

“Monitoring & Evaluation: a continuous cycle of learning?”

A qualitative research on the meanings stakeholders assign to Monitoring, Evaluation & Learning and what consequences these meanings have on implementation.



Name: Juliette van Rooij
Student number: 5677688
Study: Master Sportbeleid & Sportmanagement
Supervisor: Marianne Dortants
Second reader: Michel van Slobbe
Date: 2017-06-23

Preface

It is great to have completed my Master thesis, within the interesting area of sport for development. I have gained much knowledge and also discovered an area where I would like to work in the future. Therefore, I would like to thank ISA for the opportunity to join their wonderful team.

During the process of writing, there were some people that contributed to complete this thesis. Therefore, I would like to thank my supervisors, Marianne Dortants and Ward Karssemeijer, for their guidance and support during this period. I also want to thank all the respondents, without their cooperation I would not have been able to conduct this research. Furthermore, I would like to thank my parents and friends for their love and support.

Last but not least, I would like to show special gratitude to my boyfriend during this graduation process. Tom, thank you for contributing valuable and encouraging advice, feedback on my work and your love.

I hope you enjoy reading this master thesis.

Juliette

's-Hertogenbosch, juni 2017

Summary

The field of sport for development (SfD) has grown extraordinarily in recent years, with a massive growth in the number of initiatives that use sport as a tool to have social impact. SfD initiatives have been criticised on the way that evidence has been produced and has been demonstrated as programme success. These critiques are mainly focused on the shortcoming of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems. Therefore, the SfD Vital power of sport programme is working on developing a new strategy towards M&E. This strategy is called Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) and focuses on continuous learning. Hence, one can say the SfD Vital power of sport programme moves from a traditional M&E strategy towards a MEL strategy. Due to this movement, this study use the term moving perspective, which refers to the underlying process during the transition from M&E to MEL. The aim of this study is to gather insights in the meanings stakeholders of the SfD Vital power of sport programme assign to the MEL strategy and what the consequences are regarding the implementation of MEL.

The goal of the SfD Vital power of sport programme is to move from M&E to MEL, but operates in an institutional context and depends on individual and organisational actors. Therefore, this study has been conducted by means of the institutional logics perspective. The institutional logics perspective assists in understanding individual and organisational behaviour in providing insights in different logics and which consequences link to changing logics in order to implement MEL, which focuses on continuous learning, successfully.

The available literature shows different explanations towards SfD. However, the SfD Vital power of sport programme focuses on the definition of using sport to exert a positive influence on social issues. In addition, this literature study lists the available literature on M&E. The available literature discusses different approaches towards M&E. However, it does not go in depth on the consequences of a changing or moving strategy within M&E systems. Moreover, the available literature is limited regarding the opinions and experiences towards M&E from the perspective of Southern actors. Therefore, this study focuses on all stakeholders of the SfD Vital power of sport programme, which includes Southern actors. Additionally, due to the institutional logic theory forming the theoretical framework, this study attempts to gain insights in the behaviour of stakeholders towards developing MEL influenced by the moving perspective. Hence, this research can support stakeholders in order to make the right decisions towards implementing new M&E strategies in SfD programmes.

This study has been conducted from an interpretative research point of view. The study has used different data collection methods: document analysis, participative observation and semi structured interviews. This research has conducted 13 interviews with stakeholders from the SfD Vital power of sport programme and focused on stakeholders from the Netherlands and Kenya. The observation notes are written down, interpreted and analysed. The interviews are recorded, transcribed and analysed. The analysis consisted of open, axial and selective coding.

The results show that the respondents see M&E as an important aspect of their work. They distinguish traditional M&E and MEL. The meanings they assign to those approaches concur with the available literature. On the one hand respondents mention a shift from traditional M&E towards MEL. On the other hand, they mention that MEL is being seen as a luxury and it will not replace M&E on the short term. Although some of them experience a shift, they also realise that moving from M&E towards MEL is a long-term process. The co-creation meeting can be seen as the starting point of this long-term process and as one of the underlying aspects of the moving perspective. In

addition, the respondents have mentioned several challenges and opportunities towards implementing the MEL strategy successfully.

According to the theoretical framework and the findings this study has defined two logics regarding M&E in the SfD Vital power of sport programme, which are the accountability logic and learning logic. The accountability logic is the dominant one and the learning logic is upcoming because of internal pressure. The institutional logics perspective assists in understanding individual and organisational behaviour in providing insights towards the two logics. Since the accountability logic has been described as a top down approach stakeholders have a passive attitude towards accountability and therefore the accountability logic. The opposite is true for the learning logic, because it is a bottom up approach and encourages input from the field. Even though the learning logic provides the space to deliver input, it has been found that stakeholders show a passive attitude towards M&E activities. Since the dominant logic has been embedded in the way of working for a long time, this attitude is not moved in one day and will be a lengthy process.

To conclude, the accountability logic and learning logic should exist side by side. However, as long as the accountability logic is dominant, the logics are conflicting with each other rather than complementing each other.

Finally, the researcher has three recommendations for the SfD Vital power of sport programme. The first recommendation encompasses the involvement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) in the movement from M&E to MEL. Secondly, the researcher recommends to implement an online platform in order to monitor, document and share data, knowledge and experiences. The third recommendation is to design an explanation video of MEL in order to spread the MEL message in order to communicate and share knowledge and experiences.

Contents

1.	INTRODUCTION	7
1.1	THE AIM OF THE STUDY	9
1.2	RESEARCH QUESTION	9
1.3	SOCIAL AND SCIENTIFIC RELEVANCE	10
1.4	REPORT STRUCTURE	10
2.	THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	11
2.1	INTRODUCTION	11
2.2	INSTITUTIONAL LOGICS PERSPECTIVE	11
2.3	MOVING PERSPECTIVE	12
2.4	LINK THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND STUDY	15
3.	LITERATURE REVIEW	18
3.1	SPORT FOR DEVELOPMENT	18
3.2	MONITORING AND EVALUATION	19
3.2.1	Monitoring and Evaluation approaches	23
3.2.2	Conceptual framework and evaluation framework	26
3.2.3	Tools	27
3.3	SUMMARY	27
4.	METHODOLOGY	29
4.1	METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH	29
4.2	PHILOSOPHICAL POSITION	29
4.3	METHODS	29
4.4	RESPONDENTS	30
4.5	ANALYSIS	31
4.6	THE ROLE OF THE RESEARCHER	32
4.7	RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY	33
5.	RESULTS	34
5.1	MONITORING & EVALUATION	34
5.1.1	Meaning M&E	34
5.1.2	Numbers	35
5.1.3	Beneficiaries	36
5.1.4	M&E versus MEL	37
5.2	CO CREATION MEETING	39
5.3	TOOLS	42
5.4	CONSEQUENCES	44
5.4.1	Challenges	44
5.4.2	Opportunities	47
5.5	SUMMARY	50
6.	DATA ANALYSIS	51
6.1	ACCOUNTABILITY LOGIC	51
6.2	LEARNING LOGIC	51
6.3	MOVING PERSPECTIVE	52
6.4	CONSEQUENCES	54
7.	CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS	56
7.1	CONCLUSIONS	56

7.2	DISCUSSION	59
7.3	RECOMMENDATIONS	60
8.	BIBLIOGRAPHY	61
9.	APPENDIX	67
9.1	TOPIC LIST	67
9.2	CODING TREE	68
9.3	CODING PROCESS	70
9.4	OBSERVATION NOTES	71
9.5	OVERVIEW PLATFORMS	72

1. Introduction

The field of sport for development (SfD) has grown extraordinarily in recent years, with a massive growth in the number of initiatives that use sport as a tool to have social impact (Harris & Adams, 2015). Nevertheless, after all those years of experiences in the SfD field, SfD initiatives have been criticised for the way that evidence has been produced (Harris & Adams, 2015). Moreover, the critics are focused on the way evidence is used to account for and demonstrate the apparent success of SfD initiatives (Harris & Adams, 2015). According to Coalter (2007), Coalter & Taylor (2010) and Pawson & Tilley (1997) much of this critique has emphasized shortcomings in methods of monitoring and evaluation (M&E), which supports a perceived vulnerable evidence base regarding what works, why and within which contexts. M&E strategies have been admitted in SfD programmes to improve them. In line with Kay (2012), Schulenkorf (2012) defines M&E as the key to continuous improvement of SfD initiatives. Moreover, the United Nations emphasise the importance of M&E. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP, 2009, p. 5) declares that "Without effective planning, monitoring and evaluation, it would be impossible to judge if work is going in the right direction, whether progress and success can be claimed, and how future efforts might be improved". Additionally, the UNDP (2009, p. 7) mentions that "programmes and projects with strong monitoring and evaluation components tend to stay on track".

This study zooms in on one specific SfD programme to find out how the M&E strategy within that particular partnership functions. This programme is named SfD Vital power of sport, which is a partnership between International Sports Alliance (ISA), KNVB WorldCoaches (KNVB) and Right To Play (RTP). Nelson Mandela (2000) once said: "Sport has the power to change the world, it has the power to inspire. It has the power to unite people in a way that little else does. It speaks to youth in a language they understand...". ISA, KNVB and RTP were inspired by Mandela's vision on sport. However, the Dutch partners are aware that this vision does not legitimise their SfD initiatives. They started a partnership in 2012 with over 100 local partners to invest in the power of sport by jointly implementing the Sport for Development programme 2012-2015. They all believe that the world has a lot to gain from sport. Sport and play are essential to the development of children and youth. They continued their SfD initiative in the SportforDevelopment.nl Vital power of sport 2016-2020 programme.

The SfD Vital power of sport programme consists of a multi-stakeholder process, which means that different actors from different organisations are involved in different contexts. The programme is internationally oriented. As mentioned before the programme partners, ISA, KNVB and RTP, work with local partners in the following countries: Egypt, Indonesia, Kenya, Mali, Mozambique, Palestinian Territories, South Africa and Surinam. Which means that, including the Netherlands, nine different contexts and cultures are involved. The Dutch partners are called 'Northern' actors and the local organisations in developing countries are named 'Southern' actors (van Eekeren, 2013). Moreover, the communities within those countries have cultural and contextual differences as well. Additionally, the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) is an important stakeholder as they support the programme financially. It is clear that the SfD Vital power of sport programme operates in a complex and dynamic field, which depends on diverse actors from different organisations working in distinctive contexts.

Despite this complex and dynamic field, the Dutch partners and the international stakeholders were able to develop a Theory of Change (ToC) within this programme. According to ISA, KNVB and RTP (2015) the ToC describes the process of change by outlining causal relations in the programme, i.e. between the outputs

(responsibilities), the long-term outcomes (conditions) and impact. The programme has implemented a M&E strategy in order to get to know if the ToC works and to account for the Dutch MFA. This can be seen as the traditional way of doing M&E (Kay, 2012). Traditional M&E will be further explained in the literature review. In addition, the Sfd Vital power of sport programme is working on developing a new strategy towards M&E, decided upon by the stakeholders in the Sfd partnership while implementing the 2016-2020 programme. The reason why the new strategy is needed is firstly to try and address the shortcomings of M&E systems. Secondly, to facilitate learning on local level in order to increase the impact of interventions. This new strategy is called monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL). Therefore, one can say the Sfd Vital power of sport programme moves from a traditional M&E strategy towards a MEL strategy. In other words, a process takes place. Therefore, the term moving perspective is used for the process during the transition from an M&E strategy to a MEL strategy. Although the Sfd Vital power of sport programme is working on developing a new strategy, the old and current strategy still applies at this time.

The moving perspective consists of a process in which stakeholders, both programme managers and implementers, provide each other continuous feedback on the way they believe MEL should be implemented. MEL implies that it is just about adding a learning approach to the current M&E strategy. However, it is more complex and the reason this study prefers using the term moving perspective. The term moving perspective is also used since it is not about a change from A to B, but about all underlying elements that move from a traditional M&E strategy towards a MEL strategy during the transition process. The goal of the development towards a MEL strategy is to create action learning based on the practices of the Sfd Vital power of sport programme. The action learning approach could provide additional insights on the sources of successes and failures the programmes encounter. By learning from previous successes and failures the interventions can be improved. This occurs by focussing more on observing, analysing, reflecting and acting by providing a toolbox that can be used to share the experiences. Sharing among partners, learning about your own and others' activities and experiences supports the improvement of the programme in the long run.

Although M&E presumably assists in improving programme development (Schulenkorf, 2012), in practice it does not work like that. M&E systems are designed by the organisational requirements of those commissioning it (Kay, 2012). The available literature shows that it is widely believed that M&E is about continuous improvement of Sfd initiatives, but Kay (2012) discovered that it is about accountability to funders. Despite this knowledge on M&E, the Sfd Vital power of sport programme focuses on a new M&E strategy which emphasises on a continuous learning cycle rather than just focusing on accountability (ISA, KNVB, RTP, 2015). This is contradictory to the presumable impact of a M&E strategy, because, in reality it turns out that "the need to demonstrate accountability by collecting data frequently takes priority over concerns to disseminate it to provide programmes with learning" (Kay, 2012, p. 891). Nevertheless, the Sfd Vital power of sport programme focuses on a programme with learning. For this programme to be successful, it is important to identify how the moving perspective influences the meanings stakeholders assign to the MEL strategy and how it affects the implementation of the MEL strategy.

In addition, it is valuable to discover it is imperative to consider what the consequences of a moving perspective are for the behaviour of different organisations and actors in this programme with regards to implementing a new strategy. This is relevant as limited knowledge is available on moving embedded strategies in the Sfd field. Consequently, it is not known in the Sfd field whether it is possible to move over from the traditional M&E to a new strategy, in this case to the MEL strategy. Or whether

they can exist side by side.

Moreover, Kay (2012, p. 900) argues that M&E should be reoriented “from the interminable pursuit of ‘definitive’ evidence, which primarily addresses the priorities of external funders, to discover alternative types of knowledge that may prove more appropriate, valid and obtainable and offer more value to sport in development programmes in-country”. This is in line with Edwards (2015), he also suggests that Sfd initiatives should encourage alternative types of knowledge in order to learn and not only be focused on accountability. It is necessary to reorient M&E in order to increase the impact of the Sfd interventions, since the current M&E strategy is insufficient. It is problematic that the impact of Sfd interventions cannot be sufficiently underpinned, since this can threaten the continued existence of the Sfd Vital power of sport programme (Schulenkorf, 2012). Due to the lack of knowledge on the importance of reorienting M&E in order to increase the impact of Sfd interventions, it is necessary to do research on alternative types of M&E strategies. Besides, it is relevant to examine which possible consequences the stakeholders identify to a moving perspective in the Sfd Vital power of sport programme in order to implement alternative types of knowledge successfully. Since another approach of M&E requires adjusted efforts from the stakeholders involved. To understand this moving perspective, it will be necessary to examine why M&E work differently in reality rather than in theory.

Key words in this study are:

Institutional logics perspective

Moving perspective

Sport for Development

Monitoring & Evaluation

Learning approach

1.1 The aim of the study

The aim of this study is to get insights in the meanings stakeholders of the Sfd Vital power of sport programme assign to the MEL strategy and what the consequences are regarding the implementation of the MEL strategy. The meanings stakeholders assign to MEL is influenced by the moving perspective. As mentioned in the introduction the moving perspective consists of a process in which stakeholders, both programme managers and implementers, provide each other continuous feedback on the way they believe MEL should be implemented. Insights in the meanings stakeholders assign to MEL combined with insights on the associated consequences enable implementing the MEL strategy successfully. Moreover, what do these meanings and associated consequences mean to other stakeholders involved in the programme. It is relevant to be aware of those insights since it is necessary to be able to successfully implement this new M&E strategy into the programme. Additionally, it is relevant to get those insights because M&E already assumes to assist in improving programme development (Kay, 2012; Schulenkorf, 2012). However, in reality it turns out that M&E is predominantly about accountability (Kay, 2012). Therefore, to move successfully from M&E to MEL it is necessary to discover what influences the moving perspective has on the meanings stakeholders assign to MEL.

1.2 Research question

The main question of this research is:

‘How does the moving perspective influence the meanings stakeholders assign to the Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning strategy in the Sport for Development Vital power of sport programme, and what consequences does this have on the implementation of this Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning strategy?’

