

**TOWARDS PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE FOR  
PARTICIPATORY DEVELOPMENT  
EVALUATION IN THE CONTEXT OF  
COMMUNITY BASED ORGANISATIONS**

by

**TRACEY LOUISE KONSTANT**

Thesis

Submitted in fulfilment

of the requirements for the degree

**DOCTOR IN PHILOSOPHY**

in

**ORGANISATIONAL BEHAVIOUR**

in the

**FACULTY OF ECONOMIC AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCES**

at the

**UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA**

**PROMOTOR: PROF. K. STANZ**

**30th April 2010**



## STATEMENT

I, Tracey Louise Konstant, the undersigned, hereby confirm that the thesis submitted by me in fulfilment of the degree PhD (Organisational Behaviour) to the University of Pretoria is my independent work and has not been submitted by me for a degree at another faculty or university

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Konstant', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

TRACEY LOUISE KONSTANT

31 April 2010

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to warmly acknowledge the following for their valued support, assistance, input and encouragement:

- Warm thanks to my study promoters, Professors Karel Stanz and Hannes de Beer, for great ideas, helpful input, support and encouragement. Thank you also to Dr Mias de Klerk for inspiration and direction.
- My sincere appreciation also to Christa Smit, for her great patience and consistent, wonderful responsiveness.
- The AIDS Consortium, and particularly Denise Hunt, Executive Director and dear friend, for patience, support, and enthusiasm throughout our work together. Particular thanks to Solly Matile for his assistance in coordinating participation of the Gauteng CBOs.
- My great gratitude goes to the community-based organisations in Lawley, Orange Farm, Soweto and Mabeskraal who gave so generously of their energy, for their enthusiastic participation in this process. I am in awe of their courage, commitment and integrity. These are our nation builders.
- My thanks also to the Western Province Office of the AIDS Consortium, and in particular to Thapelo Rapoo for his support in coordination of the Mabeskraal exercise.
- Appreciation to Oxfam America's South African Regional Office, and especially to Marian Gotha, for instigating, funding and supporting the Mabeskraal exercise.
- To all of the Mabeskraal Gender, Culture and HIV/AIDS Programme CBOs and NGOs, and especially to Bacha ba Kopane and Michael Modise for provision of working space. My warm acknowledgement goes out to the field team, for energy, passion and long hours: Andrea Mayer, Denise Anthony, Thapelo Rapoo and Tumahole Wendy Mofokeng (AIDS Consortium), Julia Nqandela (Lovelife), Lerato Mpatho and Michael Modise (Bacha ba Kopane), Lesedi Molebatsi and Peter Matlakgomo (Pholo Modi wa Sechaba), Mbuyiselo Botha (Sonke Gender Justice), Motshidisi Kgasoe and Niniwe Moilwe (Botho Jwarona Home Based Care), and Sammy Kgaswe (Office of the Traditional Council).
- Thanks also to the Office of the Traditional Authority, and particularly to Kgosi Mabe, Chief of the Bathloko ba Matutu nation. Thank you to Sammy Kgaswe,

Traditional Councillor for Infrastructural Development, for his patient coordination and liaison.

- My great appreciation to the circle of colleagues who have contributing their time and thinking to peer review, discussion, mentorship and advice in the course of this research. Their inspiration, incisiveness and intelligence have been invaluable.
- For the astonishing and profoundly appreciated generosity of proof readers and language editors: John Bateson, Eli Konstant, Corine Nicolai, Ingrid Obery, and particularly to Tina Konstant and Morris Taylor who provided editing for the entire manuscript.
- Finally, and most profoundly, my love and gratitude to my daughters, Keetah and Ashby who have given so much of their share of my time and attention, and an entire year without a camping trip, with uncomplaining patience and support.



## ABSTRACT

Development asks that the inequity and unsustainability of the widening gap between rich and poor be narrowed, ultimately impacting on households in the most economically excluded communities. Local community-based organisations (CBOs) provide much of the organisational fabric through which development is delivered. Largely resourced by the poorest themselves, many of these CBOs aspire to attracting funds from the development aid industry. In attempting to comply with the rules of these funding sources and compete in funding relationships, organisations become players in the funding game fraught with power imbalance and seemingly contradictory incentives. Neither the funding agencies, intent on disbursement, nor the CBOs in their desire to build organisations and contribute to their communities, seem aware of the true costs of these relationships.

Aid funding is complex, operating at numerous levels, across a multiplicity of varied organisations, stakeholders and contexts. Over the last 60 years, the aid industry has evolved complicated and highly engineered mechanisms to manage relationships with funding recipients, including detailed conventions for evaluation. As part of contractual obligation, criteria for success are pre-defined; outcomes are predicted; and targets are projected. Development, however, is not linear or predictable. It is contradictory and complex. Despite objections and alternatives since the late 1980s, 'conventional' linear, simplistic rationale has dogged the development industry.

