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Abstract

This research seeks to explore the interpretation and application of Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) in the context of Educational Empowerment by analyzing insights gathered from multiple stakeholder groups in four cities of Pakistan, Islamabad, Lahore, Quetta, and Peshawar. Analysis of the findings reveals nuances of PM&E, including “Equality and Equity, Respect and Tolerance” (pg. 58-61) that limit the potential of this transdisciplinary empowerment process. Empowerment and educational programs often employ the continuous processes of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) to gain an understanding of the implementation, efficiency, impact, and overall performance of the program. M&E also provides valuable information about rooms for improvement within elements of the program. Unlike traditional M&E, PM&E engages members from multiple stakeholder groups to define, design and strategize the process. In PM&E, these stakeholder groups further facilitate the process through data collection and analysis. However, the transdisciplinary process of monitoring and evaluation regardless of its conventional or participatory nature, is prone to be susceptible to nuances that often jeopardize the process, analysis, and information it renders. Power dynamics and positionality, interpersonal and inter-group politics, conflicts of interest and interpretation, create an environment where overtly inclusive processes have elements of exclusivity.

Keywords: M&E; Monitoring and Evaluation; PM&E; Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation; Inclusion; Equity; Equality; Inclusion; Power Dynamics
1. Introduction

1.1. Rationale of the research

The interest in Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) is a result of the international development community’s dissatisfaction with traditional approaches of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) characterized by an orientation towards the needs of funding agencies and policy makers. Outsiders carry out an evaluation in conventional approaches as a measure to maintain objectivity of the process (Estrella, 2000). A participatory approach to M&E encourages various stakeholder groups to participate in the process (Estrella & Gaventa, 1998) by contributing towards determining questions, defining the type of information or in defining measures of success of the intervention. This approach facilitates various stakeholders to decide what a program or project should achieve and how to achieve the desired (Estrella & Gaventa, 1998).

By recognizing the vital role various stakeholder groups can play in planning and designing their own development, PM&E shifts the emphasis away from externally defined and driven program and stresses on the importance of a locally-relevant process for gathering, analyzing, and using the information (Abbot & Guijt, 1998). Participation, in the context of monitoring and evaluation has broad interpretations and depends on the definition of term participation. A process is participatory in some instances if it involves all stakeholder groups in designing the entire M&E process. In other instances, it can mean relevant groups only participate in collecting data and analyzing it. Each PM&E process with its context will involve different groups of people to varying levels of engagement (Guijt, I. et al. 1998).
The field of development emphasizes the concept of participation as an essential element and recognizes that M&E of development and other community-based initiatives should be participatory. Two themes can characterize Participation in M&E: (1) Who conducts it? Distinguishes between M&E lead externally, internally, or jointly; and (2) Whose perspectives count? Distinguishes between the stakeholders that receive preference of participation: all major stakeholders, or marginalized groups (Estrella & Gaventa, 1998).

There are no prescribed set of approaches to conduct PM&E, the process evolves and adapts according to the socio-cultural, economic, political, and institutional considerations of the context. This fluid nature of PM&E has led to its practice in a wide range of cases (Estrella & Gaventa, 1998). However, the use and misuse of the process has a liner correlation. With increasing use, misuse of the process has potential to increase proportionally (Patton, 2008). This misuse may appear as exclusion within an inclusive process; substantial misrepresentation or exaggeration of information, preference for favorable statistics over others or sharing imbalanced views (Patton, 2012). Monitoring and Evaluations are inherently political activities susceptible to an influence from power dynamics, conflicts of interests and positions (Patton, 2012). This inherent political nature; fluidity and variance in interpretations of the process can potentially transform an inclusive environment to one that is exclusive where only the privileged few has access.

1.2. Aims and Objective

Primary question this research aims to explore is, what are the interpretations and applications of PM&E in a context with traditionally deep-rooted power dynamics and cultural hierarchies? This research aims to explore the nuances of equality, equity, participation, and inclusion in the context by combining insights from various stakeholder groups engaged in
different education based empowerment programs in four cities of Pakistan. The following four key objectives guide this research:

1. To explore the different interpretations stakeholders in the context have of monitoring and evaluation processes; and what effects do these interpretations render in the process.

2. To explore how different stakeholder groups experience inclusion in the participatory process of monitoring and evaluation.

3. To investigate the degree to which information and versions of reality that result from rigorous monitoring and evaluating processes are reflective of realities various stakeholders experience.

4. To design a hypothesis that facilitates a deeper nuanced understanding of equality, equity, participation, and inclusion.

1.3. Overview of the Exploration

Chapter 2 follows this chapter and reviews prominent discourse from academia and practitioners engaged with PM&E and M&E. The Literature Review shares insights from theorists and practitioners who are trying to deepen understandings of the monitoring and evaluation processes and their nuances. Chapter 3 describes the methodology and approach this research employs and describes ethical, and cultural considerations along with researcher’s situated knowledge of the context. Chapter 4 illustrates data collected through questionnaires using pi-charts and frequency tables along with brief descriptions of the collected data. Chapter 5 analyzes data collected through questionnaires and interviews to identify trends that deepen an understanding of this study. It highlights correlations among trends using bi-variant correlation analysis. Following Chapter 5 is a conclusion that shares insights gained from this research;
Chapter 6 also includes a working hypothesis of “Equity vs Equality, Tolerance vs Respect Triangle”.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Understanding Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)

Eliminating the complexity and apparent sophistication of the term, Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) is a process every human being engages. Be it a person looking at themselves in the mirror to see how they look (monitoring) and answer the question echoing in their head, will they be able to make a good impression on the interviewer looking like how they are? (evaluation). Be it a student keeping an eye on their grades (monitoring) to see if they will be able to graduate in time and secure a promising career (evaluation). Or perhaps, be it an organization looking at the performance of a program (monitoring) to see how efficient the various processes are and how efficiently the program is running keeping budget ceiling and other considerations in mind (evaluation). The Oxford English Dictionary defines Monitoring as an act of observing and checking progress or quality of something over a period. It describes Evaluation as making judgement about the amount, number, or value of something.

The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) is an influential organization working to promote policies geared towards improving the economic and social well-being of people around the world. OECD defines monitoring as a continuous function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with indicators of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds (Kusek & Rist. 2007). The OECD defines evaluation as the systematic and objective assessment of ongoing or completed project, program, or policy, including its design, implementation, and results. The aim
is to determine the relevance and fulfillment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability (Kusek & Rist. 2007). An evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process of both recipients and donors (Kusek & Rist, 2007). Spellerberg (2005) sees monitoring as the precise measurement of variables and process over time; whereas to Hellawell (1991) monitoring is a process of providing information, not results, and is a means to an end rather than an end itself. Hellawell (1991) also notes that monitoring is a surveillance (regular or irregular) carried out to ascertain the extent of compliance with a predetermined standard or the degree of deviation from an expected norm.

Although Monitoring and Evaluation are separate engagements and differ in approaches, tools, and methods, they are independent processes that complement each other. (Kusek & Rist, 2007). The terminology Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) is a commonly used combination of the two processes. Definitions illustrated above provide an understanding of Monitoring as the course of collecting data regarding an entity of interest (program/project/intervention), whereas Evaluation is the process of passing judgment or grading the object of interest’s performance, impact, or outcomes. The frequency of making observations and collecting data differentiate Monitoring and Evaluation. Monitoring is periodic while Evaluation is a one-off reassessment of indicators selected to determine the effects of particular interventions or policies or change in general. Another difference between the two is that pre-determined indicators guide Monitoring. More general questions or the assessment of data collected; such as: what activities took place; whether the activities achieved the intended objectives, or how future efforts can be improved form the basis of Evaluation (Abbot & Guijt. 1998). M&E is certainly a resource taxing process, one that has nuances and challenges that are often complex and complicated as this paper
attempts to demonstrate. The process is, however, necessary for program implementation as well as for the organization’s sustainable growth and its ability to administer/implement such programs in the future. Monitoring exists to support decision-making and planning by providing information on trends and change. Evaluation provides judgments on what worked better than others, in an attempt to highlight rooms for improvement, thereby encouraging organizational growth. (Abbot & Guijt. 1998). The M&E process has four core processes as follows (Aubel, 2004):

1. Planning and Identifying
2. Gathering the data
3. Analyzing the Data
4. Sharing the information and suggestions for correction/improvement.

Fig 1: Core steps of an M&E Process. Adapted from Aubel, 2004

1. **Planning and Defining:** The first step involves determining program/project goals and identifying stakeholders that need to participate in the process. This step also
involves designing questions about the program/project along with the indicators that and will help to answer those questions. Detailed planning involves determining the most appropriate method and tools; strategizing timelines; personal and budgets.

2. *Gathering the data:* During this stage, stakeholders collect data using methods and tools defined and created in the first stage.

3. *Analyzing the Data:* Following data collection, an analysis commences at this stage thereby converting raw data into evidence based information.

4. *Sharing the information and suggestions for correction/improvement:* The final stage involves sharing the information created by data analysis in an appropriate manner (presentations, reports, meetings). This stage also involves sharing conclusions and opportunities for improvement along with action steps that may facilitate improvement in the program/project.

2.2. **Data Collection Methods Employed in the M&E Processes**

During the monitoring phase, three basic methods determine the tools and approaches that facilitate data collection: Quantitative (QUANT); Qualitative (QUAL) and Mixed Methods (MM). These terms are not indicative of the quality or quantity of data collected during the monitoring phase; since the data gathered using QUAL may lack the quality of information. On the other hand, QUANT data may not have a significantly large number of participants contributing to the data pool. These terms do not imply the quantity or quality of the tools and approaches used for data collection either. QUANT and QUAL indicate the nature of the question and information representation. Each, however, has their particular advantages and limitations (Angela. O, et al. 2013).
2.2.1. Quantitative Method (QUANT).

QUANT answers questions such as “How much…?”; “How many…?” and “How frequent…?” Numbers that require precise measurements of variables, conveniently represent the data (Angela, O, et al. 2013). QUANT provides uniform measures of project outputs and impacts (Adato, 2011); for instance, the number of students participating in an educational program; the number of males, and females. The considerably larger sample size for data collection during this process is of importance to facilitate generalizability of the findings among a wider population (Adato, 2011). QUANT uses structured questionnaires that generate a numeric data. However, the information that QUANT provides does not offer satisfactory insights into the cause behind the numbers. For instance, this method can show the total number of participants in an educational program; however, it may not capture information behind the reasoning for the observed attendance. QUANT is considerably more resource consuming since

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Methods (QUANT)</th>
<th>Qualitative Methods (QUAL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advantages:</td>
<td>Advantages:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provide robust quantified findings</td>
<td>- Provides insights on the context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Information easier to analyze</td>
<td>- Easy to organize and cost-effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations:</td>
<td>Limitations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Costly to organize (large samples)</td>
<td>- Information collected cannot be generalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do not provide contextual information</td>
<td>- Information is harder to analyze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Offer limited insights on what is happening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1
QUAL-QUANT Advantages and Limitations (adapted from Angela. O, et al. 2013)
the process requires significantly more time, and finances to collect data from a larger population.

