, and a variety of further considerations that will now be addressed. Cohen L., Manion L., & Morrison

K. (2007) agree with Bryman, but argues that sample size depends on the purpose of the study and the nature of the population under scrutiny.

Because the current registration status of INGOs is unknown and there are uncertainties in the subsectors in which they are involved, the study worked with an unknown quantity from which to select a sample. In that light, the researcher proposed to use a statistically recommended minimum sample size of 30 elements but ended up with sample size 10 due to time factor. This sample size is in agreement with the observation that “a sample size of thirty is held by many to be the minimum number of cases if researchers plan to use some form of statistical analysis on the data”… (Cohen L., Manion L.,and Morrison K., 2007: 120).

In this study, it was assumed that INGOs have either units (departments) or individuals (where there are no units/departments) that are responsible for implementation of monitoring and evaluation activities. The sample comprised of representatives drawn from the units/departments or individuals responsible for implementation of the monitoring and evaluation function in their respective organizations.

## **3.4.3 Sampling techniques and procedure**

The study used both convenience and snowball sampling techniques, which are some of the non-probability sampling types (Bryman 2008), to select the sample to be studied. The 30 choice of convenience and snowball sampling technique has been influenced by the fact that study population is an unknown quantity (sampling frame is inaccurate); and the study population is scattered over a large geographical area, which makes it difficult to reach each one of them. In addition, accessibility of some study elements is likely to be difficult because their offices within Juba are located in areas that may be difficult to establish so convenience sampling becomes important since a convenience sample is one that is simply available to the researcher by virtue of its accessibility. Lastly, because the alternative would need a lot of preparation and the costs associated with it would be enormous.

While findings from convenience sampling strategy may be difficult to generalize, Bryman

(2008:183) notes that “…..in the field of organization studies, it has been noted that convenience samples are very common and indeed are more prominent than are samples based on probability”. He further notes that social research is also frequently based on convenience sampling. He justifies use of convenience sampling on the basis that probability sampling is frequently avoided because of the difficulties involved in the preparation and the costs involved.

As noted, a convenience sample was one that was simply available to the researcher by virtue of its accessibility (Bryman 2008). Therefore, the procedure for convenience sampling will involve obtaining a list of all the INGOs (sampling frame) from NGO Forum and identify those that are within the country with known addresses. These will constitute the accessible population.

## **3.4.4 Data collection methods**

Data collection instruments included self-administered questionnaire, key informants interview guide, and documents review checklist. Self-administered questionnaires are forms, which have questions that are organised according to the objectives of study to be filled in by respondents (Bryman 2008). They are closed ended in order to avoid irrelevant responses that may divert the study.

The second data collection instrument was key informant’s interview guide. Like the questionnaire, key informants’ interview guides were structured according to the objectives of the study. The guides were administered to the entire sample.

Both questionnaire and key informants interview guides were administered to the representatives of sampled organizations (persons who are responsible for monitoring and evaluation functions of the organizations) that are included in the sample.

A documents review checklist containing all the needed materials was developed and used to collect secondary data. Both published and unpublished materials were identified and reviewed to extract relevant information.

## **3.5 Data analysis**

## **3.5.1 Quantitative Data analysis**

In this research, the final unit of analysis was INGOs and the responses from individual INGOs to the issued questionnaires were quantified. As a start, filled-in questionnaire forms collected from respondents were checked for their completeness. Completeness check was done to establish whether both the structured and unstructured sections of the questionnaire have been properly filled or circled. It also helps to establish whether there are any missing data so that the computer software is notified of this fact since it needs to be taken into account during data analysis (Bryman 2008).

After completeness check was done, the content of the responses (for unstructured sections of the questionnaire) were analysed for themes and the themes were assigned colours. Responses that correspond with the themes were identified and assigned colours similar to that of the themes, and were coded.

Using Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS), an entry screen (data viewer) was developed. The data viewer is the spreadsheet into which data are entered (Bryman 2008). Appropriate codes were entered into the respective data viewer cells. After data entry process was completed, a data cleaning process was carried out to ensure that correct entries have been done. The analysis relied on both descriptive and inferential statistics. According to Cohen L., Manion L., and Morrison K.,(2007), descriptive statistics describe and present data for example in terms of summary frequencies. The descriptive statistics included the use of frequency tables, mean and standard deviation.

