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Summary

This paper explores the validity of a contextual approach to development research, the Temporal Logic Model. It does so, through the presentation of a case study evaluation of internally displaced people assistance in Colombia. The analysis concentrates on the relationships existing among the political and technical dimensions of traditional close-system development research methods, such as the Logical Framework, as opposed to open-system tools such as the Temporal Logic Model. The discussion of their epistemological roots leads to analyse an important and so far missed link of how those political and technical dimension may produce antithetical approaches to development research and practice.

Introduction

Despite the challenge increasingly posed by innovative and participatory approaches to evaluation practices there is still little innovation at the level of multilateral agencies. The Logical Framework Approach is seldom overcome and the room for real participation is restricted by factors that relate to power control over processes and innovation, as well as to the inner lack of institutional and technical capacities and skills amongst agency personnel.

The paper presents some reflections and findings from an evaluation process carried out for the World Food Programme in Colombia about their operation to assist internally displaced people. The evaluation was carried out in five different locations at the same time and closely worked with all the actors involved. The importance of the study lies in the first-time use of the Temporal Logic Model (TLM) in Colombia as an attempt to overcome the limitations of the Logical Framework Analysis, as well as the application of a case-study approach that draws from multiple sources of evidence to gather relevant information and data. The main methodological and empirical challenge of the evaluation was to triangulate methods in generating information for the TLM, including an asset matrix, focus groups, a short questionnaire and historical documents.

Within an overall reflection of the contrasts existing between open and closed systems of evaluation, this chapter reflects on the internal and external validity of using participatory appraisal and evaluation techniques, the political implications of their applications within multilateral agencies programmes and, finally, the usefulness of techniques derived from vulnerability studies in understanding the dynamics of internal displacement. The chapter does not pretend to illustrate how quantitative and qualitative methods could or should be combined, but rather is a case study demonstrating what can be reasonably attempted in the presence of a number of time, resource and security constraints.

Logical Framework Analysis: Technical limitations and political implications
Within multilateral agencies, two elements seem to inform the practice of evaluation of programmes and projects. The first is a need for control and analysis about what is done and, most often, about how financial resources are spent. The second is the adoption of techniques borrowed by the array of applied social sciences, according to practical feasibility and political convenience.

Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) is the most widespread methodology for project design and planning.1 As Kothari (2000) underlines, LFA is most often cited as an assessment tool, in spite of the fact that it was created as a planning tool. In fact, one way of seeing LFA is as the technical response the “community” of multilateral agencies gave to a “crisis of legitimacy” that has been affecting international development over the past 10 years (Satterthwaite, 2001; Cohen, 2001). Within this search for demonstrable results, LFA2 was created as a tool to provide a clear definition of the objective of a project (BID, 1997; NORAD, 1990) and, in turn, provide the technical parameters against which donors, implementing teams, stakeholders and also directly involved people could reach an agreement in order to evaluate outputs and outcome.

It is interesting to take a brief look to the way the literature produced by the planning or monitoring and evaluation (M&E) units of international co-operation agencies (see for example, Banco Mundial, 1996; BID, 1997; PNUD, 1997) presents the origins of LFA. This literature stresses that LFA is a response to the lack of clear objectives in development projects, meaning the lack of a logical chain linking different levels of results (mostly, outputs to outcomes) but, at the meantime, it also pragmatically skips over the well-known critiques moved to LFA about its rigidity.

Many of the critiques applied to LFA originate within a stream of research dedicated to the exploration of alternative methods and practices to conduct development research and projects implementation. The most important contribution comes from Chambers (1983) and the scholars who followed his initial input (Chambers and Longhurst, 1986; Longhurst, Chambers and Swift, 1986). These authors were, in turn, inspired to a large extent by Paul Freire’s (1985) radical reading of the need for a new approach to learning and management of power relationships within the development arena.

The ideological basis of this school of thought is a critique of “official” development (Chambers, 1995; Pasteur, 2000; Rist, 1997). Although this paper shares some of the main political arguments elaborated by the above-mentioned positions, it also points out the need to back them with more technical arguments. The following sections will focus on two key aspects of LFA -- its vertical and horizontal logic -- and explore the relationship existing between the technical and political aspects involved in the widespread use of LFA.

**The vertical logic of Logical Framework Analysis**

As illustrated in Figure 1, the vertical logic of the LFA organises what appears in the “description” column on the left, where the different implementation stages of a project (activity, outputs, objective and goal) link logistically together according to an ‘IF = THEN’ mechanism. As well as serving as a pictorial way to represent how the different project component should be carried out, the LFA vertical logic has a number of other more or less hidden implications.