The HIV support sector as a focus for funding, capacity building and service contracts from government and international aid agencies, offers rich examples of aid industry dynamics. This research, set amongst small but established CBOs working in HIV/AIDS support in Soweto and Lawley (Gauteng) and Mabeskraal (North West Province), explores alternative evaluation approaches, methodologies and principles, based on grounded evaluation. Two models are tested and compared. Firstly, inward-looking, organisation-based, reflective self-evaluation using Stories and Metaphor. Then secondly, outward-looking, community research using a Most Significant Change approach.

The evaluation processes developed help participating CBOs describe success and outcomes against their own criteria. The approaches use narrative, visual and metaphorical formats. The central purpose of the research is meta-evaluation aimed at an effective process using iterative, cumulative action research based on the principles of grounded theory. Meta-evaluation data included descriptions of the processes and the

nature of evaluation results. They are analysed using reflection, learning and re-design in an action research cycle.

The results provide both practical insights into conducting evaluation, and the principles of effective development in a CBO setting. They demonstrate that grounded evaluation can be used to understand organisational dynamics and programme outcomes. Participatory methods, particularly visual and verbal communication, are shown to be far superior to written communication in this setting. The results demonstrate the mutual compatibility and ethical inseparability of organisation development with evaluation, providing insight into the practice of utilisation-based evaluation. The value of appreciative inquiry and the risks of accusatory inquiry are described. A thread that runs through the results highlights the impact of power, ownership and process use in effective evaluation.

The research has also elaborated some of the intractable contradictions and conundrums in development aid. Money carries the power vested in global economics and market forces. In making funding judgements, evaluators purvey the power of wealth inequity: the very power imbalance which itself purports to address. As a development practitioner, an evaluator's role should be to facilitate pathways out of dependent mindsets. As gatekeepers to financial support, however, their work entrenches distortions in perceptions of wealth and power.

These complex interactions of power and ownership demand moderation and compromise. The industry requires investment of greater energy into theoretical, methodological and practical research. Suggestions for such research are included. Without fresh creativity, development and evaluation will remain frustrated forces within an entrenched, self-perpetuating system of inequity and disparity.

# Table of contents

<b>STATEMENT</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>ACRONYMS</b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>1.1 Rationale</b> .....	<b>20</b>
1.1.1. <i>Background</i> .....	20
1.1.2. <i>Development as power</i> .....	23
1.1.3. <i>The culture of the CBO-service contractor</i> .....	24
1.1.4. <i>The funders' case</i> .....	25
<b>1.2 Problem statement</b> .....	<b>26</b>
<b>1.3 Research objectives</b> .....	<b>27</b>
<b>1.4 Ontology</b> .....	<b>27</b>
<b>1.5 Epistemology</b> .....	<b>28</b>
<b>1.6 Delineation and limitations</b> .....	<b>29</b>
<b>1.7 Definitions of key terms and concepts</b> .....	<b>31</b>
1.7.1. <i>Community-based organisations</i> .....	31
1.7.2. <i>Evaluation</i> .....	31
1.7.3. <i>Participatory</i> .....	32
1.7.4. <i>Development</i> .....	33
1.7.5. <i>Assessment, as compared with evaluation</i> .....	33
<b>1.8 Underlying assumptions</b> .....	<b>34</b>
<b>1.9 Contribution of the study</b> .....	<b>35</b>