2.2.2. Qualitative Method (QUAL).

QUAL gained momentum in the 1980s as a response to the limitations of QUANT (Guijt, I. et al. 2002). Data gathered during QUAL relies on meetings, interviews, and general observations. Summarization of information in a numeric form is challenging; however, it broadly answers the "how" and "why" behind the trends. This method is considerably more appropriate in understanding population’s attitudes, behaviors, beliefs, or opinions. QUAL gathers information by asking people to explain what they observe, do, feel, or believe. (Angela. O et al. 2013), and performs better at capturing underlying issues, causes and nuances of an occurrence since it uses more flexible questions that ask for open-ended responses. Such insights can be crucial in understanding impact as opposed to merely measuring it (Rao & Woolclock, 2003).

2.2.3. Mixed Method (MM).

MM integrates both QUANT and QUAL of data collection, analysis, and interpretation to strengthen the reliability of data, validity of the findings and to deepen the understanding of the causes behind the numbers by providing greater insights into the context. (Bamberger, 2012). MM allows for generalizations about larger populations from a considerable smaller study population size (Rao & Woolclock, 2003) since MM is a combination of both QUAL and QUANT.

Choosing among QUANT and QUAL as the preferred method not only depends on the type of information needed but also on resources that are available; utilization of the generated information, and on how precise the data needs to be. QUANT is comparatively more resource
consuming and measures numbers without insights into the causes behind those figures. However, it renders information that is easily analyzed and generalized on a larger population. QUAL is comparatively less resource taxing since it has a smaller study population. The focus is on sharing insights into the causes and measures fewer numbers. Due to this lack of numbers, the data collected is challenging to analyze. The level of generalization over a larger population is also a concern given the relatively smaller study population. Apparently, QUANT and QUAL seem to be polar opposites of each other at first; this separation, however, is not absolute since qualified information can be quantified, opinions can be clustered into groups and then counted transforming QUAL based data to that generated by QUANT (Angela. O et al. 2013).

2.3. Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E)

Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) is the process of actively involving members of all stakeholder groups in the M&E process to facilitate their learning and affect the process and impact of a project or program (Pehu, 2005). PM&E is a process through which stakeholders at various levels engage in the monitoring and evaluation of a project; program or policy by sharing control over the process, content and the end results of the process and further engage in identifying or taking corrective actions. (World Bank, 2010)

Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation is empowering since it recognizes the pivotal role that people can play in planning and managing their use of the environment they are in (Abbot, J., & Guijt, I. 1998). Eija Pehu (2005) notes in “Monitoring and Evaluation for World Bank Agricultural Research and Extensions Projects: A Good Practice Note,” the four broad principles guiding PM&E:
1. **Participation:** This involves allowing the directly affected stakeholder groups to contribute in designing the M&E process, and agreeing to analyze the data together with the evaluator(s).

2. **Negotiation:** An agreement between the evaluator(s) and the directly affected stakeholder groups on what to monitor; definitions of data; the manner of sharing information and findings; along with suggestions about future actions.

3. **Learning:** This forms the basis for consequent improvement and corrective actions.

4. **Flexibility:** An essential element of PM&E since the numbers, roles, and skills of stakeholders, the external environment, and other factors are fluid and can change frequently.

In the context of monitoring and evaluation, PM&E has broad interpretations and depends on the definition of participation. In some instances, participatory implies all related groups are involved in designing the entire M&E process. In other instances, it can mean relevant groups only participate in collecting data and analyzing it. Each PM&E process with its context will involve different groups of people to varying levels of engagement (Guijt, I. et al. 1998). Participation is certainly a rich concept one that is open to interpretation. Participation is a process through which stakeholder groups influence and share control over development initiatives, the decisions, and resources which affect them. Some consider it a matter of principle; others, however, see it as a practice; yet for others still it is an end in itself – all these interpretations have merit (World Bank, 1996) since they originate from different contexts each having their nuances.
Many governments, the United Nations Agencies, and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), consider participation to be critical for program planning and poverty alleviation as a means to seek sustainability and equity (Rifkin, S. & Kangere, M. 2002). Rifkin and Kangere (2002) further note that participation is of critical vitality since people know what works for them and professionals need to learn from people who make contributions of resources (time, money, materials, labor) in the programs. People develop a commitment and ownership to the engagements they help create and by doing so they can develop their skills, knowledge and gain experiences that facilitate them in their future engagements (Rifkin, S. & Kangere, M. 2002).

Francoise Coupal (2001) notes the key differences between M&E and PM&E in the article “Results-based Participatory Monitoring & Evaluation”. In conventional M&E the donor initiates the process, and an external evaluator performs the evaluations. Surveys; Questionnaires; Interviews and Focus Groups are commonly used tools, while the outcome of the process is circulated in-house in the form of a final report. Whereas, in PM&E the donor and project stakeholders co-initiate the process. PM&E Facilitator(s) assist the project stakeholders in evaluating the program/project. An inclusive PM&E process uses a range of tools such as Participatory Learning and Action; Appreciative Inquiry and Testimonials. The outcome of this process is a better understanding of local realities; stakeholder’s involvement in decision making around analysis and about what to do with the information to adjust strategies and activities to secure better results in the future. (Coupal, F. 2001).

At first glance, it is indeed challenging to differentiate between M&E and PM&E since both apparently engage stakeholder groups in various capacities at various stages. This thin and often blurry line becomes more indistinguishable considering the diversity of interpretations regarding methods; methodologies; approaches; tools and instruments. These factors can
potentially magnify given the nature and nuances of the particular context thereby rendering activities that are fundamentally inclusive to activities that are exclusive in reality.

During the Reflective Practice Phase (RP) of my academics, my intention remained primly on exploring and deepening my understandings into the processes of PM&E along with their nuances of interpretation and application. My professional engagement during RP allowed me to make observations and have casual non-structured conversations with various stakeholder groups about PM&E and their experiences with it at SIT Graduate Institute and World Learning in U.S.A. Later, through my research focused on Nonprofit organizations in Pakistan, I discovered various interpretations and applications of PM&E along with a disconnect between interpretation and action. My analysis compares findings from my research to the academic discourse of PM&E and suggests a working hypothesis that may address disconnects mentioned above.

3. Methodology of this Research

Based on a pragmatic goal free methodology, this research utilized inductive approach to include multiple perspectives among the individuals participating in this research, and to render inclusivity of observations and findings to present various realities associated with M&E as well as PM&E within this study’s context. A pragmatic goal free methodology is not dependent on a hypothesis to prove or disprove (Furnell, 2017). Rather it allows findings from the research to craft conclusions based on what participants share (Youker & Ingraham, 2014). Unlike deductive approach, an inductive approach focuses more on the information that results from data analysis and generates a theory based on this data analysis (Youker & Ingraham, 2014). This strategy reduced the influence of prominent academic discourses and biases or positionalities of power thereby facilitating a compilation of natural and authentic findings.
This research and its methodology remained sensitive to my situated knowledge and experiences of the context and the exploration. Having diverse professional and academic experiences in the field of monitoring and evaluation I have come to form my own interpretations and opinions about inclusion and participation in M&E through exposures that span over a decade. I approached this research with an intention to understand the process of M&E and PM&E along with its nuances from the study population and strived to limit my own interpretations and opinions forming the conclusions of this research.

3.1. Invitations to Participate and Participant Communities

The study population for this research consisted of members from various stakeholder groups from five organizations based in four cities of Pakistan including Islamabad, Lahore, Peshawar, and Quetta. These participants were further sub-grouped based on cities and their positions in the organization/program/project to facilitate a statistical analysis of the data. Participation in this study was voluntary, and participating individuals had the opportunity to withdraw from the research at any stage willingly. A total of 27 individuals participated in this study including CEOs; Senior Managers; Internal Evaluators; Field Staff and Parents of students that administer, manage, or participate in education based empowerment programs run by the five organizations. Initially, the participant count of this research was 29; however, as time progressed, two participants became nonresponsive and later withdrew from the research. Both expressed reasons behind withdrawing their participation. One of the two shared that they had pressing schedules and said they would not be able to give sufficient time to participate. The other expressed their reservations against investing their efforts by taking part in this research and the benefit it would have for them. After making sure through a one-on-one phone conversation with both individuals that they did not withdraw from this research due to an
undesirable external influence, I proceeded with the 27 that remained active throughout the interactions.

Individuals received an open invitation to participate through my social circles engaged with nonprofits in Pakistan. For organizations where I did not have any connections, higher management of these organizations received invitations to participate through formal phone calls and emails leveraging indirect references and connections where possible. Various stakeholder groups from organizations where I did not have direct contacts, received invitations through their higher management.

3.2. My Positionality and Situated Knowledge of the Context

I was born and raised in Pakistan and come from a well-respected "سيد" (Syed) family with a large social circle. Islamic communities believe individuals from the Syed family are direct descendants of Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him). The most prominent religion in Pakistan is Islam, which regards Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) as the embodiment of the Word of God. My primary and secondary education is from a Military Institute in Pakistan and my first Masters, in Business Administration with a focus on Human Resource Management (HRM) is from a regarded university in Pakistan. I engaged with HRM domain professionally in 2006 and continued to serve in progressive capacities until 2014. Alongside HRM engagements, I took on the role of a Project Manager in a U.S. State Department funded education based empowerment program in 2014. Throughout my progressive career in Pakistan, monitoring and evaluation was an integral part of my engagements. While serving the HRM domain, I utilized various traditional and unconventional strategies of monitoring and evaluation to facilitate organization growth. Later, I employed various monitoring and evaluation techniques while
serving as a Project Manager. From my time in Pakistan, in professional and personal capacities, I have the privilege of having my own diverse social circles.

I recognize that elements of my existence in some instances can be a privilege that may place one in high social standings within Pakistani communities. Although I believe at my core that the family I come from is not a choice or achievement, it is rather an accident of nature, as things came to pass; the title I carry can assert influence in some social circles in Pakistan. Many Pakistani communities assume that those belonging to the Syed family have superior wisdom, ethics, piousness, and morality. I also recognize my privilege of an education from a Military Institute. Communities in Pakistan consider individuals educated from a Military Institute or those that served in the Military to be highly patriotic with superior knowledge; high levels of discipline, principles, critical thinking, and analytical ability. Another assumption associated with those affiliated with Military in any capacity is that these individuals have greater emotional; psychological and physical integrity, strength, and control.