---

1 To get an idea of the spread of the LFA it is sufficient to realise a simple internet search produces an output of more then 285,000 hits. Among them the web pages of the multilateral agencies working in the field of international co-operation, many international and national NGOs, research centres, institutes and universities researching and teaching in the broad area of development.

2 First explored by a team lead by Leon Rosenberg (den Heyer, 2001).
As den Heyer (2001) points out, LFA is part of a hard system approach to planning that mirrors social engineering. This involves an epistemological approach to development research inherited from what used to be defined as the "hard disciplines" of physics, biology, and mathematics (Wallerstein, ed, 1996). Once LFA is framed into this broader context, the above ‘IF = THEN’ mechanism can be seen as closely mirroring the main principle of the positivist epistemology: the explanation of natural and social life according to a series of cause-effect relationship. An interesting parallel can therefore be established between the search for laws regulating the natural world, which inspired Newtonian physics, as well as later on the social sciences of the eighteen century on the one hand and, on the other hand, those planning approaches that inherit this rather mechanical vision of they way social dynamics work. In this sense, the LFA’s logframe or planning matrix (as well as the whole methodology) can be defined as a deterministic tool or at least one having potentially deterministic effects.

In addition to this deterministic impact, the legitimation of the narrative of the LFA, that is, the chain that links activities to outcomes through outputs, reflects the power of those that create the project narrative itself. Speech, in this context, becomes the vehicle for imposing a logic or “meta-discourse” upon competing others and to legitimate (on the basis of power) the “correct” interpretation of things (Foucault, 1988) and, in planning terms, the "right" way according to which reality should be modified.

**The horizontal logic of Logical Framework Analysis**

Inasmuch as the vertical logic tends to dominate the use of LFA, projects teams, local government and multilateral agencies technocrats do not pay too much attention to the horizontal logic and to the key role it plays in shaping the destiny of projects (Des Gasper, 1997). This has serious implications for the chances of projects achieving their objectives.³

As Figure 1 shows, in order to move up from one level to another within the vertical logic of LFA (say from a group of activities to an output) a series of assumptions have to hold true over time. Technically, this means that the vertical logic based on the ‘IF= THEN’ equation is validated only when other conditions (the assumptions) are also fulfilled. The resulting equation is a sequence of ‘IF+AND=THEN’ prepositions that have to be satisfied if projects have to get at least slightly close to the achievement of their objectives.

**INSERT Figure 1. Logical Framework Planning Matrix**

One implication of this rather technical and technocratic observation, is that those who plan with the LFA generally accumulate uncertainty as implementation time unfolds. This is generated by the variation in the social dynamic of the context and in the broader environment. To quote White (2002, 6): “[a]ttribution becomes harder as we move along the causal chain. It is easy to attribute responsibility for delivering inputs, and usually for carrying out activities, although external factors may play a part”.

**The Temporal Logic Model: Potentials and limitations**

³ Through a review of more than 200 projects of international co-operation, Oakley (1998) showed that the majority of projects planned and implemented on the basis of LFA very seldom reached even the output stage. This was also the reason why they were rarely able to demonstrate that they got there through M&E.
The Temporal Logic Model (TLM) was designed as an attempt to create a planning and evaluation tool based on the principles of “soft system” thinking, as opposed to hard system approaches exemplified by the Logical Framework:

“Simply defined the TLM is an evaluation tool which provides an overall pictorial representation of the program components and tracks design modifications during implementation” (den Heyer, 2001, 11).

This model was first developed by a group of researchers working at the Evaluation Unit of the International Research Development Centre (IRDC) in Ottawa, Canada. One of its principal aims is to help stakeholders to understand what they are doing (or planning to do) in terms of something that is part of a broader dynamic framed within a wider open system.

In her critique of the LFA, which is grounded in the greater usefulness of open system approaches to planning, den Heyer points out that a programme is an ongoing dialogue with complex external factors. Programme design “should change as the program adapts to a sometimes-chaotic environment, unintended effects emerge, or program assumptions are undermined. From this perspective, program management becomes more of an art form than a science” (den Heyer, 2001:2).

Figure 2 below illustrates the logical statements of the model and (divided in columns A and B), the two main logical chains that conform it. The model has four lines of horizontal logic and one vertical. The horizontal logic is made by the programme context row, programme design row, modification row and subsequent programme design rows. The vertical logic unfolds through a series of stages. The combination of the two logics is meant to convey the programme story.

