# Comparing QuIP with thirty other approaches to impact evaluation

| Approach and brief description.[1] | How the QuIP compares. |
|---|---|
| Appreciative enquiry<br>A participatory approach that focuses on existing strengths rather than deficiencies - evaluation users identify instances of good practice and ways of increasing their frequency. | The QuIP is more narrowly focused on generating credible impact evidence; it is neutral in eliciting accounts of positive and negative drivers of change. |
| Beneficiary assessment<br>An approach that assesses the value of an intervention as perceived by the (intended) beneficiaries, aiming to give voice to their priorities and concerns. | The QuIP is a form of beneficiary assessment, but offering more specific and detailed guidelines. |
| Case study<br>A research design that focuses on understanding a unit (person, site or project) in its context, which can use a combination of qualitative and quantitative data. | The QuIP is based on multiple individual/household case studies, often clustered within purposively selected sites, which may also constitute cases (hence a 'small n' rather than a single case approach). |
| Causal link modelling<br>This approach integrates design and monitoring to support adaptive management of projects. Managers identify the processes required to achieve desired results and then observe whether they take place along a logic model or results framework. | Elaborating a logic model as part of the theory of change for an intervention is a necessary step for attribution coding and hence using the QuIP to confirm if an intervention is achieving what was intended. The QuIP also focuses on the final causal link from outcomes to impact on intended beneficiaries which is also often the hardest to assess. |
| Collaborative Outcomes Reporting<br>An approach that builds on contribution analysis, adding expert review and community review of the assembled evidence and conclusions. | The QuIP can be viewed as one way of collecting outcome data for COR. It shares a strong emphasis on multi-stakeholder engagement to validate, interpret and explore potential implications of findings. |
| Contribution Analysis<br>An approach for assessing the evidence of claims that an intervention has contributed to observed outcomes and impacts. | The QuIP is a form of contribution analysis, but offering more specific and detailed guidelines. |
| Cost Benefit Analysis<br>A general approach for comparing incremental benefits and costs of an action compared to one or more alternatives. Key steps include: identification of option; scoping of key stakeholders and the impact on them of each option over time; quantification key impacts; valuation and aggregation of costs and benefits. | The QuIP can contribute to identification and scoping of positive and negative causal effects of an intervention on intended beneficiaries and other stakeholders. To go beyond this requires combining it with more precise quantification and valuation of effects based on supplementary data collection, modelling and simulation. |

---

[1] Much of the text in this column is mostly taken from http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/approaches