To answer the main question, the following sub-questions are formulated: 5566

- 'What does Monitoring and Evaluation mean in the field of sport for development?'
- 'What does Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning mean in the field of sport for development?'
- 'What effects does the moving perspective have?'

1.3 Social and scientific relevance

Besides the huge number of SfD initiatives nowadays, the United Nations (n.d.) assume sport as an important and powerful tool to contribute in tackling social challenges. According to the United Nations (n.d.) sport has proven to be a cost-effective and adaptable tool in encouraging peace and development objectives. The United Nations will continue using sport to achieve the realization of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals in 2030. Therefore, this study has social relevance, since during the next years the focus will be on the role of sport to contribute to the peace and development objectives. Moreover, the overall goal of the SfD Vital power of sport programme has social relevance on its own, since the programme contributes to the development of young people. It is important to realise the initiatives in the best possible way or improve the initiatives where necessary in order to have better or more impact on the development of young people.

This study has scientific relevance because the available literature provides little acknowledgement on the meanings people involved in SfD programmes assign to a learning approach within the M&E strategy. Moreover, there is little known about the consequences of a moving perspective within M&E. However, research has been done on monitoring, evaluation and learning in the SfD field (Coalter, 2006; Harris & Adams, 2015; Kay, 2012; Levermore, 2011; Schulenkorf, 2012). The available literature focuses on prevailing M&E strategies within the SfD field and their shortcomings. However, this research attempts to provide insights in the meanings stakeholders of the SfD Vital power of sport programme assign to a new strategy. In this particular case the MEL strategy, which is influenced by the moving perspective. and what it means to them. As a result, the study will contribute by broadening the knowledge about the values international stakeholders assign to a moving M&E approach in the SfD field. Moreover, it will contribute to extending the knowledge about the consequences associated by a moving perspective towards M&E in the SfD field.

1.4 Report structure

This report provides insights in the meanings stakeholders assign to the MEL strategy within the SfD Vital power of sport programme and how the moving perspective influences these meanings. Moreover, this report depicts insights in the possible consequences of a moving perspective identified by the stakeholders involved in the programme. Following this introduction, chapter two presents the theoretical framework. The theoretical framework explains the institutional logics theory, which will be used to analyse the obtained data. The third chapter depicts the literature review. This chapter examines the available literature about the SfD field and M&E. This is followed by a discussion of the research methodology in chapter four. In the fifth chapter the results are presented. The obtained data is analysed by using the theoretical framework in chapter six. Chapter seven contains of the conclusions, discussion and the recommendations, which are suggested by doing this study.

2. Theoretical framework

2.1 Introduction

As previously stated the SfD Vital power of sport programme operates in a dynamic and complex field of different actors such as people, organisations, and social, political and economic institutions. The SfD Vital power of sport programme is working on a new M&E strategy towards MEL. To implement this new strategy, it is necessary to discover how all these actors interpret and act on the new strategy according to their believes regarding M&E in the SfD field.

The institutional logics perspective can provide insights on the way stakeholders interpret the new strategy and how this affects their believes and the implementation of the new strategy, which is MEL. Moreover, this study focuses on the moving perspective, which consists of the process in which stakeholders, both programme managers and implementers, provide each other continuous feedback on the way they believe MEL should be implemented. The institutional logics perspective can be applied to understand the moving perspective, because the institutional logic perspective helps to understand how personal believes and the environment influence stakeholder behaviour. Therefore, the institutional logic perspective is used to understand and explain how M&E is internalised in the SfD field and how this affects the the believes and behaviour of the stakeholders of the SfD Vital power of sport programme. For this study data gathered by observations and conducting interviews will be applied to the institutional logics perspective in explaining stakeholder believes and behaviour. The next paragraph describes the concept of the institutional logics perspective and the concepts within this theory are discussed. In addition, the moving perspective will be explained. After this the connection between those concepts and this study will be discussed.

2.2 Institutional logics perspective

According to Thornton, Ocasio and Lounsbury (2012) the institutional logics perspective can be used as a theoretical framework for analysing the interrelationships among institutions, individuals and organisations in social systems. This perspective helps to answer questions on how individual and organisational actors are influenced by their situations in multiple social locations in an interinstitutional system. The term 'inter-institutional system' has been introduced by Friedland and Alford (1991) and has been defined as society. The inter-institutional system permits two improvements in institutional analysis. Firstly, "it is non-deterministic, that is no institutional order with its accompanying principles of organization and logics of action is accorded causal primacy a priori. Second, the inter-institutional system provides researchers with an understanding of the institutional foundations of categories of knowledge" (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008, p. 104).

The institutional logics perspective is derived from the institutional theory. Selznick (1957), one of the first authors who wrote about institutional theories, assumes that when an organisation will be institutionalised it is injected with determined public values which ignore technical requirements to be a legitimate organisation.

Scott (2014) has elaborated on the institutional theory. He argues that organisations should adapt to a certain pressure, which comes from the environment, in order to maintain their legitimacy. An organisation does not only have institutions within the organisation, but also operates in a larger field, the institutional environment. Scott (2008) describes institutions as the rules, norms and values which determine our behaviour to a large extent and are taken for granted. The pressure may come from

the government or other organisations, but also subtle cultural expectations from the organisational field in which the organisation works (Waardenburg, 2016). DiMaggio and Powell (1983) describe organisational field as the organisations, in the aggregate, that establish a recognised field of institutional life. Organisations are affected by the institutional context and the associated social values in which the organisation is located. Consequently, organisations are becoming more alike. This is called isomorphism (Scott, 2014).

Thornton and Ocasio (2008) build further on Scott's theory (2014). However, they are not focused on isomorphism, but their focus is on the influence of institutional logics on organisations and individuals. Thornton and Ocasio (2008, p. 101) define institutional logics as "the socially constructed, historical patterns of material practices, assumptions, values, beliefs, and rules by which individuals produce and reproduce their material subsistence, organise time and space, and provide meaning to their social reality". According to this definition Thornton and Ocasio (2008, p. 101) assume that "institutional logics provide a link between individual agency and cognition and socially constructed institutional practices and rule structures". In accordance with the institutional logics perspective institutions have their own logics which have an influence on individual or organisation acting levels and provide them a legitimate framework to act in. Individuals and organisations are aware of differences in cultural norms, symbols and practices of various institutional regularities and they take those differences in mind, their beliefs and decisions. Friedland and Alford (1991) emphasise two perspectives within the relation between individuals and institutional logics. The first one emphasises the opportunities according to the acting level and the second one focuses on the obstructions of the acting level. Institutional contradictions provide individuals and organisations with opportunities for actions and institutional change by taking advantage of these contradictions. As a limitation, institutional logics constitute individual preferences and organisational interests, and the categories and repertoires of actions to achieve these interests and preferences. According to this, Zucker (1977) assumes that dominant institutional logics are considered as truth. The concept embedded agency has been attached to this approach. This means that an actor is affected by an environment, but the actor interprets this pressure on his own way. Moreover, the actor has the freedom to act and make his own choices in order to make a difference (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008). In other words, an individual is affected by the environment, but the individual has an influence on the environment as well. An organisation can get in a conflict, through the pressure and influence from the environment and the own values, if these different logics do not overlap or cannot fit together.

Whereas the different definitions of institutional logics vary in their emphasis they all assume a core meta-theory: "to understand individual and organizational behaviour, it must be located in a social and institutional context, and this institutional context regularises behaviour and provides opportunity or agency and change" (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008, pp. 101-102).

2.3 Moving perspective

Weick (1995) assumes that people create their own truth by interpreting actions and situations from previously acquired experiences. Consequently, every actor or stakeholder acts according to this truth. Moreover, this truth can also be influenced by the environment (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008). These truths can be seen as individual stakeholder perspectives. All these stakeholder perspectives combined with the environment form the moving perspective during a transition. The moving perspective, in a broad sense, influences the movement of an organisation from one situation to another. Specifically, it does not deal with the movement from A to B, but it deals with

meanings stakeholders assign to underlying aspects within the movement from A to B. Some examples of underlying aspects influenced by the moving perspective: stakeholders realise the B strategy, MEL in this case, does not align with the organisation's mentality, budget, goals etc. All meanings assigned to the various underlying aspects within the transition define what meanings stakeholders assign to the overall programme developed during the transition.

As previously stated the term moving perspective is used in this research paper underlining the process during the transition from an M&E strategy to a MEL strategy. The moving perspective consists of the process in which stakeholders, both programme managers and implementers, provide each other continuous feedback on the way they believe MEL should be developed and implemented. It is important to learn from each other and give continuous feedback towards a developing strategy, because it broadens the existing knowledge base and assists in implementing a new strategy (Elsendoorn et al., 2007). Moreover, the moving perspective focuses on all stakeholders, from the board to the people in the field which is necessary to successfully implement a new strategy. By including stakeholders in the decisions made on the new strategy involvement is created which leads to a sense of ownership among all stakeholders (Maclay, 2015). According to Ter Steege (2011) involving stakeholders of all levels in a changing process creates trust. Consequently, this trust simplifies the implementation of a new strategy (Ter Steege, 2011).

In addition, another part of the moving perspective is exemplifying the transition from M&E to MEL based on the philosophy of science. The philosophy of science provides insights in the way people assign meanings to knowledge concerning social sciences. Within the social sciences different paradigms exist. According to Scott & Usher (1996, p. 15) "a paradigm is a framework that functions as a map or guide for scientific communities, determining important problems or issues for its members to address and define acceptable theories or explanations, methods, and techniques to solve defined problems." It is relevant to be aware of different paradigms, because large confusion can arise when people do not understand each other's paradigm (Knoops, 2010). Referring to this study it is relevant to understand different paradigms in order to be able to move to MEL. This study will explain two scientific paradigms: positivism and critical theory. These paradigms have been chosen since the transition from M&E to MEL can be associated with a transition from one paradigm to another. This chapter discusses the two paradigms and in the literature review they will be applied to M&E and MEL.

August Comte, who is the founder of positivism, believes that positivism, as a sociological paradigm, can compete with natural science (Kramer, 2015). Moreover, it is a paradigm which focuses on gathering reliable and concrete knowledge in order to positively change the social world (Kramer, 2015). According to Vincke (2007) positivism is based on three principals:

- Positivism uses methodologies of natural science in order to gather valid scientific knowledge;
- Gathered knowledge must be based on experiences;
- Facts and values must be strictly separated, and they are neutral and value-free.

The aim of positivism is to create scientific explanations of reality by producing objective generalisations (Calhoun, Gerteis, Moody, Pfaff & Virk 2012). Since scholars have broad opposing values, experiences, and emotions, authentic science is thought to be inaccessible unless all human actors except rationality are eliminated from the

research process (Calhoun, et al., 2012). Researchers aim to distance themselves from the ideals, vested interests, and emotions produced by their, race, sex, class or other unique features. By decontextualizing themselves, they become objective observers (Calhoun, et al., 2012). Moreover, positivists are mainly concerned with establishing reliability and validity of data. Reliability refers to the consistency of the data and validity with regards to the researcher measuring what he intends to measure (Russel, Elton, Swinglehurst & Greenhalgh, 2006). Indicators are identified in advance in order to measure the causal relationship (Kramer, 2015). Positivists use experimental methods and counterfactual measurements (Armytage, 2011). According to Scott and Usher (1996), positivistic research can be linked to prediction and control. Additionally, positivism focuses on facts and the 'truth', for example by using best practices or evidence based research (van Amsterdam, 2016). However, "positivism depends on quantifiable observations that lead themselves to statistical analysis" (Collins, 2011, p.38). In other words, data should be reduced to numbers (Kramer, 2015). Moreover, another characteristic of positivism is the cause-consequence relationship (Vincke, 2007). In short, the positivist paradigm believes in 'objectivity', 'scientific' measurement, certainty and positivists assume there is only one 'truth', which is absolute (Russel, et al., 2006).

In response to shortcomings of positivism other paradigms were constituted. For example, a shortcoming that has been mentioned by Houghton (2011) is that positivism fails to distinguish between the natural and social worlds. Moreover, critics are focused on the 'objectivity' of actors (Bryman, 2008). Therefore, the critical theory paradigm is a response on the positivism paradigm. According to Scott & Usher (1996) a paradigm shift is possible and consists of a new way of looking at the world and hence new ways of working. According to this, the critical theory paradigm consists of another way of looking at the world than the positivistic paradigm. It is critical in the sense that this paradigm challenges the positivistic paradigm (Scott & Usher, 1996).

Contradicting the positivistic paradigm, which is objective, the critical theory is subjective (Calhoun, et al., 2012) and reflective (Geuss, 1981). The central idea of critical theory is that knowledge is structured by existing sets of social relations. It provides knowledge which involves prevailing social structures. These structures are seen as oppressive structures (Tones & Green, 2004). Scott & Usher (1996) elaborate on oppressive structures and suppose that critical researchers discover historical and structural conditions of oppression and they attempt to transform those conditions. Moreover, critical researchers describe the empirical world in terms of underlying structures and mechanisms and the events that put them in action. This demands not only an analysis of the empirical world and hermeneutic understanding, but also theoretical explanations of mechanisms (Tones & Green, 2004). According to Tones & Green (2004) the primary tasks of critical theory are the development of valid ideas of the abstract reality and their use in the explanation of tangible events and experiences. The aim of critical theory is emancipation, which means to free individuals from the ideological (and material) limitations to their understanding (Tones & Green, 2004). Referring to Tones & Green (2004, p. 238) "Self-determination or the full development of human potential requires knowledge, not only of the empirical and hermeneutic kind – valuable though this is – but also of the critical sciences. This aims at exposing people to exactly how and why their society operates, thereby allowing them to become fully involved in its transformation to the sort of society that they want."

According to van Amsterdam (2016) critical theory paradigm focuses on the following aspects:

- Questioning the status quo and inequality

- Reality and researcher are social products, which are constituted through power relations;
- Critical theory examines how reality can work oppressively and what the role of power is;
- Providing insights into how assumptions and evidence can lead to marginalisation and privileges.

In short, critical theory refers to the detection and unmasking of beliefs and practices that limit human freedom, justice and democracy (Scott & Usher, 1996).

Additionally, to understand the movement from M&E to MEL it is important to clarify how the current M&E approach has been developed. SfD became popular in the Netherlands in the 80's (ISA, n.d.). This is about the same time New Public Management (NPM) became popular in the Netherlands. NPM is a management philosophy, which has been applied in the public sector. According to Alexander (2000) NPM has two characteristics. Firstly, NPM focuses on "the efficiency of markets and the value of competition as a strategy for improving organisational performance" (Alexander, 2000, p. 288). Secondly, NPM emphasises on "the conception of management as a generic practice perfected by the private sector" (Alexander, 2000, p. 288). In other words, this management system requires entrepreneurial organisations which emphasise on the values of efficiency, economy and effectiveness (Terry, 1998). As a result of the emphasis on business-oriented practices, donors expected non-profit organisations to professionalise their management and to demonstrate measurable outputs (Alexander, 2000). Moreover, results became more important rather than the process (Manning, 2001). Due to this, the development of NPM can clarify the development of traditional M&E within the SfD field, since SfD organisations have to account to the funders (Kay, 2012). As a result, their M&E strategies are focused on accountability, and measuring outputs.

The moving perspective is supported by the institutional logics perspective. According to the institutional logics perspective logics are changeable. Research shows that both internal and external pressure on an organisation can change the organisation's logic. It is an interaction between the organisation and the logic. The dominant logic constitutes the organisational behaviour, but organisational behaviour can constitute the logic as well (Van der Roest, 2015). This is in line with Suddaby and Greenwood (2005). They emphasise the importance of conflicting logics, because actors who are sensitive to such contradictions are more aware of the possibilities to change a logic. Moreover, those actors are more motivated to act on it. Shifting logics are secured by rhetoric (Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005). Rhetoric is the art of persuasion and it is important to change a dominant perspective of a particular social group. Several studies have revealed that there is a close relationship between rhetoric and legitimacy. It is about using convincing language to achieve and legitimise a change within logics. Rhetoric can also be used to resist a certain change within logics (Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005). This does not necessarily mean that one logic is replaced by the other, as it is also possible that multiple logics can exist side by side (Skirstad & Chelladurai, 2011). This will be further explained in the next paragraph. However, the partnership must know how to deal with these different logics and paradigms.

