Participant-Driven Evaluation

Final Report to the Weatherhead Center Medium Faculty Grant Ryan Sheely Assistant Professor of Public Policy, Harvard Kennedy School of Government

In November 2010, I was awarded a \$25,000 Medium Faculty Grant from the Weatherhead Center to design and implement a research project entitled "Participant Driven Evaluation" (PDE). The initial stated purpose of the PDE project was to better understand the methodological limits and the potential adverse political consequences of quantitative social science field research in developing countries, and to understand the extent to which both of these shortcomings can be overcome by combining the core logic of quantitative social science with the methodological and normative orientation of participatory research. In contrast to traditional participatory research methods, the core idea of PDE is to integrate qualitative participatory methods with more conventional quantitative methods, in particular, field experiments and sample surveys. PDE thus has the potential to bring communities into debates about evidence-based policy from which they have historically been excluded.

In this brief report, I provide an overview of the research conducted on the PDE project since 2010, providing the qualitative results of the preliminary program design phase, as well as preliminary quantitative and qualitative results of the Research Capacity Building and Local Capacity Building components of the project.

Overview, Research Purpose, and Evolution of Research Questions

The original inspiration for the Participant-Driven Evaluation project was the idea that the incorporation of community members into research design, data collection, and analysis has the potential to both improve the quality of data and to use research as an empowerment tool, allowing communities to hold politicians and civil society organizations accountable for project performance. Yet, although the possible gains from combining experimental and participatory methods are intuitively appealing, a number of unanswered epistemological, methodological, and theoretical questions have prevented attempts to combine these methods into a toolkit that can be used by communities, researchers, and policymakers.

These initial questions motivated the original application to the Weatherhead Center's Medium Faculty grant in October 2010, and the preliminary program design phase of the project, which took place from November 2010 to April 2012. Table 1 below summarizes these initial research questions, as they were articulated in the initial funding proposal, along with a summary of the revised and reformulated research questions that emerged from the initial program design phase of the project.

	Initial Research Questions		Finalized Research Questions
1)	To what extent is it possible to combine participatory me extent are these methods methodologically, epistemologi	thod cally	s with quantitative social science field research? To what y, and normatively incompatible with one another?
•	To what extent does the conduct of randomized impact evaluations have unintended social, political, and economic consequences within communities? Does combining randomized evaluations with participatory methods reduce these consequences?	2)	To what extent are community members able to grasp the core concepts and methodologies of research? To what extent are they able and willing to develop their own research agenda, conduct research, and use the results as leverage for change? Does quantitative data produced through participatory methods satisfy the standards of evidence-based policy-makers?
•	To what extent are individuals from marginalized rural communities willing and able to participate in the design and implementation of field experiments and sample surveys?	3)	What are the social, political and economic effects of quantitative field research and field experiments on communities? Does combining participatory methods with quantitative field research and field experiments mediate these social, political and economic effects?
•	Does Participant-Driven Evaluation enable typically marginalized individuals and communities to participate in evidence-based advocacy and policymaking at local, national, and international venues?	4)	How does the participant and community-driven research agenda differ from the research agendas of professional researchers? Which of these research agendas are more aligned with the community's own development goals, and is either of the two more likely to bring about tangible improvements in standards of living?
		5)	To what extent does involvement in randomized field experiments and PDE projects strengthen or weaken democratic practices within a community? To what extent is the effect of these types of research projects on political outcomes mediated by changes in personal and collective efficacy?
		6)	To what extent does increased knowledge of research and increased willingness to conduct research shape the relationships between the community and external stakeholders? Does involvement in conducting their own research enable community members to view themselves as partners rather than beneficiaries?
7)	Under what circumstances can a system of Participant-De What levels and forms of outside support might be neces	riven sary	n Evaluation be economically and socially sustainable? to operate such a system over the long-term?

Table 1: Research Questions

In the program design phase of the project, I conducted and supervised a year of qualitative research that led to the development and piloting of the core components and protocols of the PDE program, and also gave me the opportunity to revise and refine the first set of research questions and the proposed research design. The current set of research questions reflects a shift in the project focus in response to the initial fieldwork.

With the finalization of the program design phase, the two additional core components of the PDE project crystallized: Research Capacity Building and Local Capacity for Democracy. Village Research Workshops and Research Conferences form the Research Capacity Building Component, while the Local Capacity for Democracy Component allows communities to conduct their own research projects in response to the needs and priorities of the village, and carry out follow-up trainings to assist in the linkage of community-driven research projects to collective action and accountability efforts.

The Program Design and Research Capacity Building components are focused on answering the first 4 research questions, and have been supported since 2010 by the initial grant from the Weatherhead Center (the 2010 Medium Faculty Grant was granted an extension until June 30, 2013) and the William F. Milton Fund at Harvard Medical School. The Local Capacity for Democracy component is focused on answering research questions 5 to 7, and has been supported since 2011 by funding from the Ash Center's HKS Faculty Research Grant. Because the Local Capacity for Democracy component is scheduled to be completed in August 2013, this report primarily focuses on the Program Design and Research Capacity Building Components, and provides briefer overviews of preliminary research regarding the Local Capacity for Democracy component.

Overview of PDE Program and Research Design

Program Design

As developed through preliminary qualitative research, the PDE intervention is a training curriculum and support system that is made up of a series of three participatory workshops forming the Research Capacity Building component– Village Research Workshops, Follow-up Village Training Workshops, and Research Conferences, as well as 3 research opportunities forming the Local Capacity for Democracy component– two Village Research Projects, and a Combined Research Project. Participation which is voluntary for all the workshops and research projects.

