

A Synthesis of Communication products and practices

NRSP R8492 Final Technical Report Annex C4

Mini case study analysis document

**Pat Norrish
June 2006**

This document is an output from a project funded by the UK Department for International Development (DFID) for the benefit of developing countries. The views expressed are not necessarily those of DFID.

Framework for Analysis

Pat Norrish 2005

**Distributed to the synthesis project researchers for comment
In response the East Africa team developed a SWOC framework for analysis
which is attached.**

1 What follows is very much a first go at what you might do in a preliminary analysis. Please let me know whether you can make it work and if it then tells us anything in relation to the main research question:

Have the communication strategies put in place by NRSP and other RNRR Programmes made a difference and, if so, what difference, why, and what can we learn from them about improving research outcomes?

2 As far as the analysis goes I am not so much worried about how we do it as about what we are trying to get from it.

3 We have been using outcome mapping as the basis of our questioning of the programme managers so logically one step in the analysis has to be linked to outcomes and the graduated progress markers where we have them.

4 The outcome mapping question doesn't seem to have been explicitly addressed in some interviews (see point 6 where I have tried to pull out as far as possible what we have. I think we can make an assumption that PMs were looking for a change in practice by project leaders and their teams, and presumably in attitudes towards communication; ultimately they were hoping this would lead to better uptake and positive affect livelihoods.

So we need to look at the data from the project teams (the researchers) and ask:

- What evidence do we have to support that assumption?
- What kinds of changes can we see?
- Are there any general patterns emerging?
- To what extent are any changes attributable to what programmes have put in place?
-

5 We are also asking outcome mapping questions of the project teams. I assume that these will relate to what they think stakeholders might want to do with project communication products or how they might want to benefit from project communication activities. However, if attitudes are only slowly changing then it may be that project teams expectations are still focused on what they as researchers want the stakeholders to do.

6 Whichever is the case you will need to see what kinds of expectations they have and then ask the same questions as in 3 above about the data which you are collecting from the stakeholders This approach should hold good for both stakeholder groups A and B:

- What evidence do we have to support that assumption?
- What kinds of changes can we see?
- Are there any general patterns emerging?
- To what extent are any changes attributable to what programmes have put in place

7 below are some of the expectations of PMs based on interviews:

LPP
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What did you expect to see happen Communication and Knowledge Management to raise awareness in messenger institutions and farmers • What would you like to have seen, Greater appreciation of the power and influence of communication (institutional and empowerment products) and information and awareness leading to adoption and adaptations viz becoming knowledge. • What would you love to have seen? More impact on livelihoods. Alas more time is required for these KN and communication approaches to influence poor farming communities
CPP
Idea is to (i) create regional links (ii) encourage networking and learning from each other,
FMSP
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achieving sustainability • Increasing the demand for the products and getting people to take it on beyond the life of the project
CPHP
Partners for innovation is trying to stimulate genuine partnerships with more diverse players. If diverse partnerships – technology moved into commercial arena with this modal – desire is to stimulate this

Using a SWOC analysis to highlight lessons learned in Communication of Research

The Ugandan and Bangladesh teams decided to go ahead with a SWOC analysis as they were familiar with the technique. They developed the table below to guide them. The first table is a reminder about resources and project activities etc. which need to be checked on. The following table demonstrates what might be looked for in terms of the SWOC, whilst understanding that it will be different in each project.

Resources provided by programme	Project activities and programme requirements	Research Process	Communication Outputs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Budget ▪ Facilities ▪ Mentoring/support ▪ Training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pre-project stakeholder meeting ▪ Stakeholder analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Research approach ▪ Communication plan/strategy ▪ Participation of end-users in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Accessibility of materials/activities ▪ Type of

NRSP R8492 FTR Annex C4: Framework for analysis

Resources provided by programme	Project activities and programme requirements	Research Process	Communication Outputs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expertise (within project team) ▪ Access to communication specialist/expertise ▪ Support network ▪ Guidelines and formats 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Understanding the communications context ▪ M and E plan ▪ External reviews ▪ Project reviews ▪ Institutional analysis/histories 	<p>communication process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Participation by other stakeholders ▪ Scaling-out strategy 	<p>materials produced for different stakeholder groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Communication models

Strengths			
<p>Is the budget adequate to carry out all communication activities, including M&E?</p> <p>Was there sufficient communication expertise in the team?</p> <p>Where mentoring or support services available?</p> <p>Was there access to guidelines on how to design/implement a communication plan/strategy?</p>	<p>Was a thorough stakeholder, institutional or other analysis conducted?</p> <p>Is a communication M&E system/plan in place?</p> <p>Were regular reviews conducted to assess effectiveness/ impact of communication activities?</p>	<p>Does the research approach take account of different stakeholders needs?</p> <p>Does the approach involve participation / collaboration?</p> <p>Does it include a strategy for scaling-out/sustainability?</p> <p>Are end-users sufficiently engaged in the process?</p> <p>Are the objectives of communication defined?</p>	<p>Have end users been fully engaged in the process of developing communication outputs?</p> <p>Have the needs of indirect beneficiaries been considered?</p> <p>Has the process for communication been evaluated and not only the products?</p> <p>Is there a strategy for distribution, multiplication, updating in place?</p>
Weaknesses			
<p>What resources were inadequate?</p> <p>What caused this inadequacy?</p> <p>Was the training and mentoring support available of sufficient quality/appropriateness?</p>			
Opportunities			
<p>Were any co-funding mechanisms considered?</p> <p>Were there networks available for sourcing information/support/guidance?</p>			

NRSP R8492 FTR Annex C4: Framework for analysis

Were there learning opportunities with other projects/programmes?			
Threats			
No policy uptake			
No institutionalising			
Lack of further budget			