## **3.5.2 Qualitative data analysis**

Information collected from key informants were qualitatively analysed. To begin with, dataon evaluation use from key informants’ interviews were transcribed into meaningful text.Content analysis was used to analyse the data. According to Bryman 2008, content analysisis an approach to the analysis of documents and texts that seeks to quantify content in terms ofpredetermined categories (themes) and in a systematic and replicable manner. Content analysis entailed a coding of responses into categories from which themes was developed.

Cohen L., Manion L., and Morrison K., (2007) contend that the intention of coding is to deconstruct the data into manageable chunks in order to facilitate an understanding of the phenomenon in question. In that light, content analysis will involve coding (deconstructing) the data into themes (categorization of phenomena or phenomenon).

The themes were assigned colors based on the dimensions under each main variable. Corresponding responses were identified and categorized according to the theme under which they fall. After this was completed, analysis was made based on the themes and, logically interpreted, and later processed.

## **3.6 Data Presentation:**

Quantitative data was presented in tables and charts while qualitative data was presented as text according to the theme under which they fall.

## **3.7 Validity and Reliability:**

## **3.7.1 Validity**

Validity refers to the issue of whether a tool that is designed to gather information on a particular subject really gathers the information on that subject (Bryman 2008). According to Cohen L.,Manion L., and Morrison K., (2007) quoting Winter 2000 contends that validity measurement has taken many forms and in quantitative data may be addressed through the honesty, depth, richness and scope of the data achieved, the participants approached, the extent of triangulation, and the disinterestedness or objectivity of the researcher. They further assert that validity can be improved through careful sampling, appropriate instrumentation and appropriate statistical treatment of data. The methods proposed and the instruments that will have been designed taking into account the above parameters

As noted in 3.4.4 three tools were used, namely: questionnaire that was mainly used to collect quantitative data, key informants interview guide, and documents review checklist that was used to collect qualitative data.

To establish (validity qualitatively and quantitatively), the tools were given to two research experts to evaluate the relevance of each question in the instruments to the objectives of the study, and rate each item on the scale of very relevant (4), quite relevant (3), somewhat relevant (2), and not relevant (1).

The researcher considered items that were rated as very relevant and quite relevant, and conduct a content validity index (CVI) test to the check the validity of the questionnaire content. With the help of a statistician, the CVI was computed using the following formula

CVI/n

Where “CVI” equals items rated relevant/very relevant (three and four by both research supervisors. Where “n” is the total number of items in the instrument. The researcher attained validity of coefficient of 0.75 or 75%. Creswell (2003) argues that items with validity coefficient to at least 0.70 are accepted as valid and reliable in research.

## **3.7.2 Reliability**

Reliability refers a situation where there is a strong correlation between outcomes of two measurements carried out at different time using a similar tool (Bryman 2008). For qualitative data, the researcher during data collection exercise ensured that the data recorded from interviews with respondents reflect the facts, responses, observations, and events. The researcher also took multiple measurements, observations, or samples and checked the truth of the record with the research experts to verify response consistency and customize questions so that all the appropriate questions were asked. The experts helped to confirm responses against previous answers where appropriate and detect questions likely to elicit inadmissible responses. The researcher also used standardized methods and protocols for capturing the observations, alongside recording forms with clear instructions.

The researcher used triangulation to ensure reliability of the data collected. Triangulation means that one is using more than one method to increase the accuracy of data, while triangulation of source means collection of the same data from a variety of sources. By triangulating methods or sources, the researcher was able to double-check the results. (Mugenda &Mugenda, 1999), refers to this as “cross examination”. By triangulating methods and sources, one can be more confident especially when the results are similar. However, if an investigator uses only one method, the result may clash. By using more than one method to get at the answer by one question, the hope is that they will produce similar answers, or if the answers are not similar, the researcher may need to amend the question.

Lastly, the researcher repeated the pre-test of the instruments after two weeks to establish consistence in responses. The researcher ensured that instruments were pretested on respondents who were not part of the sample size. According to Amin (2005), test-retest reliability can be used to measure the extent to which the instrument can produce consistent score when the same group of individuals is repeatedly measured under the same conditions.

The results from the pre-test was used to modify the items instruments.

To ensure internal reliability of qualitative data, the Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient test was performed. Upon performing, the test with a statistician, the results where the alpha is 0.7 and above were considered reliable, according to Amin (2005).

## **3.8 Ethics**

Ethical considerations were based on the following principles: do no harm to participants, informed consent, protection of privacy, and avoidance of deception, according to Bryman

(2008).

