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Part 1. Introduction to the QuIP
• What is it, and what is it for?

Part 2. Case study
Concern Worldwide, anti-poverty pilot graduation programme in Malawi
Qualitative Impact Protocol (QuIP): the backstory

**Design and pilot testing** (2012-15)
ESRC/DFID funded collaborative action research to design and test a qualitative impact protocol (the QuIP) in Malawi and Ethiopia.

**Commercial testing** (2016-18)
Set up BSDR Ltd as a social enterprise to deliver QuIPs under commercial conditions. 40+ commissioned QuIP evaluations in 15+ countries.

**Reflection and documentation of ten case studies** (2016-19)
Key informant interviews with commissioners.
BSDR QuIP studies 2016-2019

Activities
Child nutrition
Climate change adaptation
Community mobilisation
Early famine response
Factory working conditions
Housing improvement
Medical & midwife training
Microfinance
Rural livelihoods
Value chain improvement
Sexual & reproductive health rights
Organisational development

Countries
• Bolivia
• Burkina Faso
• Cameroon
• Ethiopia
• Ghana
• Kenya
• India
• Malawi
• Mexico
• Mozambique
• Nepal
• Pakistan
• Sierra Leone
• Tanzania
• Tajikistan
• Uganda
• UK
• Zambia

Commissioners
• Acumen
• Bristol City Council
• C&A Foundation
• Diageo
• Self Help Africa
• Habitat for Humanity
• Oxfam
• Save the Children
• Seed Global Health
• Tearfund
• Tree Aid
• Rutgers International
• Itad
• Concern Worldwide
• Aga Khan Foundation
• MannionDaniels
• Send a Cow
• Oxford Policy Mgt
Core purpose - useful attribution

Even when we can monitor change (e.g. in selected poverty indicators), how can we credibly and cost-effectively verify claims that our activities are contributing to this change, especially in complex contexts?

Enabling intended beneficiaries to **voice** their felt experiences, in an open, credible and respectful way.

Reflecting the **diversity** of their experience (what works for whom, how and why).

Providing other stakeholders with a flexible **reality check**

... in a **timely** way to influence follow-up actions.
Implementing agency

Social investor

Intended beneficiaries

Commissioned researchers

Other knowledge communities

Independent researchers

Performance assessment (short feedback loop)

Impact evaluation (intermediate feedback loop)

Social research (long feedback loop)

Project specific theories of change

Mid-range theory

General theory

Scope: filling an evidence gap
Five key features of the QuIP

Self-reported attribution (with latent counterfactuals) Not statistically inferred attribution based on exposure variation.

Eclectic: draws on Process Tracing, Contribution Analysis, Most Significant Change, Outcome Harvesting, Realist Evaluation, Beneficiary Assessment...

Dual purpose: Confirmatory (testing prior theory) and Exploratory (open-ended).

Bayesian in spirit – augmenting prior views, not starting with zero knowledge.

Good enough – balancing credibility and cost-effectiveness; not aiming for absolute or universal truth.
Five steps in design and data collection

Deliberation and co-design with the commissioner, including case selection and choice of impact domains.

Informed case selection: Purposive with some random sampling based on quantitative monitoring data.

Sample size: benchmark of 24 semi-structured interviews and four focus groups (collected by two field researchers in 7-10 days).

Interviewing, translation and data entry by highly skilled and local field teams using pre-formatted Excel sheets to facilitate coding and analysis.

Double blindfolding: Data obtained where possible by independent field researchers without knowledge of the intervention.
Blindfolding

**Why do it?** To enhance credibility by reducing the risk of pro-project and confirmation bias (of intended beneficiaries and field investigators), thereby giving equal weight to all possible drivers of change.

**How far?** Can be combined with unblindfolded data collection: e.g. through joint follow-up interpretation of findings. Exploratory analysis can also be blindfolded but not confirmatory.

**Is it essential?** No. One strategy for reducing bias. Scope for degrees of blindfolding

**Is it feasible?** Yes, but harder in low trust contexts. Some degree of blindfolding is always possible.

**How ethical?** Greater good (should be proportionate), should be based on informed consent, and can be time-bound.
Five features of coding, analysis and use

**Exploratory coding** of multiple drivers and outcomes of change. **Confirmatory coding** of causal claims as explicit, implicit or incidental to project actions.