<b>1.10</b>	<b><i>Brief chapter overview</i></b> .....	<b>36</b>
1.10.1.	<i>Chapter 1. Introduction</i> .....	36
1.10.2.	<i>Chapter 2. Literature review: Situation context</i> .....	36
1.10.3.	<i>Chapter 3. Methods: Research approach in brief</i> .....	36
1.10.4.	<i>Chapter 4. Results</i> .....	37
1.10.5.	<i>Chapter 5. Discussion</i> .....	37
1.10.6.	<i>Chapter 6. Conclusion</i> .....	38
<b>1.11</b>	<b><i>Ethics</i></b> .....	<b>38</b>
<b>1.12</b>	<b><i>Additional institutional requirements</i></b> .....	<b>38</b>
<b>CHAPTER 2.</b>	<b><i>LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK</i></b> .....	<b>40</b>
<b>2.1</b>	<b><i>Introduction</i></b> .....	<b>40</b>
<b>2.2</b>	<b><i>HIV, development, civil society and accountability</i></b> .....	<b>40</b>
2.2.1.	<i>South African scenarios for the future: The position of civil society in the institutional fabric</i> .....	41
2.2.2.	<i>History: Civil Society in post-apartheid South Africa</i> .....	43
2.2.3.	<i>The “third sector”: Defining civil society</i> .....	44
2.2.4.	<i>Tensions and interests: The roles of civil society</i> .....	47
2.2.4.1.	<i>The third sector</i> .....	47
2.2.4.2.	<i>The public-private-civil services niche</i> .....	48
2.2.4.3.	<i>Agents of democracy?</i> .....	48
2.2.4.4.	<i>So aren’t NGOs and CBOs actually private sector?</i> .....	48
2.2.4.5.	<i>Service providers to the poor</i> .....	49
2.2.4.6.	<i>The role of CBOs</i> .....	49
2.2.4.7.	<i>Sustained developmental impact?</i> .....	50
2.2.4.8.	<i>CBOs in the HIV and AIDS response</i> .....	50
2.2.5.	<i>Size of the NGO / CBO sector</i> .....	53
2.2.5.1.	<i>In money</i> .....	53
2.2.5.2.	<i>In numbers</i> .....	53
2.2.5.3.	<i>In people</i> .....	54
2.2.6.	<i>Organisational behavior and organisational relationships:</i> .....	55
2.2.6.1.	<i>Power</i> .....	55
2.2.6.2.	<i>Donor relationships</i> .....	56





2.2.6.3.	<i>Downward accountability: Constituents</i> .....	57
2.2.6.4.	<i>Inward accountability: Staff and volunteers</i> .....	59
2.2.6.5.	<i>Upward accountability: Funding sources</i> .....	60
2.2.6.6.	<i>Holding the powerful to account</i> .....	61
2.2.7.	<i>Monitoring and evaluation (M&amp;E)</i> .....	61
2.2.7.1.	<i>Conventional, 'logical' evaluation methods for M&amp;E</i> .....	63
2.2.7.2.	<i>The impact of funding and evaluation on organisations</i> .....	66
2.2.8.	<i>Capacity building</i> .....	70
<b>2.3</b>	<b><i>Towards alternative principles and practice in evaluation for CBOs</i></b> .....	<b>71</b>
2.3.1.	<i>Organisational Learning: Moulding organisational behaviour</i> .....	71
2.3.2.	<i>Principles of developmental M&amp;E</i> .....	71
2.3.3.	<i>Complex dynamic emergent systems</i> .....	74
2.3.4.	<i>Emergence</i> .....	75
<b>2.4</b>	<b><i>Conclusions of the literature review</i></b> .....	<b>75</b>
<b>CHAPTER 3. RESEARCH DESIGN</b> .....		<b>77</b>
<b>3.1</b>	<b><i>Introduction</i></b> .....	<b>77</b>
<b>3.2</b>	<b><i>Overarching theoretical framework: evaluation and meta-evaluation</i></b> .....	<b>78</b>
3.2.1.	<i>Grounded theory</i> .....	78
3.2.1.1.	<i>Grounded theory in brief</i> .....	78
3.2.1.2.	<i>The grounded theory debate</i> .....	79
3.2.1.3.	<i>Grounded theory</i> .....	79
3.2.1.4.	<i>Grounded theory method</i> .....	80
3.2.1.5.	<i>Constructivist grounded theory</i> .....	81
3.2.2.	<i>Critical change theory and process use</i> .....	81
<b>3.3</b>	<b><i>Research structure: Three worlds and two legs</i></b> .....	<b>82</b>
<b>3.4</b>	<b><i>Research approach</i></b> .....	<b>84</b>
3.4.1.	<i>Meta-methodology : Key concepts in reality-based methods development</i> .....	84
3.4.1.1.	<i>Exploratory research</i> .....	84
3.4.1.2.	<i>Action Research for methods development</i> .....	85
3.4.2.	<i>Evaluation: Key concepts in alternative, participatory, developmental processes</i>	86
3.4.2.1.	<i>Action Learning or Participatory Action Research</i> .....	86
3.4.2.2.	<i>Narrative in evaluation</i> .....	86
3.4.2.3.	<i>Metaphor</i> .....	87