Do no harm principle: Under the do no harm principle, the researcher ensured that no physical harm, harm to participants’ development, loss of self-esteem, stress and inducing participants to perform acts that are reprehensible happened. Since the researcher interacted with confidential records of the organizations.

Informed consent principle: Under informed consent of participants, consent to participate in the study was not only sought from the organizations, but also from individuals within the organizations that were responsible for filling in the questionnaire and answering to the interview questions. In addition, the researcher produced informed consent forms that were signed between the respondent on behalf of the organization and the researcher. This aimed at protecting the researcher from any future litigation. A copy of the consent form will be attached to the final report as exhibit that consent was sought.

Protection of privacy of participants’ principle: the researcher carried out no covert actions. Participants had the right not to answer any questions that they did not deem appropriate, terminate the interview where they feel uncomfortable, and seek clarification on any questions that they consider may cast their organization in bad light and had the right to get a response from the researcher.

Avoidance of deception: Under avoidance of deception, the researcher ensured that organizations respondents understand that the study was strictly for academic purposes and not to promote their organizations or any other organizations.

Use of data for its purpose: The researcher ensured that data was strictly used for the purpose for which they were collected. All the organizational documents that came into possession of the researcher were returned to the respective organizations.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

**PRESENTATIONS OF FINDINGS, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

## **Overview**

This Chapter presents the findings obtained from the study through key informant Interviews, questionnaires and document review as methods of data collection. The presentation of the findings for this study was done in line with the research objectives; do evaluation characteristics affect use of evaluation by INGOs in South Sudan, do organizational characteristics affect use of evaluation by INGOs in South Sudan and do stakeholder participation influence use of evaluation in INGOs in South Sudan.

Below are the key findings from the study.

## **Do evaluation characteristics affect use of evaluation by INGOs in South Sudan**

Six INGOs out of ten have strongly agreed and agreed that they used the results because the consultants were credible, the evaluations were carried out at the right time, the reports were delivered in a timely manner, the evaluations were communicated to them in easy to understand language, the recommendations were very clear and the findings were very relevant representing 60% of the total number of INGOs studied. Additionally 60% of the organizations agreed to the quality of their last evaluations being high meaning 40% of the studied INGOs were not fully satisfied with the quality of their last evaluation. This could be because other INGOs engage internal evaluation staff to conduct evaluation for them due to high financial implications of hiring external consultant and most of these internal evaluation staff do not have the capacity to do quality evaluation.

According to the study, the following sub factors under evaluation characteristics affect the use of evaluation by INGOs in south Sudan;

* Credibility of the consultant
* Carrying out evaluation at the right time
* Delivering reports in a timely manner
* Communicating evaluation in easy to understand language
* Clear recommendations and relevant findings
* High quality of evaluation

## **Do organizational characteristics affect use of evaluation by INGOs in South Sudan**

Eight INGOs representing 80% have strongly agreed and agreed that they used the evaluations because they considered them appropriate to their organizations, six INGOs (60%) strongly agreed and agreed that they take evaluations very seriously, all the ten INGOs (100%) strongly agreed and agreed that they need information to inform their programming, reporting and project execution, Eight INGOs (80%) have strongly agreed and agreed that their organizations have individuals in decision making positions that are committed to evaluation use and their organizations promote an environment where evaluation information is critical in decision making, six INGOs (60%) have strongly agreed and agreed that their organizations are usually in search of new information and as such they use evaluation findings and usually have resources for conducting evaluations and for implementation of its recommendations meaning that only 40% of the organizations usually don’t have enough resources for conducting evaluation and implementing its recommendations. This could be due to poor planning at programme design stage because that is where you plan your evaluation and some INGOs operate with limited budget therefore it becomes tricky for them to implement recommendations of evaluation let alone hiring external consults.

The study however revealed that the following sub factors under organizational characteristics affect the use of evaluation by INGOs in South Sudan;

* Evaluations are considered appropriate by organizations
* Organizations take evaluation very seriously
* Organizations need information to inform their programming, reporting and project execution
* organizations have individuals in decision making positions that are committed to evaluation use
* Organizations promote an environment where evaluation information is critical in decision making
* Organizations are usually in search of new information and as such they use evaluation findings
* Organizations usually have resources for conducting evaluations and for implementation of its recommendations

## **Do stakeholder participation influence use of evaluation by INGOs in South Sudan**

Five INGOs (50%) indicated that there was extensive involvement of stakeholders in Initial discussions about the evaluation and the remaining 50% indicated there was some involvement of stakeholders. Five INGOs (50%) indicated some involvement of stakeholders in data collection, presenting the evaluation report, disseminating evaluation results representing 50% of the INGOs studied and the remaining 50% of the INGOs indicated little involvement of stakeholders in data collection, presenting the evaluation report, disseminating evaluation results representing.