2.4 Link theoretical framework and study

Since the institutional logics perspective has been explained, the link between the perspective and this study can be made. The SfD Vital power of sport programme has added another M&E strategy to the programme in order to increase the impact of SfD interventions. However, in practice it turns out it is difficult to change an internalised

strategy or pattern or to adjust to a changing strategy (Johnson, 1992). In order to change a strategy it is important to understand the social and institutional context where individuals and organisations are located. Therefore, in this study it is essential to get to know the social and institutional context of the Sfd Vital power of sport programme. The institutional logics perspective enables the researcher to answer questions on how individual and organisational actors are influenced by their situations in multiple social locations in an interinstitutional system. This study links to the institutional logics perspective, since it focuses on the meanings stakeholders of the Sfd Vital power of sport programme assign to the new MEL strategy of the programme. Additionally, this study wants to discover which consequences these meanings have on successfully implementing the new strategy. Moreover, this study focuses on the moving perspective, which influences the meanings stakeholders assign to the transition from ME towards MEL. Therefore, the concepts within the institutional logics perspective need to be applied to this study. First, the organisational field consists of the individuals, organisations and institutions from the Sfd field. The individuals in this study are people who work at the Dutch partner organisations, local partner organisations in Kenya and persons who work at the Dutch government. The organisations in this case are ISA, KNVB, RTP and the partner organisations located in Kenya. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs can be seen as an institution. According to the available literature on M&E in the Sfd field, the Sfd Vital power of sport programme is not the only Sfd initiative that makes use of M&E as accountability rather than continuous learning (Kay, 2012). Therefore, one might speak of isomorphism in the Sfd field (Scott, 2014). However, the Sfd Vital power of sport programme attempts moving the M&E logic in the programme, which means the concept of embedded agency can be applicable in this case. Since, actors of the Sfd programme will be affected by the Sfd field, but they have influences on the environment as well.

From the institutional logic perspective, it is assumed that accountability is dominant within M&E strategies in the Sfd field (Kay, 2012). As previously described the Sfd Vital power of sport programme attempts to move to MEL, which focuses on continuous learning in order to improve the impact of the interventions. Due to this, one could distinguish two logics: M&E logic and MEL logic. The institutional logics perspective looks at the influence of this new logic on stakeholders and whether stakeholders can also influence this logic themselves. Central to the concept of institutional logics perspective is the question regarding how the broader context influences the behaviour of the actors. Through interviews, stakeholders are asked about experiences and values they attach to the M&E logic and MEL logic and how these roles interact. In addition, attention is paid to the tensions between both logics and how they are connected. The question is whether stakeholders perceive the focus on learning as an element within the M&E logic or as a new logic. In the second case, it is interesting to find out if the MEL logic and M&E logic can coexist and whether they complement or limit each other.

Several studies have been accomplished towards multiple logics within an organisation. The institutional logics perspective examines if logics are complementing or obstructing each other. For example, Skille (2011) has conducted research on several logics within a sport club. He distinguished the competitive logic, which is mainly dominant in a sport club. According to Skille (2011) multiple logics within a sport club are conflicting. Therefore, he concludes that as long as the competitive logic is dominant, there is no place for other logics. Since top sports is exclusive, which contradicts the inclusion value of the sport-for-all logic (Skille, 2011). Other studies show that multiple logics are possible within an organisation or sport club (Skirstad & Chelladurai, 2011; Van der Roest, 2015). The case study of Skirstad and Chelladurai (2011) shows that a Norwegian football club has been transformed from an amateur

club with an amateur logic towards a club with multiple logics, the professional and commercial logic. However, they assume that the organisation structure of the club has been adapted in order that the different logics are able to operate independently from each other (Skirstad & Chelladurai). According to Reay & Hinings (2005) when a dominant institutional logic exists, at the field level, it is because other logics are subordinate. Therefore, the process of moving from a dominant logic to another involves stakeholders using their power to accomplish such shifts (Reay & Hinings, 2005). Therefore, it is relevant to use the institutional logic perspective in order to discover if it is possible to move from M&E to MEL or if they can exist side by side in the SfD Vital power of sport programme.

In short, the institutional logics perspective assists understanding individual and organisational behaviour in providing insights in different logics and which consequences they link to changing logics in order to implement MEL, which focuses on continuous learning, successfully. The goal of the SfD Vital power of sport programme is to move from M&E to MEL, but works in an institutional context and depends on individual and organisational actors. In the literature is little known about the meanings individual stakeholders of a SfD initiative assign to M&E and MEL. Additionally, there is a gap in the available literature on the consequences, which are associated by the meanings of the stakeholders on all levels, in order to successfully implement MEL. Moreover, the available literature does not show consensus on the question whether it is possible to have multiple logics within an organisation.

3. Literature review

This literature review will examine the SfD field first in order to get to know background information about the SfD field. Followed by comparing current M&E approaches to the new M&E strategy within the SfD Vital power of sport programme in order to answer the sub questions: 'What does Monitoring and Evaluation mean in the field of sport for development?' and 'What does Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning mean in the field of sport for development?'. This literature review will discuss literature from Northern researches as well as Southern researchers. However, there is limited literature on SfD and M&E written by Southern authors.

3.1 Sport for Development

As mentioned before, the field of SfD has grown extraordinarily in recent years. Since the First World War international SfD initiatives have been applied by developed nations as part of their foreign policy and aid programmes. Additionally, the end of colonial empires left a void for world powers to use sport as a resource to support political and ideological change (Burnett, 2001). Even though it is not a new concept it still proves to be challenging, since it is used in numerable ways according to power and interest differences (Harris & Adams, 2015). For example, sport can be used for those who are participating in sports or it can be used as vehicle to address social issues. Moreover, the first contest of the SfD concept deals with the conceptualisation of the term development itself. 'Development' is a complex term, which means many things to many people in different contexts (Hartmann & Kwauk, 2013). Since development can be applied to different contexts, it can have different meanings. "Development can refer to something as philosophical as the progress of humankind or as practical as the social engineering of emerging nations" (Hartmann & Kwauk, 2013, p. 286). In other words, development can be conceptualised and related to an individual level or to a broader stage, namely system level.

In the light of discussing literature from Northern authors as well as Southern authors, it is important to note that this definition of development is an outcome of Northern development paradigm (Van Eekeren, 2013). However, Hartmann & Kwauk (2013) argue that the variety and ambiguity around the conceptualisation of development presents one of the most important initial challenges for understanding and theorising the SfD field. According to them too many times, various conceptions of development "have led to misunderstanding of and miscommunications about sport-based initiatives and applications as well as inconsistently and inappropriately applied programming strategies" (Hartmann & Kwauk, 2013, p. 286). Referring to the SfD Vital power of sport programme the development is more focused on a system level, since the programme requirements contribute to vital communities. In addition, several terms are interchangeably used in the SfD field: sport for development, development through sport, sport-in-development, sport and development, sport-for-change and sports development (Van Eekeren, 2013). This research will use the term Sport for Development, because this term is jointly used by ISA, KNVB and RTP within the SfD Vital power of sport programme. In the available literature, different explanations are used to define the ambiguous concept of sport for development. The different explanations will be discussed and applied to the Dutch partner organisations within the SfD Vital power of sport programme.

According to Kidd (2008) there are three broad, overlapping, approaches of sport for development, which can be applied to the way of working of ISA, KNVB and RTP. First, Kidd (2008) mentions traditional sports development approaches in which the provision of basic sports coaching, equipment and infrastructure are the central concern. For instance, the Norwegian Olympic Committee and Confederation of Sports

(NIF) commenced encouraging sport for-all projects in Tanzania in 1984. Moreover, this is how the KNVB began supporting football programmes in developing nations (Edwards, 2015). Secondly, Kidd (2008) distinguishes humanitarian assistance. This approach uses fund-raising in sport to provide conditions of aid assistance, often for refugees. Some of the Right To Play work belongs to this approach (Van Eekeren, 2013). The last approach has been named 'sport-for-development-and-peace movement'. This category includes a broad variety of organisations and loose coalitions (Kidd, 2008). These organisations and coalitions concentrate on wide social development, ISA concentrates on this type of development as well. Referring to Kidd's (2008) approach, ISA, KNVB and RTP use different SfD classifications. Namely, ISA's work relates to the sport-for-development-and-peace movement, KNVB refers to the traditional sports development approach, and some of the work of RTP belongs to humanitarian assistance approach.

However, Kidd (2008) is not the only one who has conceptualised sport for development. Another approach has been proposed by Levermore (2008). He suggests a disaggregated categorisation of six major groups in order to discuss the contribution of development initiatives. The categorisation consists of the following clusters: conflict resolution and intercultural understanding; building physical, social, sport and community infrastructure; raising awareness, particularly through education; empowerment; direct impact on physical and psychological health, as well as general welfare; economic development/poverty alleviation (Levermore, 2008).

In addition, Coalter (2007) proposes another classification of SfD initiatives. Firstly, traditional sport practices which assume that sport has inherent developing characteristics for participants. Secondly, sport plus practices in which sports are adapted and augmented with comparable programmes in order to increase their potential to achieve development goals. Finally, Coalter (2007) mentions plus sport practices in which sport is used as a tool to address social or development issues. In line with Coalter's plus sport classification, Lyras and Welty Peachey (2011, p. 311) define SFD as: "the use of sport to exert a positive influence on public health, the socialisation of children, youths and adults, the social inclusion of the disadvantaged, the economic development of regions and states, and on fostering intercultural exchange and conflict resolution".

As noticed before, ISA, KNVB and RTP use three different types of SfD classifications referring to Kidd's approach. Nonetheless, the jointly SfD Vital power of sport programme is more in line with the latter definition, developed by Lyras and Welty Peachey (2011) and in line with the plus sport classification (Coalter, 2007). According to the SfD Vital power of sport programme, sport has several unique characteristics which enables sport to contribute in development and to address social issues (ISA, KNVB & RTP, 2015). However, all partners believe that comprehending the intrinsic values of sport is conditional to use sport as a tool to contribute to positive change and social issues.

3.2 Monitoring and Evaluation

This literature study provides an overview of what is currently known about M&E. The available literature acknowledges that there has been conducted research on monitoring and evaluation within the SfD field as well as outside this area (Coalter, 2006; Kay, 2012; Maclay, 2015; Schulenkorf, 2012). According to Kay (2012) M&E systems necessarily provide multiple interests. The people who impose the M&E systems mainly emphasize the positive contributions. M&E strategies have been admitted in SfD programmes to improve the programmes. However, as mentioned in the introduction of this study, Coalter (2007), Coalter & Taylor (2010) and Pawson &

Tilley (1997) argue much of the critiques on SfD initiatives have emphasized shortcomings in M&E methods. The shortcomings refer to the lack of understanding how and why a programme works. Moreover, "what processes produce what effects, for which participants, in what circumstances" (Coalter, 2007, p. 3). These critiques are intensified by the following statements from, a Southern author, Zimbabwean activist: "Your reporting 'format' – or shall we call it 'templates' – is all about you and what you want to know. It is not about us and what we want to learn' (...) 'I tell you what I think you want to hear" (Win, 2004, p. 126). This statement is supported by Kay (2012). Despite a supposed equal and democratic partnership, local actors often face unchanging requirements in order to collect data in forms designed by external partners. These forms are usually not made on basis of local organisational culture. Additionally, it is overlooked that there are basic practical issues as well, such as language skills, administrative experience and IT competences (Kay, 2012).

The available literature describes different explanations on M&E within the SfD field (Holte-McKenzie, Forde & Theobald, 2006; Coalter, 2006; Levermore 2011). Holte-McKenzie et al. (2006) describe M&E as a recognised management tool that permits for learning and change when implemented regularly. This definition differs from Coalter (2006). Since he defines monitoring as the regular, systematic and routine collection of information and analysis from projects and programmes related to a planned and agreed programme of action. The definition used by Levermore (2011) elaborates on the definition from Holte-McKenzie et al (2006). Levermore (2011, p. 340) describes the following definition of monitoring: "an activity that tends to be conducted internally by staff implementing the programme and its purpose is to keep track of what is happening and check progress being made towards achieving objectives; in this sense, measurement serves the needs of managing the project operation." This definition differs from Coalter's (2006) in the way that they use different terms to define the concept and the two discussed scientific paradigms. Coalter (2006) uses terms such as 'systematic collected' related to 'planned programme' contradicting to Levermore (2011) who emphasises on ongoing tracking of the implemented programme. Whereby Coalter (2006) monitoring defines from a more positivistic view, because Coalter's definition is focused on a cause-consequence relation, which is one of the characteristics of positivistic research (Vincke, 2007). Levermore (2011) describes monitoring from a more critical theory paradigm, because the purpose of critical theory practitioners is to identify structures or activities in order to change them. Hence, inequalities and injustices might be counteracted (Bryman, 2008). The sportanddev.org platform (n.d.) adds to these definitions that monitoring occurs for four main purposes. Firstly, to learn from experiences to improve future practices and activities. Secondly, to have internal and external accountability of the resources used and the results obtained. Thirdly, to take informed decisions on the future of the initiative. Finally, to promote empowerment of beneficiaries of the initiative.

Furthermore, Coalter (2006) describes that evaluation is the process of undertaking a systematic and objective examination of monitoring information in order to answer agreed questions and judge the programme or project. Levermore (2011, p. 340) uses a different explanation of the definition of evaluation: 'highlighting how the objectives of programmes are being met and how the programme is working at different levels; it is inclined to be an externally led process with the intended purpose of 'learning lessons'. The different definitions regarding evaluation also refer to the different scientific paradigms. Coalter (2006) describes both evaluation and monitoring from a positivistic paradigm. Levermore (2011) describes evaluation also from a critical theory paradigm. The Sportanddev.org platform (n.d.) adds that evaluation should help draw conclusions on five main aspects of the programme. The platform suggests

the following five aspects (Sportanddev.org platform, n.d.; Elsendoorn, van Kempen, Rijnen & Teeuwen, 2007):

- **Relevance:** is the extent to which an intervention or programme deals with the issues and the needs of the target group.
- **Effectiveness:** is the extent to which an intervention or programme achieves the objectives it has set, or the results of the project meet the project's original objective.
- **Efficiency:** is measured based on the human and material costs used to attempting to achieve a proposed result.
- **Impact:** is the general effect (both positive and negative) of the intervention or programme on the target group.
- **Sustainability:** means that the results of the intervention endure after the programme has stopped.

M&E is not only a management system in the SfD field, but also important in other areas. Research shows that for example the field of conservation and river management deal with M&E strategies as well (Stem, Margoluis, Salafsky & Brown, 2005; Verbrugge, Ganzevoort, Fliervoet, Panten & van den Born, 2017). The field of conservation consists of management of nature and of Earth's biodiversity (Soulé, 1986). According to Stem et al. (2005) the field of conservation has increasingly concentrated on importance of M&E, because it has faced continues struggles to demonstrating progress. Additionally, practitioners and scholars within the conservation field acknowledge that good management goes beyond implementation. Therefore, Stem et al. (2005, p. 296) suggest "effective management is integrally linked to well-designed monitoring and evaluation systems". M&E is defined as a system which can provide public and internal accountability and assist demonstrating impact (Stem et al. (2005). Moreover, in the conservation field M&E depicts insights on how well a programme or strategy is working and recognises the circumstances under which an intervention is likely to succeed or falter (Hatry 1999; Blann & Light 2000). According to this, M&E is the basis for improved decision making and effective management. Stem et al. (2005) distinguish key components within M&E systems as following: approaches, conceptual frameworks, evaluation frameworks and tools. According to Stem et al. (2005), organisations and practitioners in the conservation field are confusing the purposes of the different components of a M&E system. Therefore, Stem et al. (2005) propose the following definitions of the common elements in a M&E system, which are depicted in table 1. The different components can be applied to the SfD Vital power of sport programme.

Term	Proposed definition	Relationship to other terms
M&E approach	A specific process for doing M&E, generally accompanied by a series of steps or guidance	An approach is one of the two main components of an M&E system. An approach may also use an evaluation framework and a variety of tools to assist in the undertaking of M&E.
Conceptual framework	A representation of cause-and-effect relationships in a generic fashion.	A conceptual framework is the other main component of a M&E system. Conceptual frameworks provide a generalized representation of reality used to develop specific conceptual models (an evaluation tool).
Evaluation framework	A presentation of the management processes and expected results to be considered in an evaluation.	The application of an evaluation framework is a step in an approach to determine the management processes and expected results that should be considered.
Tool	An instrument that aids in the actual undertaking of M&E activities	A tool provides the means to accomplish M&E. An M&E approach will often involve the use of many tools.