3.4.2.4.	<i>Stories of Most Significant Change</i> .....	89
3.4.2.5.	<i>Qualitative evaluation</i> .....	90
<b>3.5</b>	<b><i>Research setting</i></b> .....	<b>92</b>
3.5.1.	<i>Informal settlements</i> .....	92
3.5.2.	<i>Low-income suburbs</i> .....	94
3.5.3.	<i>Rural village</i> .....	95
<b>3.6</b>	<b><i>Sampling</i></b> .....	<b>96</b>
3.6.1.	<i>Sampling strategy</i> .....	96
3.6.2.	<i>Sample population</i> .....	97
3.6.3.	<i>Sample size</i> .....	98
3.6.3.1.	<i>Gauteng Stories and Metaphor process</i> .....	98
3.6.3.2.	<i>North West MSC</i> .....	100
3.6.4.	<i>Case Studies</i> .....	101
<b>3.7</b>	<b><i>Research process</i></b> .....	<b>102</b>
3.7.1.	<i>Gauteng: Stories and Metaphor</i> .....	103
3.7.2.	<i>North West: Stories of Most Significant Change</i> .....	104
<b>3.8</b>	<b><i>Data recording</i></b> .....	<b>107</b>
<b>3.9</b>	<b><i>Data analysis</i></b> .....	<b>107</b>
3.9.1.	<i>Analysis in action research and constructivist grounded theory</i> .....	107
3.9.2.	<i>Participant analysis</i> .....	109
3.9.3.	<i>Mentorship and peer review as collective analysis</i> .....	109
3.9.4.	<i>Case Study analysis</i> .....	110
3.9.5.	<i>Criteria for analysis</i> .....	111
3.9.6.	<i>Deductive and inductive analysis</i> .....	111
3.9.7.	<i>Coding, themes and patterns</i> .....	111
<b>3.10</b>	<b><i>Dissemination and Proceduralisation</i></b> .....	<b>113</b>
<b>3.11</b>	<b><i>Ensuring quality</i></b> .....	<b>114</b>

3.11.1.	<i>Rigour and trustworthiness</i> .....	114
3.11.2.	<i>Boundaries, challenges and possible sources of error</i> .....	116
3.11.3.	<i>Ethics</i> .....	118
3.12	<i>Conclusion to the methods chapter</i> .....	120
<b>CHAPTER 4. RESULTS</b> .....		<b>122</b>
4.1	<i>Introduction</i> .....	122
4.2	<i>Chapter structure</i> .....	124
4.2.1.	<i>Within the cases</i> .....	124
4.2.1.1.	<i>Non-empirical study: Action research cycle from data to theory</i> .....	124
4.2.1.2.	<i>Empirical study: CBO evaluation from stories to learning</i> .....	125
4.2.1.3.	<i>Content analysis using Theory of Change</i> .....	125
4.2.2.	<i>Between the cases</i> .....	126
4.2.3.	<i>Closing the phases</i> .....	126
4.3	<i>Inward-looking evaluation: Gauteng Stories and Metaphor emergent process</i> .....	127
4.3.1.	<i>Case Study 1: TT</i> .....	127
4.3.1.1.	<i>Diagram of process</i> .....	127
4.3.1.2.	<i>Description, reflection, learning and conclusions</i> .....	127
4.3.1.3.	<i>Exhibits from TT</i> .....	131
4.3.1.4.	<i>Action and questions leading into Case Study 2</i> .....	134
4.3.2.	<i>Case Study 2: JJ &amp; JD</i> .....	135
4.3.2.1.	<i>Diagram of process</i> .....	135
4.3.2.2.	<i>Description, reflection, learning and conclusions</i> .....	135
4.3.2.3.	<i>Exhibits from JD</i> .....	142
4.3.2.4.	<i>Reflections with mentor</i> .....	145
4.3.2.5.	<i>Action and questions into Case Study 3</i> .....	146
4.3.3.	<i>Case Study 3: QN</i> .....	148
4.3.3.1.	<i>Diagram of process</i> .....	148
4.3.3.2.	<i>Description, reflection, learning and conclusions</i> .....	148
4.3.3.3.	<i>Exhibits from QN</i> .....	152
4.3.3.4.	<i>Reflections with mentor</i> .....	154
4.3.3.5.	<i>Action and questions leading into Case Study 4</i> .....	155
4.3.4.	<i>Case Study 4: DG</i> .....	157
4.3.4.1.	<i>Diagram of process</i> .....	157
4.3.4.2.	<i>Description, reflection, learning and conclusions</i> .....	157
4.3.4.3.	<i>Exhibits from DG</i> .....	165