| | |
|---|---|
| **Critical System Heuristics**<br>An approach used to surface, elaborate, and critically consider boundary judgments, that is, the ways in which people or groups decide what is relevant to the system of interest. | The QuIP can also expose differences in how implementers and intended beneficiaries perceive a project, including its scope. But it is not so explicitly designed to challenge stakeholders' motivation, power, worldview or legitimacy. |
| **Democratic Evaluation**<br>An approach where the aim of the evaluation is to serve the whole community. [The evaluator is accountable to, works with and seeks legitimacy from the members or citizens of this community]. | While it enables intended beneficiaries of a project to share their experience with those controlling it the QuIP operates under the authority of the commissioner, rather than insisting on a broader and more democratic mandate. |
| **Developmental Evaluation**<br>An approach for evaluations of adaptive and emergent interventions, such as social change initiatives or projects operating in complex and uncertain environments. | The QuIP shares an emphasis on generating timely evidence in a complex and rapidly changing contexts, but is more narrowly specified. |
| **Difference-in-Difference Evaluation**<br>Estimates change in specified impact variables for a 'treatment' and 'control' group before and after an intervention, then uses statistical methods (e.g. propensity score matching on observable characteristics) to mitigate selection bias arising from non-random placement of cases into the two groups. | The QuIP attributes causal effects on the basis of self-reported narrative attribution of a 'treatment' group rather than through statistical inference based on comparison to a 'control' group or analysis of variable exposure to an intervention. This limits scope for quantifying the magnitude of impact, but also eliminates the need for a comparison group. |
| **Empowerment Evaluation**<br>Provides communities with the tools and knowledge that allows them to monitor and evaluate their own performance. | The core purpose of the QuIP is to provide better evidence to the commissioner, rather than to enable intended beneficiaries to conduct self-evaluation. |
| **Goal free evaluation**<br>Open interviews and observation that seeks to understand respondents' lived experience holistically and the meaning they give to it, and to view specific interventions in this light. | Blindfolding is utilised as part of the QuIP to facilitate similarly open ended and exploratory enquiry, within specified domains of respondents' lived experience. QuIP also goes further in then systematically comparing these findings with the theory of change behind a given intervention. |
| **Horizontal Evaluation**<br>An approach that combines self-assessment by local participants and external review by peers [typically through a three day joint workshop]. | The QuIP is not specifically oriented towards locally led activities, and aims to generate evidence that is more credible to a remote audience through a more tightly structured approach to data collection and analysis. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Innovation history<br>A way to jointly develop an agreed narrative of how an innovation was developed, including key contributors and processes, to inform future innovation efforts.<br>Institutional histories<br>An approach for creating a narrative that records key points about how institutional arrangements have evolved over time and have created and contributed to more effective ways to achieve project goals. | The QuIP offers more specific and detailed guidelines for building a narrative account of the impact of a specified intervention, innovation or institutional change. It places more emphasis on intended beneficiaries' own accounts of this, alongside other drivers of change. A potential limitation of the QuIP is that by focusing primarily on the intervening agency and intended beneficiaries the QuIP does not normally engage with network analysis as fully as these approaches. |
| Most Significant Change<br>Collects and analyses personal accounts of change, includes processes for learning about what changes are most valued by individuals and groups. | The QuIP shares an emphasis on eliciting respondents' own account of causal processes, but without needing to prioritise the most significant. It relies on more formal thematic analysis of causal stories, rather than on a collaborative process of ordering these. |
| Outcome Harvesting<br>Collects evidence of what has changed and works backwards to determine whether and how an intervention has contributed to these changes. Useful in complex situations when project aims or even specific activities cannot be clearly specified. | The QuIP is a form of outcome harvesting, but offering more specific and detailed guidelines. |
| Outcome Mapping<br>Unpacks an initiative's theory of change, provides a framework to collect data on intermediate changes that lead to transformative change, and allows for the plausible assessment of the initiative's contribution to results. | Elaborating a detailed theory of change for an intervention is a necessary step for attribution coding and hence for using the QuIP to confirm it an intervention is achieving what was intended and by the expected mechanisms. The use of journals by different stakeholders to monitor changes could be incorporated into the QuIP as an additional source of narrative evidence of drivers of change. |
| Participatory Assessment of Development<br>Rather than focusing on one intervention or agency PADev simultaneously addresses all interventions in a locality in relation to its overall development. This is done through a structured set of focus group discussions organised through a mediated community workshop [insert reference]. | PADev and QuIP are both based on narrative accounts of drivers of change that try to avoid focusing to avoid framing those accounts by reference to a specific activity. PADev does this by taking a community wide perspective, while QuIP does it through blindfolding. Both, but PADev especially thereby produce findings that are potentially relevant to all organisations working in the locality. |
| Participatory Impact Assessment for Learning and Accountability<br>PIALA is an eclectic approach to gathering data about a development intervention using multiple methods using a range of participatory methods, and also involves intended beneficiaries themselves in analysis and interpretation of data using the 'Sensemaker' proprietary software developed by the company Cognitive Edge. | The two approaches share the goal of generating both formative/exploratory and summative/confirmatory data at the same time, and QuIP could be incorporated into PIALA as a form of data collection. However, it adopts a more transparent and precise approach to deriving and presenting data from primary sources. Representatives of intended beneficiaries can be invited to interpret findings, but are not directly involved in generating them. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Participatory Evaluation<br>A range of approaches that engage stakeholders (especially intended beneficiaries) in conducting the evaluation and/or making decisions about the evaluation. (This also incorporates Participatory Rural Appraisal, and Participatory Learning and Action. | QuIP aims to give voice to a sample of intended beneficiaries, and to involve them in interpreting and using findings; but does not to involve them directly in data analysis or management of the evaluation. It primarily responds to demand for upward accountability. |
| Positive Deviance<br>Involves intended evaluation users in identifying 'outliers' – those with exceptionally good outcomes - and understanding how they have achieved these. | Where changes in key outcome variables is being monitored across a population then QuIP sample selection and data collection can be deliberately biased towards positive deviants. But it can equally be used to illuminate drivers of change more widely across the population, or indeed to focus on gaining a better understanding of reasons for negative deviance. |
| Process Tracing<br>In its simplest form this is a case study method that starts by identifying a single discrete outcome, such as a murder. It provides guidelines for systematically identifying a package of necessary and sufficient causes to explain the outcome and rejecting alternative packages that could also explain it. | QuIP also seeks evidence to confirm or challenge a theory of change (that an intervention was a necessary condition for impact on an intended beneficiary). QuIP does this for multiple cases and possible impacts, and like process tracing each additional piece of evidence adds to or weakens the commissioners' prior belief in the theory. Though not quantified this can be described as a form of 'Bayesian updating'. |
| Qualitative Comparative Analysis<br>A statistical approach for identifying packages of necessary and sufficient conditions for achieving a desired outcome across a sample of case studies. | If each QuIP interview is treated as a discrete case, then together they form a 'small n' sample that could possibly be utilised for QCA to analyse multiple factors contributing to specified outcomes, including the contribution of a specified intervention. |
| Randomised Controlled Trials<br>An approach that produces an estimate of the mean net impact of an intervention by comparing results between a randomly assigned control group and experimental group or groups. | QuIP is based on a fundamentally different approach to impact attribution that avoids the need to compare intended beneficiaries with a control group. However, if sufficient resources are available then there is potential complementarity between the two approaches: e.g. QuIP to elucidate causal mechanisms, unanticipated consequences and reasons for heterogeneity of impact; an RCT to quantify the average impact across a selected population. |
| Realist Evaluation<br>Realist evaluation is a form of theory-driven evaluation but is distinguished by its philosophical emphasis on the how interventions influence particular decisions (or not). (It also emphasises complexity, heterogeneity and the benefits of combining different methods of data collection and analysis). | The QuIP can be viewed as a narrower and more detailed approach to realist evaluation, or as one method that can be incorporated into realist evaluation. It shares the emphasis on complexity, an appreciation of the benefits from using mixed methods, an interest in 'what works, for whom and in what context', and an appreciation that change occurs through multiple pathways (or what realists call context-mechanism-outcome configurations). |