Within TLM, each stage can be seen as a snapshot of the planning-implementation-monitoring-evaluation process taken over a period of time. The ‘IF =THEN’ statement typical of logic chain models such as LFA is here enriched and modified by an additional sentence that works like a verification question previous to the beginning of each stage of the programme: “If these are the contextual issues the programme needs to respond to, then this is the intervention designed to address it. But if the programme needs to be adapted, then this would be the modified design” (den Heyer, 2001:10). According to the author’s vision:

“The Temporal Logic Model reads like a newspaper. It is comprised of two stages, with the second stage repeated throughout the program. The first stage embodies the original program vision and is referred to as the program planning stage. The program planning stage is followed by a series of monitoring stages, which record changes over the span of the program” (den Heyer, 2001: 11).

INSERT DIAGRAM 2. Logical statements within the temporal logic model

The political implication of using TLM consists of a clear rejection of the centrality of the concept of objective planning and evaluation. This, in turn, also becomes a rejection of the “meta-discourse” that we identified above as one of the main features of LFA. TLM can be seen as an applied tool that rests on an epistemological reflection, shared by participatory M&E authors (Estrella 2000; Kothari, 2000; Kumar, 1993; Pasteur and Blauert, 2000), which rejects the notion that external actors can meaningfully evaluate the actions of others.

---

4 See the original IDRC paper at their website: [www.idrc.ca](http://www.idrc.ca)

5 It can be argued that there also is a third logic within TML that originates from the semantic and conceptual interaction between the first two.
Its epistemological roots can be traced back to the distinction between closed and open systems made by Ludwig von Bertalanffy and, more broadly, to the first elaborations of the system theory dating back to the 1930s when a deep crisis affects the scientific paradigm that had dominated science since the early XVIII century. As Emery (1974) explains, open systems have no fixed rules or laws that regulate their functioning. The positive outcome of any adapting process depends on the correspondent specific context and relationship a system has with its environment. Therefore, adaptation is a process that has to be repeated and re-validated every time that each organism or system attempts to adapt to some kind of change. The TLM transposes these same principles to the logic of planning.

The main limitation of the TLM approach, however, is that it mostly works as a logic container or organiser. Its different boxes literally need to be “filled up” with concrete/”real” information and data collected through research methods. This prompts the following questions:

- Is there any specific method of data collection that fits TLM better than others?
- To what extent can the blending of informal-formal methods of data collection and analysis mirror the informal-formal dynamic present within the TLM in its vertical and horizontal logic?

In the section below we consider the use of a qualitative and participatory case study approach to evaluation that was used to “fill” the TLM boxes in the context of a World Food Programme operation in Colombia.

**Applying the case study methodology to TLM: An evaluation of the World Food Programme’s Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation**

Over the past 15 years according to 1999 data, more than 1.5 million Colombians have been displaced from their homes and had their livelihoods disrupted due to political violence. Just in the three year period 1996-1999, conflict created 750,000 internally displaced people (WFP, 1999: 2).

The World Food Programme’s Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation (PRRO 6139) arose out of this context, with the following long-term objectives:

1. “To cover food deficits in order to restore human capacity and enhance social cohesion.
2. To support initial settlements, resettlement, and return to facilitate reintegration into society.
3. To mitigate the impact of future crises” (WFP, 1999, 8).

The immediate objectives of the PRRO were:
1. “To contribute to household food security of IDP’s during initial stages of settlement.
2. To support and promote local initiatives through food-for-work activities, in order to:
   a. Promote productive capacity, increasing opportunities for self-reliance.
   b. Rehabilitate basic social and economic infrastructure.
   c. Increase capacity building of local authorities and IDP communities through training, increased participation in PRRO activities, organization and advocacy.

---

6 It is here important to note that the LFA matrix was realised only a later stage, when implementation had already begun.
3. To promote the improvement of the diets of IDP pre-school and primary schoolchildren, and increase the coverage and attendance of these children in day-care centres and schools.

4. To improve food security of the most vulnerable groups-children, the malnourished and expectant mothers, and specific ethnic groups” (WFP, 1999: 8).

The evaluation team for this project classified the questions to be answered according to three categories target group, external and social dynamic, and management of the project (see Table 1).