	Research Capacity Building Component		Local Capacity for Democracy Component
Vi	llage Research Workshops	Vi	llage Research Project I
•	4 days long and held with participants nominated by the community itself Each Village Research Workshop engages participants in discussions about the motivations for and applications of research, while teaching them methodologies of data collection, project evaluation and data presentation.	•	On the last day of the workshop, each group of participants is granted a small research fund (about \$50 per project) to conduct a research project of their own, either to identify solutions to a problem, or to evaluate the effectiveness of a solution in their community. All groups then present the results of their research
•	At the end of the workshop, if the participants		to the community in order to general community-

desire to register as a Community Based Organization, PDE assists the group in registering in order to facilitate follow-up community research projects by the group.	wide interest and accountability.
Follow-up Village Training Workshop	Village Research Project II
 Held about a month after the Village Research Workshops with the same participants. The aim is to solidify understandings of concepts and skills taught during the Village Research Workshop. 	 After the Follow-up Village Training Workshop, another round of funding is made available for the village workshop participants to carry out follow-up research projects. Groups are encouraged to design the follow-up research based on the findings of their first research.
PDE Research Conference	Combined Research Project
 After the Follow-up Trainings, Village Representatives from each Treatment village are invited to join one of three Research Conferences (divided by geographical location), where they are taught more advanced methods of research, accounting for omitted variable biases and difference in differences methodologies. 	 After the Research Conferences, Village Representatives are then given the opportunity to conduct a larger scale project evaluation in collaboration with Village Research Committees from neighboring villages and an NGO or government organization of their choice. \$100 is granted to every participating village to carry out project implementation, and \$100 is similarly granted for conducting project evaluation. Village Representatives decide as a group what intervention to evaluate, the evaluation strategy, as well as all financial and logistical arrangements. These research results are then presented during a Final Meeting held after completion of the Phase 2 workshops.

Table 2: Program Design

Research Design

A randomized phase-in field experiment has been used to test the effect the PDE intervention on the attitudes and behavior of participants, communities, and politicians. The sample for this evaluation is a randomly selected set of 32 villages in Kenya's Laikipia East and Central Districts. 16 of these villages were randomly assigned to the first wave of PDE workshops and 16 were assigned to the second wave of workshops. The random assignment to roll-out phases makes it possible to conduct surveys before and after the first roll-out, which in turn makes it possible to treat the second roll-out group as a control group for the purpose of evaluating the impact of

the PDE intervention. The results of this evaluation will be shared with all 32 Village Research Committees after the second wave of workshop implementation, during the Final Meeting.

Timeline	Activ	vities
	16 Phase 1 Villages	16 Phase 2 Villages
November 2011- April 2012	Program	Design
September-October 2012	Baseline	e Survey
January 2012-May 2013	 Village Research Workshop (January- February 2013) Follow-up Training (March 2013) Research Conference (April-May 2013) 	
June-July 2013	Endline	Survey
July-August 2013		Village Research Workshop
August 2013	Final N	leeting

Table 3: Research Design

Two types of data were collected to evaluate the system of Participant-Driven Evaluation: 1) quantitative data collected during baseline and endline surveys and quizzes and 2) qualitative data collected through interviews and observations during all phases of the project.

The quantitative data consists of the baseline and endline surveys, as well as pre- and post- workshop quizzes. Baseline and endline surveys are administered to 33 randomly selected community members in each village as well as to the workshop participants and the village elder, and will measure indicators like personal and collective efficacy, attitudes to research and relationships with stakeholders. Pre and post workshop quizzes are administered to all participants of the Village Research Workshops, in order to measure their understanding and retention of the core concepts and skills taught during the workshop.

Detailed qualitative data were recorded by trained observers during the workshops, in order to: 1) Assess the viability of simultaneously training and supporting multiple research committees; 2) Document workshop participation dynamics across communities that vary with respect to education levels, inequality, and ethnic diversity; and 3) Document participants' interest and aptitude for research that directly targets community problems compared to research that is driven by outside researchers and organizations.

Preliminary Results

In this section, I utilize evidence from the baseline survey that I conducted in May 2012 and qualitative observations collected during PDE activities from July 2010 to May 2013 to showcase the major intellectual findings and contributions of the research funded by the Weatherhead Center's 2010 Medium Faculty grant. This discussion is designed to provide a broad overview of the preliminary findings from the PDE project; many of the findings highlighted below will be explored in greater depth in the academic articles that I will be writing over the course of the 2013-2014 academic year. Similarly, this report focuses on the research questions and sub-questions that can be answered with the completed research activities that were findings related to the connections between community participation, empowerment, and social science field research. The specific sub-questions regarding the effects of the PDE intervention on community capacity, efficacy, and empowerment and the long-term sustainability of the project will be able to be answered upon the completion of the endline survey and further qualitative research supported by the Ash Center, which will be completed in September 2013.

1. Ability to Combine Participatory and Quantitative Research and Community Capacity to Participate in Research

Although the preceding discussion of the program design phase of the PDE project indicates that it is possible to teach and implement social science research methods and concepts in a broadly accessible and participatory manner, a major unresolved concern is whether this workshop and the related research activities can actually be implemented in an inclusive and participatory manner, or whether the execution of projects will require a trade-off between rigor and inclusiveness. Moreover, even if the workshops are able to bridge participatory and quantitative modes of research, do these brief workshops actually enable community members to acquire the skills to conduct high-quality research? Observations and records from the implementation of the PDE program provide evidence about the basic feasibility of these core aims of the PDE project.

Participation and Social Science Research

From the observation notes that the PDE facilitators took during the research workshops, participants exhibited not only a high level of interest across the board, but also a high level of understanding of the materials and concepts taught. Although qualitative analysis of the workshop observation notes is not yet complete, we have synthesized some broader impressions from these notes.

