

Hello!

In their own words: how we (the boring adults) worked with young people (the cool kids) in Papua New Guinea to develop a bilingual post-program survey, why we did it, and why it was a good idea

What is the meaning of this?!

- We want to share some of the process that we used to develop a survey that works well with children, in a setting where the culture is very diverse
- In the process of developing a monitoring tool, it is important to encourage participatory approach in a order to develop a survey that works well for participants, so you get the right kind of information

What we are going to talk about

- We will tell you about Equal Playing Field, what it does
- We will tell you a little about the monitoring and evaluation framework
- We will tell you a little about the background to the deciding to redevelop the survey
- We will talk about the way we redeveloped the survey
- We will talk about what we learnt

About Equal Playing Field

- A small NGO operating in Port Moresby
- Mission is to end violence against women in Papua New Guinea
- Flagship activity: an eight-week respectful relationships program
 - Young people do an eight-week curriculum. The first half-of the program they play touch rugby and the second half of the program they do a facilitated program
 - The program is led by volunteer facilitators (they tend to be young-ish, early 20s)
 - A more recent innovation were the development of school action groups – students who participate in the curriculum then go onto to do activities in the school

About the evaluation

- This evaluation was a partnership between two independent evaluation consultants, the school of global studies at RMIT, and Equal Playing Field
- Had a mixed-methods approach, use of interviews with students, volunteers, EPF staff and analysis of pre-and-post survey data
- Did participatory analysis of findings using mostly Most Significant Change
- The program had a substantive M&E framework that had been developed in partnership with a large Australian NGO

Evaluation Actors

Evaluation team

Comprised of

- Australian academic
- PNG academic
- Australian consultant
- EPF M&E officer

Equal Playing Field

Program implementers

- Program staff
- Volunteer facilitators

Participants

- Students who participate in the eight-week curriculum
- Students who participated in the eight-week curriculum and who are now part of the School Action Groups

About the existing survey and evaluation

- Existing evaluation framework was comprehensive, and had ToC and pre and post surveys, and did not provide enough guidance on how data should be collected and analysed
- Existing survey measured pre and post experiences of the eight-week curriculum:
 - Was developed by the International NGO
 - Not suited to PNG context
 - In English, but most students better with Tok Pisin
 - Words and structure of sentences not understood by the students as well and the volunteer facilitators who administered
 - Survey not user friendly

Existing surveys

When we started the evaluation, the International NGO talked about how great the framework and evaluation was Why?!

- Appeals to 'markers' of quality and assumptions
- It was up to us to show them the ways in which the survey was invalid

Our analysis

Junior's earlier comments, I also found:

- The survey – administered at the end of the eight-week program – did not delineate between changes that happen at the end of the program and longer-term outcomes
 - Example: *If both a husband and wife have jobs, the husband should also share the housework such as washing dishes and doing laundry*
- Pre and post questions not effective at measuring changes in perception of self
 - Example: *It can be funny seeing people teased*

Solution

- Design a survey based on what students told us happens for them
- Use a range of perspectives about what changes happen for students, based on the experiences of people who have deep knowledge of the program
- Make it bilingual (English is official language but most kids more comfortable in Tok Pisin)
- Include multiple perspective to strengthen the validation

Redesigning the survey

Two things to consider when redesigning the survey:

- Making sure the survey captured the kinds of changes that happened for students at the conclusion of the program
 - Solution: analysis of evaluation data with volunteer facilitators and students
- Making sure that the surveys were worded in such a way as to enable consistent understanding of the meaning of the questions
 - Solution: get the students to write the questions

So here's what we did

Step one: create the survey constructs (the dimensions of change)

- We used the interviews we conducted with students to create 'stories of change'. These were one-page stories in the students own words. We conducted a Most Significant Change workshop with the volunteer facilitators. They analysed the stories.
- From this MSC, we were able to develop the constructs
- Volunteers had good insight into types of changes they saw happen with students.
- Focus on types of changes that happen in and at end of program

Constructs

Program activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Friendly environment• Learning is fun• Encouraging positive change	Immediate outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Learn about empathy• Learn about respect for people• Learn about gender equality• Moving from being aggressive to being assertive• Building self-confidence• Building self-awareness• Increasing positive interactions• Leading others• Being more aware of others needs
Questions about behavior change	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Boys and girls more likely to become friends		

Step two: create the survey questions

- After the MSC workshop took constructs and selected paragraphs from stories that reflected the constructs developed
- Went to visit the School Action Groups, they were chosen for two reasons: they have a deep and positive experience of the program, and they experience being facilitated, so we felt that they would be comfortable with the process

Step two: create survey questions

Process on the day:

- At the workshops, we had four students to one facilitator, all facilitators spoke Tok Pisin and English
- Similar process to MSC – read the (shorter story) and discuss the changes
- Once the changes were identified, we asked the students ‘if you wanted to know if a student experienced this change, how would you ask them?’ We did this twice, once in English and once in Tok Pisin
- From this we were able to write the survey

Learnings from this workshop

- How students responded in the workshop, what they thought about it
 - High expectations!
 - They had fun
- What we learned
 - Not making assumptions about communication and language
 - Level of knowledge and understanding is different based on background

Step three: test the survey questions

- Then, we went to a different school which had a school action group
- Got the students to test the survey and make sure the questions made sense
- Made some more changes based on their feedback

This workshop was not as successful – why?

- What we learned: even though it was a school action group in port Moresby, the context was still very different, and we should have provided more support

Step four: test the survey

- We then implemented the survey in Port Moresby and Bougainville at four schools with 200 responses
- We were worried about whether the survey would work in Bougainville, but it worked really well
- We analysed the data and also got a statistician to check the data to make sure the responses made sense

Did this make a difference?

- Program had frustrations with first survey, because the language was too formal
- Felt was that the redevelopment of the survey was very beneficial
- We can use this process for survey development in the future
- Got more interesting results from the survey
- Response from the students: 'this survey is cool' – they really liked having the survey in both languages

Was this survey design participatory?

The case for yes:

- In the process of developing the survey, we consulted the students, consulted the volunteers
- Unlike the first survey, no staff, volunteers or students involved in the survey

The case for no:

- Student involvement in the survey was limited – institutional and resource limitations
- More of a case of managing multiple perspectives

Take-aways

- MQP, he said yesterday ‘think globally, act globally, and evaluate globally’. Need to be aware of the different contexts. Australian NGO who designed the first survey did not think globally, they thought about the setting they came from.
- Working with programs and NGOs, variability in capacity and establishment,, need to provide more support for analysis and reporting – provide mentoring support
- When you are an expert, you get your way, but we have to deal with the outcome
- Was interesting the ways in which some of the people we interacted with made use of buzzwords to defend the initial survey (e.g. pre and post, validated)
- The people closest to the action (volunteers and students) have the best understanding of the journey of the change
- (Personal opinion) pre and post surveys are very difficult to design when they involve measuring changes in understanding of self
- All of the evaluation team spent more time on this project than was initially planned for budgeted for