

## Annexes



**Authors:** Louise Scheibel Smed, John Rand, Carsten Schwensen, Munguzwe Hichaambwa.

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

Sida Evaluation 2024:1d

Commissioned by Sida, Evaluation Unit.

**Published by:** Sida, 2026

**Copyright:** Sida and the authors

**Date of final report:** 2025-08-26

**Art.no.:** Sida62846en

urn:nbn:se:sida-62846en

This publication can be downloaded/ordered from [www.Sida.se/publications](http://www.Sida.se/publications)

# Annex 1: Data Reliability and Credibility

Table 1. Source criticism of data collected as part of Strategic Evaluation of Sida's Work with Poverty

Criteria	The Strategic Evaluation of Sida's Work with Poverty
Usability	Impact assessment of the SAP II
Credibility	Independent evaluation report conducted by external consultants
Results level	Impact and outcome data
Data quality	High quality
Quantitative/ qualitative evidence	Both quantitative and qualitative data collected. Since no baseline data were available from the targeted communities, the quantitative survey had to rely on recall questions. In order to mitigate bias, comparison with control groups and different matchings have been applied. Qualitative interviews, outcome/impact harvesting workshops, focus group discussions and visits to mines have been conducted in both treatment communities.
Reliability	Highly reliable
Conclusion	Highly usable since it addresses impact level and mitigates bias as much as possible without a baseline.

Table 2. Source criticism of Sida Decentralised Evaluation, Strengthened Accountability Programme II, 2022

Criteria	Sida Decentralised Evaluation, Strengthened Accountability Programme II, 2022
Usability	Primarily outcome level
Credibility	Independent evaluation report conducted by external consultants
Results level	Outcome and output level
Data quality	High data quality
Quantitative/ qualitative evidence	Solid qualitative data collection with 50 FGDs/interviews and an e-questionnaire with 14 implementing partners and resource organisation.
Reliability	Highly reliable
Conclusion	Sufficient confidence but without the impact level the usability has shortcomings.

Table 3. End of Project Evaluation Report for the Diakonia, Zambia Country Office, Strengthened Accountability Programme (2014-2017)

Criteria	End of Project Evaluation Report for the Diakonia, Zambia Country Office, Strengthened Accountability Programme (2014-2017)
Usability	Only outcome and output level, very limited on impact.
Credibility	Independent evaluation report conducted by external consultants
Results level	Outcome and output level
Data quality	Sufficient data quality
Quantitative/ qualitative evidence	Based on primarily qualitative data (around 50 interviews). Results only cover North-Western Province of Zambia where SAP I was implemented. SAP II covers 13 districts in North-western, Copperbelt, Luapula & Southern Provinces
Reliability	Reliable
Conclusion	Sufficient confidence but with shortcomings in usability and less convincing data quality but suitable as background/context background.

High confidence	Sufficient confidence	Limited confidence	Insufficient evidence
Based on usability, addresses impact level, identified bias mitigated, good data quality	Confidence reduced by shortcomings to usability, indications of bias not mitigated, less convincing data quality	Low confidence due to lack of usability, clear bias not mitigated, poor data quality	Insufficient evidence to support contribution judgement