Although literacy was not a prerequisite to join the workshop, facilitators observed a tendency for the illiterate participants to look to more literate participants for leadership and guidance. Similarly, literate participants also tended to be more confident in answering questions and explaining difficult concepts to fellow participants. During the follow-up training, many facilitators observed that participants would answer recap questions in a chorus, right after the questions had been asked. Encouragingly, most of the participants were able to understand some of the more difficult concepts, such as how to ensure accuracy and isolate project impact from non-project influences. Even during the Research Conferences attended by elected representatives from each village, we found that participants were able to understand complex concepts like omitted variable bias and random assignment. Below is a sample excerpt from Follow-up Training Workshop observation notes, showing a high level of engagement:

During the Follow-up training what is held about a month after the Village Research Workshops, the participants were asked what their favorite charts were.

Participant 1: Table, because it can contain more information and it is easy to draw.

Participant 2: Weather Map, because it can give information of what is happening at different places at the same time and on the same map.

Participant 3&4: Pie chart, because it looks like a chapatti and it is easier to remember.

Participant 5: Bar graph, because I can draw a big graph and subdivide it into smaller sections.

Capacity to Conduct Social Science Research

In general, facilitators observed a high level of sophistication with regards to identifying a clear research question in line with the community's priorities. While some research topics dealt with general issues like understanding why there is poverty in the village or identifying a solution for the bad hygiene in the village, some research topics dealt with very specific issues like identifying a solution for the domestic fighting in the village that impedes children's performance in school, or understanding how to solve the problem of people not wanting to pay for their water bills. The identification of a collective action problem as in the case of people not being able to pay for their water bills was striking, and indicates that community research agendas have significant overlaps with that of professional researchers, both in the variety across major themes, as well as depth within specific themes.

During the Research Workshops, participants were taught how to draft a data collection plan before conducting their research. Figures 1-3 present examples of the data collection plans they produced for the Village Research Projects.



Figure 1: Participant Data Collection Plans

For the initial village research projects, the budgets that the participants created were very basic calculations. After a session on budgeting during the Follow-up Training, the participants were able to produce budgets like the following for the follow-up research projects:

		UNIL	WW	DHIT	PAKE	Anton	APPEne and is					
LANNING & PREAMARTIM	8	BOOKS		17180	10.00	80 20	PLANNING	DETAILS	Quantity	Unit	Amant	Comments.
	8	PENS			16	120 0	O BATA COLLECTION			Kehr	Kihi	
	.4	FAUNT			40	160.0	0	1. Olming & Prenastions		-	-	S. Rund also & Note allections
FLIP PAPES	10	PIERes		1	20	200	Do	S D' days	E.			The manual plan a Dare deliterary
ATA COLLECTION (ROUND I	8	PURSES.		1	35	10.64	1000	Pripcharts	Sper	-		6 to borrow from provides
URSTIGNAR PRINTING	3	PAGES			35	105		=> Pularkari		-	-	J projece researce.
PHEROLOPY SURVEY	100	COPIES			9	900		2. Data Collection -				
	8	PENCILS			20	165 00		> Computes Print cors	5page	40	200	
- The second second	8	RUBBERS	3.	1	10	8000		> Photocopy Durtopts	80 pager	3	240	+ Exmai
RECORD BOOK	. 1	A4	1.3	1000	4	40'00	GROUP RECORD	2 Transmit	1 Date		300	- to Nanyaki lown
TRANS DORT	1	1. S. S. S. S.		2	2.50	2.50	TO PRANI AND PHOTO COPYING	3. Data margare	C.D.H			
AIRTIME	1100		1		1.	100	GROUP COMMINATION	ST WIS DOOK	DBR	-	-	- have be Decon
DATA ANALYSIS			1		1.00			=> Pen	5pcr	-	-	Durent Diolitet
THICK PAPERS	10	SHICK PARENS			20	20 w		>> Aipchan to graphs	aper	-	-	Milliones h 2
FLIP PAPES (draw gro ph	1			.0		500 '40	and the second se	=> Markers for graphs	4.00-	-	-	
FAUNT PEN	6	Preces	10.00		40	2.00 10		=> Poncils	Fort	-	-	
RULERS (draw graph	2	200	1	-	zo	4000		DTok	2	0.00	1600	P
Transport	2495		100			600	TO PORCHASE MARTERIALS		2	000	1000	
ATRIIME	-		18.6			100		=> Mire Mins	Sm .	200	600	
CALCNAATION	8	Boors			10	30.00	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	=> Helding			500	
SHARING RESULTS		1.200		0.000				Diransport to Juakali			200	
REFRESHMENT	30	PEDPLE			30	900		4- Sharing Rosults				
PHOTO COPIES .	1	PAGE	30	Cories	3.00	9000		=> Photocopy Reports	2000	3	GD	
MEETING PUBLICIT			-	-	1	10000		Mission Art	2 child		1300	
TOTAL COSTS	-	-				5000		ES Pois direct Fimi -		1/1	Eco	
						100		10	all	KILI		

Figure 2: Participant Budgets

During the follow-up training, the project team also held a similar training on how to develop project time schedules in a format typically used in many large -scale social scientific field research projects. The participants went on to produce the following time schedules for the follow-up research projects:



Figure 3: Participant Time Schedules

Summary of Findings and Linkage to Research Questions: In the above section, we have presented evidence on the capacity of community members to conduct research. Overall, a broad cross-section of community members were able to grasp the core concepts and methodologies of social science research (Research Question 1), and were also willing and able to develop their own research agenda and conduct research (Research Question 2).

2. Community Experiences With and Attitudes Towards Research

A second core focus of the PDE project is understanding the social and political dynamics of social science field research. Data from the baseline survey that preceded the start of the PDE workshops provides us with an overview of how community members' attitudes towards research are shaped by their experiences with a variety of research activities, including seeing research taking place in the village, being asked questions, being employed by a project, or being trained by a project.