My personal and professional experiences, a continuous search for knowledge and self-improvement and an inclination towards understanding human emotions and psychology have enabled me to continuously observe and analyze the systems, communities, trends, and nuances of Pakistan. I refuse to accept my privileges without responsibility. Although these privileges enable me to exist within social circles navigating the nuances of Pakistan with relative ease compared with those without them, I consider it my responsibility to make sincere contributions to the communities and facilitate in improving the quality of life by encouraging sustainable growth and development. This research is an attempt at making such a contribution.
3.3. Ethical and Cultural Considerations

The culture of Pakistan has deep rooted hierarchies that can influence social interactions on both personal and professional levels. Participation in education based empowerment programs is a sought-after privilege in many Pakistani communities. Parents are particularly cautious about how they share their experiences and opinions about these programs since their child/children’s education and participation in these programs is important. This study focuses on M&E and PM&E, a number of factors including power dynamics, positionality and interests influence this process which inherently is a political engagement (Patton, 2012). Therefore, caution was necessary throughout the interaction with the study population to ensure this research:

- Does not interfere with the student(s) future education or participation in their respective programs.
- Does not intimidate the participants.
- Upholds privacy; anonymity and confidentiality of participant identities and the data.

In Pakistan, many communities assume education and professional experiences from USA to be superior. This assumption may render a power dynamic on a subconscious level between those who have experiences from USA and those who do not. Furthermore, some social circles in Pakistan assume that Pakistanis who live outside of Pakistan for long, lose touch with their native culture. This assumption can result in a subtle social exclusion, with limited and cautious personal interactions tactfully crafted to merely appear appropriate. Although I was born and raised in Pakistan, I am pursuing my second Masters from U.S.A. since 2015. This
research and the interaction with the study population considered this fact and took necessary measures to ensure such assumptions do not influence the quality of data.

The culture of Pakistan places high values on personal relationships and in-person interactions; a culture Western academia often refers to as high context (Bennett, 1998). Given my geographic location, mails; phone and Skype calls served as interaction mediums since being here in the U.S.A. I could not have in-person interactions with the participants of this research in Pakistan. Due to this limitation, building appropriate rapport with the participants of this research adequately so they share their insights, opinions and experiences sincerely was a challenge. Appropriate measures of having multiple one-on-one conversations before formal inquiry facilitated rapport between the participants of this research and myself. This limited the potential for receiving "Sab acha hay / Sab theek hay"- all is well / all is fine type of responses that generally arise due to limited rapport particularly when discussing sensitive subjects like this research.

The Holy Month of Ramadan " رمضان" commenced in Pakistan on May 26, 2017. During Ramadan, Muslims observe thirty consecutive fasts from Dawn "Fajr" to Dusk "Maghrib" (Maghrib) while offering the five compulsory prayers they offer year-round. Fasting is very taxing on energy levels since Muslims do not eat or drink from Fajr to Maghrib during this Month.

It is common to observe reduced patience thresholds; shortened attention spans; general hastiness; fluctuating blood pressure and sugar levels while fasting given the low nutritional intake. To manage this research for completion in August, 2017 and acknowledging Ramadan, I collected data initially through questionnaires. Participants furnished the questionnaires during
Ramadan and emailed back once complete before Eid-ul-Fitr (the religious celebration after Ramadan observed as a three-day National Holiday every year). I scheduled one-one-one interviews with the participants after Eid-ul-Fitr.

Another nuance that was not considered at the time of strategizing this research but emerged during initial conversations with the study population was that of a general uneasiness and caution of the participants due to the recent developments in U.S.A.’s political environment. News of President Donald Trump planning to revise U.S.A.’s budget with a significant reduction in international diplomacy and foreign aid (Memoli & Bierman, 2017) has spread far and wide in Pakistan along with various interpretations, of recent political trends. All organizations within the study population have either administered or plan to host foreign funded empowerment programs in the near future. Initially, due to limited rapport and trust, participants perceived this research to be an investigation into the nonprofits operating in Pakistan. A strategic data mining approach disguised as a well-crafted academic pursuit designed to appear non-threatening while collecting detailed information about the nonprofits (commonly referred to as NGOs in Pakistan), its stakeholders and finances. On one instance, a participant directly and openly shared this concern and asked me to clarify. Realizing that such misinterpretations surrounding this research will have a devastating impact on the findings and conclusions, I used my personal privileges strategically (Syed family, Military association, and social network) to subtly address and counter these misconceptions. I decided not to use SIT Graduate Institute’s formal letter of support since my experiences in Pakistan lead me to believe the more one tries to justify one's position with formal letters of acknowledgment and references, the more one arouses suspicion. I recrafted my interactions with the study population to share more personal details about myself and shared my experiences in the U.S.A. more openly with them. In doing so, I was able to
encourage their confidence with this research thereby creating a sincere personal space where they could share their opinions, insights, and experiences truthfully.

3.4. Strategy Designed for this Research

In efforts to maintain prime focus on individual stories, experiences, and insights, and to have elements of generalizability, a hybrid technique combining qualitative and quantitative methods, commonly referred to as Mixed Methods (MM) formed the basis of this research’s strategy. Hybrid method facilitated triangulation and generalization, and provided alternate opportunities to the participants for sharing insights, experiences, and stories the research instruments could not touch upon.

There was a considerable time span between when participants furnished the questionnaire and participated in one-on-one interviews. This contributed towards the triangulation of the data and reduced chances of intentionally tailored responses, exaggerated, or otherwise compromised information to form the conclusion of this research. Interaction with the study population spanned over six stages as illustrated in the table on the following page (Table 2: Phases of Interaction with the Participants).

Before sending the questionnaire to the participants, I shared a consent letter with detailed information about the research, my position, and their rights as a research participant. I translated this consent letter in Urdu, Pakistan’s National Language, and shared with the participants based on their personal preferences.

---

1 See Appendix A
2 See Appendix B
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>Stakeholder Group / Individuals</th>
<th>Communication Medium</th>
<th>Languages used</th>
<th>Duration (appx.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st contact</td>
<td>Introduction about myself and the research. Extended invitation to participate.</td>
<td>CEOs; Senior Managers; Previous Colleagues and Personal Network</td>
<td>Facebook; Email and Phone calls</td>
<td>English; Urdu and Pashto</td>
<td>25 minutes per person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd contact</td>
<td>Shared consent letter with more personal information about myself and more details about the research.</td>
<td>CEOs; Senior Managers; Field Staff; Internal Evaluators and Parents</td>
<td>Email and Skype calls</td>
<td>English; Punjabi; Urdu and Pashto</td>
<td>15 minutes per person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd contact</td>
<td>Upon receiving furnished consent form, shared Questionnaire.</td>
<td>CEOs; Senior Managers; Field Staff; Internal Evaluators and Parents</td>
<td>Emails and Skype calls</td>
<td>English; Punjabi; Urdu and Pashto</td>
<td>5 minutes per person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th contact</td>
<td>First interview</td>
<td>CEOs; Senior Managers; Field Staff; Internal Evaluators and Parents</td>
<td>Phone and Skype calls</td>
<td>English; Punjabi; Urdu and Pashto</td>
<td>10-20 minutes per person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th contact</td>
<td>Second interview (in-depth)</td>
<td>CEOs; Senior Managers; Field Staff; Internal Evaluators and Parents</td>
<td>Phone and Skype calls</td>
<td>English; Punjabi; Urdu and Pashto</td>
<td>45-60 minutes per person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th contact</td>
<td>Third interview (closing)</td>
<td>CEOs; Senior Managers; Field Staff; Internal Evaluators and Parents</td>
<td>Phone and Skype calls</td>
<td>English; Punjabi; Urdu and Pashto</td>
<td>20-30 minutes per person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The design of the questionnaire included questions that sought participants knowledge (interpretations); attitudes; opinions and experiences with the study context. The questionnaire consisted of seventeen nominal; ordinal and open-ended continuous questions. I also translated this questionnaire in Urdu and participants had the option to either furnish the English version or the translated Urdu version of the questionnaire. Strategy for analysis was to understand different realities of inclusion; participation; positionality and influence participants experience while engaging in monitoring and evaluation process. Frequency and multivariant crosstabulation analysis facilitated the analysis of trends observed during questionnaire and interview phases.

The 17 carefully designed questions aimed to encourage participation from participants regardless of their level of expertise in M&E and PM&E. During 1st Contact phase I noted slight confusions among the participants regarding the term Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E), therefore I excluded the term from the questionnaire intentionally. The questionnaire indirectly collected data about participants opinions, experiences, and insights about the practice of PM&E. All questions were voluntary and participants could choose to skip questions; however, the 27 participants responded to all the 17 questions. To embed triangulation within the questionnaire, sensitive questions that could have received compromised responses were re-worded with alternate but similar responses and repeated at different stages within the series. This tactic improved the likelihood of sincere and truthful responses to these particularly triggering or loaded questions.

Three phases of semi-structured interviews designed to be open and conversational commenced after Eid-ul-Fitr (Ramadan’s conclusion). Carefully designed interview questions

---

[^3]: See Appendix C
[^4]: See Appendix D
encouraged participants to focus on the inquiry of this research and contributed towards triangulation of data the individual had shared earlier through the questionnaire. These conversational interviews did not present participants with direct questions about the information they shared earlier. Rather the conversation sought to explore reasoning behind their responses. In this manner, the participants did not feel confronted and shared their stories, insights, and experiences openly without specific questions dictating and restricting what and how much they shared.

I used IBM’s Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) to record and analyze the data from the questionnaires. Insights collected through one-on-one interviews improved reliability of analysis and contributed towards deepening the analysis of data. Data analysis commenced once 22 participants had shared information through questionnaires and interviews. Initiating data analysis at the 85% data collection completion mark served as a time management strategy. I continued to interact with those participants who had already shared their opinions, stories and insights through the questionnaire and interviews – updating them about the progress and findings of the research. This strategy served towards strengthening rapport with the study population and contributed significantly towards further refining interview styles for interviews yet to take place.

3.5. Limitations of this Research

As illustrated in the Literature Review of this paper, a nuance of qualitative based research is the limited ability to generalize findings since data collected through qualitative methods is often difficult to generalize over a larger population. Experiences, opinions, insights, and stories participants share may have similarities with what another individual expresses; however, they remain personal and unique to the individual. The hybrid method of this research
combined qualitative data and quantitative data from the participants; their personal stories, opinions and experiences with M&E and PM&E forms the conclusion of this study.