Meanwhile Four INGOs (40%) indicated there was extensive involvement of stakeholders in Identifying evaluation team members, developing the evaluation plan, developing data collection tools, developing data collection process and reviewing collected data for completeness. Three INGOs (30%) indicated some involvement of stakeholders in Identifying evaluation team members, developing the evaluation plan, developing data collection tools, developing data collection process and reviewing collected data for completeness and the remaining three INGOs (30%) indicated little involvement of stakeholders in of stakeholders in Identifying evaluation team members, developing the evaluation plan, developing data collection tools, developing data collection process and reviewing collected data for completeness.

Additionally all the ten INGOs (100%) indicated there was no involvement of stakeholders in analyzing data, interpreting collected data and writing evaluation reports representing 0% stakeholder’s involvement. This may be due to low level of literacy especially among target communities and INGOs as a whole deal with the poor, often voiceless people, illiterate who may even fear to ask questions. The chances that such stakeholders will use evaluation are very limited and involvement of stakeholders in all the stages of evaluation is not always a guarantee that they will use the evaluation result.

## **Purposes for which evaluations are carried out**

The study revealed four primary purposes for which evaluations are carried out in INGOs in South Sudan and these include the following;

* To determine outcomes or impacts
* To improve on internal operations and strategy
* To enable us learn what works and what doesn’t work
* To account to our stakeholders

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| S/No | Primary Purpose of evaluation | No of response |
| 1 | To meet donor requirements | 6 |
| 2 | To determine outcomes or impacts | 10 |
| 3 | To improve on internal operations and strategy | 10 |
| 4 | To enable the organization make important decisions | 5 |
| 5 | To enable us learn what works and what doesn’t work | 10 |
| 6 | Because evaluation has a budget | 3 |
| 7 | To enable us market our organization | 4 |
| 8 | To account to our stakeholders | 10 |

## **Use of evaluation results**

Six INGOs have strongly agreed and agreed that they used the results to interest others in their programme, used the results to convince others of the value or merit of the programme ,used the results to lobby for support/resources, used the results to enhance organizational commitment to and understanding of the programme, used the results to promote further evaluation, used the results to meet contractual or legal requirements, used results in application for further funding, used the results to advocate for the programme, use the results to convince others that the programme did well, used the results to convince stakeholders that the project has worked. This indicates that 60% of the studied INGOs have really used the evaluation results to advocate for their programmes. Meanwhile four INGOs (40%) agreed that they used the results to teach others about evaluation practice and the remaining six INGOs strongly disagreed and disagreed to teaching others about evaluation practice. In addition, all the 10 INGOs strongly disagreed and disagreed to using the results to advocate against the programme meaning 100% of the INGOs did not use the results against their programmes.

Four INGOs (40%) strongly agreed and agreed that they used the results to show misalignment between organizational values and practices meaning the evaluation results of the 60% of the INGOs did not spell out misalignment in values and practices in those respective organizations. Moreover, 100% of the INGOs have strongly disagreed and disagreed that they used the results to show unethical behaviors of organizational member meaning the results did not indicate any unethical behavior of organizational members. Additionally 40% of the INGOs have agreed that they used results to re-align political support for the programme, re-align political opposition to the programme and to initiate small changes/modifications to the programme. And, 60% of the INGOs strongly agreed and agreed that they used results to increase funding meaning the 40% are okay with their funding and 40% agreed that they used the results to intentionally keep the programme the same.

Six INGOs (60%) strongly agreed and agreed that they used the results to redefine programme stakeholders and reorganize or restructure the programme.

Meanwhile 60% of the INGOs have strongly agreed and agreed that they used the results to make decisions regarding programme improvement, planning, to decide to continue the programme and to identify further evaluation needs. Additionally 10% of the INGOs used the results to alter policy that governs the programme and 100% strongly disagreed and disagreed that they used the results to cancel the programme meaning no programme was cancelled because of evaluation results.