Preliminary results, available in Table A1 of the Appendix, indicate that respondents from villages in which research had been conducted in the past were more likely to think that communities benefit from research, although respondents who had previously been asked questions as part of a research project were *less* likely to think that communities benefit from research, as can also be seen in Figure 4, and tended to display less faith in research.



Figure 4: Research Questions

Figure 5: Training

However, respondents who had been trained as part of a research project were significantly more likely to report a favorable personal experience with research, were more likely to think that communities benefit from research (see Figure 5), and tended to display more faith in research. The positive effect of training on perceptions of research is a strong initial suggestion that participatory methods can overcome negative perceptions of research caused by being employed for research purposes without any actual engagement. These same relationships hold with the inclusion of control variables, and we additionally see a positive relationship between age and belief that community will benefit, wealth and faith in research, and education and the belief that communities will benefit as well as a positive personal/village experience with research (Table A2). The endline survey will provide a further test of this interpretation; if participatory methods overcome negative perceptions of research, attitudes towards research should be more positive in treatment villages.

Summary of Findings and Linkage to Research Questions: The findings above provide a preliminary answer to Research Question 3, by showing that while non-participatory research methods can alienate community members and dampen their faith in research, engaging community members in the research process can actually reverse this effect. Indeed, in villages where respondents had been trained, respondents reported significantly favorable views of research. Moreover, our data provides initial evidence for the view that participant-driven evaluation is more socially sustainable than traditional quantitative field research, as it bolsters, rather than erodes, community confidence in research and its benefits (Research Question 7).

3. Involvement in Research and Research Preferences

A third core focus of the PDE project is understanding community members' perceptions of who can and should be involved in research. Even if it is possible and desirable to design community-driven social science research, would the level of community involvement enabled by a PDE intervention actually represent a change from the status quo in terms of who is actually involved in the process of research?



Involvement in Research



As shown in Figure 6, the results of our baseline survey indicate that respondents believe communities are less involved in research than more "traditional" researchers, which include professional researchers, academics, government and private sector researchers. Specifically, **respondents believed that communities are less involved in conducting research, usually benefit less from research, and are generally less interested in results of community research than traditional researchers.** The biggest discrepancy between traditional researchers and the community arises in the perceived allocation of responsibility for research, closely followed by perceived allocation of benefits from research. It is also striking that, although a majority of community members *do* believe that they benefit from research, this category receives the lowest score of the three. The difference between researchers and community is significant at the 1% level for all three types of research activity.



Figure 7: Desired Community Involvement

Although communities generally strongly desire to be involved in all stages of a project, on average respondents gave the lowest score to evaluating effectiveness of projects and interventions, while the highest desirability was assigned to drawing conclusions from the project, as can be seen in Figure 7. Despite the variation being very low, the mean difference between interest in drawing conclusions and evaluating effectiveness is statistically significant at the 5% level.

Further analysis (see Table A3 in Appendix) reveals that believing the community is responsible for conducting research is strongly correlated with thinking the community benefits from research and believing the community is interested in community research. Furthermore, having previously been employed by a research project is significantly negatively correlated with thinking the community is responsible for conducting research. By refining our analysis to take into account the four different types of research activity (Table A4), we see that a person who has been previously employed by a research project is more likely to think that the community should be involved in both evaluating a project and drawing conclusions from a project. Faith in research is positively correlated with desired level of community involvement across all stages, as well as with willingness to research. Wealth and political efficacy are both positively correlated with desire to be involved in implementation, and political efficacy is also positively correlated with willingness to conduct research.

Research Preferences



Figure 8: Distribution of Project Type

In our Phase 1 project villages, we tracked the types of research projects that community members actually choose to become involved in. In the 16 Phase 1 villages, 20 initial research and 15 more follow-up research projects were conducted, for a total of 35 village-based research projects⁴. Of the village research projects, a majority was aimed at identifying various issues or problems within the community⁵. A small portion of research projects, however, was focused on evaluating specific solutions to problems⁶. This distribution of project types above supports the ex-ante preference distribution in Figure 7.

⁴ One village decided not to do a project at all after the workshop, and four larger villages broke into groups and conducted two or more research projects within the village.

⁵ Examples include identifying solution to the jigger (a type of insect that causes skin infections) problem in the village, or understanding how to work as a community to access water cheaply.

⁶ Examples include evaluating whether or not planting trees can solve the water pollution problem in the village, evaluating the solution of employing youth to fix the road and evaluating whether the food given by CDF (the Constituency Development Fund) is helping the kids.



Figure 9: Distribution of Village Research Projects

In Figure 9, we show the distribution of *topic* areas chosen by community members. Of the 35 research projects, many dealt with infrastructural issues like lack of access to water and poor roads, as well as health and sanitation issues like water pollution and poor hygiene. Of particular interest is that a total of 15 projects were concerned with water-related issues -10 regarding lack of access to water, and 5 regarding water pollution.

In the long run, it will be interesting to compare the distribution of research preferences revealed in the PDE workshops to that of "traditional researchers", especially in the context of quantitative social science research in sub-Saharan Africa.

Summary of Findings and Linkage to Research Questions: In the above section, we laid out results from both our baseline quantitative survey and from project activities indicating that there is a widespread willingness among community members to participate in field research. Specifically, our analysis shows that current research practices impart community members with a feeling of being less involved in research than professional researchers, academics, government and private sector researchers, to the point that community members believe they benefit less from research than this group (Research Question 3). We have also shown that there is a strong willingness among communities to conduct research and use the results to draw conclusions (Research Question 2), although interest in evaluation lags relative to other research activities. After the completion of the ongoing endline survey (funded by the Ash Center), we will evaluate whether community members' interest in evaluation increases as a result of increased capacity to conduct research. The distribution of research projects recorded by the project's facilitators also provides a preliminary answer to Research Question 4, indicating that community members have a marked interest in conducting research on projects related to infrastructure and health. We also see some evidence of a positive answer to Research Question 6 –involvement

in research gives community members more faith in research, which in turn renders community members more willing to conduct research.