Furthermore, data collected from 27 individuals and the resulting information and findings may not be sufficient to generalize over a population of approximately 185 million. The intention of this research is not to present a unified version of “truth,” it is rather to offer various interpretations, experiences, and opinions of participants, to share the “truth” that they live and experience. By doing so, this research attempts to deepen a nuanced understanding of PM&E in the context.

4. Research Findings

This section illustrates the collected data question by question, through pi-charts and frequency tables along with brief descriptions of the trends. Significantly more individuals from Islamabad took part in this research followed by Lahore, Peshawar, and Quetta. Participants shared their interpretations, insights and experiences with monitoring and evaluation processes of their respective programs. Data suggests Internal and External Evaluators commonly conduct the M&E process with members in managerial capacity contributing to the design and strategy of the process. Participates generally see the Evaluators and the Organization in a positionality of specialized knowledge inspecting and passing judgements on the trends and performance of the programs. Among the five organizations participating in this research all conduct traditional monitoring and evaluating processes except for one organization that follows a participatory approach to the process. Data reveals that in programs administered/hosted by the five participating organizations, the donor’s fund and include the monitoring and evaluation process as a part of the project.
1. Question 1: Where in Pakistan is your Organization/Project/Program situated:
(select all that apply).

Table 3: Frequencies for responses to Question 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Islamabad</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quetta</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahore</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peshawar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of the twenty-seven participants that responded to Question 1, 37% were from Islamabad, 14.8% were from Quetta; 25.0% were from Lahore and 22.2% were from Peshawar.
2. *What is your role in the Nonprofit/program/project?*

![Chart 2: Depicts the position of the participant within the organization/program/project.](chart.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid CEO/CFO/COO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Manager/Project Manager/Principal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Evaluator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent of participating Student(s)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all participants, Parents of students attending educational empowerment programs in the respective cities was the largest group with 9 individuals. This count was followed by 8 Senior Managers/Project Managers/Principals (grouped in the same category); 4 CEO/CFO/COOs \(^5\) and 3 participants each from Internal Evaluator and Field Staff groups.

---

\(^5\) *Chief Executive Officer/Chief Finance Officer/Chief Operating Officer*
3. *What in your understanding is M&E?*

**Chart 3: Depicts how participants understand M&E**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A process designed to judge program/project process against initial plans.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To investigate shortcomings and room for improvement.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To see the impact of the program/project.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the above.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most common understanding of the M&E process among 70% of the study population is that it is a process designed to see the impact of the program/project and judge program/project process against initial plans and to investigate shortcomings to improve program/project.
4. Choose one of the following that in your opinion defines an Evaluator:

Table 6: Frequencies for responses to Question 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid A Judge</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Inspector</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Observer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Explorer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40% of the participants see an Evaluator as an Inspector and only 11% feel the Evaluator is like an Observer. Almost 30% of participants interpret an Evaluator as an Explorer while 18% believe an Evaluator to be like a Judge.
5. Who defines the M&E process in your organization/project/program?

Chart 5: Depicts stakeholder groups that define M&E process for organizations/projects/programs, according to participants

Table 7: Frequencies for responses to Question 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who defines the M&amp;E process in your organization/project/programa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Organization (including CEO, Managers and Field Staff)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Evaluators (Internal or External)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Donor Agency/Partner</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Participant community (including Students, Parents, Schools)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the above</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>266.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

This question received multiple responses and participants chose more than one values to the variable (question); the total number of responses (N) and percent of cases exceeds 27 and 100% respectively. 36% and 34% of the participants said that Organization, Internal and
External Evaluators define the M&E respectively. Only 1% of the participants said Students, Parents and Schools contribute towards defining M&E of the programs/projects.

6. *Where does the funding for the M&E process come from?*

Chart 6: Depicts the funding source for M&E process

![Chart 6](image)

Table 8:
**Frequencies for responses to Question 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid The Organization</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Donor Agency/Partner</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked where does the funding for the M&E process come from, 22% of the participants said that it comes from the organization. Whereas 77% of the participants believe it to be funded by the donor agency or the partner funding the project/program.
7. Who conducts evaluations in your organization/project/program?

Table 9: Frequencies for responses to Question 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who conducts evaluations?</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Evaluators</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Evaluators</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Participants and Community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Management staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

Participants while responding to this question selected multiple responses; therefore, number of responses (N) and percentage of cases exceeds 27 and 100% respectively. All participants said Internal and External Evaluators conduct evaluations; however, 5% of the participants reported that Internal Management conducts evaluations and another 5% said Participants and Community (of the program/project) also contribute in the evaluation efforts.
8. What tools of M&E have you experienced/used most?

Chart 8: Depicts the types of M&E tools participants have experienced/used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E tools experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys (on paper or online)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews (in person or on phone/Skype)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group discussions</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>237.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10:
Frequencies for responses to Question 8

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

Surveys and Focus group discussions are the most common M&E tools experienced by the participants, with a 42% and 32% reporting so. Interviews are also experienced with 15% reporting exposure to this tool. Only 1 participant shared that they had experienced and used Desk Reviews as a M&E tool as well.

Participants while responding to this question selected multiple responses; therefore, number of responses (N) and percentage of cases exceeds 27 and 100% respectively.
9. To what extent do you feel the M&E process or the Evaluators did not allow you to share more about your experiences?

Chart 9: Depicts frequency of M&E process not allowing participants to share more about their experiences.

![Chart showing frequency of M&E process not allowing participants to share more about their experiences.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37% of the participants said that the M&E process or the Evaluator sometimes did not allow them to share more about their experiences with the project/program. 29% reported that the M&E process or the Evaluator often do not allow them to share more and 11% said that it always the case. 22% however, said that the M&E process and Evaluators have always allowed them opportunities to share their experiences to their satisfaction.
10. In the M&E of a project/program whose insights do you think are more important? (choose all that apply).

Table 12: Frequencies for responses to Question 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whose insights are more importanta</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The CEO and NGO Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Field Staff</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Participants and Community</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the above</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

A majority (63%) of the participants believe insights from all stakeholder groups are important in the M&E process. For 49% of the participants, insights from the field staff, participants (of the program/project) and the community are more important. 7% consider insights from the CEO and Nonprofits (commonly referred to as “NGO” in Pakistan) to be more
important. Participants while responding to this question selected multiple responses; therefore, number of responses (N) and percentage of cases exceeds 27 and 100% respectively.

11. In your experiences with M&E, how many times were you intimidated by the M&E process?

Table 13: Frequencies for responses to Question 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Never</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40% of the participants reported that the M&E process sometimes intimidated them. Where 22% said they were always intimidated by the M&E process. Equal number of participants (5% each) reported being never and often being intimidated by the M&E process.
12. How often do you feel your position in the organization/project/program influenced your participation in the M&E process?

Chart 12: Depicts the frequency participant's position influenced participation in M&E process.

![Circle chart showing frequency of responses to Question 12](chart12.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost 52% of participants said that their position in the organization/project/program has never influenced their participation in the M&E process. On the opposite side of the spectrum 7% reported that their position often influenced participation in the process. 40% said that their position sometimes influences their participation in the M&E process.
13. In your experiences with M&E whose insights are captured most in the process?

Chart 13: Depicts whose insights M&E captures most, according to the participants.

![Pie chart showing insights captured most: 18% The Donor Agency/Partner, 40% The CEO and NGO Management, 38% The Participants and Community, 4% All of the above.]

Table 15: Frequencies for responses to Question 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insights captured most in M&amp;E a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Donor Agency/Partner</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CEO and NGO Management</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Participants and Community</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the above</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>166.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

66% of the participants reported that the M&E process captures insights from CEO and NGO Management more than other stakeholders. 63% said the M&E process in their experiences captures insights from participants of the program/project, and 29% reported the process is more inclined towards the donor agency. Only 7% said the process captures insights from all stakeholder groups. Participants while responding to this question selected multiple responses; therefore, number of responses (N) and percentage of cases exceeds 27 and 100% respectively.
14. In your opinion to what extent does the M&E process share information that is based on actual impact/performance of the program/project in the field?

Chart 14: Depicts opinions of participants regarding the nature of the information shared by the M&E process.

Table 16: Frequencies for responses to Question 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never based on actual</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes based on actual</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often based on actual</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always based on actual</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among all participants, almost 52% reported that the information generated by M&E processes is sometimes based on actual realities in the field; a further 11% said the information is never based on actual performance/impact in the field. 14% said the information is often based on actual and another 22% reported the information to be always based on actual realities in the field.
15. Would you say the M&E process shares information that is exaggerated (like marketing) or is it more reality based?

Table 17: Frequencies for responses to Question 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat exaggerated</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat reality based</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always exaggerated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always reality based</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked about the extent to which M&E shares information that is reality based, almost 15% said it is somewhat reality based, and another 7% said it is always reality based. Whereas almost 30% said it is somewhat exaggerated and another 14% said the information is always exaggerated. 33% reported that the information is neutral, it is neither reality based nor is it exaggerated.
16. What is your understanding of the main purpose of the M&E process?

Chart 16: Depicts participants opinion about the main purpose of M&E

Table 18: Frequencies for responses to Question 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main purpose of M&amp;E</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percent of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To enable the organization to showcase their efficient and effective program/project implementation to secure grants in the future</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To record program/project's performance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To discover ways to improve the program/project's performance and impact</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the above</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

A significantly large group of participants believe the main purpose of M&E is to enable the organization to showcase their effective program/project implementation to secure future
grants. This group believes discovering ways to improve and recording program/project’s performance is also the main purpose of M&E. 70% of the responses this question received is indicative of this belief. Participants while responding to this question selected multiple responses; therefore, number of responses (N) and percentage of cases exceeds 27 and 100% respectively.

17. **Would you like to contribute further in this research by participating in an interview (one-on-one)?**

![Chart 17: Depicts participants willingness to participate in one-on-one interview with the researcher.](chart)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All 27 participants shared their willingness to contribute more in this research by participating in one-on-one interview sessions.
5. Analysis of Research Findings

As mentioned in the Aims and Objectives, this research focuses on exploring realities of M&E and participation that stakeholders from respective communities experience from their position within the organization/project/program. Analysis of data collected through questionnaires and interviews reveals similarities between experiences, opinions, and interpretations from members of same subgroups. Furthermore, the analysis also reveals a strong positive linear correlation between the position of the stakeholder within the project or organization and inclusion, participation, and views on reliability of the M&E process. There are however disconnects observed between interpretation and actions surrounding the M&E process, especially among groups in a managerial capacity and those that are not. These disconnects and the positive linear correlation between the positionality of the stakeholder and inclusion into the monitoring and evaluation process renders perceived PM&E as non-inclusive since it includes some and excludes others.

