

Generations For Peace Programmes
in Kaduna, Nigeria:

Programme
Research

2

Monitoring & Evaluation Capability and Programme Impact

- Executive Summary -



Sairah Yusuf

Summer Field Research Intern
The University of Oxford

July 2012 - February 2013



© GFP 2013 | Kaduna, Nigeria | Photo by Richard Julliant

Research Context and Aims

This report analyses Generations For Peace (GFP) sport-for-peace programmes conducted in Kaduna State, Nigeria. GFP is a global non-profit organisation, utilising sport-based games to impart peace-building education and transform conflict in 46 countries and territories. GFP members run two types of sport-for-peace programmes in Kaduna. These usually target women and children, and consist of advocacy events or empowerment seminars that impart peace-building and income-generating skills, as well as sport-for-peace events that involve peace drills and sport-based games aimed at fostering trust and cooperation. These two sets of programmes have been in operation consistently since 2008. This report analyses these programmes along two parameters: first, how far are GFP Pioneers and Delegates able to monitor and evaluate their own programmes? Second, what impact have these programmes had on the ground in Kaduna State?

These questions are particularly important to answer given the scarcity of evidence-based research on the impact of sport-for-peace programmes. By analysing this impact, this study aims to test the validity of the GFP model of behavioural change through sport facilitation and peace-building exercises. Assessing monitoring and evaluation (M&E) capability amongst GFP volunteers also helps analyse the development of – and demand for – M&E systems in a volunteer-based organisation. These two avenues of investigation are interconnected; assessing GFP members' capacity to monitor and evaluate their own programmes and judge impact is the first step to ascertaining the actual impact these programmes have had. Further, the community-driven nature of GFP programmes means that project conception, design, and implementation is entirely the prerogative of community volunteers, and assessing their ability to monitor, evaluate, and revise these programmes is critical to ensuring the long-term sustainability and performance of these programmes. This will then allow the Generations For Peace Institute to pinpoint where investment in volunteers' capacity can improve data collection, a necessary step in a final and comprehensive assessment of programme impact. For these reasons, this report presents data both on monitoring and evaluation capability and programme impact.

Research Methodology

In order to address these questions, research was carried out in Kaduna City, Nigeria, between 29 November 2012 and 7 December 2012. 62 individuals – comprising GFP implementers, local partners, community beneficiaries (such as school staff and children's parents), and programme participants – were approached for semi-structured interviews and focus groups. The researcher conducted 12 focus groups with four to six participants (usually 20 minutes to 45 minutes each), and 16 semi-structured interviews (usually lasting between 30 minutes and 50 minutes each). Semi-structured interviews and focus groups were chosen over other research tools – such as surveys or structured questionnaires – because they offered room for open-ended questions focusing on

conflict context, theories of change, indicators, baselines, and Most Significant Change (MSC) stories, as well as mechanisms for learning and adaptation. Focus groups in particular allowed interviewees to respond to and build upon the experiences of other members, offering a platform for more detailed discussion and reflection. On 6 December 2012, over 30 GFP Pioneers and Delegates were asked to come to an agreement, through discussion, as to what constituted the most significant change brought about by the programme. In addition, the research relied on programme reports made available by the GFP Satellite Office in Kaduna, as well as observation of two important events held by the GFP Satellite Office: first, on 30 November 2012, an Advocacy For Peace Event targeted at 30 women from St. Matthews Catholic Church Women's Group, held at Zumuntemata Hall, St. Matthews Television, Kaduna, and second, a Sport For Peace Programme for Youth session held with about 70 students at Prince Schools, Kaduna, on 3 December 2012.

This methodology was limited in two ways. The first limitation was geographic: due to time constraints, data collection took place in Kaduna City alone and programmes initiated outside the city could not be viewed directly. Through a GFP Refresher Workshop being held in the city during the course of the research, this limitation was overcome by speaking to Pioneers and Delegates who had arrived in Kaduna City from different areas in the state. The second had to do with access: in order to facilitate exchanges with programme participants, girls had been selected by GFP volunteers by contacting their parents and arranging for some of them to stay after school for interviews. This was absolutely necessary – without parental permission, it would not have been possible to gather any data from them. However, it made it difficult to ascertain if these girls formed a representative sample of the girls who participated in these programmes. This issue was addressed at Prince Schools; interviews were held during school timings, and a random sample of girls and boys who had taken part in the Sport For Peace session held earlier that day was selected. Answers given by this group matched the answers of programme participants at the Government Schools as well as the testimony of most community beneficiaries, lending validity to the data gathered from interviews that had been directly arranged by the GFP Satellite Office.