4. Efficacy, Engagement with Leaders and Stakeholders, and Empowerment

A final core theme that is central to the PDE project is the linkage between research and politics. In particular, the PDE project investigated two dimensions of the politics of research: 1) the possible effects of participation in research on individual, collective, and political efficacy and 2) the ways that research shapes the interactions and power dynamics between citizens, community leaders, and other stakeholders, including civic organizations, government agencies, and "traditional" researchers.

Efficacy

Our findings indicate that exposure to research is not significantly correlated with how respondents perceived the collective efficacy of their village (see Table A5 in Appendix), although these correlations are negative both with and without the addition of control variables (except for how many times they have been trained as part of a research project, which is positive without control variables). Interestingly, however, the correlation between wealth and perceived level of collective efficacy is positive and highly statistically significant, indicating that wealthier village members have more faith in the ability of their village to function well and benefit its citizens. We also see a mildly significant negative relationship between being female and perceived collective efficacy.

Exposure to research is also not significantly correlated to self-efficacy. The relationship is generally positive, except for a negative relationship between number of times respondents have been asked questions as part of a research project in the last year, and perceived self-efficacy (this was positive without controls). However, the relationships between being female and self-efficacy and being older and self-efficacy are highly statistically significant and negative, suggesting that younger males have the highest self-confidence and feeling of efficacy. It is also interesting to note that in contrast with collective efficacy, a person's wealth does not seem to be a predictor for self-efficacy. Finally, we see a slightly significant positive relationship between education and perceived self-efficacy.

Another interesting pattern revealed by the baseline data is that political efficacy is more similar to selfefficacy than to collective efficacy in terms of its relationship with research exposure and control variables. That is, exposure to research is generally positively but insignificantly related to perceived political efficacy, except for having previously been trained being mildly statistically significant, while there is a strong and significantly negative relationship between the latter and both age and being female. This similarity between self-efficacy and political efficacy seems to indicate that more self-confident respondents also feel like they understand and are qualified to participate in political decision-making, and have faith in the capacity of the political system to deliver for community members.

In sum, there was no significant relationship between efficacy and research exposure in our baseline data. Rather, the story emerging from our data is one related to socio-economic status and empowerment, with wealthier individuals having more faith in the efficacy of their village, and younger males having more confidence in both themselves and their village's political system. After the completion of the endline survey, we will be able to estimate whether involvement in participant-driven evaluation can actually *increase* perceived

efficacy. Preliminary evidence from our project villages indicates that this might be the case, as in some villages, facilitators noticed an improvement in relationships between workshop participants over the course of conducting their own research projects.

However, in general, we observed lack of efficacy acting as a limiting factor on quality of community research. For example, in villages where compensation or financial assistance was raised as an issue, the group as a whole would be less likely to complete a research project, and more likely to get into conflicts with each other. In one village, the facilitators discovered that the subarea had been spreading rumors before the workshop that the PDE staff was going to give them more than what was promised. As a result, the participants came with expectations of money, and when they found out there was no compensation for attending the workshop, many stopped attending. Only 5 out of 12 people completed the workshop, and no research project was done in that village. Nevertheless, in several other villages, although participants raised the issue of compensation and financial assistance with the facilitators, the explanation as to why there is no compensation was well accepted. In these cases, participants' performance on the research projects did not appear to be affected.



Engagement with Community Leaders and Stakeholders





In addition to assessing individual, collective, and political efficacy, the baseline survey also asked community members about the perceived involvement and efficacy of community leaders (the chief and village head) and other community stakeholders (NGOs, CBOs, Religious Groups, 'Traditional' Researchers, and County Councils). The 'involvement' variable captures how satisfied respondents are with how the stakeholder works in the community, how active stakeholders are in solving community problems, how effective the stakeholder is at resolving community issues, and if the stakeholder involves the community in its official activities. In general, community leaders' perceived involvement level was higher than that of stakeholders. This same pattern holds for the community's sense of efficacy in dealing with the two groups: the stakeholders' perceived efficacy was much lower than that of community leaders. For both involvement and efficacy, the difference between stakeholders and community leaders was significant at the 1% level.



The finding that community leaders are more involved and effective relative to other stakeholders is reinforced by results on stakeholder relationship indices, which measure how satisfied respondents are with how particular groups operate within the community (Figure 12). Here, village heads score the highest, followed by religious groups and chiefs (heads of Locations or Sub-locations within a district). The County Council (the representative local government) scores significantly lower than all other stakeholders.

Empowerment

Qualitative notes from our treatment villages provide initial evidence of the striking effect that research training had on participants' ability to effect change within their communities, as well as on their patterns of engagement with community leaders and stakeholders. Although village researchers were only required to present their research results in a community meeting, some communities went further and reached out to other stakeholders who could help them to solve problems. In one village, the village research team showed their results evaluating a community water dam to the village head, and obtained a grant of 5 million shillings (US\$58,000) to expand the dam. A second village researching the effectiveness of pesticides shared their results with the District Officer, who helped them to invite an organization to teach the community how to apply pesticides in a way that causes least harm to crops. Another village evaluating tree planting as a solution to water pollution decided to set aside 2000 shillings (\$23) of their allocated research allowance to start a tree nursery, while a fourth team researching the problem of trash in the community used the remainder of their research allowance to buy dustbins for the community shopping center. A further village, researching solutions to the problem of bad roads, decided to register their research group as a Community-Based Organization. They then proposed a plan to the county council to employ local youths to help build the road.