5.1. Interpretation of Monitoring and Evaluation processes

Empowerment programs require significant financial, human resources and logistical resources to operate. The diverse stakeholder groups have different interests vested in these programs. One-on-one conversations with the participants from different stakeholder groups revealed the diversity of these vested interests. Some reported they are interested in empowering the youth and the organization as well. Others shared that the projects are a source of livelihood; while others said it is rewarding and therefore empowering for them to see the youth improve their skills and capacities. The nature of the vested interest has a bearing on the interpretation of the monitoring and evaluation process.
The perception of the monitoring and evaluation process among communities participating in this research is similar to what previous academic discourse suggests, an endeavor to pass judgments on what worked better than others in an attempt to highlight rooms for improvement, thereby encouraging organization growth. (Abbot & Guijt. 1998). A significantly large number of participants shared their interpretation of the monitoring and evaluation as a process designed to judge the program/project against initial plans to investigate shortcomings and room for further growth. Participants also understand this process as a tool to
see the impact of the program/project ⁶.

For most of the organizations and communities participating in this research the organization, evaluators and donor agencies/partners define the monitoring and evaluation process ⁷. Participants further elaborated this trend during interviews. Those in managerial positions (CEOs, Senior Managers, and Donor Agency) implied that participant community (Students, Schools, and Parents) lack the specialty required to define, strategize, and plan an effective monitoring and evaluation effort. Participants of this research perceive Internal and External Evaluators differently. It appears their positionality contributes towards forming this interpretation ⁸. CEOs consider Evaluators to be Inspectors, whereas Parents of participating students consider them to be a Judge or an Inspector.

During an interview with a CEO, they mentioned that Evaluators are Inspectors because they inspect trends, reports, performances, and impacts (Participant, personal communication, June 2017). However, Parents responded by saying Evaluators pass a judgement on whether the

---

⁶ See Crosstabulation Table 21 in Annexure
⁷ See Crosstabulation Table 22 in Annexure
⁸ See Crosstabulation Table 23 in Annexure
program is doing well after inspecting its performance and results (Personal communication, June 2017). Parents further added, that they feel more intimidated by the Evaluators and the evaluation process since continuation of the programs their child/children attend depend on what Evaluators mention in their reports\(^9\). Senior Managers, Project Managers and Principals shared similar feelings of intimidation; however, the primary stimulus for their feelings was a concern for their livelihood. One participant said the paycheck they get from working on the project is the primary source of income, and that it would be very challenging to maintain a comfortable living should the program conclude (Personal communication, June 2017).

Analyzing this trend of intimidation and relating it with the participants positionality, it becomes clear that Senior Managers and Parents of participating students feel significantly more intimidated by the monitoring and evaluation process. Internal Evaluator and Field Staff elaborated this trend by saying Senior Managers generally focus on one project and Parents do not have sufficient alternate opportunities of empowerment programs to choose from. They said, should the program conclude, Senior Managers and Parents would find it difficult to secure another project to join. The Internal Evaluators and Field Staff, they said, do not feel much intimidated since their positions are not as specialized as those of Senior Managers (Personal communications, June 2017).

\(^9\) See Crosstabulation Table 24 in Annexure
The level of intimidation a stakeholder group feels and how they interpret the Evaluator to be does imply a positive correlation. Stakeholder groups that interpret Evaluators as a Judge or an Inspector, with reasonable variance, feel more intimidated by the monitoring and evaluation process.

5.2. Inclusion and Participation in the Monitoring and evaluation processes

Unlike how rigorous academic discourse interprets inclusion and participation in the monitoring and evaluation, findings of this research suggest that inclusion and participation in the process is dependent on positionality of the stakeholder and the level of influence they afford to exert. The primary stakeholder group that contributes in defining, planning, and strategizing the monitoring and evaluation effort, all belong to positions of power and authority.

Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) is the process of actively involving members of all stakeholder groups in the M&E process to facilitate their learning and affect the process and impact of a project or program. (Pehu, 2005). Trends observed during this research suggest, stakeholders from a positionality of power and influence experience significantly more

10 See Chart 19
opportunities of participating in planning and designing the monitoring and evaluating effort than those who are not in such positions. When asked to elaborate more on this observation, the Parent stakeholder group during one-on-one conversations expressed the interpretation of specialization surrounding monitoring and evaluation. They shared an inability to participate in designing the monitoring and evaluation processes since they do not have the educational qualifications required to do so. Almost all of them said they would like to participate in designing a monitoring and evaluation effort, since it is their children that participate in these programs and it is their future that is of prime concern. They further added that evaluators and organizations see a very limited facet of the child/children(s) lives and so their capacities to conclusively suggest how to improve the program’s impact is limited (Personal communication, June 2017).

On the other side of the spectrum, other stakeholder groups shared that the Parents are more concerned about what the students learn and other matters of their own; they do not have time to invest in such a rigorous and statistical process. A few of them shared that they would prefer to include Parents in the define and design stage of the M&E effort, however it is not the Parents ability that is a limiting factor, it is the funds and time they have available to conduct monitoring and evaluation cycles (Personal communications, June 2017). They also mentioned that commissioners of M&E and the Evaluators often do not have adequate understandings of what different tools and approaches can offer and therefore prefer to remain with the conventional.

Each PM&E process with its own context involves different groups of people to different levels of engagement (Guijt, I. et al. 1998). There was one organization participating in this research that includes all stakeholder groups in the design and define stages of M&E effort.
The monitoring and evaluation effort within this particular organization is in line with what Guijt (1998) mentioned. However, the Senior Manager and Evaluator groups of this organization said during interviews that it was “not easy to achieve” (Participant, personal communication, June 2017). They said there was immense effort invested in generating an interest in PM&E on higher managerial levels (Personal communication, June 2017). The CEO and CFO of this organization said, the process of PM&E was new to them and once they saw the advantages “PM&E was the only choice since mutual development is the focus” (Personal communications, June 2017). Participants in managerial positions of this organization illustrated during interviews that PM&E is not only to facilitate empowerment, it also serves towards the project implementation. One participant mentioned during an interview that including different stakeholder groups, particularly those from the communities hosting the project is a manner of showing respect and acknowledgement for their knowledge of the region, and experiences. A participant added “I don’t know what happens in that community, I live in another city; those living there may not have a degree in M&E but they have something I am not educated in, social dynamics of that community. They know what works for them and they also know how to make things work – our programs work better when we sit at the same dastarkhwan" (Personal communication, July 2017). What this participant was saying has a direct bearing with what Rifkin and Kangere (2002) shared in an academic discourse, participation is of critical vitality since people know what works for them and professionals need to learn from people who make contributions (money, material, labor) in the programs. People develop a commitment and ownership of the project and in doing so they develop their own skills and gain experiences that facilitate their empowerment (Rifkin, S. & Kangere, M. 2002).

\[1\] Das-tar-kh-wan: The sheet of cloth spread on the floor for people to sit together and eat meals.
The community (city) and the preference of M&E tools also present a correlation. The cities of Islamabad and Lahore are comparatively more developed than Quetta and Peshawar. The latter two also face greater regional conflicts and traditional hierarchies are more prominent than Islamabad and Lahore.

Among the four cities, Islamabad seems to have a greater variety of tools stakeholders experience and use. A participant elaborated on this trend during an interview that they consider city’s particular culture before utilizing tools. Quetta and Peshawar are more traditional and it is challenging to conduct in-person interviews and focus group discussions with both male and female participants in the same space and time. Therefore, a survey is the preferred tool (Personal communication, June 2017). There is however a concern which all stakeholder groups implied, surveys allow participants to share their experiences and insights to a limited degree. A participant from the Parent subgroup shared during a conversation that they are asked to fill out a questionnaire and “enclose the ocean in a jar” (Personal communication, June 2017).

---

12 See Crosstabulation Table 25 in Annexure
Further elaborating on how they felt furnishing surveys, they said that it doesn’t suffice to merely have participants fill out a yes/no form with a scale of satisfaction since it will share the effect however the cause and reasoning behind that effect remains uncovered (Personal communication, June 2017).

Analysis of data also reveals a relationship between the positionality of the stakeholder and the level to which the monitoring and evaluation process allows them to share their insights, opinions, and experiences\(^\text{13}\).

![Chart 23: Participants position and level to which M&E did not allow them to share details about their experiences](chart)

Participants from the Parent subgroup expressed during interviews and through the questionnaire that the monitoring and evaluation processes they experience provide them with fewer opportunities to share their opinions and insights. Comparing this with the CEO subgroup, the stakeholders felt that the monitoring and evaluation process provides them with ample

---

\(^{13}\) See Crosstabulation Table 26 in Annexure
opportunities to share their opinions and insights. A participant commented on this trend by saying “I can’t imagine not letting the CEO speak, I like my job” (Personal communication, June 2017).

5.3. **Realities Monitoring and Evaluation processes shares with stakeholders**

Analysis of data reveals there are diverse interpretations about the nature of information monitoring and evaluation shares\(^\text{14}\). Participants from the Parent subgroup shared that information resulting from the monitoring and evaluation effort is commonly not based on what actually happens in the field. During interviews participants from the Parent subgroup said that M&E is just a formality that the organization needs to do and show how well they implemented the project (Personal communication, July 2017).

![Chart 24: Participant positionality and interpretation of M&E information](chart24.png)

This trend has a bearing with the insights this subgroup shared about feelings of intimidation and the level to which the tools allow them to share. The CEO and Senior Manager groups commented on this trend by saying that there were times when exaggeration means

---

\(^{14}\) *See Crosstabulation Tables 27 and 28 in Annexure*
continuation of the program. They further added projects and programs never go as planned and there are always shortcomings that restrict project’s impact. However, if they share this information openly, even when the donor asks to share lessons learnt, the competition gets an advantage and can secure the next cycle of project implementation. (Personal communication, July 2017).

Triangulation and bi-variant crosstabulation of this trend shows that the Parent subgroup believes the information resulting for monitoring and evaluation effort is indeed tailored to certain degrees. The CEO and Senior Manager subgroup cautiously commented on this trend by saying that, monitoring and evaluation reports can serve as marketing instruments, the intention behind exaggerating is not for malicious purposes, rather a measure to secure future projects.

They further clarified by sharing “it’s not that we dint make mistakes, but if we don’t get the next project we will not be able to improve our performance or the project’s impact” (Personal communications, July 2017). When all stakeholders were asked to comment on this trend, they implied feelings of regret and exclusion. Participants with managerial positionalities see this as
“a necessary evil that must be entertained so empowerment projects can run; those awarding the project often expect 100% effectiveness without considering the challenges that need to be managed in the context, most of which are near impossible” (Personal communication, July 2017). The Parent subgroup, greatly appreciates these projects and empowerment opportunities; however, they shared feeling objectified and said, “they ask me for how I feel and then show it to the word with more spices and excitement – what gets shared with the world is not how I really feel. Why ask me how I feel when you will not share it just as it is?” (Personal communication, July 2017).