Table 1 Proposed definitions of common terms used in M&E (Stem, et al., 2005)

Although the M&E definitions have similarities within and outside the SfD field, the M&E strategy of the SfD Vital power of sport programme links best to the definition written by Levermore (2011), since the strategy focuses on continuous learning. Additionally, the strategy can be compared to the four main purposes suggested by the sportanddev.org platform (n.d.), because the SfD Vital power of sport programme applied a monitoring, evaluation and learning strategy to the programme for three main purposes. Firstly, to learn from implemented activities, which concurs with the first goal of the sportanddev.org platform. Secondly, to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of programme implementation, which is comparable to the third purpose of the sportanddev.org platform. Finally, ISA, KNVB and RTP (2015) require accountability for programme results to beneficiaries involved stakeholders and funders, this one links to the second purpose of the sportanddev.org platform (n.d.).

Even though different studies on M&E have assumed that the goal of M&E is to improve programmes or interventions, in reality it comes down to accountability to funders (Kay, 2012). Moreover, M&E is associated with collecting data for filling reports that are hardly used as the basis for deeper reflection or inspire local practitioners to develop new and creative solutions (Partos, 2016). As mentioned before, despite this acknowledge the partners of the SfD Vital power of sport programme still apply a new strategy which focuses on continues learning.

3.2.1 Monitoring and Evaluation approaches

According to the different components of a M&E system, this research distinguishes three different approaches: traditional M&E, participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) and MEL. According to the theoretical framework these approaches could be seen as logics. Since these approaches have influence on the acting level and the way of thinking of organisations and individuals.

Firstly, transparency and accountability have been the main focus on traditional M&E regarding executed activities and achieved results. In this M&E approach the process has mainly been driven by the donor and the implementing agency (Shah, Kambou, Goparaju, Adams & Matarazzo, 2004). Donors and implementing agencies use traditional M&E to justify the programme investments (Kay, 2012) and to judge project success (Shah et al., 2004; Maclay, 2015). The main focus is on achieved output in this approach (Maclay, 2015). In other words, to check if the intervention has been implemented according to the proposed plan. Moreover, the indicators to measure the achievement are defined by the donor and/ or the implementing agencies (Shah et al., 2004). This implicates that traditional M&E is often organised top down. Furthermore, data will be collected through formats designed by external partners. The formats are designed in conformity with their administrative systems and M&E activities are executed on determined moments, namely during a mid-term evaluation and at the end of the programme based on facts and figures (Kay, 2012). According to Shah et al. (2004), collecting data under these circumstances means that local stakeholders do not always know why they are collecting data and only deliver the data to their superior without interpreting and analysing it themselves.

Moreover, in traditional M&E it is not uncommon that a team of external evaluators are visiting the local community to collect the necessary data in order to write the final report at the end of a project (Shah et al., 2004). Generally, the local community is not benefiting from the M&E activities, but the funder does. Since the M&E indicators and plan are designed externally, it is hard for local stakeholders to use the collected information for their own benefits. Moreover, local stakeholders usually do not receive a copy of the evaluation report (Shah et al., 2004). The positivistic paradigm can be applied to the traditional M&E approach since several elements of traditional M&E are comparable to characteristics of the positivistic paradigm. First, traditional M&E focuses on accountability, which can be seen as a mechanism of control. This concurs with the characteristics of positivism described by Scott & Usher (1996), which are prediction and control. Secondly, positivism depends on quantifiable observations which lead to statistical analysis. This can be recognised as a similarity to traditional M&E, which put emphasis on facts and figures based on quantitative outputs. More similarities between positivism and traditional M&E are the indicators used during research, which are determined in advance, of both concepts. Additionally, both traditional M&E and positivism focus on evidence based research.

SfD became popular in the Netherlands in the 80's (ISA, n.d.). This is about the same time New Public Management (NPM) became popular in the Netherlands. NPM is a management philosophy, which has been applied in the public sector. According to Alexander (2000) NPM has two characteristics. Firstly, NPM focuses on "the efficiency of markets and the value of competition as a strategy for improving organisational performance" (Alexander, 2000, p. 288). Secondly, NPM emphasises on "the conception of management as a generic practice perfected by the private sector" (Alexander, 2000, p. 288). In other words, this management system requires entrepreneurial organisations which emphasise on the values of efficiency, economy and effectiveness (Terry, 1998). As a result of the emphasis on business-oriented practices, donors expected non-profit organisations to professionalise their

management and to demonstrate measurable outputs (Alexander, 2000). Moreover, results became more important rather than the process (Manning, 2001). Due to this, the development of NPM can clarify the development of traditional M&E within the SfD field, since SfD organisations have to account to the funders (Kay, 2012). As a result, their M&E strategies are focused on accountability, and measuring outputs.

Secondly, the available literature depicts research on PM&E (Danielsen, Burgess & Balmford, 2005; Estrella and Gaventa, 2000; Shah et al., 2004; Villaseñor, Porter-Bolland, Escobar, Guariguata, & Moreno-Casasola, 2016). Villaseñor et al. (2016) propose PM&E as the active involvement of local stakeholders in the systematic data collection. At this point, PM&E differs from traditional M&E, because PM&E strives to include all stakeholders in all aspects of the process (Holte-McKenzie et al., 2006). The importance of local involvement in M&E was first identified in developing countries, with the purpose to empower local communities and improve management of environmental resources (Danielsen et al., 2005; Estrella and Gaventa, 2000). Moreover, PM&E refers to the recognition that stakeholders should not only be involved in outlining the problem, but also in collecting, analysing and interpreting the data for programme development and analysis (Bradley, Mayfield, Mehta & Rukonge, 2002; Edun, 2000; Estrella, 2000; Oakley, 1988). Therefore, PM&E has the potential to build local knowledge into the M&E process as well as to incorporate various capacities of local stakeholders. Consequently, local stakeholders are able to evaluate their own needs and priorities, to make decisions on these problems and take action to address them accordingly (Estrella & Gaventa, 2000). Due to this, PM&E has grown in popularity during recent years. Additionally, Villaseñor et al. (2016) distinguished two aims within PM&E. Firstly, PM&E projects intent collaborative learning. The second one aims at a more evidence-based approach, which is used to improve management efficiency. these aims can sometimes overlap. This is in line with Alender (2016), who has also distinguished different goals within the PM&E approach. PM&E assists both scientific and management aims as well as requiring opportunities for learning and collaboration among involved stakeholders. From a scientific view, PM&E has been constituted as a result of the shortcomings of traditional M&E. Due to this, it is assumable that PM&E has arisen from a critical theory paradigm. The critical theory has been developed as a result of the limits of the positivistic paradigm (Houghton, 2011; Bryman, 2008). Moreover, PM&E involves stakeholders from all levels. This is similar to the critical theory paradigm, since this paradigm aims to emancipate people, which means that individuals of all level provide knowledge to research.

The third approach, which will be discussed is the MEL strategy, also named desirable approach or creative M&E as defined by the Sportanddev.org platform (n.d.). This approach elaborates on a combination of the two previous approaches, traditional M&E and PM&E, since M&E is much more than simple accountability (Sportanddev.org, n.d.; Coalter, 2007). Furthermore, creative M&E is described as a participatory approach, which has combined traditional M&E, standardised M&E tools with alternative and innovative M&E tools (Sportanddev.org, n.d.). According to Maclay (2015) M&E must strive to know what is happening in and on the field at any time. The emphasis in this approach is on learning (ISA, KNVB & RTP, 2015) since the SfD field encourages approaches that ensure both SfD initiatives and local stakeholders learn from previous experiences and share them with each other in order to learn from each other as well (Hayhurst & Frisby, 2010). In other words, this is an action-based learning approach. Action-based learning emphasizes learning which consists of questioning of structures and organisational practices. Moreover, it encourages an emphasis on collective learning and reflection (Reynolds & Vince, 2004). It is important to learn from experiences and each other, because it broadens the existing knowledge base and assists in making the interventions more effective (Elsendoorn et al., 2007). This

approach not only guarantees that management decisions are informed by local realities, but is an empowering process for all stakeholders as well. It creates ownership of the project by local staff, encourages learning across the board, and promotes downward accountability within the organisation (Maclay, 2015). From a scientific view, MEL, similar to PM&E, has been constituted as a consequence of critiques on traditional M&E. Therefore, it can also be assumed that MEL has arisen from a critical theory paradigm. The critical theory has been developed as a result of the limitations of the positivistic paradigm (Houghton, 2011; Bryman, 2008). Moreover, MEL involves stakeholders from all levels. This is similar to the critical theory paradigm, since this paradigm aims to emancipate people, which means that individuals of all level provide knowledge to research. Moreover, the critical theory is questioning the status quo and inequality. The MEL approach uses a bottom up approach, which means that inequality has been reduced. However, this study does not go in depth on power relations.

Although this study distinguishes three different M&E approaches, the available literature shows different classifications of M&E approaches as well. According to Arkesteijn, van Mierlo and Potters (2007) and van Mierlo, Arkesteijn and Leeuwis (2010) a distinction can be made between the following three approaches:

- Result-oriented M&E
- Constructivist M&E
- Reflexive M&E

Result-oriented M&E focuses on accountability and steering. In other words, this approach emphasises on effectiveness and on monitoring and evaluating results against the objectives, which are often defined in advance (van Mierlo & Regeer, 2010). Moreover, indicators are used to measure the progress. However, these indicators are often predefined. Result-oriented M&E considering that reality can be defined objectively (Arkesteijn et al., 2007; van Mierlo et al., 2010). This approach is often based on assumptions about how the programme interventions can generate the intended results. Moreover, result-oriented M&E does not involve all stakeholders in the process, which means there is little room for joint learning. However, a strong point of this approach is the logical thinking: it enforces programme managers to explicate where they want to contribute and how they think they can do so (Arkesteijn et al., 2007; van Mierlo et al., 2010).

Result-oriented M&E can be compared with traditional M&E, because they overlap each other. Both approaches are focused on accountability and monitor and evaluate results using predefined indicators.

The goal of constructivist M&E is learning and adjusting activities. According to van Mierlo and Regeer (2010) constructivist M&E believes in more than one reality. Moreover, reality is constructed by interaction and negotiation between all actors (Arkesteijn et al., 2007; van Mierlo et al., 2010). Therefore, this approach emphasises on learning together and sharing experiences. It is a participatory approach, because it involves all actors in order to determine the agenda together and learn together. The power of this approach is the sharing of views, because it provides new insights and intensifies relationships between actors within a programme (Arkesteijn et al., 2007; van Mierlo et al., 2010). However, Arkesteijn et al. (2007) and van Mierlo et al. (2010) put a marginal comment to this approach as well. They are convinced that constructivist methods have based their monitoring and evaluation on the current perspectives and the objectives of the stakeholders involved, which are often at odds with the need to put the institutional preconditions up for discussion and to develop other, radically different realities. After all, it is exactly these current perspectives that

may be part of the shortcomings towards M&E (Arkesteijn et al., 2007; van Mierlo et al., 2010).

Some of the features of the constructivist M&E approach can be linked to PM&E and MEL. All these approaches are focused on involving all stakeholders in the M&E process, which means that all approaches are participatory. Therefore, PM&E and MEL can be linked to the participatory feature of constructivist M&E. Moreover, MEL overlaps on the learning focus as well. Both, MEL and constructivist M&E are focused on shared learning and making adjustments on activities.

The main objective of reflexive M&E is to encourage learning processes in programmes that focus on system innovations. Referring to Elzen and Wieczorek (in: van Mierlo & Regeer, 2010, p. 35) system innovations are “the multiple ambitions of sustainable development which imply that a single change is insufficient and that more is required than technological innovation alone. Changes are also needed in terms of social and institutional aspects. The chains may have to be configured differently, for instance, or there may be a need for new actors to participate; perhaps the relationships between the actors will need to change”. The main question in this approach is whether the programme interventions are specifically encouraging those learning processes in the system that result in changes to practices and in the way these practices are embedded in institutions (Arkesteijn et al., 2007; van Mierlo et al., 2010). According to Arkesteijn et al. (2007) and van Mierlo et al. (2011) stakeholders in an innovation programme can influence one another if they examine and comprehend each other’s driving forces and the developments in the surrounding system. Consequently, reflection on the relationship between the programme and the system (or the systems) is stimulated, as a consequence is reflection on the connection between short-term results and the long-term ambitions. Stakeholders involved can learn from the interaction of ideas and reflection, which benefits the reflexivity of the programme (Arkesteijn et al., 2007; van Mierlo et al., 2010). Reflexive M&E elaborates on constructivism. However, it is more normative than the current constructivist M&E, because it embraces clear norms for the programmes that are to be monitored in terms of the long-term goal, for example: sustainable development, the process, which is a common learning process and the programme approach, which refers to the creation of beneficial conditions (Arkesteijn et al., 2007; van Mierlo et al., 2010).

Reflexive M&E differs from the approaches which are mentioned above, because it is specifically focused on system innovations. However, the movement from M&E to MEL can be linked to this approach. Since this movement can be seen as a system innovation. It is a learning process which includes changes on social and institutional aspects as well. In other words, the traditional M&E is embedded in the SfD field for a lengthy period of time and the SfD Vital power of sport programme have decided to change this strategy in order to address the shortcomings and to facilitate learning on local level. The SfD Vital power of sport programme focuses on all stakeholders perspectives to examine and understand everyone’s driving forces in order to move from M&E to MEL successfully.

3.2.2 Conceptual framework and evaluation framework

Stem et al., (2005) describe a conceptual framework as the representation of cause and effect relationships and the evaluation framework focuses on the management processes and the expected results. The conceptual framework is an essential piece of a M&E system (Maclay, 2015). In the SfD field two main conceptual frameworks are distinguished: the logical framework and the theory of change (ToC). These frameworks can also be evaluation frameworks, because they show the expected results as well as the cause and effect relationships. The latter has become more

popular in recent years. The logical framework, also known as logframe, 'outlines the activities, outputs, outcomes, and goals in a logical progression on one table' (Maclay, 2015). The ToC is described as a framework that 'maps out the context and possible change processes which could occur in a programme' (Vogel, 2012). Vogel (2012) appoints a logframe as a fixed linear model of implementation. At this point a ToC differs from a logframe, because a ToC is featured as a flexible framework (Vogel, 2012). Since the ToC enables stakeholders to improve programme design, implementation, evaluation and learning (Vogel, 2012). For example, the ToC enables stakeholders to discuss and exchange their personal, organisational and analytical assumptions with an open, learning approach (Vogel, 2012). Additionally, the ToC is used to understand rationales and how things are intended to work, but also to explore new possibilities through critical thinking and discussions (Vogel, 2012). However, both frameworks, the logframe and the ToC, focus on the why and how an initiative works. As mentioned in the introduction the SfD Vital power of sport programme uses a ToC.

3.2.3 Tools

Tools are instruments that aid in the actual undertaking of M&E activities. In other words, M&E tools assist collecting information from the field, but M&E tools are also used to document the information (Stem et al., 2005). Collecting data can be done by quantitative tools and qualitative research or a combination of both (Maclay, 2015). Which tool should be used, depends on the required information (Coalter, 2007). For example, if the programme requires measuring how many coaches have participated in a training and how many youth they reach every week, a survey can be used. In this case quantitative data has been required. Another example, if the programme likes to know what kind of impact sport activities have on young people, interviews or focus groups can be done in order to gather qualitative data.

3.3 Summary

In summary, this literature review offers some valuable insights in the SfD field and the accompanying M&E strategies. The available literature shows different explanations towards SfD. However, the jointly SfD Vital power of sport programme refers to the definition developed by Lyras and Welty Peachey (2011). They describe SfD as the use of sport to exert a positive influence on social issues, such as public health and the socialisation of children, youths and adults. However, ISA, KNVB and RTP all believe that comprehending the intrinsic values of sport is conditional to use sport as a tool to contribute to positive change and social issues.