An excerpt from Research Conference observation notes showcases both an increase in empowerment and efficacy among community members: *When going through a case study, the facilitator describes a hypothetical situation in which a researcher wrote to a newspaper editor in order to point out a mistake in a* published research report. One participant commented "it is like for us, if we see errors in a research, we can be able to correct (them)." Another agreed, saying "yes, there is a difference between us and those who have not studied (research)". The whole class agrees.

Summary of Findings and Linkage to Research Questions: Taken together, the quantitative and qualitative results in this section indicate that there are several key political dimensions of social science research in the rural Kenyan villages that were the site of the PDE project. First, various markers of socio-economic status, such as age, wealth, and gender, are related to individuals' perceptions of individual, collective, and political efficacy in our baseline data. However, we also see remarkable qualitative evidence of community members from many segments of society became empowered, enabling them to start viewing themselves as partners in the process of research (and development more generally). In particular, this was achieved through involvement in conducting their own research and using research as leverage for change (Research Question 2, Research Question 3; Research Question 6).

Further, participating in research seems to have shaped the relationship between the community and both community leaders and other stakeholders, as shown in the example above where a research group proposed a plan to the County Council (Research Question 6). Moreover, we see signs that participant-driven evaluation can be economically and socially sustainable in both in the enthusiasm and commitment displayed by research groups, as well as their success in securing external financing for their projects (Research Question 7).

These findings call into question the standard practice in much social science field research in international development, in which research is primarily led and 'owned' by stakeholders such as NGOs and 'traditional' researchers, rather than communities themselves. The problematic nature of this standard practice is evidenced by the finding that stakeholders are generally perceived to be less effective and active in trying to solve community problems, take community opinions and concerns less seriously, and that communities are generally less satisfied with how they operate relative to local leadership and initiatives (Research Question 3). These results could also indicate that involvement in randomized field experiments designed and implemented exclusively by external stakeholders weaken democratic practices within communities through the lack of 'voice' that community members have in traditional research activities (Research Question 5).

Conclusions and Next Steps

The initial motivation for the PDE Project was the hypothesis that the conduct of social scientific field research in developing countries can have unintended political and social consequences, but that meaningful and well-designed inclusion of community members in every stage of the research process can mitigate negative outcomes and actually harness research as a tool for empowerment and activism. In this report, I have presented the preliminary results of the field research funded by the Weatherhead Center and the Milton Fund, which validated these core hypotheses and provided a tremendous amount of quantitative and qualitative evidence regarding the ability of community members to substantively participate in research, and the ways in which this participation may shape empowerment by increasing individual, collective, and political efficacy and changing the power dynamics between citizens and local leaders and other stakeholders.

As mentioned throughout this report, the findings from the research funded by Weatherhead will be augmented and extended with in-progress fieldwork and data collection that is supported by the Ash Center for Democratic Governance. Upon the completion of this second phase of data collection in September 2013, I will begin writing the academic articles and giving presentations that expand upon the findings presented in this report, and will also start compiling the PDE workshop materials and placing them on the internet, for the purposes of making them broadly available to communities, researchers and policymakers.

Appendix

Participant-Driven Evaluation

Final Report to the Weatherhead Center Medium Faculty Grant

		T	able A1: Att	titudes towa	rds Researd	ch		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	Village Experience	Own Experience	Impact on Physical	Impact on Emotional	Impact on Financial	Impact on Intellectual	Will community	Faith in Research
Past Research	0.105	0.035	-0.024	-0.039	0.048	0.030	0.033**	0.029
	(0.088)	(0.083)	(0.034)	(0.045)	(0.042)	(0.039)	(0.015)	(0.098)
Asked	-0.050	0.009	-0.001	0.033	-0.102*	0.020	-0.071**	-0.241**
(nontorio	(0.081)	(0.067)	(0.040)	(0.046)	(0.057)	(0.049)	(0.029)	(0.102)
Employed	0.116 (0.105)	0.136 (0.116)	0.004 (0.122)	0.063 (0.134)	0.096 (0.128)	0.037 (0.100)	-0.141* (0.079)	0.072 (0.174)
Trained	0.082 (0.049)	0.210*** (0.044)	0.016 (0.052)	-0.005 (0.044)	-0.020 (0.074)	-0.019 (0.032)	0.080*** (0.018)	0.295*** (0.092)
Constant	3.235***	3.068***	4.156***	4.097***	(0.111)	4.135***	0.797***	-0.122
N	162	104	730	703	664	742	1024	787