Table 1. Classification of areas of interests from the TORs according to three units of analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Environment and Social Dynamic</th>
<th>Project Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People’s Resources</td>
<td>Management of Risks and Assumptions</td>
<td>Targeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets and capacities</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land ownership</td>
<td>Loss or stealing of food</td>
<td>Quantitative Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target group interaction with PRRO</td>
<td>Armed actors influence on PRRO</td>
<td>M&amp;E System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality and Relevance of Food For Work</td>
<td>Role and effectiveness of contingency aid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Human Resources Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity, quality and acceptance of rations</td>
<td>Issues of security and personnel protection</td>
<td>Operational challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability and Development</td>
<td>Mobilisation and capacity to provide resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment with women</td>
<td>Co-ordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food security</td>
<td>Relationships with Partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs of non-displaced communities</td>
<td>Colombian Government Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fieldwork research was a substantially ‘extractive’ process, oriented to the collection of relevant information from different actors. Given the above-mentioned time constraints, it would have been very difficult to create a “deep” process of co-operative evaluation with fieldwork stages of 4 to 5 days per setting. Nonetheless, considering an ideal scale of participation, such as Arnstein’s (1969)7, the work realised (see Table 2) could score on level 4 and, perhaps, level 5. People’s opinions and views were highly valued and participants were both strongly encouraged highly self-motivated.

Table 2. Arnstein’s ladder of participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Manipulation</th>
<th>Consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Manipulation</td>
<td>People are given a voice, but no power to ensure their views are heeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>These levels assume a passive audience, which is given information which may be partial or constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>People are told what is going to happen, is happening or has happened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>People are given a voice, but no power to ensure their views are heeded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Cited in IEG (2001).
Level 5 Involvement
People's views have some influence, but traditional power holders still make the decisions.

Level 6 Partnership
People can begin to negotiate with traditional power holders, including agreeing roles, responsibilities and levels of control.

Level 7 Delegated power
Some power is delegated.

Level 8 Citizen control
Full delegation of all decision-making and action.

The evaluation methodology allowed for a sequencing of methods to accommodate analysis of secondary and historical sources along with a process of institutional engagement which allowed a broad range of stakeholders to participate in the design of the research and the preparation of the research outputs (see Table 3).

### Table 3. Case study methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Stage</th>
<th>Research Approach</th>
<th>Researched Variables</th>
<th>Involved Actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Preliminary   | Analysis of secondary and "historical" sources | • Project design  
• Project objectives  
• Targeting  
• Inputs  
• Strategy  
• Context  
• Actors and institutional dynamics | Consultancy |
| 2. Workshop for the Analysis of parts 1, 2 and 3 of Country Office Report + | • Brainstorm  
○ SWOT matrix  
○ Strategy analysis  
• LMT baseline | • History of the project and of the process of its implementation according to Country Office, Associates and national and international involved NGOs | PRRO  
ICBF  
RSS  
PMA  
Associates  
Consultancy |
| 3. LTM baseline | • Stakeholders analysis | • Analysis of the variables to be researched during fieldwork | Consultancy, WFP and local actors and stakeholders |
| 4. Specific fieldwork working plan preparation | | | |
| 5. Meeting with representatives of PRRO | • Brainstorm | • Discussion of the objectives of the evaluation | PRRO, WFP and consultancy teams |
| 6. Meeting with thematic UN-IDP group | • Key issues analysis | | |
| 7. Fieldwork | See fieldwork details in Table 4 below | | |
| 8. Data processing and analysis | • Interviews transcription  
• Focal groups results and notes systematisation  
• Survey coding and processing  
• Triangulation of evidence | • ALL | Consultancy |
| 9. Fieldwork report preparation | • Qualitative analysis of contents and evidence  
• Basic quantitative analysis of survey results | • ALL | Consultancy |
| 10. Preliminary report preparation | | • ALL | Consultancy |
| 11. Preliminary report presentation | • Power Point | • ALL | PRRO, WFP, and consultancy teams |
The case study research activity itself was carried out in five geographical departments in the north, north-west and west of the country. Three fieldwork teams were formed, each comprising one member of the evaluation team acting as fieldwork co-ordinator, one PRRO member from the national level and one regional co-ordinator. For security reasons a tight schedule was organised and followed by fieldwork teams.

In order to maximise the external validity and reliability of the findings (Marsland 1998), the teams applied the same pattern and sequence of research tools in each of the case studies (see Table 4). The first step was an introductory transect walk through the settlement aimed at establishing some degree of trust with the internally-displaced people in that site and to acquaint the research teams with the environment.