In addition, an overview of the available literature on M&E has been showed. M&E is an ambiguous concept and different explanations are described. The M&E strategy of the SfD Vital power of sport programme links best to the definition written by Levermore (2011), since the strategy focuses on continuous learning. Moreover, this study distinguishes three different M&E approaches. Namely, the traditional M&E which is about accountability to the funder, PM&E strives to active involvement of local stakeholders in the systematic data collection and the MEL strategy, which focuses on continuous learning. Additionally, those approaches can be linked to philosophical paradigms. Traditional M&E can be compared to the positivistic paradigm and the PM&E and MEL can be applied to the critical theory paradigm. However, the available literature shows a different distinction: result-oriented M&E, constructivist M&E and reflexive M&E. Result-oriented M&E focuses on accountability and is based on predefined objectives. Constructivist M&E emphasises on shared learning and reflexive M&E is related to learning processes in system innovations.

Briefly, many literature is available on M&E. Even though, the available literature

discusses different approaches towards M&E, it does not go in depth on the consequences of a changing or moving strategy within M&E systems. Moreover, the available literature limited discusses the opinion and experiences towards M&E from the perspective of Southern actors. Therefore, this study focuses on all stakeholders of the SfD Vital power of sport programme, which includes Southern actors. Additionally, due to the institutional logic theory forming the theoretical framework, this study attempts to get insights in the behaviour of stakeholders towards developing MEL influenced by the moving perspective. Hence, this research can support stakeholders in order to make the right decisions towards implementing new M&E strategies in SfD programmes.

4. Methodology

This section illustrates the working method of the thesis.

4.1 Methodological approach

This study uses a qualitative research approach. Qualitative research provides the ability to discover profound meanings of behaviour, experiences and feelings (Boeije, 2005). This research attempts to uncover which meanings involved stakeholders of the SfD Vital power of sport programme assign to a learning perspective within the monitoring and evaluation strategy. Profound thoughts and feelings of the involved people are examined. The study consists of a case study which examines the SfD Vital power of sport programme.

4.2 Philosophical position

This study paradigm adopts an interpretative research approach. According to Bryman (2008) this is an epistemological position that requires the researcher to get to know the subjective meaning of social action. Interpretative research is based on the vision that social characteristics are influenced by the experiences of individuals, specifically the interaction between the individuals (Bryman, 2012). This research is aimed at the meanings involved people of the SfD programme assign to a learning approach within the monitoring and evaluation strategy of the programme. The interpretative paradigm is suitable for this study, because this paradigm is focused on the understanding of the ideas, actions and interactions of the respondents, whereas feelings and thoughts of the individual are the central elements (Boeije, 2005). Moreover, Burnett (2015) mentions in her study that future research should employ an interpretive framework in order to estimate better how efforts aimed at development through sport may be understood in local communities and facilitate better the shared ownership of these programmes. In addition, this study is written from an interpretative paradigm view, because MEL focuses on local learning. This means that the gathered information is context bound and the goal of MEL is gathering in-depth information rather than generalising information. Therefore, this study is written from an interpretative paradigm, because this paradigm enables the researcher to discover in-depth information.

4.3 Methods

To collect the data this study uses different research methods. The methods consist of document analysis, participative observation and semi-structured interviews.

- Document analysis

In preparation for this study, document analysis has been conducted to obtain relevant background information on the SfD Vital power of sport programme. The following questions have formed then main focus during the analysis of the documents: 'What does the SfD Vital power of sport programme exactly contain of?', 'What is the purpose of the partnership?', 'What is already known about M&E?' 'How is the SfD Vital power of sport programme positioned in the SfD field? The document analysis has contributed to answer the sub-questions. In addition, it has contributed to the design of the topic list, which is used during the interviews. The following documents are analysed:

- Sfd programme proposal: Sportfordevelopment.nl 2016-2020 The vital power of sport (2015). This document has been analysed to get background information of the Sfd initiative formulated by ISA, KNVB and RTP.
- Mid-term evaluation: Sport for development: The potential value and next steps Review of policy, programmes and academic research 1998-2013 commissioned by ISA, KNVB and RTP. The mid-term evaluation

has been examined to get information about the previous M&E strategy.

- Policy document of Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands: 'A world to gain: A new Agenda for Aid, Trade and Investment. This document has been examined to find out about the position of the SfD Vital power of sport programme in relation to Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- Participative observation during the Co Creation meeting
Last November the first Co Creation meeting took place. The participants of the Co Creation meeting consisted of Dutch partners ISA, KNVB and RTP. Additionally, international stakeholders from Kenya and Mali were present. Those partner countries were selected because the Dutch partners are all well represented in them (or at least two). The participative observation has enabled the researcher to understand the concerns in the M&E and learning strategy of the SfD Vital power of sport programme.
- Documents, E-mails, Whatsapp group regarding to the Co Creation meeting
As a result of the Co Creation meeting in November different documents regarding Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) are developed in order to continue the process.
 - MEL Vision: Informative. This document gives insight in why we apply MEL.
 - MEL Guide: For reference. This document consists of background information towards MEL.
 - MEL an activity step by step: Guidance form. This is a form to guide you through doing MEL on an activity.
 - MEL tools: Documentation overview. This document shows the different tools to use for each step of the MEL cycle.

These documents have been used as background information for this research. In addition, the participants were asked for their commitment on the long term. Therefore, they developed a future path at the end of the Co Creation meeting. This future path consisted of various assignments for the short term, but also for the long term. These assignments are communicated by E-mail. Therefore, this E-mail conversations and content are used as in-depth input for this study. Moreover, a Whatsapp group has been created to keep in touch with each other in order to share experiences with each other. This communication is also used as input for this study in order to get more in-depth information.

- Semi-structured interviews
Semi-structured interviews are conducted, because this offers the researcher the opportunity to interview the respondents to obtain more in-depth information. The interviews are held based on a topic list, which can be found in appendix 9.1. The topic list has been formulated by means of the research question and the relevant available literature. The subjects on the topic list are not fixed. They could be adjusted during the interview when the respondents have initiated other themes.

4.4 Respondents

To derive an answer on the research question interviews are conducted with involved people of the SfD Vital power of sport programme. Both participants of the co-creation meeting as non-participants are interviewed. Participants are selected based on their participation in the co creation meeting. Nonparticipants are selected on the basis of their responsibilities towards M&E in their organisations. Moreover, the nonparticipants are introduced by the participants of the co creation meeting. However, almost all interviewees are required to be partners of the SfD Vital power of sport programme. In this study, the Dutch partners and the international partners from Kenya are

interviewed, because those partners are able to express themselves in English or Dutch. Moreover, Kenya is one of the leading nations in the sport for development field. There are more than hundreds of small CSO's implementing sports for development with a strong community base (ISA, KNVB & RTP, 2015). Additionally, one southern country, Kenya, has been selected because the results of this study cannot be generalised, because it is context specific. Therefore, this research focuses on profound information collected at a local level of one country. The interviews with the Kenyan partners were held during Skype meetings, since the researcher and respondents were not in the same country. Moreover, the Knowledge & Effectiveness Manager of Partos has been interviewed in order to discover which trends they are aware of regarding M&E in the international development field. Partos is the Dutch membership body for organisations working in international development. The interviews are held in the language the researcher and respondent commonly know the best in order to obtain more information. The interviews with the Dutch partners are held in Dutch, since it is the mother tongue of the researcher and the Dutch respondents. The interviews with the Kenyan partners were held in English, since it is the common language of the researcher and the Kenyan respondents. The following organisations have collaborated on this research: International Sports Alliance, KNVB WorldCoaches, Right To Play, TYSA, OrangeLink, Girls Unlimited, SOPA, Amani Kibera and Partos. Table 2 depicts the features of the respondents.

Country	Participate in first Co-Creation meeting	Function
The Netherlands	Yes	Project leader
The Netherlands	No	Project leader
The Netherlands	Yes	Project coordinator
The Netherlands	No	Project coordinator
The Netherlands	Yes	Director
The Netherlands	No	Programme manager
Kenya	Yes	CEO
Kenya	Yes	CEO
Kenya	Yes	Co-founder
Kenya	No	Coach
Kenya	No	Coach
Kenya	No	Director
The Netherlands	No	Manager Knowledge & Effectiveness

Table 2 Features of the respondents

4.5 Analysis

All interviews were recorded and completely transcribed. During the participative observations, the researcher has written down observation notes, while focusing on three main questions: 1. What do I see? 2. What do I hear? 3. What is my interpretation? An example of this can be found in appendix 9.4 Observation notes. Subsequently, these notes are worked out in so-called 'field notes'. Afterwards the data has been analysed by incorporating the following three phases: open coding, axial coding and selective coding (Boeije, 2005). Edwards & Skinner (2009) pretend coding as the organisation of raw data into conceptual classifications. Every code is effectively a category into which all data is placed. It is the first step in providing some form of logical structure to the gathered data. During the coding process, the data-analysis software Nvivo has been used. In the first phase, all important pieces are highlighted and receive a name. No selection on relevant material has been made yet during the

open coding (Boeije, 2005). Subsequently the axial coding took place. During the axial coding, themes were linked to codes. Moreover, the most common, relevant and important codes became main codes, which means distinction between important and less important fragments have been made. The remaining codes became sub codes and the less relevant or common codes are ignored. Finally, during the selective coding process, less relevant themes are omitted and the main and sub themes remained in order to answer the research question. Additionally, themes are compared, connections are made and the research results has been derived. Appendix 9.3 highlights the coding process. As mentioned before, the interviews with the Dutch partners are conducted in Dutch. However, this research report is written in English in order that the international partners are able to read it as well. Therefore, the researcher translated the Dutch quotes to English. This is mentioned at all quotes from Dutch respondents, which are used in the results section. In addition, the researcher has used fictitious names in the result section in order to guarantee the anonymity of the respondents.

4.6 The role of the researcher

This research is executed by one researcher. The researcher is a Dutch white female and working at ISA. Additionally, the researcher has participated in the co creation meeting, which means that the researcher is actively involved. All those aspects can be influencing the results of the study. Hence, the respondents could give social desirable response. In addition, the researcher studies at the Utrecht University. Therefore, the researcher has introduced herself as a student in order to emphasis the independency of the researcher. Since it is possible that respondents could give social desirable response as a consequence that the researcher works at ISA. Moreover, the researcher was not able to do all interviews face to face, therefore several interviews have been conducted by using Skype. The researcher is aware of the disadvantages of conducting Skype interviews. For example, it was not possible to observe the nonverbal communication, because the internet connection did not allow using video during the interviews. Additionally, the researcher has struggled with using the accurate terminology towards the movement from M&E to MEL. The researcher believes that it is not just about a changing strategy, because that would imply that the strategy changes straight from traditional M&E to MEL. However, it is more complex, because it is not only about implementing a new strategy, it is also about the underlying elements of implementing a new strategy. The most important element is the moving perspective, since the moving perspective consists of a process in which stakeholders, both programme managers and implementers, provide each other continuous feedback on the way they believe MEL should be implemented. In addition, using the term learning approach implies that it is just about adding an additional element to the traditional M&E. Therefore, the researcher does not use the term changing strategy or learning approach. In addition, a new strategy has several consequences on the acting level of all stakeholders. Moreover, the new strategy requires a different mentality. For example, traditional M&E requires writing reports, namely based on quantitative data in order to account to the funder. This contradicts the MEL strategy which requires qualitative data in order to improve interventions and learn on a local level. Within the moving perspective stakeholders provide input and feedback on how the MEL strategy should be implemented. The researcher is aware that it goes beyond adding an extra element to the traditional M&E. Therefore, the researcher decided to work with the term moving perspective. To reduce the influence of this struggle, the researcher has mentioned the struggle and decided to work with the term moving perspective as a working definition.

4.7 Reliability and validity

Reliability and validity are important criteria in establishing and assessing the quality of the research. Reliability refers to the influence of the observations by accidental or unsystematic errors (Boeije, 2005). According to Bryman (2008) reliability can be separated in external and internal reliability. External reliability means the extent to which a research can be replicated (Bryman, 2008). It is a difficult criterion to gather in qualitative research, because it is unmanageable to 'freeze' the social environment and the circumstances. In order to increase the reliability of research, it is desirable to apply a standardized working method of data collection and analysis (Boeije, 2005). The researcher has worked systematically during this study. The method of the study is described in detail, so the research is transparent. This will enable other researchers to replicate the method used in this study. Moreover, this study has described the role of the researcher. Since Bryman (2008) suggests that a qualitative researcher needs to adopt a similar social role to that adopted by the original researcher. Otherwise, it will not be comparable to the original study. Internal reliability means when there is more than one researcher. Therefore, 'members of the research team agree about what they see and hear' (Bryman, 2008, p. 390). Although this study has one researcher, this study attempts to guarantee internal reliability. During the research process the researcher asked feedback from the thesis supervisor, internship supervisor and the research buddy to increase the internal reliability. Validity concerns whether what is being measured is also what the researcher intended to measure (Boeije, 2005). In order to ensure the validity of this study, all interviews have been conducted based on a topic list. This topic list has been designed based on the research question, sub questions and the literature review. Therefore, it is intended to measure what the researcher wants to measure. Moreover, to increase the validity this research uses triangulation. This means that that data is collected by using different methods (Boeije, 2005). This study has applied literature research, document analysis, participative observation and semi-structured interviews.

5. Results

This chapter presents the results obtained by conducting interviews, participative observation and document analysis. The results are described by means of the following themes: M&E objective, co creation meeting, M&E tools and the consequences towards implementing MEL. These themes are based on the data obtained and are related to the main and sub research questions as formulated in the introduction. They illustrate how involved stakeholders assign meaning to a new strategy within the M&E strategy of Sfd Vital power of sport programme. Moreover, they show the consequences associated by the meanings stakeholders assign to the MEL strategy, influenced by the moving perspective, in order to implement the MEL strategy successfully.

5.1 Monitoring & Evaluation

5.1.1 Meaning M&E

As mentioned in the literature review different studies on M&E assume that the goal of M&E is to improve programmes or interventions. This concurs with the purpose of the M&E strategy of the Sfd Vital power of sport programme. The M&E strategy has been implemented in order to learn from implemented activities, improve the effectiveness and efficiency of programme implementation, and account for programme results to beneficiaries, involved stakeholders and funders. Both local partners and Dutch partners see M&E as an important aspect of their work.

"Yes, for me monitoring and evaluation is such an important department, because it actually keeps us informed on the impact of our work" (James).

[Translated from Dutch]

"I think it is crucial, because if you don't do it, I don't even think it make sense to start a project." (Emma)

However, in the past years the importance on M&E has changed, this has been encountered by Collin: [Translated from Dutch] *"Well, over the years, it is something that has gained importance."* Not only the importance has increased, strategies have also evolved. The literature review describes that M&E strategies have evolved over time. This study illustrates those developments by introducing three different approaches of M&E: traditional M&E, PM&E and the MEL strategy. The Vital power of sport programme intends to develop the latter approach. For this transition, the stakeholders attempt to expand on the traditional M&E strategy by formulating learning goals and activities for the Sfd Vital power of sport programme. These learning activities aim to improve the impact of the activities, and in the end, enable everyone involved to identify the progress markers that help to understand the success drivers and improvements in the programme. During the interviews respondents were asked what M&E means to them. The Dutch respondents mentioned accountability first.

[Translated from Dutch]

"Hmhm monitoring and evaluation means to me, on the one hand, I experience it as something uhm you just need to do, it just belongs to it. If you work with public money you must have to account well and I think that is important." (Elly)

[Translated from Dutch]

"There must be constant reflection on what is being done. How it is done and especially how money is spent" (Emma).

The quotes by Elly and Emma are different compared to the way Kenyan respondents look at monitoring and evaluation. The Kenyan respondents mentioned that M&E is an important tool for impact measurement and continuous assessments of work you do instead of accounting for actions.

"So, for me monitoring and evaluation is the tool that we use to see if our objectives as sport for development organisations are really creating an impact in the lives of the people you are working for." (Tess).

"For me uhm monitoring and evaluation is a continuous assessment of a how you implement a project and how you intent it is like a, it is like a guidance. (...) The monitoring part and evaluation part guide you. (...) Is it doing an impact? So, it is like an assessing. Assessing what you're a doing, but is a continuous, what maybe can help you planning in future or change strategies of implementation." (Michael)

It is remarkable that Dutch partners assume that local partners do not recognise the importance of M&E. While almost all local partners mentioned that M&E is an important part of their work and that they act accordingly in order to improve and change programmes to increase their impact. Therefore, it is questionable if the answers of local partners are socially desirable or that they are further developed than Dutch partners realise. Moreover, it is notable that the Dutch partners mention accountability and the obligations towards M&E, while the local partners focus on impact measuring and continuous assessment in order to change or improve interventions or programmes. The meanings Dutch partners and Kenyan partners assign to M&E are conflicting since the Dutch partners mention accountability, which is a characteristic of the traditional M&E and the local partners mention impact measuring and a continuous process, which are characteristics of the MEL strategy. These meanings towards M&E can be distinguished as traditional M&E and the MEL strategy. During the interviews these two perspectives are discussed.