**Conclusion on use of evaluation results**

The study generally show that INGOs use evaluation results for the following; to interest others in their programme, to convince others of the value or merit of the programme ,to lobby for support/resources, to enhance organizational commitment to and understanding of the programme, to promote further evaluation, to meet contractual or legal requirements, to apply for further funding, to advocate for the programme, to convince others that the programme did well, to convince stakeholders that the project has worked, to increase funding, to redefine programme stakeholders and reorganize or restructure the programme, to make decisions regarding programme improvement & planning, to decide to continue the programme and lastly to identify further evaluation needs.

However, the study also revealed that INGOs do not use evaluation for the following; to teach others about evaluation practice, to re-align political support for the programme, re-align political opposition to the programme and to initiate small changes/modifications to the programme, to advocate against the programme, to show misalignment between organizational values & practices, to intentionally keep the programme the same and lastly decide to cancel the programme.

## 

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

**DISCUSSIONS**

## **Overview**

This Chapter presents the discussion of the results from the 10 INGOs who were involved in this study. The researcher also made deeper analysis into the findings to find out the relationship between the objectives of the research and the findings while incorporating the literature reviewed as discussed below.

## **Do evaluation characteristics affect use of evaluation by INGOs in South Sudan**

The study generally shows INGOs used the results of their evaluations because of the credibility of the consultants. This is in agreement with Cousins & Leithwood, (1986) that Credibility of the evaluator and communication with stakeholders have been demonstrated to affect evaluation use. Some of the INGOs however used National consultants to carry out the evaluations for them due to financial constraints.

The study also show that INGOs used their evaluation results because the evaluations were carried out at the right time and the reports were delivered in a timely manner. This contradicts Weiss and Bacuvalas, 1977 (in Leviton and Hughes, 1981) that timeliness alone was not consistent in having results used. INGOs in South Sudan are under strict donor scrutiny and must deliver certain things as their donors want, and within a specific period. Most donors request for evaluation report of the last project when you apply for new grants meaning that your next funding depends on whether you have conducted evaluation for your last project or not.

The study as well revealed that INGOs used evaluations because the recommendations were very clear and the findings were very relevant. This is in agreement with Bayley (2009) that the potential utility of an evaluation involves the relevance of the findings to the issues of concern in policy and programme. Relevance of the findings guarantee evaluation use.

## **Do organizational characteristics affect use of evaluation by INGOs in South Sudan**

The study generally show that INGOs are usually in search of new information and as such they use evaluation findings and this is in agreement with Weiss (1998) that the more an organization adopts a ‘climate of rationality’ and looks externally for new knowledge, the more likely it will turn to evaluation and use evaluation findings.

The study also show that INGOs need information to inform their programming, reporting and project execution which is in agreement with Bayley (2009), evaluations are only one of many potential sources of information that influence decisions about a programme, i.e. the availability and perceived credibility of competing information significantly affect utilization of evauation studies. Evaluation provides credible information about programmes and INGOs really need this information to adjust or redesign or align their programmes with the needs of the beneficiaries.

The study further show that INGOs have individuals in decision making positions that are committed to evaluation use and their organizations promote an environment where evaluation information is critical in decision making. This is in agreement with Chelimsky (1977) that the most important factor in assuring use of evaluation findings was not the quality of evaluation but the existence of a decision maker who wants and needs an evaluation and has commitment himself to implementing findings. It is very important to have decision makers who are committed to evaluation use so that they can push for the findings to be implemented.

Additionally the study shows that more than half of the INGOs usually have resources for conducting evaluations and for implementation of its recommendations. This is in agreement with Bayley (2009) that evaluation use was also found to be influenced by organizational financial climate, where financial climate represents economic consequences of any change to the programme arising from the evaluation. However, the INGOs indicated that if evaluation findings suggest changes in programming that requires limited expenditure, then the findings are more likely to be accepted and used than if there are enormous financial implementations.

## **Do stakeholder participation influence use of evaluation by INGOs in South Sudan**

The study generally show stakeholders involvement at the early stages of evaluation which includes; Initial discussions about the evaluation, identifying evaluation team members, developing the evaluation plan, developing data collection tools, developing data collection process and reviewing collected data for completeness.

Surprisingly, stakeholders were not involved in the next three stages that is analyzing data, Interpreting collected data and writing evaluation report this may be due to low level of literacy especially among target communities.