	_	Table A2: A	ttitudes tov	vards Rese	arch (with	controls)		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	Village Experience	Own Experience	Impact on Physical Health	Impact on Emotional health	Impact on Financial Situation	Impact on Intellectual Experience	Will community benefit	Faith in Research
Past Research in Village	0.133	0.117	-0.012	-0.037	0.030	0.018	0.048***	0.149**
	(0.084)	(0.111)	(0.033)	(0.048)	(0.051)	(0.045)	(0.013)	(0.067)
Asked Questions	-0.063	-0.113	0.002	0.038	-0.110*	0.026	-0.080**	-0.243***
	(0.082)	(0.087)	(0.044)	(0.053)	(0.062)	(0.050)	(0.031)	(0.078)
Employed	0.082	0.112	-0.076	0.010	0.165	-0.004	-0.159*	0.051
	(0.101)	(0.104)	(0.105)	(0.127)	(0.143)	(0.085)	(0.089)	(0.136)
Trained	0.048	0.210**	0.007	-0.003	-0.041	-0.017	0.060**	0.144**
	(0.069)	(0.093)	(0.070)	(0.057)	(0.095)	(0.044)	(0.023)	(0.065)
Female	-0.091	-0.037	-0.086	-0.092	-0.035	0.007	-0.040	-0.367**
	(0.156)	(0.165)	(0.057)	(0.060)	(0.075)	(0.052)	(0.040)	(0.143)
Age	-0.030	0.052	0.004	0.013	0.076	0.051	0.043***	0.067
	(0.067)	(0.102)	(0.033)	(0.041)	(0.055)	(0.045)	(0.015)	(0.079)
Wealth Index	0.023	0.010	0.034	0.002	-0.057*	-0.032	0.029	0.351***
	(0.070)	(0.153)	(0.020)	(0.026)	(0.032)	(0.038)	(0.019)	(0.061)
Education	0.113**	0.188**	0.003	0.011	-0.010	0.047*	0.037***	0.037
	(0.053)	(0.088)	(0.018)	(0.023)	(0.025)	(0.026)	(0.011)	(0.055)
Activeness Index	-0.011	-0.203***	0.009	-0.006	0.005	0.015	-0.018	0.045
	(0.058)	(0.067)	(0.022)	(0.030)	(0.026)	(0.032)	(0.019)	(0.047)
Exposure Index	-0.046	0.059	0.059*	0.024	-0.035	0.042	0.009	0.014
	(0.062)	(0.122)	(0.030)	(0.034)	(0.036)	(0.030)	(0.018)	(0.059)

N	Constant	Rural Index
155	3.108*** (0.287)	0.110* (0.056)
86	2.635*** (0.487)	-0.113 (0.101)
680	4.266*** (0.148)	0.016 (0.028)
660	4.130*** (0.189)	0.018 (0.032)
618	3.823*** (0.179)	-0.030 (0.035)
693	3.964*** (0.158)	-0.036 (0.022)
963	0.680 * * * (0.093)	-0.041* (0.023)
739	-0.152 (0.307)	0.057 (0.070)

	Others benefit from		Community benefits from research		Other responsible to research		Community responsible for	Trained	Employed	Asked Questions	Ċ	Past Research in Village			
				(0.082)	0.370***			0.070*** (0.021)	-0.185*** (0.089)	-0.051* (0.027)	(0.016)	0.024	(1)	Commu	
(0.079)	0.023	(0.062)	0.492***	(0.074)	0.131*			0.018 (0.012)	-0.078 (0.056)	-0.008 (0.012)	(0.008)	0.008	(2)	nity respons research	
(0.085)	-0.053	(0.070)	0.479***	(0.092)	0.080			0.017 (0.013)	-0.066 (0.056)	-0.013 (0.012)	(0.007)	0.005	(3)	sible for	Table A3
								-0.014 (0.019)	0.084** (0.037)	-0.004 (0.023)	(0.018)	0.011	(4)	Other: co	3: Researce
(0.066)	0.517***	(0.048)	-0.030	(0.054)	0.310***	(0.030)	-0.029	-0.010 (0.016)	0.033 (0.024)	-0.015 (0.013)	(0.010)	0.008	(5)	s will be inter mmunity rese	ch Involve
(0.076)	0.513***	(0.049)	-0.006	(0.066)	0.259***	(0.032)	-0.024	-0.005 (0.012)	0.032 (0.027)	-0.004 (0.012)	(0.013)	-0.001	(6)	ested in arch	ement
								0.069*** (0.021)	-0.127 (0.080)	-0.045 (0.026)	(0.020)	0.006	(7)	Commu co	
(0.057)	0.024	(0.063)	0.403***	(0.059)	0.035	(0.060)	0.219***	0.018 (0.014)	-0.028 (0.042)	-0.004 (0.019)	(0.016)	-0.013	(8)	nity will be in mmunity rese:	
(0.075)	0.118	(0.073)	0.335***	(0.077)	-0.037	(0.070)	0.247***	0.006 (0.018)	-0.039 (0.032)	-0.004 (0.014)	(0.008)	0.008	(9)	arch	

Ν	Constant	Education	Self Efficacy	Political Efficacy	Collective Efficacy	Wealth Index	Others Interested in community research		Community interested in
1024	0.515*** (0.107)								
1022	0.159** (0.060)						-0.041 (0.039)	(0.065)	0.212***
641	0.294 *** (0.106)	0.003 (0.010)	0.005 (0.008)	-0.011 (0.009)	0.023** (0.009)	0.005 (0.012)	-0.027 (0.036)	(0.064)	0.207***
1024	0.723*** (0.047)							(0.059)	0.033
1022	0.153^{***} (0.049)							(0.045)	-0.026
641	0.231*** (0.070)	-0.002 (0.008)	0.005 (0.008)	0.014 (0.010)	0.011 (0.008)	0.026 (0.017)		(0.062)	-0.111*
1024	0.808***						0.044 (0.080)		
1022	0.319*** (0.082)						-0.038 (0.065)		
641	0.440 *** (0.108)	-0.009 (0.011)	0.012 (0.011)	-0.003 (0.011)	-0.002 (0.011)	0.030** (0.012)	-0.150* (0.076)		