5.1.2 Numbers

The respondents pointed out different aspects of traditional M&E. Several respondents emphasised the use of quantitative data expressed by numbers in traditional M&E to analyse the effectiveness of the strategy. A couple of them mentioned that they are focused or were focused on numbers. Therefore, they were collecting information regarding the amount of youth reached or coaches trained.

"You know, before we had uhm we were focusing more on numbers. Like uhm number of materials, number of kids reached, and number of activities done. So those were like the most important deliverable." (Rick)

Jessie confirmed the use of numbers as well. She mentioned that it is part of their action plan. An action plan helps coaches planning their training course. Additionally, the action plan also includes an evaluation part.

"Ja, cause in our action plan uhm we have that session of how many number of players you train? Or how many kids do you train and how many sessions do you give and the number of topics." (Jessie)

Moreover, various respondents pointed out the disadvantage of collecting quantitative data. Michael mentioned the limitation of using numbers, because numbers do not go in depth on the impact you might have on young people. For example, the amount of trained coaches is not telling you if your intervention has impact on the lives of young people.

"So sometimes you can be able to say I have trained 50 people, but are these 50 people really implementing within the organisation. You have given the knowledge. Are they really working on the community context, transferring knowledge? That is now, you can say he is working, he is reaching 20 to 30 children. But after training, maybe 10 to 5 people can be able to go and implement...So I think looking at the number maybe, trained coaches ja, is important maybe to train more coaches, but it does not actually bring out the change, because it is the implementation level now whereby is this person really working. Ok if he is working, I have trained him, is he now transferring the skills. It is a matter of transferring the skills you have learned one and other." (Michael)

Despite the limitations of using numbers some of the respondents also emphasised the importance of numbers.

"...numbers are important, because they also give you the statistics they give you the general overview of the people who you are impacting." (Kevin)

"(...) and also numbers are very important and also the regularity of these people, because we believe that if they come on a regular basis. So they are not going to miss important lessons and life skills that we have for them. So also I think we have tools to measure that." (Tess)

Although using numbers have limitations, numbers are important and that means they should be part of the new strategy. This is also emphasised by Robin since he thinks that numbers will always be interesting to look at. In his opinion numbers are conditional in realising change or to have impact. However, he is also aware of the limitations of numbers. He pointed out that you also want to know the story behind the numbers. Laura agreed and adds that it is mainly about quantitative data. However, she also mentioned that development organisations are collecting qualitative data nowadays. In other words, they are collecting the stories behind the numbers. In addition, she recognised the challenge of putting qualitative data into quantitative reports. [Translated from Dutch] *"That is quite complicated, but that uhm therefore organisations are now looking for solutions."* (Laura) This means that the focus on just using numbers is moving to a combination of numbers and the stories behind these numbers.

5.1.3 Beneficiaries

Another aspect that has been mentioned by the respondents deals with the beneficiaries from the M&E systems. One of the respondents linked numbers to the beneficiaries of M&E, because Robin said that they would never use numbers for themselves, but just to show the outside world what they do. Moreover, the donor has been pointed out as the most important beneficiary of traditional M&E by several respondents.

"One if I look it from the traditional way, it is for the donor." (Rick)

"I think like uhm it has been a traditional way of maybe reporting or please the funding partners." (James)

Donor organisations benefits from M&E in the way that they know what happened with their donations. Laura confirmed that it occurred in the past the most important actor was the donor in the past. However, she also said that it is not wrong to account to

the donor, but it is problematic if you are just accounting to your funder instead of your own organisation or your own target group.

[Translated from Dutch]

"Well, within that programme it happened that the emphasis was really on accountability and also in a way that met the requirements of the ministry. So yes, very much upward accountability. However, there is nothing wrong with accountability on its own. It is just an issue when you only account to your donor instead of to your target group. Then it is a problem." (Laura)

5.1.4 M&E versus MEL

Other points with regards to traditional M&E are the delays in collecting and receiving information towards an evaluation deadline and that reporting is needed to complete a project, which has been financed by subsidies. Moreover, the reports need to be written according to the standard that is required by the donor. This latter experience concurs with the experiences described in the literature review. Since the Zimbabwean activist also mentioned that she had to apply M&E according to donor formats. She admitted that she just wrote down what the donor wanted to hear. Additionally, traditional M&E does not require changes. These statements are confirmed by Rick: *"And then in traditional way you didn't have to reflect. You just had to write a nice report, for the standard that has been required by the donor. And then you are completed it. (...) It was nearly possible to change anything, because you had to follow the whole cycle through."* Hence, several respondents said that traditional M&E does not focus on learning, but focuses on accountability. These findings correspond with the definitions of M&E in the literature review.

Although some respondents pointed out accountability, most of them experience changes towards M&E. Six respondents have participated in a co creation meeting, which has been organised in order to develop the M&E strategy in the SfD Vital power of sport programme. The next paragraph elaborates on the results resulting from the co creation meeting. Hence, during this meeting these six respondents became aware of a new strategy within SfD Vital power of sport programme. However, nonparticipants experienced a switch as well. One of the respondents said that in the past, it was mainly about numbers and now it is more about the story behind the numbers. According to Robin, *"I think that is learning."* Moreover, in his opinion learning already happens in the field, but unconsciously. People are not aware the fact that they are observing. This results in them not writing down their observations. Consequently, they are unable to reflect on observations they had during an earlier stage. Several respondents confirm the importance of learning.

"Yes, learning, cause we still need that. I think that it is very important to improve the interventions for the youngsters. Learning is a very important aspect." (Tess)

One of the participants of the co creation meeting experiences a shift towards M&E. He emphasised the shift from traditional M&E towards the new M&E strategy; the MEL strategy.

"(...) the shift from the traditional way of monitoring and evaluation which I mentioned earlier. Upon the North we want to report, you know, give the donor report, you know. We leave lessons learned you know, as a small as an annex, but for us here, from this process, the learning is not a learning. It is the central of the monitoring and evaluation, it is the centre of it. It should be the centre of it. So when we bring this learning at the central then the question that we are saying what we want to learn from this? What we want to pick from this particular children, that comes in there."

That is why learning has to come at the centre of the organisation and you have to be willing to pick key lessons and these key lessons are part of the bigger picture of the organisation.” (Kevin)

As mentioned traditional M&E has mainly focused on satisfying donors. The respondents experience that when the purpose of M&E is moving to learning instead of accountability, there are different beneficiaries. Almost all respondents said that MEL should be applied in order to develop oneself.

“(…) the first thing you need to do it for yourself (…)” (James)

Some of the respondents mentioned that M&E is not only important and useful in developing yourself, but for other stakeholders as well.

“It really guides you on where you heading to. So if your target group is children and you wanted them to change their behaviour, to have a positive attitude, towards maybe sexual reproductive health. It is them whom benefit, if you are on the right track, M&E is really guiding you towards achieving that. And also it is for the organisation. Cause if you don’t have good measuring tools or systems you end up <inaudible> your programme still or ending up without maybe the impact is not captured. You don’t even know what you are doing as an organisation. So, the second people you are doing it for yourself. And the third person is also the people who are supporting you. They really need to know. They really need to know if there are putting up their resources for the right costs.” (Tess)

One of them even pointed out that you should engage in M&E regarding all stakeholders.

“The MEL way is for all the stakeholders.” (Rick)

Other points mentioned towards MEL are MEL being fun and practical. Moreover, the MEL strategy provides continuous learning in order to improve the way of working or changing interventions. Hence, interventions can be adjusted at any time.

“So, I think there is a continuous learning moment in these and the opportunity to improve situations or to make it better the projects and also activities. So, I think that is the difference. So, and then of course we also learned that sometimes you can have, you can change things. What is the plan something, something you are doing and then you facing reality and then of course with MEL it allows you to make changes. Of course you have to have an argument for every changes and that makes you grow. (...) But the MEL is a bit different, because now we don’t have to wait until all those stages. Of course we can still maintain the same stages.” (Rick)

In other words, most of the respondents experience a shift from traditional M&E towards the MEL strategy. This shift is influenced by the moving perspective. As previously stated the moving perspective consists of the process, in which stakeholders, both programme managers and implementers, provide each other continuous feedback on the way they believe MEL should be implemented. This process influenced the meanings stakeholders assign to MEL and the shift itself. Moreover, they distinguish similar characteristics which belong to traditional M&E and the MEL strategy as described in the literature review. Although several respondents said that MEL is adaptable, they also realise that it is a process which takes time. However, one of the respondents is sceptic and thinks that MEL is a luxury and an unnecessary addition at the moment. Therefore, MEL cannot be fully integrated on the short term.

Due to this, traditional M&E can not be replaced by MEL at this moment. Another respondent added that you should keep applying traditional M&E in order to be able to apply MEL. This means that traditional M&E and accompanying rules, beliefs and thoughts still prevail. For example, the SfD Vital power of sport partnership must still deliver a midterm evaluation and an end report.

5.2 Co Creation meeting

As stated in the previous paragraph, this section elaborates on the co creation meeting. The SfD Vital power of sport programme proposed several key elements towards the M&E strategy within the programme. One of the proposed elements consists of an integral M&E system, using mixed methods, which should be developed in close collaboration with external research institutes and the involved CSO's. Therefore, ISA, KNVB and RTP collaborated with the following two external research institutes: Utrecht University (UU) and MDF consultancy (MDF). Last November UU and MDF facilitated a co creation meeting in order to develop the MEL strategy within the SfD Vital power of sport programme. The Dutch partners and partners from Kenya and Mali attended the meeting. However, this study just focuses on the Kenyan and Dutch partners. Additionally, not all the respondents of this study participated in the meeting. Therefore, in this paragraph only responses of the six participants of the co creation meeting are discussed. Prior to the co creation meeting participants were asked about their expectations of the meeting. The expectations of the participants concur in developing a simple system, which is easy to communicate and to implement in all countries.

"I will look back at a very successful co creation meeting when we have accomplished:

- *A common understanding about the need for and power of MEL within SFD.nl*
- *A MEL approach that is innovative and practical (functional and realistic)*
- *A smart approach how we can make the co created MEL approach something alive and kicking in all countries"* (Rose)

"I will look back at a very successful co creation meeting when we have accomplished that our sports for development programme can develop a simple MEL system and tools that can define and capture the characteristics of our own approach to structure learning that constitute the basis of development through reflection on our own Sfd activities." (Tess)

One of the respondents emphasised his expectations during the interview.

"My expectation, one was to have a very simple, that realized how simple it can become to process monitoring, evaluation and learning. I wanted to have a formula that is more simple to communicate and implement. So that is what I was exactly looking at." (Rick)

The co creation meeting has initiated the first steps towards the new MEL strategy for the SfD Vital power of sport programme on documenting activities and choices, and to improve the practices by actively using them to learn about activities and improve on them. Additionally, the co creation meeting has been organised in order to gather input for a guide regarding MEL, which can be used to get more insights about successes and difficulties of interventions by focussing more on active evaluation and documentation outcomes of activities. The participants experienced the meeting in a positive way.

[Translated from Dutch]

"...I think it was a really good session to do it step by step in order to experience it. We are great supporters of experiential learning, I think all of us as SfD organisations. This meeting was an excellent example of that. You just must do it and we did it. We applied it to our own situations." (Rose)

However, it is notable that there are differences between the experiences of the Dutch partners and the Kenyan partners. The Dutch partners did not experience a lot of new information, but they became aware of the learning element in the field; stakeholders are already learning, even though unconsciously.

[Translated from Dutch]

"Uhm, but specific on MEL, I don't think we have heard appalling new information..." (Elly)

[Translated from Dutch]

"It was indeed, uhm, you can say it was a kind of level the playing field. Eventually the statement is that we are all learning within our own context and that we also do some sort of similar work." (Vince)

This contradicts the Kenyan partners, who have experienced a big shift towards MEL as a result of participating in the co creation meeting.

"For me that was a big shift, that meeting in Holland, was very important of going through those and looking at that was also important, because that inter guides you towards the process." (Kevin)

This contradiction is remarkable compared to the first paragraph of this chapter because, Dutch partners mentioned accountability being a key element within M&E. Additionally, several local partners mentioned continuous assessment and impact measuring as part of M&E, which could both be described as characteristics of MEL. When the respondents were asked about MEL, it is the other way around, because the Dutch partners did not gather new information towards M&E. Moreover, some of the local partners even experienced a big shift from M&E to MEL.

During the co creation meeting a learning cycle was used and consisted out of four steps: observe, analyse, reflect and act. The cycle has been introduced in order to discover the successes and failures in activities of the programme. During the co creation meeting every step was discussed and filled in by the participants of the meeting. Hence, every step includes several ideas on methods and tools that can be used to collect, document and share the knowledge on the different steps. The input for these steps was gathered by discussing cases that were prepared by participants on three different experiences: one regarding successes, one regarding adjustments that were made to achieve success and one regarding the stumbling blocks encountered. Therefore, participants had to be committed and dedicated before the meeting started. Not only before, but also during and after the co creation meeting commitment and dedication was expected from all participants. During the meeting, all participants were actively involved and everyone prepared the three cases. Therefore, everyone has shown their commitment and dedication to developing the process of the MEL strategy.

"All participants are actively involved and everyone is writing key notes" (Observation co creation meeting)

At the end of the meeting the participants created a roadmap together. Two plans were designed; one for the short term (next three months) and one for the longer term of the SfD Vital power of sport programme. The roadmap shows the commitment and dedication of the participants. The roadmap includes the following elements:

- The MEL co-creation group will start applying the MEL cycle on their activities, and documenting the different steps.
- The MEL guide will be developed, which will function as a starting point for the MEL activities, and provides a toolbox of documentation strategies to use.
- An online platform will be created where all participants can share their experiences and progress as well as interesting findings.
- After initial use by the core MEL participants the guide will be re-evaluated and adjusted.
- Several other co-creation meetings will be organised to improve the guide, sharing cases and further developing the monitoring, evaluation & Learning strategy.
- For other partners in the SfD Vital power of sport programme, more details about the guide and its use will be provided during fall 2017.
- The MEL co creation group will be updated about the MEL programme regularly and will be informed how the MEL programme and guide can help and support the activities organised.

"Everyone is willing implementing the learning cycle and share the information with each other. They want to stay in touch with each other." (Observation co creation meeting)

However, the development process of the MEL strategy was not finished at the end of the meeting. Therefore, the participants developed the roadmap in order to follow up the process. A couple of days after the meeting a Whatsapp group was set up in order to stay in touch with each other. However, the communication in the Whatsapp group remains limited so far. It is difficult to stay in touch when everybody is acting from their own environment and context. Everyone is busy working on their daily activities. This is also shown by the limited responses on follow up mails. For example, during the meeting the participants suggested doing research on the opportunities for a common online platform in order to share knowledge and experiences. In January the participants received a follow up mail in which they were asked to provide suggestions for an online platform. However, only one participant answered that mail. Both examples show it is not easy to be actively committed and dedicated when you are not in the same place at the same time. Nonetheless, that does not mean the participants are not committed or dedicated, because all participants cooperated by giving an interview for this study. Additionally, as mentioned in the roadmap, the participants were asked to apply the MEL cycle to a daily activity and share their experiences at the end of April. Even though the limited communication in the Whatsapp group and the limited responses on the online platform request, almost all participants responded. This is notable since the latter request was done by the UU and the previous examples were initiated by ISA. Moreover, the participants were asked to apply the MEL cycle on daily activities. However, two of them organised a MEL workshop within their organisation instead of applying the MEL cycle on a daily activity. Image 1 depicts one of the organised MEL workshops. It is remarkable that two of the participants have organised a MEL meeting within their organisation, because they were not asked to do something else. The intention of this assignment was to keep it simple and apply the MEL cycle on a daily activity in order to confine additional work. This could mean that the participants of the co creation meeting experience that they feel they have to share the MEL strategy within their

organisations first, before they can apply the MEL cycle on daily activities. Moreover, it could mean that the participants normally do not execute M&E tasks and that they have to share it with the people in the organisation who are responsible for M&E.