# Annex 2: Overview of Survey Questions and Training of Enumerators

Table 4. Questions repeated from ZDHS, RALS and the Baseline from 2020	
Question	Source
Would you say that the money that you earn is more than what your (husband/wife/partner) DHS earns, less than what he/she earns, or about the same?	
How many of the following animals does this household own?	DHS*
Does any member of this household own agricultural land?	DHS
How much hectares, acres, or lima of agricultural land do members of this household own?	DHS
Are there any trees growing in your field?	RALS*
What is the main tree species in your field?	RALS*
How many trees did you initially plant in this field?	RALS*
In what year did you plant most of the trees in this field?	RALS*
How many trees are currently in your field?	RALS*
Did this household produce any fruits (orchard or other) and/or vegetables during last year?	RALS*
Who usually decides how the money you earn will be used: you, your (husband/wife/partner), or you and your (husband/wife/partner) jointly?	DHS
Who usually makes decision about major household purchases?	DHS
Married women should not own land or any property.	Baseline
It is always important to prioritise educating a boy child over a girl child	Baseline
Men are better leaders than women	Baseline
What is the main source of drinking water for members of your household?	DHS
How long does it take to get there, wait, get water, and come back?	DHS
What kind of toilet facility do members of your household usually use?	DHS
Where is this toilet facility located?	DHS
What health services do you have in the community?	Reply options from DHS
Observe main material of the floor of the dwelling	DHS
Observe main material of the roof of the dwelling	DHS
Observe main material of the exterior walls of the dwelling	DHS
Does any member of this household have a bank account?	DHS
Do you own a mobile phone?	DHS
Do you own a bicycle?	DHS
Do you own a motorcycle or motor scooter?	DHS
Does your household have electricity?	DHS
Please tell me if these apply to your relationship with your husband/partner:	DHS
Did your husband/partner ever:	DHS
Did your husband/partner do any of the following things to you?	DHS

Thinking about what you yourself have experienced among the different things we have DHS been talking about, have you ever tried to seek help?

From whom have you sought help?

DHS

\*Slightly adapted

Table 5. “What the questions ask about”		
Question group	Codes	Questions concerns what
Identifier	IDF	A mix of things
Demography	A	Respondent
Income, employment, economics	B, C1, C2	Household
Livestock	C3 (some questions)	Households
	C3 (some other questions)	Females in household
Land	C4 (some questions)	Households
	C4 (some other questions)	Who in household (M/F)
Trees	C5	Some question ask for ownership by “household” others by “you”.
Gender attitudes	D	Respondent (only females?)
WASH	E	Household
Health	F	Community
Assets	G	Household / dwelling
GBV	H	Respondent (only females)

Field data collectors were selected from a pool of well qualified and the experienced data collectors were rigorously trained. They consisted of three men and three women, all with prior experience from implementing national large-scale surveys. The selected enumerators had gone through similar training sessions before, but pre-survey training was still conducted to ensure that all enumerators were up to date on the key principles to be applied for the data collection. The training session was developed before going to the field in a one-day session. It was mainly conducted in English using both the paper and electronic versions of the questionnaire for an easy conceptualisation of the flow of questions. The training modules are reflected in Table 48.

The training session included:

- A clarification of the **sample strategy** and how the enumerators should go about selecting the respondents for the questionnaire. This built on the sample strategy described in 3.2.
- Clear guidelines for **ethical considerations**. Ethical conduct in field data collection, especially informed consent and confidentiality, formed part of the training process. Due attention was paid to ensure that participants consent to participating and it was emphasised towards enumerators that respondents can opt out anytime during the questionnaire if they feel uncomfortable continuing. Data was discarded when this occurred.



- A thorough training in the questionnaire to ensure that all enumerators understood each question and the purpose of asking the question was conducted. A specific emphasis was put on **translating each question from English to Tonga**. Rather than translating the full questionnaire, each question during training was translated into Tonga to have a common translated version for all participants.
- A training module was held on **GBV issues** and how to handle these sensitive questions. What was covered was that GBV is violence directed against a person because of that person's gender or violence that affects persons of a particular gender disproportionately. It can be physical, verbal (including hate speech), psychological, sexual, or socio-economic. When asking GBV questions, ensure the survivor's trust and empowerment. All in all, the questioning should be guided by respect for the survivor's choices, wishes, rights, and dignity. The female respondents were again asked for their consent and informed of their possibility to opt out of the interview in case they felt discomfort.
- Enumerators were trained to collect data using the **KoBoCollect mobile app**. While this was the planned data collection tool, the only facility that had power had been rented out on a long-term basis and tablets could therefore not be charged. Therefore, enumerators had to revert to using paper questionnaires.
- Due attention to **quality assurance** was included in the training for enumerators. The question-by-question instruction in the questionnaire, its purpose and implementation were supplemented with instruction and practice in the research protocols related to how to handle each question in the local language and coding.
- A **pre-test** was conducted on the first day so that the enumerators could get a practical feel of the questionnaire. It was at this point it was realised the need to shift to printed questionnaires. Respondents during the pre-test were not sampled in the actual survey. Modifications in the questionnaire and a shift to paper questionnaires was implemented before the actual survey began the following day.