Findings: M&E Capability and Programme Impact

Monitoring and evaluation capability was determined according to the following criteria: understanding of the conflict situation; stated and actual theories of change; mechanisms for learning and adaptation; measurement of impact through indicators; baseline studies, and most significant change stories; and finally, assessment of unintended outcomes and causal attribution of change.

All stakeholders on the ground had a detailed understanding of the conflict context in their community. 28 of 49 respondents identified “religious conflict” as the pressing problem GFP programmes were trying to address, and a number of individuals were able to outline reinforcing cycles of conflict in their communities. Individuals also possessed a shared and focussed theory of change for their programmes, with 43 of 54 respondents stating that GFP programmes functioned through bringing different ethnic and religious groups together through sport-based games, increasing trust by breaking down barriers and cultural stereotypes, improving





interpersonal relationships, and eventually leading to positive dynamics for sustainable peace (labelled here as the Socialisation Effect). Mechanisms for learning and adaptation were clearly in evidence, through regular formal meetings set up by the GFP Satellite Office in Kaduna and an informal system of personal mentorship. These were largely used to solve immediate problems of implementation rather than providing a platform for rethinking the theory of change guiding the programmes in question. Precise measurements of programme impact were absent, as no baseline studies were carried out and significant change stories were not gathered; while demographic information and changing numbers in attendance were noted, data regarding attitudes and behavioural change was available only in the form of individual observations and anecdotal evidence. Finally, there was little evidence that implementers had taken into account unintended outcomes and disentangled the effects of the GFP intervention from other factors that might be driving change in their communities. As a result, while the foundation for effective monitoring and evaluation existed – a clear understanding of the conflict context, a shared and precise theory of change, and structured mechanisms for learning and adaptation – there was room for greater capacity-building to equip implementers with the ability to properly use indicators and other measurements to track change.

The actual impact of the project was evaluated in five ways.

- first, a standardised assessment of the scale of change was carried out by asking respondents if the GFP interventions had led to a big change, small change, or no real change in their communities – to which 23 out of 30 replied that the change was indeed “big.”
- second, impacts captured through anecdotal evidence and observations were systematically compiled; incidents demonstrating a breakdown of cultural stereotypes, improved interpersonal relationships, and changes in individual mind-sets reoccurred frequently.
- third, Most Significant Change (MSC) stories were collected from all respondents and presented to over 30 GFP Pioneers and Delegates for discussion. Two major changes emerged from this: a personal change in the attitudes and behaviour of GFP members themselves, and an increase in trust and tolerance within the community, with people from different ethnic and religious backgrounds better able to be friends with one another.
- fourth, important unintended outcomes of the programme were put forward, consisting most strikingly of the mainstreaming of the GFP message in other aspects of participants’ lives.
- finally, by confirming that no other social and development initiatives in the area work with the same target participants, and accounting for the effect incidents of violence may have on programmes, this report definitively concluded that the observed impacts were a direct result of GFP programmes in Kaduna State.

Overall, this showed that the programmes were having a significant impact in the eyes of respondents on the ground, in line with the outcomes put forward by respondents’ theory of change.

Conclusions and Recommendations

This report concludes with four major themes that emerged from this research:

- first, the fact that GFP Satellite Office programmes are gender-focussed in a way that does not match the concerns of most of the respondents in Kaduna, who appear more interested in religious and ethnic divides;
- second, some participants and GFP representatives have shown interest in moving beyond sport as a peace-building tool, diversifying the techniques used to impart the same messages;
- third, increased decentralisation poses challenges for maintaining standardised content in all programmes;
- fourth, and perhaps most importantly, GFP Pioneers and Delegates recognise the necessity of monitoring and evaluation in order to track change and improve the quality and outcomes of their programmes. This is a particularly significant conclusion, given the recognised challenges of putting in place M&E systems in volunteer-based organisations.