Interpretation of the monitoring and evaluation process and perception of elements create an environment that has the potential to include or exclude regardless of the tool, method and approach utilized. A kitchen knife helps to cut fruit and prepare meals; however, the same instrument that facilitates health and nutrition can cause harm. The more this tool causes harm the more negative perception surrounds it and the more intimidation it renders to those exposed to it, even if they see someone preparing a nutritious meal. Similarly, Unmanned Vehicles (UVs) ensure deployment in critical areas without posing a direct threat to the human operator(s). They can serve by providing surveillance and data from the edge of a volcano surrounded by molten lava. This data can then help predict potential eruptions and strategize evacuation plans. When armed with ammunition in place of cameras, seismometers and satellite imagers, the same UV can cause damage and harm. However, predictions and targeting can be inaccurate, resulting in unintended loss of life. In both these instances, tools and instruments designed to protect people from harm, contributed to exposing them to it. The more such instruments result in harm, greater are the misconceptions and negative interpretations associated with them.
Monitoring and Evaluation is comparatively a new engagement in the context of Pakistan; the cultural dynamics however span decades. Being relatively new, most communities participating in this research implied that they are still experimenting with the engagement and the negative associations are not a result of intention rather a byproduct of an active learning environment.

Inclusion in monitoring and evaluation seems to have nuances and depends on a number of factors including, financial resources, human resources, and cultural dynamics. PM&E is possible in Pakistan’s context as one of the participating organizations illustrated it. Interestingly, all participant groups from within this organization shared an overarching positive experience with the monitoring and evaluation process. These members also shared higher levels of satisfaction with the process and vividly expressed the many ways in which they experience empowerment. Organizations and communities that prefer to engage with conventional approaches of monitoring and evaluation, experienced challenges that are more complex and resource taxing to manage. The organization implementing PM&E also shared the challenges they had to overcome; however, in what they expressed and the manner in which they shared it implies that by having multiple stakeholder groups participating in the effort they distributed responsibility, and encouraged stakeholder’s ownership into the programs. In doing so, they created an environment of respect where all stakeholders understood or made sincere efforts to understand the challenges that each member faces.

Inclusive environments in the monitoring and evaluation process not only render information that has higher degrees of reliability; it also offers multiple perspectives of reality and in doing so offers greater depth in understanding the context and measures that can improve program’s implementation and impact in the communities.
6. Conclusions: My Experiences, Reflection, and Personal Learning

Participating stakeholder groups of this research contribute towards deepening an understanding into the elements that facilitate participatory monitoring and evaluation processes within the context. Their insights and experiences also reveal challenges and obstacles that can potentially jeopardize adequate monitoring and evaluation. Empowerment programs are multi-stakeholder engagements with large investments of resources and interested vested in the program by each stakeholder group. Resources invested in the program include funds, grants, and financial contributions; logistics; labor and time. Interests vested include: livelihoods, education, reputation, and empowering prospects. Each stakeholder group has its own stake in the project and contributes to the best of their ability to ensure profitability of this stake. Given this reality, each stakeholder group has its own culture that influences social interactions and engagements. Dissatisfaction arises whenever a stakeholder group feels their stake is at risk or interprets another group’s action or engagement as a trespass on their interests. This interpretation without corrective intervention escalates and contributes towards a false perception of another group thereby jeopardizing an inclusive environment.

Each stakeholder group has their own specific culture; however, they all exist within the same environment with different interests vested and a common source that provides potential satisfaction of that interest. In this coexistence, there exists a common space of tolerance among the stakeholder groups. This space of tolerance is merely a point where there is overlap among the different cultures. Most of the stakeholder’s culture remain hidden and other cultures are often oblivious of those. In this environment of equality, social distances are greater than the understandings of cultural nuances. Furthermore, tolerance is inclusive of common knowledge but exclusive of subtler nuances that often restrict respect from entering the social dynamic.
Through this research I have developed a working hypothesis that attempts to deepen the understanding of elements that challenge engagements of equality and equity in an inclusive environment. Those participating in multicultural contexts, regardless of sincerity of intentions, often remain oblivious to these sensitivities since diplomatic appropriateness and political correctness warranted in such environments requires elevated levels of tolerance - tolerance, that locks participants in their own circles of similarity thereby creating a socially acceptable distance within an inclusive environment. Consider three stakeholder groups (A, B, and C) each with their own cultures and nuances (a, b, and c) coexisting in the same environment, represented by the triangle in the following image. These stakeholder groups have a span of social and geographic distance between them (x, y, and z). This distance has shortened with technological advancements such as the Internet and Social Media; however, considerable distances continue to remain.

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha &= \frac{x_1}{x_2} \quad ; \quad \beta = \frac{y_1}{y_2} \quad ; \quad \gamma = \frac{z_1}{z_2} \\
\alpha > (x_1 + x_2) \quad ; \quad \beta > (y_1 + y_2) \quad ; \quad \gamma > (z_1 + z_2) \\
t_1 &= a - b \quad ; \quad t_2 = b - c \quad ; \quad t_3 = c - a \\
t_1 \propto \alpha \quad ; \quad t_2 \propto \beta \quad ; \quad t_3 \propto \gamma \\
K = \left\{ t_1, t_2, t_3 \right\} \\
K < (A+a), (B+b), (C+c)
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 2: Equality Triangle ©
Each stakeholder group has developed some insights and familiarity with the culture of the other stakeholder groups \((x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, z_1, \text{ and } z_2)\) over time. Since each stakeholder group has their own specific cultures, there exists a degree of separation among them; however, with efforts, insights gained into cultures of each other creates a space where these three stakeholders interact by tolerating the differences among them \((t_1, t_2 \text{ and } t_3)\). The space of tolerance between each stakeholder group is a mere fraction of the total distance between them. In this environment of tolerance and equality, common knowledge emerges \(K\) and all stakeholder groups maintain equal distances, invest equal levels of rigor and effort to maintain a triangle with equal distances and a perfect circle of coexistence between them. This space is equal and inclusive for all the stakeholders. However, there is a significantly large area that remains unknown and hidden \((a, b, \text{ and } c)\), since the only space where these stakeholders interact forms common knowledge and tolerance \((t_1, t_2 \text{ and } t_3)\). Social interactions that commonly take place in this space \((t_1, t_2 \text{ and } t_3)\) include development and empowerment projects, conflict transformation and peacebuilding, and the monitoring and evaluation of these initiatives.

The considerably large area of cultural nuances and contextual awareness that remains hidden encourages interpretations, assumptions, and biases, despite sincerity invested in the interaction. This unexplored area most participants and stakeholder groups often remain oblivious to, facilitates misinterpretations of intentions and actions thereby jeopardizing sincere endeavors each culture renders towards their own empowerment and that of the others. There is more complexity that falls into perspective when one realizes A, B and C can be individuals, regions or Nations since culture is not merely regional or territorial. They are all mentioned here as stakeholders since despite having their own space, each shares a common space and resources
where each has a particular stake and responsibility, a space that goes beyond the program, project or the context, this common space and resource is the Earth.

The illustration becomes further complicated when we consider the cultures are not regional or territorial since members from the same stakeholder group can have their own sub-cultures which are as unique to them as the fingerprints on human fingers.

This research and my rigorous academic exploration during my on-campus phase, gave me the privilege of deeper insights into participation, inclusion, equity, and equality. The concept equal participation for all, indeed sounds politically correct and appropriate; however, despite being participatory and equal, it renders exclusion since some participants may need more than others to participate and to feel included. This research aimed to explore the dynamics of Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) as processes of educational empowerment programs in Pakistan, a Country with a traditionally hierarchical culture. It found similarities between the nuances of monitoring and evaluation as I experienced here in the US during my Reflective Practice phase. During casual conversations here in the US, individuals often mentioned the challenges they have to navigate in order to have their voices heard. They further shared the distances between what they experience and what evaluative reports mention. The latter receives a preference of attention and acknowledgement since statistical calculations form the basis of these reports. Individuals in senior management capacities are often unaware of this version of reality since they are considerably higher up in the hierarchy and given this social distance are not close enough to the individual in the field (Personal conversation, December 2016). Findings of this research suggest similar trends in Pakistan. The data suggests disconnects between versions of realities and exclusivity in an otherwise participatory engagement. It is intriguing to note similarities among the experiences of monitoring and evaluation processes and
the interpretations despite the economic, social, and geographic spans of space between the two countries.

Galtung’s Conflict Triangle (Galtung, 2011) provides further clarity to the trends observed through this research. Galtung (2011) suggests three elements that form the core of any conflict, Attitudes, and Assumptions (A), Behaviors (B) and Contradictions (C). In this triangle, A creates B; B enforces C and C informs A (Galtung, 2011). This process is cyclic and without appropriate intervention to disrupt the chain continues to gain momentum as time passes and encourages escalation of conflict within the environment. Among Attitudes, Behaviors and Contradictions; Behaviors, like leaves of a plant, are the most apparent. Whereas Attitudes and Contradictions require greater effort to understand.

![Conflict Triangle](image)

**Figure 3**: Conflict Triangle. Adapted from Galtung, J. (2011)

Attitudes, Behaviors, and Contradictions this research revealed include: a preference of organizations and evaluators designing and planning evaluations of programs; tailoring of realities and participations in the evaluation process as a mere formality. Those with specialized education and expertise are the only ones who can plan, design, and strategize evaluations. Organizations know more what a community needs; organizations are in an authoritative position however they cannot understand. Process is fair and inclusive, and renders information that is
based on absolute realities from the field. Sharing information that is positive and preferred will ensure students continue to participate in programs that continue to develop and run. Conflict in this context emerges from the sense of diverse levels of dissatisfaction participants experienced at various levels and capacities; including feelings of exclusion, objectification, and those of frustration associated with producing high results all the time.

Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E), as my learning suggests, is merely a social engagement where people interact with people to see how they are doing and ask them what they need to do better. An engagement where all participants share leadership roles and guide the direction of the interaction. This transdisciplinary domain is both an art and a science where specialties need not dictate a positionality of superiority. This involves creating multicultural and inclusive spaces where individuals can share their experiences, opinions, and feelings openly, knowing it is safe to do so. Reducing the distances between stakeholders, going beyond the mere limitation of tolerance and stepping into the region of respect encourages the creation of such a space. In doing so, the equality triangle with firm equal sides becomes equity triangle with fluid sides. A social construct where common knowledge is free to move and focus more on regions less explored.