| | |
|---|---|
| Social Return on Investment<br>Identifies a broad range of social outcomes (not only the direct outcomes for the intended beneficiaries of an intervention) then quantified and values these, and compares them with the investment cost. Hence this is one form of social cost benefit analysis. | The QuIP can help to identify wider outcomes of an investment, and data collection can be extended to possible indirect and unintended beneficiaries (and losers) from an investment. It rarely enables impact to be quantified or valued, so needs be combined with other data (or modelling based on estimated values) to inform a full social cost benefit analysis. |
| Success Case Method<br>The approach is based on comparing detailed evidence about two case studies: the most successful and least successful subjects of an intervention. It is a useful for understanding what enhances or impedes impact. | The QuIP also relies on comparative case studies, which may be individuals, households, organisations and/or clusters of them. Where data is available for key impact indicators then it is possible to select more and less successful cases (i.e. positive or negative deviants) for analysis. |
| Utilisation-Focused Evaluation<br>Starts with the intended uses of the evaluation by its primary intended users to guide decisions about how an evaluation should be conducted. | The starting point of a QuIP should also be dialogue with the commissioner over what additional evidence they need and why. This should then influence details of design, including timing, sample size and selection, scope, thematic analysis and data presentation. But a QuIP can also generate useful evidence about an intervention that was not anticipated or solicited for a predetermined purpose. |