4.3.4.4.	<i>Reflections with mentor</i> .....	170
4.3.4.5.	<i>Action and questions leading into Case Study 5</i> .....	171
4.3.5.	<i>Case Study 5: BN</i> .....	174
4.3.5.1.	<i>Diagram of process</i> .....	174
4.3.5.2.	<i>Description, reflection, learning and conclusions</i> .....	174
4.3.5.3.	<i>Exhibits from BN</i> .....	183
4.3.5.4.	<i>Action and questions leading into Case Study 6</i> .....	188
4.3.6.	<i>Case Study 6: CL</i> .....	190
4.3.6.1.	<i>Diagram of process</i> .....	190
4.3.6.2.	<i>Description, reflection, learning and conclusions</i> .....	190
4.3.6.3.	<i>Exhibits from CL</i> .....	196
4.3.6.4.	<i>Action and questions leading into Case Study 7</i> .....	200
4.3.7.	<i>Concluding the Gauteng Stories and Metaphor process</i> .....	201
4.4	<b><i>Outward-looking evaluation: Applying Most Significant Change methodology in community development setting</i></b> .....	<b>207</b>
4.4.1.	<i>Research setting and context</i> .....	207
4.4.2.	<i>Diagram of process</i> .....	208
4.4.2.1.	<i>STEP 1. Preparation and sensitisation</i> .....	208
4.4.2.2.	<i>STEP 1b. Recruiting the team</i> .....	209
4.4.2.3.	<i>STEP 1c. Training the researchers</i> .....	209
4.4.2.4.	<i>STEP 2. Defining the domains of change</i> .....	214
4.4.2.5.	<i>STEP 3. Defining the reporting period</i> .....	216
4.4.2.6.	<i>STEP 4. Collecting Most Significant Change stories</i> .....	216
4.4.2.7.	<i>STEP 5. Analysis: Selecting the story of most significant change</i> .....	218
4.4.2.8.	<i>STEP 6. Feeding back the results</i> .....	223
4.4.2.9.	<i>STEP 7. Verification of stories</i> .....	226
4.4.2.10.	<i>STEP 8. Quantification</i> .....	226
4.4.2.11.	<i>STEP 10. Revising the system: Recommendations</i> .....	227
4.4.2.12.	<i>Exhibits for the Mabeskraal Most Significant Change process</i> .....	230
4.4.3.	<i>Concluding the MSC Phase (MSC STEP 9)</i> .....	238
4.4.4.	<i>Gaps: What the method does not achieve</i> .....	244
4.5	<b><i>Conclusion to the results chapter</i></b> .....	<b>244</b>
CHAPTER 5.	<b><i>DISCUSSION</i></b> .....	<b>247</b>
5.1	<b><i>The practice: Towards alternative methodologies for evaluation of CBOs</i></b> .....	<b>247</b>
5.1.1.	<i>Inward and outward looking evaluation</i> .....	248
5.1.2.	<i>Stories</i> .....	250

5.1.2.1.	<i>Impact is meaning.....</i>	250
5.1.2.2.	<i>Story collection.....</i>	251
5.1.2.3.	<i>Collectively analysing narrative.....</i>	251
5.1.2.4.	<i>Stories as grounded evaluation.....</i>	252
5.1.3.	<i>Metaphor in evaluative analysis.....</i>	252
5.1.4.	<i>Facilitating participatory evaluation.....</i>	253
5.1.4.1.	<i>Who holds the pen?.....</i>	254
5.1.4.2.	<i>Community researchers: participatory learning in action.....</i>	254
5.1.4.3.	<i>The facilitator.....</i>	255
5.1.4.4.	<i>Bias and subjectivity.....</i>	257
5.1.5.	<i>Diversity as an evaluation concern.....</i>	258
5.1.5.1.	<i>Interpreting unfamiliar behaviour.....</i>	259
5.1.5.2.	<i>Familiar behaviour.....</i>	259
5.1.6.	<i>Ethics.....</i>	260
<b>5.2</b>	<b><i>The principles: Making evaluation developmental.....</i></b>	<b>262</b>
5.2.1.	<i>Power in evaluation.....</i>	263
5.2.1.1.	<i>Literacy as a vessel for power.....</i>	266
5.2.1.2.	<i>Language games in the evaluation profession.....</i>	268
5.2.2.	<i>Appreciative inquiry.....</i>	269
5.2.3.	<i>'Holding' the organisation: Evaluator responsibility.....</i>	270
5.2.4.	<i>Evaluating for inward accountability.....</i>	272
5.2.5.	<i>Evaluating in complex systems: Realist approaches.....</i>	274
5.2.5.1.	<i>Learning the language: standardising and quantifying criteria.....</i>	275
5.2.5.2.	<i>Alternative assumptions: Theory of Change.....</i>	277
5.2.5.3.	<i>Grounding evaluation criteria.....</i>	278
5.2.5.4.	<i>Quantifying outcomes: measuring grounded indicators.....</i>	279
5.2.5.5.	<i>Ownership: whose evaluation, whose criteria?.....</i>	281
5.2.5.6.	<i>Funders' criteria checklists.....</i>	282
5.2.6.	<i>Funding relations.....</i>	283
5.2.6.1.	<i>Into the funding game.....</i>	283
5.2.6.2.	<i>Community service entrepreneurs.....</i>	284
5.2.6.3.	<i>What if there was no CBO donor funding at all?.....</i>	285
5.2.6.4.	<i>Supply and demand: The funder dilemma.....</i>	286
5.2.6.5.	<i>Development evaluation: an oxymoron.....</i>	288
5.2.6.6.	<i>Funding review and evaluation: not the same thing.....</i>	289
5.2.7.	<i>What about capacity building?.....</i>	291
5.2.8.	<i>Shadow: the poltergeist of organisation dynamics.....</i>	293