There is a need to build capacities not in the science of PM&E, rather in the art of it. There is a great level of proficiency achieved in tools and instruments that collect and analyze numbers; the art behind PM&E needs a deeper exploration. Acknowledging that some stakeholders need more than others to participate actively, and the sensitivity not to hold this against them. Understanding that behaviors are like leaves of a poison ivy; trimming leaves will only remedy the potential of discomfort momentarily. Attitudes and Contradictions form the stem and the roots; cutting the stem will have more or less the same effect as trimming leaves –
the plant might potentially grow another branch. The root is where the potential for future discomfort remains and that is what needs attention. The simplest solution to remove a poison ivy is to uproot it, navigating the leaves. Building capacities of all stakeholders towards the attitudes, behaviors and contradictions that exist within the environment and prove to be crippling limitations to the potential impacts, can encourage creation of an environment where PM&E can prosper and bloom.

The experience of exploring concepts of inclusion; equity; equality; conflict transformation and monitoring and evaluation at SIT Graduate Institute was certainly an enlightening one. Stepping into the field, beyond academic discourses and rigor to explore various interpretations and applications of these social interactions has humbled me to a molecular level. Experience of conducting this research has shown me, despite having quality education and progressive professional experiences spanning a decade, my knowledge of the world that surrounds me and its diverse elements, continues to be very limited. What I know now, the insights and skills I have the confidence of calling mine, are merely one tip of a multi-peak iceberg. Conducing this research and listening to the stories from different communities, I have come to realize nuances continue to remain oblivious regardless of the intention, rigor and effort invested in the exploration.

Putting it in a vernacular befitting the domain of Military, a domain I have limited privilege of: I am engaged with a formidable adversary that has strong supply lines, motivated infantry and is capable of relentless artillery and air support. The adversary appears in the form of corruption, exclusion, inequity, and limited capacities. My adversary and I fly side by side executing rolling scissors to maneuver behind the other, in attempts to force an overshoot and ensure a lock (Shaw, 1985). It is similar to a passionate tango; my adversary and I dance
together, each with an intense desire. The tango we dance is a continuous close quarter engagement of passion, where influence and insights serve towards gaining advantage over the other. I shall proceed to deepen insights into my own abilities and that of my foe, because, if I know the enemy and know myself, I need not fear the result of a hundred battles and my victory will not stand in doubt (Griffith, 1971).

There is yet much more, I must learn and explore.
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Appendix A: English version of the Consent Letter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Participant Consent Letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Research Title: The Dynamics of Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&amp;E) in traditional Pakistan - The role and practice of Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation as processes of Education based empowerment interventions in traditionally hierarchical contexts of Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Advisor: Mokhtar Bouba - Assistant Professor and Co-Chair, ISLM. <a href="mailto:Mokhtar.bouba@sit.edu">Mokhtar.bouba@sit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Researcher: Aamer Shams Candidate MA Sustainable Development, PIM-75 +1-802-258-8164 <a href="mailto:Aamer.shams@mail.sit.edu">Aamer.shams@mail.sit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Purpose of Study:
   a. You are being asked to take part in a research study. Before you decide to participate in this study, it is important you understand why the research is being done and what it shall involve. Please read the following information carefully. Kindly ask the researcher if there is anything that requires further elaboration or if you need further information.
   b. **SIGNING THIS CONSENT FORM IS IN NO MANNER A COMMITMENT/CONTRACT THAT OBLIGATES PARTICIPATION. YOU SHALL HAVE THE RIGHT TO WITHDRAW YOUR PARTICIPATION, REVOKE STATEMENTS, OR ASK CONFIRMATION OF SHARED INFORMATION AT ANY TIME BEFORE FINAL PRESENTATION OF THE RESEARCH. CONFIRMED DATE OF THE FINAL PRESENTATION SHALL BE COMMUNICATED PROMPTLY AS RESEARCHER IS MADE AWARE OF IT.**
   c. This research aims to explore various interpretations and practises of Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) in the context of educational empowerment interventions in Pakistan, from the perspective of different stakeholders involved in these projects.
   d. This research as part of researcher’s academics, utilizes an inductive research methodology wherein it allows open-ended research questions to contribute in the formation of knowledge that shall facilitate developing a deeper understanding of PM&E in the aforementioned context.
   e. Through this research, the researcher hopes to contribute towards building a deeper understanding and sensitivity of PM&E in an endeavour to improve the effectiveness of the process in educational interventions implemented in Pakistan.

3. Procedures:
   a. Interviews:
      i. You shall be asked to share your insights, perceptions and experiences with Monitoring and Evaluation in three conversation-style interviews. Brief overview of these interviews is as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conversation 1: Introductions</th>
<th>Conversation 2: Your insights</th>
<th>Conversation 3: Thank you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration: 30 minutes</td>
<td>Duration: 60 minutes</td>
<td>Duration: 30 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   b. Survey Questionnaire:
      i. You may be asked to answer questions on a survey questionnaire. Answering questions is voluntary and you may choose not to answer particular questions. This questionnaire shall not require you to share your name, your organization/project’s name.
4. Risks and Harm:
   a. This study and its procedures shall not expose participants to any harm, physical or otherwise.
   b. The procedures may trigger some emotional stress, which can be shared with the researcher at any time throughout the conversations in confidence.

5. Confidentiality:
   a. Every effort shall be made by the researcher to preserve your confidentiality.
   b. Data (insights, reflections, experiences, surveys, transcripts) collected from you shall remain in the personal possession of the researcher, stored on a password protected device.
   c. This data shall not be shared with any institute, organization, government agency or individual, including SIT Graduate Institute at any stage.
   d. The researcher shall personally compile and share information from this data and present it in a capstone paper and a seminar at SIT Graduate Institute, latter in August 2017.
   e. This information shall not contain or imply any unique personal identifiers and shall always be represented in gender-neutral terms.
   f. Upon successful completion of the capstone and presentation, all data shall be deleted from records within 7 days.

6. Contact Information:
   a. If you have questions at any time about this study, or you experience adverse effects as the result of participating in this study, you may contact the researcher whose contact information is provided in section 1(c) of this form.
   b. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, or if problems arise as a result of your participation in this research, which you do not feel comfortable discussing with the researcher, please contact the SIT’s Institutional Review Board at irb@sit.edu

7. Voluntary Participation:
   a. Your participation in this study is voluntary. It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part in this study.
   b. After you sign this document, you shall continue to remain free to withdraw at any time, as elaborated in section 2(b) of this form.
   c. Withdrawing from this study shall not affect the relationship you have, if any, with the researcher.

8. CONSENT
   Please type a YES/NO response after the statements below. A “YES” response indicates that you understand the statement and are at least 18 years of age and you voluntarily agree to participate. If you respond “NO”, your response to this study shall not be used.

   a. I have read the 2 pages of this document.
   b. I have had the opportunity to ask questions about presented information that was not clear to me.
   c. I understand the provided information and my rights as a research participant.
   d. I understand my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving reason and without any cost.
   e. I voluntarily agree to take part in this study.
Appendix B: Urdu version of the Consent Letter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mokhtar Bouhe</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Mokhtar.Bouhe@sit.edu">Mokhtar.Bouhe@sit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aamer Shams</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Aamer.Shami@sit.edu">Aamer.Shami@sit.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+1-802-258-8154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

اس شمولیت رسماتی قائم

کیا کوئی تحقیقی یا تریاف کی دھمکی دی گئی ہے یا کیا کوئی تحقیقی قائم کا لہذا ہے کہ وہ یا یا یا یا

کامیاب ہے؟ یا کیا کوئی تحقیقی یا تریاف کی دھمکی دی گئی ہے یا کیا کوئی تحقیقی قائم کا لہذا ہے کہ وہ یا یا یا یا

کامیاب ہے؟
3 - چارچوب

آپ کے کمیل بھٹکیا بولنے والے کے سطح پر ایک تحقیق، اسٹوڈینٹ آپ کے موضوعات سے اچھی طرح سے بات کرتے ہیں۔ آپ کے کمیل بھٹکیا بولنے والے کے سطح پر ایک تحقیق، اسٹوڈینٹ آپ کے موضوعات سے اچھی طرح سے بات کرتے ہیں۔

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>موضوعات</th>
<th>آپ کے کمیل بھٹکیا بولنے والے</th>
<th>اسٹوڈینٹ آپ کے موضوعات سے اچھی طرح سے بات کرتے ہیں</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>مذکوری 30</td>
<td>30 میٹر</td>
<td>30 میٹر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>مذکوری 31</td>
<td>31 میٹر</td>
<td>31 میٹر</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 - نظر اور نظرین کی امکانات:

یہ دیکھنا ہے کہ چارچوب کی بجائے ایک چارچوب کی تحقیق کی طرح ایک نظر اور نظرین کی امکانات ہیں۔ اس نظر اور نظرین کی امکانات کے واقع مقام کے لیے ایک چارچوب کی تحقیق کی طرح ایک نظر اور نظرین کی امکانات ہیں۔

5 - چارچوب:

آپ کے کمیل بھٹکیا بولنے والے کے سطح پر ایک تحقیق، اسٹوڈینٹ آپ کے موضوعات سے اچھی طرح سے بات کرتے ہیں۔ اسٹوڈینٹ آپ کے موضوعات سے اچھی طرح سے بات کرتے ہیں۔

5 - چارچوب:

آپ کے کمیل بھٹکیا بولنے والے کے سطح پر ایک تحقیق، اسٹوڈینٹ آپ کے موضوعات سے اچھی طرح سے بات کرتے ہیں۔ اسٹوڈینٹ آپ کے موضوعات سے اچھی طرح سے بات کرتے ہیں۔
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SIT’s Institutional Review Board at srb@sit.edu

- Exploratory Analysis:

As observed, the lack of involvement in decision-making processes can create a gap in understanding project outcomes. The evaluation of these mechanisms can lead to better insights into the effectiveness of participatory M&E.

- Interactive Strategies:

Interactive strategies help in engaging stakeholders at different levels. The use of participatory methods ensures that all voices are heard, leading to more inclusive and effective decision-making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Identify stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Establish participatory mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evaluate outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Conclusion:

The integration of participatory M&E in hierarchical contexts can significantly enhance accountability and transparency. It is essential to continuously assess and adapt these strategies to ensure their effectiveness.
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Appendix C: English version of the Questionnaire

The Dynamics of Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) in traditional Pakistan

QUESTIONNAIRE

Special Instructions:
- This questionnaire is voluntary. You may decide not to answer particular questions.
- Please be truthful with your responses.
- Your personal identity WILL NOT BE SHARED.
- Kindly review your consent letter before responding to this questionnaire.