**Qual-quant integration**: e.g. through rapid generation of summary tables and visualisations to aid analysis.

**Flexible use** by commissioners and other stakeholders: quick reports, dashboards, unblindfolded debriefing...

**Audit**: easy to drill down from summary evidence to raw data for QA, auditing, peer review and learning purposes.
11. Causal Chain Visualisation - Respondent Domain Count

Driver of Change | Outcome 1 | Outcome 2 | Outcome 3
-----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------

Causal Chain Visualisation

Increase in food prices | Decreased food | Less money for spend
Drought | More time to find fodder | Meat reduced
Delayed Paspal payment | No or decreased income | Decreased school attendance
End of CPW NGO support | Livestock no value/died | Decreased school attendance

Respondent Code | Question ID | Question Answer
-----------------|-------------|-----------------
DHFC-2 | C1 | My husband used to work as daily labor on watershed management to earn more, but now he has cut back due to drought and our income has decreased in the last six months.
DHFC-2 | D1 | There has been an increase in the cost of food items and a decrease in income sources. Purchasing food items has become very expensive.
DHFC-2 | D5 | As far as last year drought was bad but different interventions from government organization and NGOs were supporting us. Now there are no more interventions while we are in a recovery period.
DHFC-7 | C1 | Last time our income was better than this six months because last time we got different kind of help from different NGOs but now there is no help and we don't have any other income from other source except livestock.
DHFC-7 | D1 | Concerning the food, the variety of food that we had before is better than during the last six months because we were given different kind of food from different organization as there was drought but now there is no that much food that we get from support and we were given wheat by NGOs. Every family was given a kilo of wheat per day but now there is no wheat and we also do not consume different variety of food.
DHFC-7 | E1 | There is a change on what we spend money during the last six months. Now we spend more money for food than anything before. It is because last year we got different kind of help including food from different NGOs but now we do not have that.
DHFC-2 | C1 | Previously, we got food support from NGOs and we didn't worry for food but in the last six months we don't get support of food.
DHFC-2 | E1 | Most of the time we spend more money on food during the last six months than ever before. It is because the price of food items is getting expensive while the value of our livestock has declined because of the drought. Mainly in the last two months we were not able to produce enough food, and we started buying food from the market.
Case selection

Is there census data?

- Yes
  - Is there data about changes in outcomes?
    - Yes
      - Confirmatory analysis stratified by outcomes and confounding factors
    - No
      - Confirmatory analysis stratified by confounding factors
- No
  - Opportunistic selection (e.g. by location or snowballing)

Is there a theory of change?

- Yes
  - Exploratory analysis stratified by outcomes
- No
  - Exploratory analysis stratified by contextual factors
Case study 1: Concern’s Graduation Programme in Malawi

Graduation from Extreme Poverty

- Comprehensive Targeting
- Intensive and multi-faceted interventions over 22 months
- Community targeting and enabling environment interventions
- Asset Transfer
- Consumption Support
- Savings + Financial Access
- Skills Training + Coaching
Mixed methods: RCT plus staggered QuIP studies

Treatment/Control Arm: Equal split between Mangochi and Nsanje for each arm

- Female Recipients 600 HHs
- Male Recipients 600 HHs
- Female + ‘Transforming Gender & Power Relations’ Training: 600 HHs
- Control Group 1,500 HHs

QuIP 1 in pilot areas, QuIPs 2 & 3 over two years to identify explanatory causal mechanism driving observed changes.
Findings from the first round of the QuIP:

- A total of 24 interviews plus 4 focus groups: 12 + 2 in Mangochi; 12 + 2 in Nsanje
- The types of individuals interviewed were men and women, married and single, those with labour capacity and those that needed a proxy (not so many of these)

Very strong positive self-reported effects from the Graduation within 8 months of implementation

- Stopped going for ganyu (casual Labour)
- Increased purchasing power
- Increased food security
- Increased assets
- Invested in a new business
- One negative impact was animosity between households and community.
Very strong positive self reported effects from the Graduation within 8 months of implementation