<b>5.3</b>	<b><i>Development, power and CBO character in metaphor</i></b> .....	<b>295</b>
5.3.1.	<i>The Knights</i> .....	295
5.3.2.	<i>The Saints</i> .....	296
5.3.3.	<i>The Snakes</i> .....	297
5.3.4.	<i>The Sheep</i> .....	298
<b>5.4</b>	<b><i>Conclusion to the discussion</i></b> .....	<b>303</b>
<b>CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSION</b> .....		<b>304</b>
<b>6.1</b>	<b><i>Introduction</i></b> .....	<b>304</b>
<b>6.2</b>	<b><i>Summary of findings and associated recommendations</i></b> .....	<b>304</b>
6.2.1.	<i>Theoretical contribution</i> .....	304
6.2.1.1.	<i>Complex dynamic theory</i> .....	305
6.2.1.2.	<i>Emergence</i> .....	305
6.2.1.3.	<i>Grounded theory</i> .....	306
6.2.2.	<i>Meta-evaluation: Methodological contribution</i> .....	306
6.2.2.1.	<i>Action research</i> .....	306
6.2.2.2.	<i>Iterative, cumulative coding</i> .....	306
6.2.3.	<i>Developmental evaluation for CBOs: Practical contribution</i> .....	308
6.2.3.1.	<i>Organisation-centred, visual and verbal communication and evaluation formats</i> .....	309
6.2.3.2.	<i>Appropriate M&amp;E technology</i> .....	310
6.2.3.3.	<i>Intangible, complex, systemic thinking</i> .....	310
6.2.3.4.	<i>Alternatives to predictive planning and evaluation</i> .....	311
6.2.3.5.	<i>Responsive, pragmatic, organisation relevant evaluation</i> .....	312
6.2.3.6.	<i>Purpose prevails over method</i> .....	313
6.2.3.7.	<i>Be appreciative</i> .....	313
6.2.3.8.	<i>Facilitation, more than evaluation</i> .....	314
6.2.3.9.	<i>Participation</i> .....	314
6.2.3.10.	<i>Evaluation and organisation development</i> .....	315
6.2.3.11.	<i>Internal accountability</i> .....	316
6.2.3.12.	<i>Capacity building</i> .....	316
6.2.3.13.	<i>Ethics</i> .....	317
<b>6.3</b>	<b><i>Conundrums and unanswered questions</i></b> .....	<b>317</b>
6.3.1.	<i>Subjectivity</i> .....	318
6.3.2.	<i>Exploitation or volunteerism</i> .....	319
6.3.3.	<i>Funding relationships</i> .....	321



6.3.3.1.	<i>More, smaller, easier funding relationships.....</i>	321
6.3.3.2.	<i>Funding review and learning evaluation .....</i>	322
6.3.3.3.	<i>A culture of engagement.....</i>	323
6.3.3.4.	<i>The power of money.....</i>	324
6.3.4.	<i>Power as a development resource .....</i>	325
6.3.5.	<i>Development and colonialism: dare we ask? .....</i>	326
<b>6.4</b>	<b><i>Returning to the research question: achievements and limitations of the study ....</i></b>	<b>327</b>
6.4.1.	<i>Problem statement and research objectives.....</i>	327
6.4.2.	<i>Thesis outline.....</i>	327
6.4.3.	<i>Limitations and unmet potential.....</i>	328
<b>6.5</b>	<b><i>Suggestions for further research .....</i></b>	<b>329</b>
6.5.1.	<i>Further theoretical research.....</i>	329
6.5.2.	<i>Methodological research.....</i>	329
6.5.3.	<i>Suggestions for practical research.....</i>	330
<b>6.6</b>	<b><i>Potential significance .....</i></b>	<b>332</b>
<b>6.7</b>	<b><i>In closure.....</i></b>	<b>332</b>
<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>335</b>
<b>APPENDICES</b>	<b>.....</b>	<b>352</b>
	<i>Appendix 1. Mentor and peer review demographics for action learning reflective data analysis .....</i>	352
	<i>Appendix 2. The questionnaire template .....</i>	353
	<i>Appendix 3. TOC - Presentations, and written publication on a CD attached to this thesis (to be compiled for final publication) .....</i>	356
	<i>Appendix 4. Programme for the Partners' inception meeting for the NW Province Gender, Culture and HIV programme MSC review.....</i>	357
	<i>Appendix 5. Partners' meeting for the NW Province Gender, Culture and HIV programme MSC field work preparation and training .....</i>	359
	<i>Appendix 6. MSC Community feedback Mabeskraal 25 September 2009 Draft Plan.....</i>	363