1. Where in Pakistan is your Organization/Project/Program situated: (select all that apply)
   a. Islamabad
   b. Quetta
   c. Lahore
   d. Peshawar

2. What is your role in the Nonprofit / program / project:
   a. CEO / CFO / COO
   b. Senior Manager / Project Manager / Principal
   c. Internal Evaluator
   d. Field Staff
   e. Parent of participating Student(s)

3. What in your understanding is M&E:
   a. A process designed to judge program/project process against initial plans
   b. To investigate shortcomings and room for improvement
   c. To see the impact of the program/project
   d. All of the above.
   e. Other: ____________________________

4. Choose one of the following that in your opinion defines an Evaluator:
   a. A Judge
   b. An Inspector
   c. An Observer
   d. An Explorer

5. Who defines the M&E process in your organization/project/program:
   a. The Organization (including CEO, Managers and Field Staff)
   b. The Evaluators (internal or External)
   c. The Donor Agency/Partner
   d. The Participant community (including Students, Parents, Schools)
   e. All of the above.

6. Where does the funding for the M&E process come from?
   a. The Organization
   b. The Donor Agency/Partner

If you have questions, please contact the researcher, Aamer Shams on:
Aamer.shams@mail.sit.edu, or +1-602-258-9154
The Dynamics of Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) in traditional Pakistan.

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

7. Who conducts evaluations in your organization/project/program:
   a. Internal Management staff
   b. The Donor Agency/Partner
   c. External Evaluators
   d. The Participants and Community
   e. Internal Evaluators

8. What tools of M&E have you experienced/used most?
   a. Surveys (on paper or online)
   b. Interviews (in person or on phone/Skype)
   c. Focus group discussions
   d. All of the Above
   e. Other: ____________________________

9. To what extent do you feel the M&E process or the Evaluators did not allow you to share more about your experiences:
   a. Never
   b. Sometimes
   c. Often
   d. Always

10. In the M&E of a project/program whose insights do you think are more important? (choose all that apply)
    a. The Donor Agency/Partner
    b. The CEO and NGO Management
    c. The Field staff
    d. The Participants and Community
    e. All of the above

11. In your experiences with M&E, how many times were you intimidated by the M&E process?
    a. Never
    b. Sometimes
    c. Often
    d. Always

12. How often do you feel your position in the organization/project/program influenced your participation in the M&E process?
    a. Never
    b. Sometimes
    c. Often
    d. Always

If you have questions, please contact the researcher, Aamer Shams on:
Aamer.shams@email.ist.edu or +1-803-259-8164
The Dynamics of Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) in traditional Pakistan

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

13. In your experiences with M&E whose insights are captured most in the process?
   a. The Participants and Community
   b. The CEO and NGO Management
   c. The Donor Agency/Partner
   d. All of the above

14. In your opinion, to what extent does the M&E process share information that is based on actual impact/performance of the program/project in the field?
   a. Never based on actual
   b. Sometimes based on actual
   c. Often based on actual
   d. Always based on actual

15. Would you say the M&E process shares information that is exaggerated (like marketing) or is it more reality based?
   a. Somewhat exaggerated
   b. Somewhat reality based
   c. Neutral
   d. Always exaggerated
   e. Always reality based

16. What is your understanding of the main purpose of the M&E process?
   a. To enable the organization to showcase their efficient and effective program/project implementation to secure grants in the future
   b. To record program/project’s performance
   c. To discover ways to improve the program/project’s performance and impact
   d. All of the above

17. Would you like to contribute further in this research by participating in an interview (one on one)?
   a. Yes
   b. No

Thank you for your truthful responses. Although your personal information (name, gender, organization’s name) will not be shared, your responses will help generating a deeper understanding of the Participatory M&E process in the context of Educational programs/projects in Pakistan. If you would like the researcher to share the findings of this research with you, please send personal email. Alternatively, you may contact him by phone. Your further inactions with the researcher regarding this research shall be kept confidential at all times.

Thank you for your insights, time and your sincere contribution!

Sincerely,
Aamer Shams
Candidate: Masters in Sustainable Development
SIT Graduate Institute, VT, USA

If you have questions, please contact the researcher, Aamer Shams on:
Aamer.shams@sit.sit.edu, or +1 802 258 8164
Appendix D: Urdu version of the Questionnaire

1. آپ کا انتخاب ہے؟
   - ہیڈکوارٹر
   - ڈیپارٹمنٹ
   - گروپ
   - ڈیوٹی ڈائریکٹر
   - ڈائریکٹر
   - ڈائریکٹر آف مارکتینگ
   - ڈائریکٹر آف سروسز
   - ڈائریکٹر آف ہائور

2. آپ کا مlahاژ کی کیفیت کی ہے؟
   - اہم
   - متوسط
   - ایمبینس
   - اہم

3. آپ کا انٹرنیٹ کی کیفیت کی ہے؟
   - اہم
   - متوسط
   - ایمبینس
   - اہم

4. آپ کا ہیڈکوارٹر کے مطابق مقامی سیالاں دیکھنے کا سعمالہ ہے؟
   - ہیڈکوارٹر
   - ڈیپارٹمنٹ
   - گروپ
   - ڈیوٹی ڈائریکٹر
   - ڈائریکٹر
   - ڈائریکٹر آف مارکتینگ
   - ڈائریکٹر آف سروسز
   - ڈائریکٹر آف ہائور

---

Aamer.shams@mail.sit.edu
+1-802-258-8164
شکل 4.1: اکثریت مردم نے تجربے کے ذریعے آگے بڑھنے کی کوشش کی۔

6. آپ کی اپنی کورنگنہ کا کسی اور کردار/روہنگی کا کوئی تاثیر نہیں ہے؟
7. آپ کی اپنی کورنگنہ کا کسی اور حاضر ہے؟
8. آپ کی اپنی کورنگنہ کا کسی اور علماء/علماء کا کوئی تاثیر نہیں ہے?

6. آپ کی اپنی کورنگنہ کا کسی اور کردار/روہنگی کا کوئی تاثیر نہیں ہے?
7. آپ کی اپنی کورنگنہ کا کسی اور مشوره/مشورے کا کوئی تاثیر نہیں ہے?
8. آپ کی اپنی کورنگنہ کا کسی اور علماء/علماء کا کوئی تاثیر نہیں ہے?

9. آپ کی اپنی کورنگنہ کا کسی اور کردار/روہنگی کا کوئی تاثیر نہیں ہے?
10. آپ کی اپنی کورنگنہ کا کسی اور علماء/علماء کا کوئی تاثیر نہیں ہے?

ارکائیز: کمپیوٹر سائنس اور تعمیراتی انجینئرینگ کے مرکزی تحقیق

Aamer.shamsi@mail.sfu.edu
+1-802-235-8154
EXPLORING PARTICIPATORY M&E IN HIERARCHICAL CONTEXTS

Amer chaps@gmail.com
+1-602-258-3164
شوہری معاشرے میں انسانی تربیت کے ذریعہ انسانی انسان کے ذریعہ

سوائے عام
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آپ کی قدرت ہے کہ آپ افراد کے ذریعہ انسانی انسان کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے اس قدر کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ کی طاقت کے ذریعہ
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## Annexure

### Table 20: Location of Organization/Community and Understanding of M&E Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>A process designed to judge program/project process against initial plans</th>
<th>To investigate shortcomings and room for improvement</th>
<th>To see the impact of the program/project</th>
<th>All of the above</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where in Pakistan is your Organization/Project/Program situated?</td>
<td>Islamabad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quetta</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lahore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peshawar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table 21: Location of Organization/Community; Positionality of Participant and Interpretation of an Evaluator Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your role in the nonprofit program/project?</th>
<th>Choose one of the following that in your opinion defines an Evaluator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO/CFO/COO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where in Pakistan is your Organization /Project/Program situated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamabad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quetta</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahore</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Manager/Project Manager/Principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where in Pakistan is your Organization /Project/Program situated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamabad</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quetta</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahore</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peshawar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Evaluator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where in Pakistan is your Organization /Project/Program situated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamabad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahore</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peshawar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where in Pakistan is your Organization /Project/Program situated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamabad</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahore</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peshawar</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent of participating Student(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where in Pakistan is your Organization /Project/Program situated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamabad</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quetta</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahore</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peshawar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 22: Location and Stakeholders defining M&E in Organization/Community Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where in Pakistan</th>
<th>Organization (including CEO, Managers and Field Staff)</th>
<th>Evaluators (Internal or External)</th>
<th>Donor Agency/Partner</th>
<th>Participant community (including Students, Parents, Schools)</th>
<th>All of the above</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Islamabad</td>
<td>Count 9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quetta</td>
<td>Count 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahore</td>
<td>Count 7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peshawar</td>
<td>Count 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Count 26</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages and totals are based on respondents.

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.

### Table 23: Positionality of Participant and Interpretation of an Evaluator Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your role in the nonprofit/program/project?</th>
<th>Choose one of the following that in your opinion defines an Evaluator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO/CFO/COO</td>
<td>A Judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Manager/Project Manager/Principal</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Evaluator</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent of participating Student(s)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 24: Positionality of Participant and Frequency of Feeling Intimidated by the Process Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role in the nonprofit/program/project</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO/CFO/COO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Manager/Project Manager/Principal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Evaluator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent of participating Student(s)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 25: Location of Participant and M&E Tools Experienced/Employed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Surveys (on paper or online)</th>
<th>Interviews (in person or on phone/Skype)</th>
<th>Focus group discussions</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Islamabad</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quetta</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lahore</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peshawar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages and totals are based on respondents.

a. Dichotomy group tabulated at value 1.
Table 26: Positionality of the Participant and Frequency of M&E Process Not Allowing them to share more about their Experiences Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your role in the nonprofit/program/project?</th>
<th>CEO/CFO/COO</th>
<th>Senior Manager/Project Manager/Principal</th>
<th>Internal Evaluator</th>
<th>Field Staff</th>
<th>Parent of participating Student(s)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you feel the M&amp;E process or the Evaluators did not allow you to share more about your experiences?</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO/CFO/COO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Manager/Project Manager/Principal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Evaluator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent of participating Student(s)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 27: Participants role in organization/program/project and interpretation of the nature of information

M&E renders Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your role in the nonprofit/program/project?</th>
<th>In your opinion, to what extent does the M&amp;E process share information that is based on actual impact/performance of the program/project in the field?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never based on actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO/CFO/COO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Manager/Project Manager/Principal</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Evaluator</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent of participating Student(s)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28: Participants role in the organization/program/project and interpretation of the information M&E renders as being exaggerated Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your role in the nonprofit/program/project?</th>
<th>Somewhat exaggerated</th>
<th>Somewhat reality based</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Always exaggerated</th>
<th>Always reality based</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEO/CFO/COO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Manager/Project Manager/Principal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Evaluator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent of participating Student(s)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you say the M&E process shares information that is exaggerated (like marketing) or is it more reality based?