Finally, the report offers some recommendations to address these issues, building upon suggestions for improvement and sustainability put forward by the GFP representatives themselves. These can be listed as follows:

1. **Broaden programme scope at the Office level:** It would be useful to expand the mandate of the GFP Satellite Office programmes, so that – in addition to the gender-focussed programmes that are currently in place – more programmes are targeted towards addressing religious and ethnic divides in men, women, and children in these communities, and not in women alone.
2. **Offer in-depth training for needs assessment, monitoring and evaluation:** Implementers have a good grasp of the conflict context in which they operate, they broadly agree on the theory of change that guides their interventions, and mechanisms for learning, adaptation and improvement exist both formally and informally. However, formal procedures for tracking change do not exist. This can be remedied by offering intensive training workshops to improve implementers' monitoring and evaluation capacity. The Refresher Workshop in Kaduna (4-6 December 2012) aimed to fill this gap by including a section on monitoring and evaluation. It would also be useful to equip a few select individuals with greater expertise in monitoring and evaluation; using the informal system of personal mentorship already existing in Kaduna, these individuals can then work through an evaluation plan for each programme individually with the implementers concerned.
3. **Involve more participants at the planning stage:** Better results might be obtained by making the process of deciding programme content and structure more participatory, drawing upon the insights of community members and target participants when constructing programmes.
4. **Improve vocational training/skills acquisition outcomes:** The regular seminars put in place by the GFP Satellite Office impart income-generating skills to female participants. However, it is unclear how much of an impact these skills have had, especially when most women are only exposed to these sessions once. It would be useful to arrange repeated workshops for these skills. In addition, the Office can help associate women with small-scale commercial manufacturers (in the case of liquid soap production, or even hand-knitted garments) in order to transform these skills into a real source of income.
5. **Improve control over programme content:** Standardisation can be ensured by a process akin to "peer review," where other GFP Pioneers and Delegates look over the planned programme, potentially asking a few questions about what each implementer plans to say and what the programme is meant to achieve. In the case of unplanned deviations, other GFP representatives on the ground can step in and steer programmes back on track.
6. **Facilitate attempts to move beyond sport-based programmes:** Participants and implementers have expressed a desire to move beyond sport as a tool for peace building, diversifying into peace theatre or community festivals. At the time of research, no independent work had been done by GFP members outside of sport-based games. However, it might be useful for the Kaduna Office to facilitate such attempts by forming a network where individuals can be put in touch with other organisations in the region that might be pursuing peace efforts using different tools.

About the Summer Field Research Intern

Sairah Yusuf

Sairah Yusuf completed her undergraduate degree at the Lahore University of Management Sciences (LUMS), in Lahore, Pakistan, and spent a year working in the development sector in Pakistan, focusing on government restructuring and institutional development. In 2010, Sairah was awarded the Noon Scholarship for the MPhil. in Politics: Comparative Government at the University of Oxford. At Oxford, her studies centred on the politics of the Middle East and the politics of South Asia. During this time, she focused on researching informal institutions and state building in South Asia, while carrying out fieldwork in northern Pakistan. This research sparked her continuing interest in the effectiveness of local, community-based processes of change.

About the Summer Field Research

Generations For Peace awards two research grants annually to selected postgraduate students pursuing Masters or Doctorate studies at the University of Oxford. The awardees conduct a field research which takes place during the University's summer vacations. The multi-disciplinary field research is focused on an activity or programme implemented in one or more countries in which Generations For Peace volunteers operate. In terms of outputs, each awardee is expected to provide a full research report focused on the local activity/programme, including a detailed write-up of the research conducted and any practical recommendations for the activity/programme organisers; and a supplementary report with further meta analysis and recommendations for Generations For Peace regarding activity/programme adjustment and opportunities for further research. A key objective of Generations For Peace in supporting research grants is to support knowledge transfer and capacity development therefore, it is also expected that the awardees will use their best endeavours to demonstrate (within the limits of practical context of their particular research situation) some knowledge transfer to and capacity development of the local actors.



[/generationsforpeace](https://www.facebook.com/generationsforpeace)



[@Gens_For_Peace](https://twitter.com/Gens_For_Peace)



[/generationsforpeace](https://www.youtube.com/generationsforpeace)



[/in/generationsforpeace](https://www.linkedin.com/company/generationsforpeace)

www.generationsforpeace.org