Research activities also included semi-structured interviews with community leaders about their main concerns. These interviews were conducted on the basis of a topic guide and were designed to gather basic data on availability of public services, the history of displacement of the community, the main coping and income generation strategies and to elicit local perceptions of the programme. The use of an asset matrix was thought to be a valuable tool in order to show to WFP the importance of starting to tackle the issue not only from a point of view of humanitarian assistance, but to link it up with strategies oriented towards the at least partial reestablishment of people’s livelihood.

### Table 4. Fieldwork Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Researched variables</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence building</td>
<td>Introductory transect through the settlement or the places where targeted IDP’s are living</td>
<td>Environment, Spatial identification of key and critical areas</td>
<td>Target group people, Country Office team members, Governmental agencies team members, Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General matrix of settlement</td>
<td>Semi-structures interview with thematic guide</td>
<td>Basic services, Access to public services, Population profile, Income generation, Main post-displacement activities</td>
<td>Leaders, Committees, People with special functions or tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of community (or communities)</td>
<td>Focal groups</td>
<td>Target groups perception of the implementation of the project over their situation with relation to key aspects</td>
<td>Target groups, PRRO partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic workshops with “target groups”</td>
<td>SWOT, Venn diagram, Assets Matrix, Problem tree</td>
<td>The 20 questions proposed by the TORs, categorised according to their closeness to the following units of analysis: a. Target groups</td>
<td>Target groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

8 The case study locations were Medellín (Antioquia), Cartagena, Carmen de Bolívar and San Basilio de Palenque (Bolívar), Quibdó (Chocó), Montería (Córdoba) and Sincelejo (Sucre).

9 In each workshop target groups were asked to evaluate the state of a range of assets at various points in time: Before displacement occurred, during the three months after displacement when the government provided official assistance rations, during the period (variable for group to group) that separated the end of the emergency provision and the arrival of the assistance brought by PRRO, and after the arrival of PRRO assistance.
Thematic workshop with local PRRO personnel, NGOs and stakeholders. Metaplan

- Environment and social dynamic
- Management of project

b. Environment and social dynamic
c. Management of project

Interviews
Structured and semi-structured questionnaire

PRRO and evaluation teams to interview 20 IP’s en each of the settlements or localities visited for each of the 5 fieldworks

In-depth interviews with community leaders
Semi-structured interviews with thematic guide

Evaluation and WFP team

Interviews with local representatives of PRRO partners
Semi-structured interviews with thematic guide

Evaluation team

The same exercise was conducted with local PRRO personnel, NGOs and stakeholders and was repeated with national teams in order to triangulate the results of both and provide better feedback to the TLM on the issued signalled as important to WFP by the TORs. Table 5 presents the very simple matrix that was used to compare results. It was essentially a content analysis, with similar matrices produced for each case study (one for each of the three main units of analysis). These were later summarised in a comparison matrix to elicit trends in the results of the evaluation.

Table 5. Results comparison matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Target groups</th>
<th>External actors and social dynamic</th>
<th>Technical aspects of PRRO</th>
<th>Implications and elements for conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focal analysis with target groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venn diagram</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observational guide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conceptual, technical and political reflections on the TLM approach

The application of a case study method to TLM for the WFP evaluation allowed the team to reflect on den Heyer’s (2001) observations regarding the model. The evaluation confirmed in the first instance her assertion that the TLM is complementary to the “social learning process”. In other words, by recording programme context changes and interim assessment, the TLM encourages reflection on past and present activities. This can become quickly problematic, however, if project management is uninterested in
information that diverts attention from immediately understandable and quantitatively measurable. TLM can also run up against time constraints imposed by project cycles, which prevent exploratory engagement in social learning with local stakeholders.

Den Heyer’s second conclusion is that the TLM does not have a specified time-frame in contrast to standard logic models (such as LFA) that cannot move beyond the first phase of a programme to incorporate a long-term vision. The WFP evaluation suggested that this may not be the case. Certainly, standard logic models are rigid and often cumbersome to handle because of their embedded logic, yet from a technical point of view one could use the LFA matrix as a step within an unfolding story as the TLM does. Indeed, the German agency GTZ recommends that this should be done, with particular attention to the flexibility aspect. That is, according to GTZ, LFA should be reformulated whenever the internal or external changes make the actual matrix outdated. This is actually what TLM does on its horizontal logic (Germann and Gohl, 1996).