However, stakeholders were involved in the last two stages, which include; presenting the evaluation report and disseminating evaluation results. This contradicts Christie (2003), Greene (1988) and Turnbull (1999) that stakeholder involvement increases evaluation use. Stakeholder participation in INGO sector evaluation is not compulsory and their participation in INGO is not a guarantee that evaluation will be used. The low level of literacy especially among target communities casts doubts on their ability to use evaluations and this is clearly revealed by the study as stakeholders were overlooked in data analysis, data interpretation and evaluation report writing.

## **5.1 Limitations of the study**

* Limited time and resources to conduct the study. The study was conducted in only 10 INGOs instead of the planned 30 INGOs and to draw conclusion on evaluation use based on study conducted in only 10 INGOs may not be appropriate.
* Some of the staff interviewed in the 10 INGOs are new staff and were not present when the last evaluations were conducted in their respective organizations. This may have introduced some bias in the study.

## **5.2 Recommendations**

Based on the findings from this research study, the following recommendations can be drawn;

* INGOs should plan evaluation early especially during project design and allocate enough fund for evaluation and implementing the recommendations
* INGOs should hire external consultants with extensive experience in evaluations to carry out evaluations for them. Some INGOs in South Sudan are now using National consultants to conduct evaluation for them and these national consultants have low capacity meaning there are chances that the quality of the evaluation will not be good.
* Building Capacity of internal evaluation staff. INGOs should start building the capacity of their monitoring and evaluation staff in conducting evaluations. With shrinking funding, it will not be easy for INGOs to hire external consultants now and then.
* Empowering stakeholders. INGOs should start empowering stakeholders so that they are able to appreciate the findings of evaluation, use the results and own the projects.
* External evaluators should be task to work hand in hand with internal evaluation staff throughout the evaluation process so that internal evaluation staff can learn from the external consultants.

## **5.3 Conclusions**

In conclusion, the findings from this study revealed that evaluation characteristics and organizational characteristics affect evaluation use in INGOs in South Sudan.

The sub factors influencing evaluation use under evaluation characteristics include; credibility of the consultant, carrying out evaluation at the right time, delivering reports in a timely manner, communicating evaluation in easy to understand language, clear recommendations, relevant findings and high quality of evaluation.

Meanwhile under organizational characteristics, the sub factors include; evaluations are considered appropriate by organizations, organizations take evaluation very seriously, Organizations need information to inform their programming, reporting and project execution, organizations have individuals in decision making positions that are committed to evaluation use, Organizations promote an environment where evaluation information is critical in decision making, Organizations are usually in search of new information and as such they use evaluation findings and Organizations usually have resources for conducting evaluations and for implementation of its recommendations.

The study also revealed that stakeholders’ participation does not necessarily influence evaluation use in INGOs in South Sudan. In addition, in this study they were not engaged throughout the evaluation process due to low level of literacy especially among target communities as most of the INGOs deal with the poor, often voiceless people, illiterate who may even fear to ask questions. The chances they will use evaluation are very limited and involvement of stakeholders in all the stages of evaluation not always a guarantee that they will use the evaluation result.
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## **APPENDICES**

## **LETTER OF INTRODUCTION**

My name is Taban Denis Johnson. I am a participant in Diploma Programme in Monitoring and Evaluation at Africa Institute for Project Management Studies.

Your organization was selected to participate in this study on the basis that it is one of the International NGOs that exist in the database of NGO Forum South Sudan. As an INGO, this study assumes that you regularly carry out reviews/evaluations of your programme/projects/partners either at Midterm or at End of Project or both as part of the requirement for adhering to generally acceptable standards and operational norms.

Please take note that your participation in this survey is voluntary. I will not connect your identity with your responses in any report or communication of results unless you feel so. Therefore, I would like to thank you for accepting to assist in the study of evaluation practices INGOs in South Sudan. The topic of study is “Factors Influencing Evaluation Use by INGOs in South Sudan”. It is intended to establish factors that influence evaluation use and purposes for which evaluation are carried out in order to develop strategies for more utilization of evaluation.

This is a self-administered questionnaire and you are expected to be as candid as possible in your responses to the questions by ticking what you think is most appropriate to evaluation practice in your organization. In case you have not fully understood anything, please feel free to contact me on +211914907094 or on me email: luvenray@gmail.com. I will at a later stage come to collect the questionnaire and will have the opportunity to interface with you in a face-to-face interview.

I am looking forward to you cooperation.