## List of Tables

TABLE 1.	<i>ABBREVIATED OUTLINE OF A TYPICAL LOGICAL FRAMEWORK TYPE MATRIX</i> .....	64
TABLE 2.	<i>EMPIRICAL AND NON-EMPIRICAL CONCEPTUAL LAYERS OF META-METHOD, METHODOLOGY RESEARCH AND BUSINESS CONTENT</i> .....	84
TABLE 3.	<i>CHARACTERISTICS AND APPLICATION OF QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH SORT OUT FONT ETC</i> .....	91
TABLE 4.	<i>DEMOGRAPHICS OF THE SAMPLE OF 6 METHODS ITERATIONS WITH GAUTENG CBOS FOR THE STORIES AND METAPHOR PHASE</i> .....	99
TABLE 5.	<i>SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS OF THE NORTH WEST MOST SIGNIFICANT CHANGE PHASE</i> .....	100
TABLE 6.	<i>MENTOR AND PEER REVIEW DEMOGRAPHICS FOR ACTION LEARNING REFLECTIVE DATA ANALYSIS</i> .....	109
TABLE 7.	<i>MEASURES IN THIS STUDY FOR OPTIMISING INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL TRUSTWORTHINESS</i> .....	115
TABLE 8.	<i>ETHICS ISSUES CHECKLIST</i> .....	119
TABLE 9.	<i>COMPARING, CONTRASTING AND COMBINING STORIES AND METAPHOR METHODOLOGY WITH ESTABLISHED MOST SIGNIFICANT CHANGE METHODS</i> .....	249
TABLE 10.	<i>THE POWER GAMES OF THE CRYSTAL BALL</i> .....	263
TABLE 11.	<i>HYPOTHETICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR OUTPUTS OR ACTIVITIES IN AN IMAGINARY AIDS SUPPORT CBO</i> .....	276
TABLE 12.	<i>HYPOTHETICAL CONVENTIONAL EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR OUTCOMES OR IMPACTS OF AN IMAGINARY AIDS SUPPORT CBO</i> .....	276



TABLE 13.	<i>HYPOTHETICAL GROUNDED EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR OUTCOMES OR IMPACTS OF AN IMAGINARY AIDS SUPPORT CBO</i> .....	280
TABLE 14.	<i>COMPARING COLONIALISM WITH DEVELOPMENT</i> .....	326

## List of Figures

FIGURE 1	<i>FOUR SCENARIOS FOR SOUTH AFRICA'S FUTURE</i> .....	41
FIGURE 2	<i>THREE SCENARIOS FOR A FUTURE OF ENGAGED CIVIL SOCIETY AND EFFECTIVE STATE</i> .....	43
FIGURE 3	<i>NDOSD ANALYSIS OF OBJECTIVES OF REGISTERED NPOS</i> .....	51
FIGURE 4	<i>EVALUATION AND LEARNING FROM EXPERIENCE IN RELATION TO THE ORGANISATIONAL HIERARCHY. FOR THE PURPOSES OF THIS RESEARCH, THE TERM "EVALUATION" REFERS TO PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT AT THE ORGANISATIONAL LEVEL.</i> .....	72
FIGURE 5	<i>DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN THE NON-EMPIRICAL AND EMPIRICAL ELEMENTS RELEVANT TO THIS STUDY, IN TERMS OF THE THREE WORLDS FRAMEWORK</i> .....	83
FIGURE 6	<i>THE ACTION LEARNING CYCLE</i> .....	85
FIGURE 7	<i>HIV PREVALENCE RATES IN RELATION TO SETTING</i> .....	93
FIGURE 8	<i>FLIER DISTRIBUTED TO AIDS CONSORTIUM TRAINEE ORGANISATIONS TO RECRUIT VOLUNTEERS INTO THE STUDY.</i> .....	97
FIGURE 9	<i>CASE STUDIES IN AN ITERATIVE ACTION LEARNING PROCESS, DRAWING NEW GROUNDED DATA INTO THEORY ACCUMULATION</i> .....	102
FIGURE 10	<i>THE ACTION LEARNING CYCLE AS APPLIED IN THE NON-EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS FOR DEVELOPING GUIDELINES AND PRINCIPLES FOR A MORE DEVELOPMENTAL EVALUATION APPROACH.</i> .....	108