Table 6. Training overview			
Time		Activity	
08:30	to 09:00	Introductions	
09:00	to 09:15	Review of Survey Staff Roles and Duties	
09:15	to 09:30	Review of Ethics and Rules of Conducting Interviews	
09:30	to 09:45	Review of Basic Interviewing Guidelines	
09:45	to 10:00	Basic Survey Definitions	
10:00	to 10:30	Break	
10:30	to 11:00	Sampling Strategy	
11:00	to 13:00	Review of Questionnaire	
13:00	to 14:00	Lunch	
14:00	to 15:00	Review of Questionnaire	
15:00	to 17:00	Review of Questionnaire focused on gender issues and gender-based violence	

**Testing of data collection instrument and instrument consistency.** As indicated above, prior to deployment of the data collection instrument, the instrument was thoroughly tested to ensure that quality control checks were functioning as intended. Instruments were also pre-tested in the programme area on the first day among non-sampled households, followed by a review meeting. This resulted in re-phrasing of some questions, adjustment of vocabulary, or response options to better fit the local context and the more severe decision to shift to paper version of conducting the survey.

**Use of Paper Questionnaire Instead of computer aided personal interviewing (CAPI).** While it was anticipated that tablets would be used for CAPI and an appropriate applicant was developed and loaded on the devices it was discovered upon arrival that the only available lodging facility had no power. Therefore, it was decided to revert to using paper questionnaires. Although this delayed the process a bit it did not affect the process much as:

- Paper questionnaires for use were quickly printed;
- The supervisor developed an SPSS based data entry template.
- All the enumerators worked with paper questionnaires before migrating to CAPI; and
- The supervisor also entered the completed and checked questionnaires into SPSS.

This additional workload on the supervisor meant that he had less time for actual field data collection supervision, and the team was trying to complete the activity within the budgeted time.

- A. **The planned quality assurance measures** were supposed to be largely based on computer-based tools. This however had to be altered upon changing to paper-based interviewing. However, data quality checks were still conducted during the data collection process to reduce sources of bias and obtain valid and accurate responses from participants, a series of rigorous quality assurance methods for quantitative data.



- B. The supervisor checked all completed instruments before entering them in SPSS. Those with issues were returned to the concerned enumerators for rectification. Additionally, the supervisor ran data quality checks in SPSS as he entered the data. The syntax (analysis programme) applied later was developed into data cleaning syntaxes. Furthermore, debriefings were held each day after data collection in order to share experiences and if possible, improve the following day.
- C. After data collection, further review of the collected data to identify any errors or inconsistencies was undertaken. Data cleaning started as soon as data was submitted and entered from the field to check for obvious outlying entries and advise the field teams accordingly. At the end of data collection, the supervisor cleaned the data using SPSS and later analysed using the same programme. Data cleaning codes were developed to essentially check for data outliers and possible wayward connections between variables. This was conducted based on the understanding that the data quality checks above are bound to miss some errors which will be captured by SPSS. The corrections made to the data was SPSS code based, and both the original and revised data files as well as the cleaning code were saved.

The main constraints faced during the survey were:

- Lack of power such that tablets could not be used.
- Lack of refuelling facilities. The team had to travel to Kalomo for refuelling the vehicle which was very time consuming.
- Extremely hilly terrain making movements between and within communities difficult and more time consuming.

**Annex 1:** Data Reliability and Credibility

**Annex 2:** Overview of Survey Questions and Training of Enumerators



SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Visiting address: Rissneleden 110, 174 57 Sundbyberg

Postal address: Box 2025, SE-174 02 Sundbyberg, Sweden

Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

E-mail: [sida@sida.se](mailto:sida@sida.se) Web: [sida.se/en](http://sida.se/en)