According to den Heyer, the TLM provides the flexibility to be responsive to programme context, thus facilitating the articulation between micro-theory (as an expression of the internal workings of a programme) and macro-theory (as representation of the external changes affecting the programme and more often than not unpredicted by the management). This possibly is the strongest virtue of the TLM, which is also strictly connected with the use of the ‘goal’ concept as a central one rather than that of ‘objective’. However, over a short time span, such as in a “quick and dirty” external evaluation, or in the case of a serious lack of evidence about how the context has affected the programme, this virtue somehow remains only a theoretical statement. In any case, targeted groups or stakeholders do not always have the knowledge or willingness to provide feedback about the changes in context.

Den Heyer’s last point is that the TLM focuses on monitoring and recording the process over input-output monitoring. This is one of the in-built working principles of the TLM logic and there is no doubt that the TLM helps people to establish some distance from the result-oriented managerialist logic of traditional approaches to M&E. However, in light of the empirical work carried out with WFP Operation, it seems that this focus on process may get lost because the TLM is not an empirical research tool, but a logic-based tool. It organises factors logically in a way that combines a soft-system approach (on its vertical logic), with a more formal system approach (on its multi-layered horizontal logic). The lack of physical space to record process information on a single chart creates a practical obstacle to conducting the recording and analytical work necessary for process evaluation with local stakeholders.

Conclusion

There are three conclusions that can be drawn from this paper. First, that adoption of different planning and evaluation approaches it is not a politically neutral field of debate, as in general are neither science nor the production of knowledge.

The paper illustrates how the orthodox application of LFA planning is an applied case of the closed-system approach of multilateral agencies. Through the formulation of goals and objectives it determines the likelihood of a powerful political steering of the project as the main tool for development orientation.

The second conclusion of the case study shows that there is no guarantee that qualitative or participatory research is ‘empowering’ or ‘non-extractive’. On the other hand, it also shows that there are no strong arguments to affirm that quantitative research methods structurally prevent either empowerment or participant construction of knowledge.
Finally, the case study shows that the most relevant question is not a methodological one, but has to do with the combination of politics, policy and techniques within development research. In this sense, the distinction between contextual and non-contextual approaches seems to be a much more promissory horizon for research than the rather technical discussion on the quantitative – qualitative divide.

In contextual approaches and methods, the main interest is the understanding of the relationship existing among different individual and groups, their social, cultural natural and economic environments and the process of auto-organisation that take place through the dynamic changes affecting the system (whereas a system in this case is any social process made by structures and relations). On the contrary non-contextual approaches and methods are mainly interested in the determination of the behaviour of a set of variables but not in the systemic relationships existing among those and other aspects of reality.

According to the above, the third conclusion is that the question of how contextual and non-contextual approaches relates to different epistemological perspectives has been so far overlooked within development research, inasmuch specific questions such as those which follow have no yet been answered with the necessary clarity and support of empirical evidence.

How different epistemologies reflect in the practice of planning and evaluation?
How theirs political implications and visions of reality determine the use of qualitative and quantitative methods?

---

10 In the correct use of the LFA planning matrix or master plan there always is one and just one objective per project, because the conceptual argument behind it says that you can only aim at one thing per time. In the case of the presence of multiple objectives, the matrix splits in as much similar matrix as is the number of the objectives. In this case the formal definition of what is being carried out changes from project to programme and, accordingly should change the resources and time available to implement it. The relationship objective(s) to goal can be a one to one relationship in the case of a single objective, whereas it becomes a many to one relationship in the case of a programme with multiple objectives. The matrix shows in this case as a cascade.
**Figure 2 - Logical Statements within the Temporal Logic Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Planning Stage</strong></td>
<td><strong>Program Context</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vertical Logic Statement:</strong> If these are the contextual issues that the program needs to respond to...</td>
<td>Horizontal Logic Statement 1: 'IF these are the issues for this population, THEN we hope to create this change based on these premises.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Inputs / Resources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Horizontal Logic Statement 2: 'IF this is what we want to realistically accomplish, and these are our resources to carry out these activities, and we will ensure long-term results with these strategies, THEN we will have this effect, which will be illustrated through these variables.'</strong></td>
<td><strong>Instalment One: (Add date here)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Period</strong></td>
<td>Horizontal Logic Statement 3: 'IF the program context has changed in this manner and the interim assessment have shown this, THEN the program should (or should not) adapt in this manner.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Inputs / Resources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But IF the program needs to be adapted...</td>
<td>Horizontal Logic Statement 4: 'IF this is what we want to realistically accomplish, and these are our resources to carry out these activities, and we will ensure long-term results with these strategies, THEN we will have this effect, which will be illustrated through these variables.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...THEN this would be the modified design&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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