Image 1 MEL meeting organised by Orange Link

One of the respondents mentioned that it is necessary to review the roadmap in order to remain on track.

"(...) think what probably we need to keep up sometimes to reviewing the timeline. And also maybe say now we have reached this place now we want to co evaluate this and then move to the next stage." (Kevin)

5.3 Tools

In order to monitor and evaluate programmes it is necessary to collect, document and share data. Data can be collected by using different tools. As previous stated in the literature review, M&E tools assist collecting information from the field, but are also used to document the collected information. During the co creation meeting participants came up with various tools to collect data and they suggested tools to document the collected data. Every part of the learning cycle has been discussed by the participants. For example, in the analysis phase participants suggested using the following tools to analyse data: critical questioning, mind mapping and focus group discussions. Additionally, they add the following suggestions to document the gathered data: stories, reports, transcripts, picture chart, checking records, symbols, matrix and flow charts. Moreover, respondents emphasised the importance of tools during the interviews. They pointed out which tools they are using in their current M&E strategy. The tools that are mentioned in the interviews are: questionnaires, focus group discussions, videos, storytelling, templates and interviews. As mentioned in the first paragraph of this chapter as well as the literature study a distinction between quantitative and qualitative information can be made. This means that there are tools that focus on collecting quantitative data and tools which gather qualitative data. One of the respondents emphasised this distinction.

[Translated from Dutch]

"On the one hand, you can measure things quantitatively, uhm counting people, how many people did you reach? Or uhm how many cases did you discover? (...) At the other hand, you can measure qualitatively, so what is the impact now? However, it is harder to measure the impact on different target groups, but you can do it by using storytelling." (Emma)

Another respondent said that it is mainly about quantitative data, which is the challenge to put qualitative data into quantitative data. It is quite complicated to express qualitative data into quantitative data. According to Laura, organisations are

looking for possible ways to enrich quantitative data. The surplus value of qualitative data is to get to know the stories behind the quantitative data in order to find out if your activity has impact or not. And if you do, which impact you have on your target group. For example, a training took place and 15 girls joined this training. However, this number does not tell you if an impact was realised on the life of the girls. Therefore, you want to know more in-depth information. To collect that qualitative information Laura mentioned various tools: visual methods, narrative reports and storytelling. The latter has been mentioned by several respondents. However, one of the respondents also mentioned a critical note towards the storytelling tool.

[Translated from Dutch]

"Although, I think it is not always representative, because often the right people are chosen to tell those stories." (Emma)

Therefore, Emma pointed out that she prefers focus groups or anonymous interviews.

[Translated from Dutch]

"Uhm so, I am more a fan of focus groups or anonymous interviewed, where people really can give their piece of mind about the project and the impact of the project" (Emma)

She is not the only one that pointed out the use of focus group discussions. Emma mentioned that focus group discussions enable people to give their honest opinion. Another reason to hold focus group discussions is to create a safe environment for people so they feel free to express themselves. One of the respondents has experienced the negative consequences: *"(...) sometimes you meet people who are shy and who don't want to talk. You know, and this kind of inside information, or you meet people who are low in self esteem. So they are not able to express themselves well."* (James)

Moreover, several respondents mentioned using visual methods to collect and document data. [Translated from Dutch] *"Yes, one photo says more than ten stories"* (Collin) Additionally, Collin adds [Translated from Dutch] *"And one video says 100 times more than ten photos"*. Therefore, he advocates to use photos and videos rather than written reports. Other respondents encourage these visual methods as well and mentioned that they are already using them.

"We have our own documentaries in type of small videos." (Kevin)

"Sometimes we also do it through like videos. We have done one documentary, that was more or less like focusing on some positive stories of what we had. So far, it was part of monitoring and documenting to the success stories we that we have had." (James)

The previous tools mainly collect and document qualitative data. However, the respondents also pointed out questionnaires or templates, which can combine quantitative and qualitative data collection.

"Yes, we have kind of form templates (...) what are you focusing, maybe which life skills are you focusing. What is the number of people attending? That one is by the number. And what change are you see?" (Michael)

At the moment, this information is often documented in Excel sheets. This is confirmed by Collin and Elly *"Yes, Excel sheets"* and *"Uhm at WorldCoaches for example, it is*

documented in Excel". However, Rick mentioned that his organisation also works with Akvo, a service provider which helps to collect and document data. It is important to note that this is not related to the SfD Vital power of sport programme. A disadvantage of documenting data in Excel sheets is that it is not accessible for everyone.

In addition, other challenges regarding collecting information are for example: people providing answers on questionnaires only to please you, or people expecting getting something in return. This can occur when they fill in a questionnaire or participate in a focus group discussion.

"Yes, the parents of children are expecting that they get a scholarship or something when we want to do an interview. But we don't give scholarships, it is just to improve the interventions. And that is what we give to them." (Tess)

This is notable, because it means you have to take into account that people have their own expectations. Therefore, it is important to manage these expectations. Moreover, one of the respondents emphasised the importance of doing M&E during the interventions rather than after a specific period in order to gather the most recent and honest information.

"We don't separate like M&E with the activities, because if you separate it and you want a child to now answer a question that they did an activity on that question maybe four months ago and you want them to learn. It is also force them to give you the correct answer rather than the honest opinion or honest feelings or attitudes towards that question you want to measure." (Tess)

5.4 Consequences

The second part concerning the main question consists of what consequences the meanings stakeholders assign to MEL influenced by the moving perspective towards implementing the MEL strategy successfully. These consequences can be divided in challenges and opportunities. First the challenges will be discussed, followed by the opportunities.

5.4.1 Challenges

This paragraph focuses on the challenges mentioned during the interviews. Some of these challenges refer to M&E in general and some of them are more concentrated on the MEL strategy. First the general challenges will be discussed and afterwards the specific challenges will be described.

Several respondents mentioned time as an important challenge. Some of them emphasised that if you want to apply M&E right, it takes a lot of time. Another respondent mentioned that on a local level people are running out of time, because they are pre-occupied executing daily activities.

[Translated from Dutch]

"However, I always have the feeling that we don't have enough time in order to do it correctly." (Vince)

"I think it is either you are running out of time or you are crazy busy with time you have." (James)

This means that the respondents experience that a shortage of time is degrading the effectiveness of M&E. Moreover, a lack of capacity is also mentioned as a challenge, which also reduces the effectiveness of M&E.

"Plus, they have so much work and they have minimal staff to do those things. And the focus is on implementing the projects. I think that evaluation feels as a burden, because they just do not have the capacity." (Emma)

Emma has mainly pointed out the lack of capacity on a local level. However, Vince has also mentioned the lack of capacity at his own organisation. According to him this is a result of not having one person in charge of M&E, instead it is one of his and his colleagues' responsibilities. Vince refers that this is a different compared to larger NGO's which often have one specific person responsible for the M&E system in the organisation. This means that other tasks often have higher priority over M&E responsibilities. Due to this a lack of expertise regarding M&E has been developed. In order to become an expert on M&E you should be fully devoted and committed towards M&E, Vince mentioned. At the moment, it is just one of the tasks that needs to be done. This has been intensified by Collin since he experiences that M&E is underrepresented in the Sfd Vital power of sport programme.

[Translated from Dutch]

"I think monitoring, evaluation and learning is marginal in the Sport for Development programme." (Collin)

Therefore, it is challenging to manage M&E being higher prioritised. One of the respondents added that due to this lack of capacity and expertise everyone developed their own way of doing things. This often leads to a delay. This means that other stakeholders are waiting for information to be able to follow up on applying the M&E process.

"Ja, ja of course. Because one of the main challenges is the delay. Everyone has that own way of doing things, ja but uhm the main challenge is the delay, also like talking right now, I am still waiting for the evaluation forms, because we did a course last year." (Jessie)

In short, the challenges towards M&E in general are related to the shortage of time and a lack of capacity, which results in a lack of expertise and often leads to a delay. These obstacles must be reduced in order to increase the value of M&E.

In addition, respondents pointed out challenges towards the new strategy in the Sfd Vital power of sport programme. Several respondents mentioned that MEL should be more fun. However, this has also been identified as a challenge, because Vince is wondering how applying MEL could be made fun. Consequently, he is wondering how to make sure applying MEL is fun. Moreover, it seems that the challenges are related to collecting information as well as storing and interpreting the collected information. One of the respondents pointed out the accessibility of the gathered data as a challenge. This is caused by the size of the programmes and the number of stakeholders involved. Therefore, it is complex and difficult to make the gathered data accessible for everyone.

"(...) I am talking about the accessibility of the gathered information. The programmes are so large, I think that is a challenge, a really big challenge" (Rose)

Tess partially agreed on the accessibility challenge. She said it is probably not hard to share collected information. However, her concern is about what to share.

"I don't think it is hard to share, but the other thing is uhm what to share." (Tess)

Emma elaborates on Tess' point of what to share. Since Emma believes that every stakeholder has their own interests towards MEL information. Due to this, it depends on the stakeholder what you want to share.

[Translated from Dutch]

"And uhm everyone has to bring forward results on their own way within their organisations. Every organisation has their own interests. Some organisations are focused on numbers and other organisation are more focused on real outcomes." (Emma)

This means that the stakeholders of the SfD Vital power of sport programme should determine what they want to share in advance, in order to keep it accessible for involved stakeholders.

Another challenge relates to the different stakeholders in different parts of the world. In order for MEL to be successful it is necessary that all stakeholders are involved within the SfD Vital power of sport programme since the stakeholders define the conditions under which the M&E strategy operates. Additionally, local partners add to these conditions since they experience the value of the strategy first hand.

This means that local partners have an important role concerning the collection of data needed for M&E. However, the challenge is to find the right division of roles. According to Elly, the SfD Vital power of sport programme should obstruct a top down approach since she believes it is important that the local partners feel a sense of ownership over the programmes as well as the M&E strategy within the programme. Moreover, she mentioned that you do not want to constantly ask local partners questions like: *"Do you already have this information?"* or *"Do you already have that information?"*, since she believes that asking such questions relates to a top down approach.

One of the respondents struggles with learning how to apply the MEL strategy, because he mentioned that sometimes you want to learn about the effectiveness of the programme, but at the same time you are learning whether a learning strategy works. This means that the MEL strategy on its own is being experienced as a challenge. Therefore, the SfD Vital power of sport programme should clarify the new strategy in order to decrease the doubt towards the way the MEL strategy should be applied. In addition, since several respondents have mentioned that you need to practice in order to be able to implement the MEL strategy the SfD vital power of sport programme should encourage the stakeholders to practice with the strategy.

"The only challenge is that if you don't practice. It is like any other exercise, you have to practice. It is like always in the beginning." (Rick)

This means that if stakeholders do not practice using the MEL strategy, it will be difficult to implement it successfully. In addition, Rick says the following about the roadmap:

"Expectations are there, there was a journey that we came up with all of us. The challenge is also there actually, because the different organisations from different spots of regions and we also have different timelines and different projects that we are running. So the challenge will be how to consolidate all that and fit in that journey. And this is not one person effort. So I think it needs to be very well coordinated to make sure that we all grow and track" (Rick)

In summary, the stakeholders mentioned several challenges towards M&E in general and the new MEL strategy. The SfD Vital power of sport programme needs to take into account both these challenges in order to be able to implement the MEL strategy successfully.

5.4.2 Opportunities

As stated in the previous paragraph the consequences towards successfully implementing the MEL strategy encompasses challenges and opportunities. This paragraph elaborates on the opportunities identified by the respondents.

Several respondents experience donor organisations shifting towards M&E. They used to be very punctual, but they started to realise that situations change over time and therefore need to adapt a programme based on new insights gained by working with the programme.

[Translated from Dutch]

"And uhm the ministry will ask organisations as well, they understand that during the running time of the programme the theory of change and the corresponding indicators can change based on new insights. They provide room to change and adapt these new insights. On condition that you just obtain the intended results. So instead of linearly following the results framework, as was the intention under the old MFS II programme, much more room is now available to change your activities, but also the corresponding indicators. So yes, and you do so by learning. That makes learning so useful, since you get room to adjust it." (Laura)

This shift has also been experienced by partners on a local level.

"Uhm I think donors are shifting, they are moving towards to more looking at the, what they call the impact, sort of what is, what does a process do to the beneficiary or customer we serve. What does that or, what is it we doing on the ground." (Kevin)

This means that implementing organisations and partners are now able to adapt and change programmes in the meantime. This is an opportunity for the SfD Vital power of sport programme, because adapting and changing programmes at any moment enables the partnership to increase its impact.

However, it is important to realise that not everybody experiences the donor shifting towards M&E.

"While I really think, I don't know how deeply you are looking at sustainability and what you have learned. That is not really being asked. So I think foreign affairs or just all donors internationally they are not an incentive to learn, but I don't know. (...) If they government would be willing to ask more learning outcomes, so learning becomes the goal. Yes, maybe it would be more that way." (Elly)

Although not everyone experiences donor organisations shifting towards M&E, it is an opportunity for the SfD Vital power of sport programme. This means that the programme managers should spread the message that donor organisations are adapting their attitude towards M&E in order to implement the new M&E strategy: MEL. Kevin added: *"a mind shift is not done in a day, it is a process that we go through."* Therefore, everyone, both programme managers as well as local implementers, should spread the message and encourage MEL. Not only the attitude of donor organisations needs to be changed in order to implement MEL. According to

one of the respondents the attitude of coaches in the field needs to be changed as well.

"And also I like to change the attitude of the coaches we are working with. So that they can stop thinking that M&E is only counting, but it is not all about numbers, but also about the quality of the programme we are doing." (Tess)

Therefore, one can say changing the attitude of all actors towards M&E provides the Sfd Vital power of sport programme with the possibility to successfully implement the MEL strategy. Added to this changing attitude opportunity one of the respondents mentioned creating awareness towards MEL as an opportunity as well.

"So I think it is really good that this is happening and that we try to change that mind set towards M&E, and of course that would not be directly perfect, but if we can create at least some awareness. Preferably in the south, not only in the north." (Robin)

Therefore, according to Robin creating awareness for MEL is an opportunity that cannot be ignored either. However, creating awareness constitutes a starting point regarding the implementation of MEL. To create this awareness, or even better to change the attitudes towards MEL, one of the respondents mentioned the possibility to use a video to spread the message.

"It is important to show the values of MEL in a way that fits the MEL strategy. For example, if we can design a short MEL video, which explains the MEL values. This video can be shared with every partner. Besides the video, we can provide some background documents, but the video shows the impact of MEL in 90 seconds." (Rose)

This means that designing a MEL video is an opportunity for the Sfd Vital power of sport programme in order to spread the MEL approach. In addition, several respondents mentioned that MEL should be fun and innovative. Therefore, a MEL video can create awareness and change attitudes in a fun and innovative way.

Moreover, most of the respondents mentioned an online platform as an opportunity for the Sfd Vital power of sport programme in order to implement MEL.

"I think one of the critical aspects that faces most of the grassroots organisations will be around uhm having, having uhm air portal." (Kevin)

Having an online platform is valuable, because it provides the opportunity to document and share gathered data, knowledge and experiences. Moreover, it is a way to communicate with each other and an opportunity to reflect on each other's work, which contributes to the value of the programme. In addition, this helps local implementers to improve their interventions on a local level. Moreover, learning from each other's experiences constitutes another opportunity. Several online environments were suggested, such as Facebook, Twitter, Trello or the organisational website. However, some respondents question the added value of an online platform. One of them said that certain organisations already use an online platform, but that does not mean it contributes to the effectiveness of the M&E strategy.

[Translated from Dutch]

"Yes, and some development organisations already have designed an online environment. However, that does not always work. It does not guarantee success." (Laura)

In addition, the respondents are aware that a platform only works if it is used actively.

"(...) if it is not actively, then it will not be as good as size, ja. So I think we still need it. I am not saying we don't need it. But we just need to activate our communication more." (Rick)

For this reason, one of the respondents questioned the value of an online platform.

"I am thinking of how do people go on to the platform. What times they create for it? Is it monthly, is it weekly or when they find good to go to the platform? So that is the question, that is a critical question that I am near to get to know how often you want to go to the platform?" (Kevin)

Moreover, Kevin emphasised that it is not always necessary to create a new platform.