## **QUESTIONAIRES**

1. **ORGANISATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS**
2. What is your organization’s primary area of focus (circle the most appropriate)?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S/No | Sector/Sub Sector | S/No | Sector/Sub Sector |
| 01 | Camp Coordination / Management | 07 | Logistics |
| 02 | Coordination and support services | 08 | Mine Action |
| 03 | Education | 09 | Nutrition |
| 04 | Emergency Shelter and NFI | 10 | Protection |
| 05 | Food Security | 11 | Water Sanitation Hygiene |
| 06 | Gender Based Violence | 12 | Health |

1. How long has your organization been in existence in this country (Circle most appropriate)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| S/No | Number of years of existence |
| 01 | From one (1) to five (5) years |
| 02 | From six (6) to ten (10) years |
| 03 | From eleven (11) to fifteen (15) years |
| 04 | From sixteen (16) to twenty (20) years |
| 05 | From twenty one (21) to twenty five (25) |
| 06 | From twenty six (26) to thirty (30) years |
| 07 | More than thirty (30) years |

1. How many states are you working in across the country (circle the most appropriate?)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| S/No | Number of states you are implementing your programme |
| 01 | Three (03) and below |
| 02 | Four (04) to six (06) |
| 03 | Seven (07) to nine (09) |
| 04 | Ten (10) to twelve (12) |
| 05 | Thirteen (13) to fifteen (15) |
| 06 | Sixteen (16) to eighteen (18) |
| 07 | Nineteen and above (19) |

1. Which statement best describes your organization

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| S/No | Type of organization |
| 01 | Our organization is South Sudan of foreign/international origin |
| 02 | Our organization is purely international |

1. **EVALUATION WORK**

**Programme evaluations/reviews are a way of examining your programme to determine what is working well or what may need changing. Evaluation may also provide information needed for reporting to stakeholders. Does your organization have an evaluation unit/department responsible for all evaluation activities?**

1. Which of these best describes your organization’s evaluation institutional arrangements

01 My organization has a fully-fledged evaluation unit that is responsible for evaluation

02 My organization doesn’t have an evaluation unit but carries out evaluation

6 Which of these best describes your organization’s evaluation practice

01 My organization takes evaluation very seriously

02 My organization only carries out evaluation as and when necessary

7. Which of these best describes your organization’s frequency of evaluation/reviews

01 My organization regularly carries out programme reviews and evaluation

02 My organization only carries out programme reviews and evaluation when necessary

8. How important was this programme to the local community?

01 Very important

02 Somewhat important

03 Somewhat unimportant

04 No important

9. How important was this programme to the organization?

01 Very important

02 Somewhat important

03 Somewhat unimportant

04 No important

1. **PUPRPOSES FOR WHICH EVALUATIONS ARE CARRIED OUT**

11. What is the primary purpose of evaluation in your organization (can tick more than one response)?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| S/No | Primary Purpose of evaluation |
| 01 | To meet donor requirements |
| 02 | To determine outcomes or impacts |
| 03 | To improve on internal operations and strategy |
| 04 | To enable the organization make important decisions |
| 05 | To enable us learn what works and what doesn’t work |
| 06 | Because evaluation has a budget |
| 07 | To enable us market our organization |
| 08 | To account to our stakeholders |

1. **EVALUATION RESULTS**

**As you think about the most recent evaluation, your organisation completed, could you please talk about its findings. Select the most appropriate response to complete each of the statements below:**

12. Results of the evaluation provided

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 01 | Mostly positive information about our programme |
| 02 | Somewhat positive information about our programme |
| 03 | Somewhat negative information about our programme |
| 04 | Mostly negative information about our programme |

13. The evaluation findings were

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 01 | Very consistent with what we expected |
| 02 | Somewhat consistent with what we expected |
| 03 | Somewhat not consistent with what we expected |
| 04 | Not at all consistent with what we expected |

14. The evaluation findings were

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 01 | Very relevant for our decision making requirement |
| 02 | Somewhat relevant for our decision making requirement |
| 03 | In a way not relevant to our decision making requirement |
| 04 | Not at all relevant for our decision making |

15. Did the evaluation findings meet the needs of your organization/?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 01 | Mostly |
| 02 | Somewhat |
| 03 | Not much |
| 04 | Not at all |
| 05 | Don’t know |

16. Did the findings meet the needs of your stakeholders?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 01 | Mostly |
| 02 | Somewhat |
| 03 | Not much |
| 04 | Not at all |