<i>FIGURE 11</i>	<i>DIAGRAM OF THE UNFOLDING CRYSTALLISATION OF PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE, THROUGH CASE STUDIES BUILDING ON SUCCESSIVE REFLECTION. ....</i>	<i>123</i>
<i>FIGURE 12</i>	<i>A PROCESS DIAGRAM GIVES A SUMMARY OVERVIEW OF THE ELEMENTS OF EACH CASE STUDY, TO BE ELABORATED AND ANALYSED IN THE CASE STUDY DESCRIPTION. ....</i>	<i>124</i>
<i>FIGURE 13</i>	<i>REVISED RECOMMENDED ORGANISATIONAL STORIES AND METAPHOR PROCESS, AS EMERGING FROM THE GAUTENG EVALUATION PROCESSES AND META-EVALUATION.....</i>	<i>201</i>
<i>FIGURE 14</i>	<i>DIAGRAM OF THE MSC PROCESS AS DESIGNED AND INTENDED FOR THE MABESKRAAL STUDY. ....</i>	<i>208</i>
<i>FIGURE 15</i>	<i>THE STEPPING STONES: GUIDING THEMES ARE IDENTIFIED TO GUIDE RESEARCHERS TOWARDS HEARING A STORY OF CHANGE WITHIN THE BROAD REALM OF GENDER, CULTURE AND HIV COMMUNICATION. ONCE IDENTIFIED, PROBING QUESTIONS ARE USED TO POPULATE THE DETAIL OF THE STORIES. ....</i>	<i>212</i>
<i>FIGURE 16</i>	<i>RATINGS OF STORIES FOR ACCOUNTS OF SIGNIFICANT CHANGE.....</i>	<i>219</i>
<i>FIGURE 17</i>	<i>FIELD RESEARCHER LERATO MPATHO OF BACHA BA KOPANE CONSIDERS THE CONTENT OF INTERVIEW NOTES IN TERMS OF STORIES OF CHANGE, IN ORDER TO RATE THEM FOR INCLUSION IN THE MOST SIGNIFICANT CHANGE ANALYSIS PROCESS (PHOTO CREDIT: ANDREA MAYER).....</i>	<i>219</i>
<i>FIGURE 18</i>	<i>EXCERPT FROM THE PROGRAMME FOR THE MSC IMBIZO, MABESKRAAL, 25 SEPTEMBER 2009 .....</i>	<i>222</i>
<i>FIGURE 19</i>	<i>REVISED RECOMMENDED STORIES OF SIGNIFICANT CHANGE PROCESS, AS IT EMERGES FROM THE MABESKRAAL EVALUATION PROCESS AND META-EVALUATION.....</i>	<i>238</i>



*FIGURE 20 PROCESS OVERVIEW CONCLUSIONS OF THE GAUTENG STORIES AND METAPHOR PROCESSES, AND THE NORTH WEST MOST SIGNIFICANT CHANGE EXERCISE..... 246*

*FIGURE 21 THE ACTION LEARNING CYCLE AGAIN..... 256*

*FIGURE 22 CONTRASTING POSITIVIST AND GROUNDED APPROACHES TO PROJECT PLANNING AND EVALUATION IN TERMS OF THE MANAGEMENT CYCLE IN EACH CASE. .... 279*

*FIGURE 23 DONOR AGENCIES' LIMITED CAPACITY, IN RELATION TO CBO SUPPLY AND COMMUNITY NEED, WITH THE POSITION OF EVALUATION AS GATEKEEPER.287*

*FIGURE 24 RECONSIDERING THE WEIGHTING OF CHARACTERISTICS OF A DEVELOPMENT ORGANISATION IN TERMS OF THE ROLE, POTENTIAL AND IMPACT OF EVALUATION ..... 302*

## ACRONYMS

AI	Appreciative Inquiry
AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
ART or ARV	Anti-retroviral treatment
ASO	AIDS Service Organisation
BN	Code given to Case Study 5
CBO	Community-Based Organisation
CD4	Blood cell count indicator for immune suppression (<200 requires ART)
CL	Code given to Case Study 6
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DG	Code given to Case Study 4
DHA	Department of Home Affairs
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
HCBC	Home and Community Based Care
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
ICT	Information Communication Technology
ID	Identity Document
IEC	Information and Education Communication
JJ & JD	Code given to Case Study 2
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MSC	Most Significant Change, also used as code for Mabeskraal Case Study
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
NPO	Non-Profit Organisation
OD	Organisation Development
OVC	Orphans and Vulnerable Children
PMTCT	Prevention of Mother to Child Transmission of AIDS
QN	Code given to Case Study 3
SADF	South African Defence Force
TAC	Treatment Action Campaign (AIDS advocacy NGO)
TB	Tuberculosis
TT	Code given to Case Study 1
VCT	Voluntary Counselling and Testing (for HIV)