| Driver                        | New maize planting | New agri practices | New agri business | No longer go hungry/starve | Stopped/reduced piece work | Increased income | Increased WASH knowledge | Increased purchasing power | Increased food security | Increased yield | Increased savings/loans | Able to pay school fees/uniform/equipment | Increased assets | Improved hygiene practices | Improved gender equality in household | Increased health | Increased new hybrid seeds | Increased time on own farm | Increased economic independence | Improved nutrition | New agricultural conservation techniques | Increased livestock numbers to sell | Increased crop diversity |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|
| Social Cash Transfer (CW)     | 36                | 40                 | 24                | 28                        | 148                       | 78                       | 2                  | 3                       | 36                       | 16                       | 3             | 4                         | 5                               | 9               | 10                        | 21                             | 8              | 25                         |                             |
| VSL                           | 11                | 4                  | 1                 | 1                         | 8                         | 5                        | 1                  | 70                      | 18                       | 2                       | 1             | 12                        | 1                               | 1               | 21                        | 21                             | 2              | 2                         |                             |
| Agricultural training and advice | 15                | 1                  | 18                | 8                         | 1                         | 13                       | 28                 | 12                      | 5                        | 2                       | 4             | 20                        | 13                              |                 |                           |                                 |                 |                            |                             |
| WASH Information              |                   |                    |                   | 26                        |                            |                          |                    |                          |                          |                          |                |                           | 27                              | 19              |                           |                                 |                 |                            |                             |
| Started a business            | 1                 | 10                 | 1                 | 1                         | 1                         | 1                        | 5                  | 1                       |                          |                          |                |                           | 1                               |                 |                           |                                 |                 |                            |                             |
| Government HSA                |                   |                    |                   |                           |                            |                          |                    |                          |                          |                          |                |                           | 6                               | 7               |                           |                                 |                 |                            |                             |
| Business training             | 7                 | 1                  | 2                 | 1                         |                            |                          |                    |                          |                          |                          |                |                           | 1                               |                 |                           |                                 |                 |                            |                             |
| VSL (NASFAM/other)            | 1                 |                    | 3                 |                           |                            |                          |                    |                          |                          |                          |                |                           | 3                               | 3               |                           |                                 |                 |                            |                             |
| Gender training               |                   |                    |                   |                           |                            |                          |                    |                          |                          |                          |                |                           | 10                              |                 |                           |                                 |                 |                            |                             |
## Increased animosity within communities – main negative impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Driver</th>
<th>Economic migration</th>
<th>Reduction in household size</th>
<th>Cash unreliable</th>
<th>Increased borrowing from community</th>
<th>Reduced income</th>
<th>Increased spending on land rent</th>
<th>Reduced farming activity</th>
<th>Reduced yield</th>
<th>Growing less sorghum</th>
<th>Unable to do business</th>
<th>Poor nutrition</th>
<th>Decrease in livestock</th>
<th>Increased animosity in community</th>
<th>Excluded from other projects</th>
<th>Claims that project is satanic cult</th>
<th>Stopped using traditional maize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being a project beneficiary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor rains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Cash Transfer not working (Gov)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor economy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop pests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASFAM failed to buy soya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of household head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring for sick relative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal disease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Causal chains based on frequency counts

1. Expand crop production (intended)
2. New agricultural conservation techniques
3. Increase crop diversity
4. Increased yield
5. Increased food security
6. Increased income
7. Agricultural training and advice
8. New maize planting technique
9. New agri practices (general)
10. Planting new hybrid seeds

19 (15) from Expand crop production (intended)
10 (9) from Increase crop diversity
9 (4) from Increased yield
15 (12) from Agricultural training and advice
18 (13) from New maize planting technique
6 (4) from Planting new hybrid seeds
6 (5) from New agri practices (general)
Diverse impact of cash transfers

Social Cash Transfer (CW)

- Increased purchasing power (148, 27)
- Increased food security (73, 27)
- Increased income (13, 12)
- Invested in or started business (32, 19)
- Increased assets (35, 20)
- Stopped/Reduced piece work 'ganyu'
- Improved nutrition (21, 14)
- No longer go hungry/starve (27, 21)
- Increased livestock numbers to sell (24, 12)

Increased purchasing power
Summary: what a QuIP can reveal

Changes in perceived outcomes across selected domains of wellbeing (positive and negative).

Perceived drivers of those changes.

Causal claims: detailed mapping from drivers to outcomes

Contribution claims: attribution of outcomes to selected interventions

Variation in change experiences (e.g. by age, gender, geographical context, exposure to intervention).

Summary tables and charts based on frequency counts, fully auditable back to text source.
And what a QuIP alone does **not** provide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Does not provide</strong></th>
<th><strong>Responses</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Estimates of the magnitude of average treatment effects | • Use as one input into microsimulation  
• Run alongside a quantitative impact evaluation. |
| Statistically representative frequency counts | • Reveals scope and range of responses  
• Combine with Bayesian updating  
• Use to design or follow-up on quantitative surveys. |
| Objective ‘facts’ | • Triangulate  
• Perceptions matter! |
| Recommendations for action | • Combine QuIP with process evaluation and follow-up stakeholder engagement. |
Ongoing work: building impact evaluation capacity

- More inclusive and sustainable development
- More and better understanding about how to produce better impact evidence
- More and better evidence of social impact
- Wider support for producing good impact evidence (demand)
- Increased capacity to produce good impact evidence (supply)
- Methodological research (University of Bath and other collaborators)
- More and better QuIP studies conducted by BSDR and by other organisations
- Capacity building (including training and networking to strengthen evaluation communities of practice)
- Internal capacity of BSDR (staff, networks, identity, systems, finance etc.)
- External grant support

- Ongoing work: building impact evaluation capacity