		Tahle A	4: Researc	h Involve	ment hv 7	lvne			
	Involve	d in Design	Invol	ved in entation	Invol Evalu	ved in 1ation	Involved i Concl	n Drawing usions	Will Research
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Past Research in Village	-0.052	-0.056	-0.015	-0.001	-0.020	-0.025	-0.023	-0.015	-0.088
	(0.035)	(0.045)	(0.014)	(0.022)	(0.029)	(0.038)	(0.017)	(0.021)	(0.104)
Asked Questions	0.054	0.051	0.003	0.004	0.029	0.040	-0.001	-0.007	0.083
,	(0.038)	(0.040)	(0.019)	(0.014)	(0.029)	(0.033)	(0.021)	(0.022)	(0.085)
Employed	-0.022	0.068	0.012	0.080	0.146**	0.099	0.148**	0.115	0.348
ļ	(0.156)	(0.063)	(0.154)	(0.087)	(0.064)	(0.092)	(0.054)	(0.085)	(0.240)
Community responsible to	-0 037	-0 070	0 036	-0.005	0.117*	0 092	0.066	0 049	* 565 0
research	(0.063)	(0 071)	(0.041)	(0 049)	(0.067)	(0 078)	(0.043)	(0.043)	(1 (())
Community benefits	-0.001	0.027	-0.055**	-0.072**	0.068	0.099	-0.025	-0.034	0.001
	(0.068)	(0.100)	(0.024)	(0.030)	(0.070)	(0.107)	(0.033)	(0.031)	(0.231)
Community									
interested in own	-0.007	-0.065	0.069	0.073	-0.009	-0.083	0.014	-0.015	-0.056
	(0.054)	(0.048)	(0.051)	(0.051)	(0.061)	(0.056)	(0.039)	(0.032)	(0.138)
Others interested in community research	-0.077	-0.095	0.010	0.005	0.006	-0.013	0.056	0.043	-0.133
	(0.067)	(0.068)	(0.061)	(0.064)	(0.073)	(0.089)	(0.061)	(0.079)	(0.280)
Faith in Research	0.061***	0.036*	0.036**	0.001	0.048**	0.031	0.046***	0.034***	0.116**

Ν	Constant	Political Efficacy	Collective Efficacy	Wealth Index	Know Research	
616	4.975*** (0.164)				-0.004 (0.014)	(0.021)
467	4.971*** (0.078)	0.010 (0.017)	0.011 (0.010)	0.005 (0.021)	0.001 (0.019)	(0.019)
620	4.828*** (0.150)				0.001 (0.012)	(0.013)
468	4.783*** (0.089)	0.028** (0.011)	0.018* (0.010)	0.064** (0.026)	0.003 (0.013)	(0.013)
614	4.548*** (0.139)				-0.010 (0.017)	(0.020)
463	4.668*** (0.153)	0.008 (0.016)	-0.007 (0.009)	0.041 (0.031)	-0.006 (0.022)	(0.021)
612	4.679*** (0.081)				-0.012 (0.010)	(0.013)
461	4.768*** (0.102)	0.023** (0.010)	0.005 (0.009)	0.021 (0.024)	-0.020 (0.012)	(0.012)
424	-0.390 (0.360)	0.085 (0.052)	0.032 (0.033)	0.147 (0.091)	-0.021 (0.061)	(0.056)

					Tab	le A5: Ef	fficacy					
		Collective	e Efficacy			Self-E	fficacy			Political	Efficacy	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Past Research	-0.007				0.073				0.078			
in village	(0.085)				(0.063)				(0.076)			
Times asked		-0.007				-0.024				0.023		
questions		(0.117)				(0.089)				(0.096)		
Times			-0.338				0.044				0.250	
			(0.218)				(0.254)				(0.212)	
Times				-0.065				0.170*				0.214*
				(0.178)				(0.084)				(0.112)
Female	-0.316* (0.165)	-0.274* (0.157)	-0.292* (0.162)	-0.305* (0.161)	-0.678*** (0.127)	-0.653*** (0.126)	-0.662*** (0.130)	-0.661*** (0.126)	-0.684*** (0.117)	-0.660*** (0.120)	-0.678*** (0.120)	-0.671*** (0.116)
Age	-0.161 (0.115)	-0.168 (0.113)	-0.163 (0.115)	-0.161 (0.116)	-0.411*** (0.089)	-0.396*** (0.090)	-0.394*** (0.088)	-0.392*** (0.089)	-0.264*** (0.084)	-0.269*** (0.086)	-0.268*** (0.086)	-0.268*** (0.083)
Wealth Index	0.471***	0.475***	0.463***	0.463***	-0.068	-0.077	-0.081 (0.084)	-0.082	-0.034	-0.038 (0.097)	-0.038 (0.096)	-0.039 (0.094)
Education	-0.071	-0.059	-0.058	-0.059	0.118*	0.123*	0.121*	0.120*	0.012	0.017	0.018	0.016

Z		Constant		Ruralness Index		Exposure Index		Activeness Index	
740	(0.392)	0.533	(0.126)	0.204	(0.126)	0.109	(0.095)	-0.085	(0.066)
743	(0.373)	0.507	(0.128)	0.207	(0.124)	0.101	(0.093)	-0.076	(0.069)
746	(0.435)	0.836*	(0.128)	0.213	(0.126)	0.118	(0.095)	-0.089	(0.066)
746	(0.402)	0.565	(0.128)	0.207	(0.123)	0.113	(0.099)	-0.083	(0.067)
864	(0.351)	0.569	(0.066)	-0.011	(0.078)	0.007	(0.067)	-0.033	(0.067)
866	(0.345)	0.645*	(0.067)	-0.017	(0.079)	0.019	(0.067)	-0.022	(0.066)
869	(0.363)	0.580	(0.067)	-0.015	(0.078)	0.018	(0.067)	-0.026	(0.066)
869	(0.316)	0.440	(0.067)	-0.017	(0.078)	0.015	(0.067)	-0.031	(0.066)
822	(0.296)	0.551*	(0.081)	0.038	(0.062)	0.118*	(0.058)	0.106*	(0.050)
824	(0.285)	0.620**	(0.083)	0.041	(0.061)	0.119*	(0.059)	0.111*	(0.050)
828	(0.356)	0.397	(0.082)	0.036	(0.062)	0.116*	(0.060)	0.110*	(0.050)
828	(0.274)	0.420	(0.082)	0.039	(0.061)	0.116*	(0.061)	0.102	(0.050)