17. Have you been able to use the results of the evaluation?

01 YES

02 NO

1. **EVALUATION CHARACTERISTICS**

18. If YES to question 17, consider the last evaluation you did and try to identify reasons why you used that evaluation. Please chose the most appropriate response for each suggestion.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S/No | Evaluation characteristics | Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 1 | We used the evaluation because we trusted the consultant/consultant was credible |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | We used the evaluation because the evaluation was carried out at the right time |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | We used the evaluation because the report was delivered in a timely manner |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | We used the evaluation because it was communicated to us in easy to understand language |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | We used the evaluation because the recommendations were very clear |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | We used the evaluation because the findings were very relevant |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | We used the evaluation because it was of very high quality |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Others (specify) |  |  |  |  |  |

19. If NO to question 17, what do you think influenced no use of the evaluation findings?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. **ORGANISATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS**

20. If YES to question 17, consider the last evaluation you did and try to identify reasons why you used that evaluation. Please chose the most appropriate response for each suggestion

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S/No | Organizational characteristics | Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 1 | We used the evaluation because we considered it appropriate to our organization |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | As an organization we take evaluation very seriously |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | As an organization we need information to inform our programming, reporting and project execution |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Our organization have individuals in decision making positions that are committed to evaluation use |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Our organization promotes an environment where evaluation information is critical in decision making |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Our organization is usually in search of new information and as such it uses evaluation findings |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Our organization usually have resources for conducting evaluations and for implementation of its recommendations |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Others (specify) |  |  |  |  |  |

21. How would you rate your most recent evaluation on the following criteria?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S/No | Overall rating of recent evaluation | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor |
| 1 | Overall assessment of the quality |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Usefulness of the evaluation |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Quality of report |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Appropriateness of report |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Timeliness of delivery of report |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT**

**Please consider how stakeholders were involved in the evaluation process. A stakeholder is anyone with stake in the programme such as programme beneficiaries, donors, local authorities, board members, other members of the community.**

22. Please chose the most appropriate response for each suggestion.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S/No | Stakeholders were involved in Evaluation | Extensive involvement | Some involvement | A little involvement | No involvement |
| 1 | Initial discussions about the evaluation |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Identifying evaluation team members |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Developing the evaluation plan |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Developing data collection tools |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Developing data collection process |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Collecting data |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Reviewing collected data for completeness |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Analyzing data |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Interpreting collected data |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Writing evaluation report |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Presenting the evaluation report |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | Disseminating evaluation results |  |  |  |  |

1. **USING EVALUATION RESULTS**

23. To what extent do you agree or disagree that you were able to use evaluation results in the way you indicated?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S/No | Evaluation results | Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 1 | Used the results to interest others in the programme |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Used the results to convince others of the value or merit of the programme |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Used the results to teach others about evaluation practice |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Used the results to lobby for support/resources |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Used the results to enhance organizational commitment to and understanding of the programme |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Used the results to promote further evaluation |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Used the results to meet contractual or legal requirements |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Used results in application for further funding |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Used the results to advocate for the programme |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Used results to advocate against the programme |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Use the results to convince others that the programme did well |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | Used the results to convince stakeholders that the project has worked | 2 | 4 |  | 2 | 2 |

24. To what extent do you agree or disagree that you were able to use evaluation results in the way you indicated?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S/No | Evaluation results | Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 1 | Used results to show misalignment between organizational values and practices |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Used results to show unethical behaviors’ of organizational member |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Used results to re-align political support for the programme |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Used results to re-align political opposition to the programme |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Used results to increase funding |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Used results to decrease funding |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Used results to initiate small changes/modifications to the programme |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Used results to intentionally keep the programme the same |  |  |  |  |  |

25. To what extent do you agree or disagree that you were able to use evaluation results in the way you indicated?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S/No | Evaluation results | Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 1 | Used results to redefine programme stakeholders |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Used results to make decisions regarding programme improvement |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Used results to reorganize or restructure the programme |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Used results to alter policy that governs the programme |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Used results for planning |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Used results to alter management and administration of the programme |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Used results to decide to cancel the programme |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Used results to decide to continue the programme |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Used results to identify further evaluation needs |  |  |  |  |  |

I value your time and thank you so much for taking your valuable time to fill in the questionnaire. When the research is completed and report approved by Africa Institute for Project Management studies, I intend to disseminate the findings of this study in an appropriate forum in which you/your organization will be invited for dissemination. I am looking forward to meeting you there.

Please do not hesitate to contact my on the following addresses

Phone +211914907094

Email: luvenray@gmail.com