"So that we also don't create a platform and then no people are going there." (Kevin)

Therefore, the SfD Vital power of sport programme could also make use of platforms already available. As stated before, several respondents have mentioned Facebook.

[Translated from Dutch]

"Yes, and Facebook would be a possibility to use, because a lot of stakeholders are already using it nowadays." (Collin)

However, some of the respondents also said that they would not prefer using Facebook as a professional working environment.

Another respondent agreed on the possibilities of using a platform. However, it should be accessible and useful for all stakeholders involved within the programme.

"So I think it can be good platform of sharing and maybe learning from each other. If all of us can be able to utilise it." (Michael)

Therefore, the stakeholders should consider the pros and cons of different possibilities. This means that having an online platform can be an opportunity for the SfD Vital power of sport programme in order to increase the value of MEL. However, the programme managers should take into account that having an online platform does not guarantee success towards the value of MEL.

Another opportunity mentioned relates to peer to peer support.

"One would be for us to do the peer to peer support. I think it would be nice for us to do peer to peer visits and supports." (Kevin)

Peer to peer support enables stakeholders to share practices and learn from each other's experiences. Consequently, it is possible to share and spread the mind shift from M&E towards MEL in order to increase the value of MEL. Peer to peer support can take place on a local level or country level. James encourages peer to peer support in order to learn from each other and support each other. He even mentioned the possibility of peer to peer support on a global level.

"I think, you know the broader it is, the better, because there are many things that you keep learning from each other. Locally is a local culture if you go to the continent of Africa you get to learn from the different cultures again, it goes global. For example

if we learn from Indonesia, it is different and you feel the inspiration is actually different from the different exchange, exchange learning programmes. So for me any form of exchange is important, if it is locally or it is international.” (James)

Other opportunities that are pointed out relate to improving staff competences towards M&E, making use of external evaluators, incorporating reminders and providing M&E requirement in English and French. Improving the staff competences was mentioned as an opportunity, because it enables your staff to execute M&E responsibilities in the field in order to increase the Impact of the work they do. Moreover, external evaluators are mentioned several times. The opportunity towards external evaluators relates to being able to objectively assess the work done and inform colleagues objectively how they can improve their work.

“The organisation asks someone, someone like a consultant, because sometimes you as yourself can say I have done this, I see it is good, but maybe hiring of getting someone different from you or someone else working for a different organisation or consultants. He will be able to figure out and say, here it is not done well, here it is not done well.” (Michael)

Therefore, hiring an external evaluator is an opportunity to increase the quality of the M&E data. In addition, incorporating reminders reminding everyone of their M&E responsibilities has been pointed out as being an opportunity. According to Kevin, reminders are not bad. It does not mean you do not know or you do not care about your tasks towards M&E. However, sometimes you need to be reminded that executing your M&E tasks is important. Moreover, one of the respondents mentioned translating everything in French, since some of the local partners do not speak English. Hence, you cannot expect from those partners that they properly execute their M&E tasks. Therefore, the opportunity at hand consists of enabling all partners in understanding what is expected from them in order to gather the correct information.

5.5 Summary

To sum up, the respondents see M&E as an important aspect of their work. They distinguish traditional M&E and MEL. The meanings they assign to those approaches concur with the available literature. On the one hand respondents have mentioned a shift from traditional M&E towards MEL. On the other hand, it is mentioned that MEL is seen as a luxury and it will not replace M&E in the short term. Moreover, one of the stakeholders mentioned that traditional M&E is conditional to MEL. Although some of them experience a shift, they also realise that changing from M&E towards MEL takes time. It is a long-term process. The co-creation meeting can be seen as the starting point of this long-term process and as one of the underlying aspects of the moving perspective. In addition, the respondents have mentioned several challenges and opportunities towards implementing the MEL strategy successfully. The next chapter will further analyse these results based on the institutional logics theory and the moving perspective.

6. Data analysis

This chapter analyses the empirical data by means of the institutional logics perspective. As previously stated an institutional logic is a set of shared ideas and beliefs. Logics lead to strategies and actions that help actors to optimise their legitimacy in the relative field (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008). The institutional logics perspective assists understanding individual and organisational behaviour in providing insights in different logics and which consequences actors link to changing logics. From the presented results two logics can be distinguished. On the one hand accountability has been mentioned and on the other hand M&E activities are related to learning. Therefore, the two logics will be defined as the accountability logic and the learning logic. This is in line with two M&E approaches described in the literature review. First the two logics will be explained. Followed by the influences of the moving perspective. Finally, the consequences will be described.

6.1 Accountability logic

The accountability logic refers to traditional M&E in the literature review. Since the logic refers to traditional M&E, it can be linked to the positivistic paradigm as well. Logics consist of rules, norms and values, which influence stakeholder thoughts, beliefs and behaviour. The main characteristics of traditional M&E or the accountability logic are transparency and accountability. It is mainly driven by the programme funder (Shah et al., 2004) in order to justify programme investments (Kay, 2012) and judge project success (Shah et al., 2004; Maclay, 2015). Moreover, data collection is focused on achieved outputs (Maclay, 2015). The indicators to measure those outputs are defined by the donor and the measure moments are also determined by the donor (Shah et al., 2004). In addition, the formats are designed by external partners and these formats are linked to their administrative systems (Kay, 2012). This is in line with meanings respondents assign to M&E. Therefore, one can say that the accountability logic has influence on the meanings stakeholders assign to M&E.

Moreover, the accountability logic has influence on stakeholders' behaviour as well. According to the top down approach of this logic, local partners mainly do not know why they are collecting data (Shah et al., 2004). The respondents confirmed that they were just writing reports to please the donor. Those reports consist of quantitative data, which is mainly collected by standardised questionnaires. Moreover, respondents did not experience the possibility to change anything during the programme, because they had to follow the proposed plan. Therefore, one can say that the accountability logic has influence on the behaviour, because the local actors were limited in doing their work in the most effective way. Since they must wait to adapt interventions or to make any changes at the end of the programme instead of during the programme. Consequently, the local stakeholders do not use the data to interpret and analyse themselves (Shah et al., 2004), because they are not allowed to make any changes during the meantime. Due to this top down approach M&E has been experienced as an obligation. Therefore, stakeholders are not internally motivated to execute M&E activities and do not feel any sense of ownership. Consequently, local stakeholders do not prioritise M&E activities, which results in delays. Therefore, the accountability logic has influence on the stakeholders' behaviour. Even though Thornton and Ocasio (2008) presume the embedded agency concept, which means that individual actors can affect a logic as well, in this case the thoughts and beliefs are influenced in such an extent that stakeholders just executed M&E activities pleasing the donor.

6.2 Learning logic

The learning logic refers to MEL in the literature review, which means that it can also be linked to the critical theory paradigm. The SfD Vital power of sport programme is developing a new strategy towards M&E. The main feature of this strategy is

continuous learning. This consists of learning from previous experiences and learning from each other. Since this broadens existing knowledge and helps making interventions more effective (Elsendoorn et al., 2007). MEL is a participatory bottom up approach, because it desires to create ownership of M&E activities by local staff. Therefore, it attempts to be driven by all stakeholders in order for everyone to benefit from it. Instead of focusing on outputs, this logic is interested in the underlying processes and outcomes. Therefore, the SfD Vital power of sport programme will use a learning cycle, which consists of four phases. These phases encompass observation, analysis, reflection and action. The data collection within this cycle is focused on qualitative data. Qualitative data is required in order to gather in-depth insights of the underlying process of the interventions and the outcomes. Collecting and documenting qualitative data requires other tools rather than questionnaires and reports. Tools that were mentioned by the respondents are focus groups, interviews, storytelling, photos and videos. Using other methods demands other stakeholder skills. However, stakeholders have the freedom to decide which tools they want use, as long as it contributes to the ultimate goal, which is increasing the impact of the SfD Vital power of sport programme. Moreover, it is a continuous process, which provides the possibility to make changes during the programme. This is in line with the meanings stakeholders assign to MEL. They also added that MEL is more practical, more fun and MEL is about quality, which implicates that people will apply MEL from intrinsically.

Moreover, the concept of embedded agency can be applied in this case, because the stakeholders are able to decide which activity they want to learn from and which tools they want to use during the different phases of the learning cycle. In addition, stakeholders of all levels have influence on the development of this logic, because they are asked to provide input. In short, MEL has been defined as learning logic, because the focus of MEL is continuous learning. MEL encourages learning from previous experiences and from each other in order to increase the impact of the interventions.

6.3 Moving perspective

The goal of the SfD Vital power of sport programme is to move from M&E to MEL, but works in an institutional context and depends on individual and organisational actors. As mentioned in the theoretical framework it is possible to change logics. Research showed that both internal and external pressure on an organisation can change the organisation's logic (Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005; van der Roest, 2015). Internal pressure derives from within an organisation itself. External pressure originates from the environment within the organisational field. The organisational field of the SfD Vital power of sport programme encompasses all individuals, organisations and institutions from the SfD field. As previously stated, the individuals in this study are people who work at the Dutch partner organisations, local partner organisations in Kenya and work at the Dutch government. The organisations in this case are ISA, KNVB, RTP and the partner organisations located in Kenya. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs can be seen as an institution. Since the SfD Vital power of sport programme intends to move from the accountability logic towards a new logic, this movement can be seen as a result of internal pressure within the organisational field in which the SfD Vital power of sport programme exists. Although a dominant logic often constitutes the organisational behaviour, organisational behaviour can constitute the logic as well (Van der Roest, 2015).

In this study, the dominant logic is the accountability logic, because traditional M&E is embedded in the SfD field. It has been part of M&E for an extended period of time. However, the stakeholders within the SfD Vital power of sport programme try to address the shortcomings and contradictions of this dominant logic. This is evidenced by the fact that the management of the SfD Vital power of sport programme has

started the development process of a new M&E strategy within the SfD Vital power of sport programme. However, the success of the implementation of this new strategy depends on the actors and organisations within the field or in this case within the partnership. According to Suddaby and Greenwood (2005), actors who are sensitive to such contradictions or shortcomings are more aware of the possibilities to change a logic. Moreover, those actors are more motivated to act on it. However, it is a complex process. Stakeholders are influenced by the moving perspective, which has been described as the process which influences the perspectives from both stakeholders and the environment during a transition. The moving perspective, in a broad sense, influences the beliefs of stakeholders during the movement of an organisation from one situation to another. In this study from M&E to MEL. The moving perspective consists of the process in which stakeholders, both programme managers and implementers, provide each other continuous feedback on the way they believe MEL should be developed and implemented. Therefore, everything that happens during the transition has influence on the meanings stakeholders assign to the new strategy. Moreover, it has influence on the behaviour of stakeholders as well.

The co creation meeting can be seen as one of the factors within the moving perspective that has influence on stakeholders' beliefs, thoughts and behaviour. So far, the co creation meeting only had influence on the participants of the meeting. However, the participants of the co creation had influence on the realisation of the new strategy as well, because they were asked to provide input towards the new strategy. The goal of the co creation meeting was to start developing the MEL strategy together with the Dutch partners and local partners from Kenya and Mali. The respondents were not only asked for feedback during the co creation, but also during the follow up process as well. The respondents mentioned that they expected to develop a common understanding of the need for and the power of MEL. This means that they are dedicated to changing the strategy. Moreover, this implicates that the stakeholders are aware that everyone should assign the same meanings towards MEL in order to implement it successfully. By including stakeholders in this developing process towards the new strategy, involvement is created, which leads to a sense of ownership among all stakeholders (Maclay, 2015). Moreover, involving stakeholders of all levels in this developing process creates trust. Consequently, this trust simplifies the implementation of MEL (Ter Steege, 2011).

In addition, shifting logics are secured by rhetoric, which is the art of persuasion (Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005). It is about using convincing language to achieve and legitimise a change within logics (Suddaby & Greenwood, 2005). During the co creation meeting rhetoric has been used to achieve and legitimise a common understanding of the importance and power of MEL. This is important in order to change the meanings and values stakeholders assign to the dominant perspective of accountability. However, this does not necessarily mean that the accountability logic is replaced by the learning logic, as it is also possible that multiple logics can exist side by side (Skirstad & Chelladurai, 2011; van der Roest, 2015). Although, the co creation meeting had a positive influence on the understanding of the importance and the power of MEL and everyone was fully committed during the meeting, in practice it is needed to continuously repeat this importance. Since everyone is back in their own context and culture it has been noticed that the attitude and behaviour regarding the dominant logic is not directly changed. This becomes apparent looking at the limited communication within the Whatsapp group and the limited responses on the follow up e-mails. Therefore, moving to another logic requires time and patience. Moreover, the stakeholders' meanings towards MEL can constantly change during this process.

Additionally, the movement from M&E to MEL is accompanied by a paradigm shift from positivism to critical theory. As previously stated, traditional M&E can be seen as part of the positivistic paradigm and MEL can be linked to the critical theory paradigm. Moreover, MEL can be seen as a response on the shortcomings of M&E. This is comparable to the critical theory paradigm, because that represents a response on the shortcomings of positivism. This means that it's not only about strategy change; it is more complex. According to the paradigm shift, it is also about changing a mind set, in this case from positivism to critical theory. These paradigms differ from their views on reality. According to the positivistic paradigm, only one objective 'truth' exist. This contradicts the critical theory, because it assumes that there is more than one truth. Due to this, the stakeholders have to change their mind set in order to implement MEL. An example could be that stakeholders should question the way of collecting data and they should be questioning why they are collecting data and for whom they are collecting data rather than just doing it the way they are asked to. Moreover, critical theory paradigm requires a process oriented way of thinking instead of result oriented.

In short, this study has defined two logics regarding M&E in the SfD Vital power of sport programme. The accountability logic is the dominant one and the learning logic is upcoming because of internal pressure. The institutional logics perspective assists understanding individual and organisational behaviour in providing insights towards the two logics. Since the accountability logic has been described as a top down approach stakeholders have a passive attitude towards accountability and therefore the accountability logic. The opposite is true for the learning logic, because it is a bottom up approach and encourages input from the field. Even though the learning logic provides the space to deliver input, it has been noticed that stakeholders show a passive attitude towards M&E activities. Since the dominant logic has been embedded for a long time, this attitude is not changed in one day and will be a lengthy process.

6.4 Consequences

The institutional logics perspective assists in understanding individual and organisational behaviour by providing insights towards the two logics and which consequences actors link to changing logics. The previous paragraphs have explained the two logics and behaviour towards these logics. This part focuses on the consequences. The respondents have distinguished challenges and opportunities towards a changing logic. Challenges are:

- Shortage of time;
- Lack of capacity;
- Expertise.

Moreover, the learning logic presumes to be fun, but how do you know it is fun? In addition, the accessibility of the gathered data within the learning logic has been pointed out as being challenging. Furthermore, the need for practice has been cited.

Apart from the challenges, opportunities are also mentioned. The main opportunity for the SfD Vital power of sport programme is that the institutions, which have a determined role within the accountability logic, change towards MEL as well. The MFA realises that it is necessary to be able to adapt or change programmes during a transition. Additionally, everyone's attitude towards M&E should be changed, ranging from the funder to the people in the field. However, the MEL message should be spread in a way that fits the values of the learning logic. Therefore, it should be an innovative way to spread the word. For example, using a video explaining what MEL is instead of using a written document. Rhetoric plays a big part in this, because the success or failure of the implementation depends on the meanings stakeholders assign to the new strategy. Moreover, these meanings have influence on their behaviour towards executing M&E activities.

Regarding these challenges and opportunities stakeholders believe that MEL is adaptable in the field. However, some of them are not sure the accountability logic will be replaced by the learning logic. Other stakeholders even mentioned that the accountability logic is conditional to the learning logic, which means that the two logics should exist side by side. On the one hand, they complement each other. On the other hand the two logics conflict at certain points. According to the respondents, the logics complement each other since the accountability logic is focused on numbers, which is the basis of the information in the learning logic. However, the learning logic provides the stakeholders freedom to adapt or change programmes in during the programme in order to increase the impact of the overall goal of the Sfd Vital power of sport programme. This conflicts with the fact that the Sfd Vital power of sport partnership must still deliver a midterm evaluation and a final evaluation, which will be assessed based on the proposed plan. Another conflicting aspect deals with trust. The learning logic involves all stakeholders from all levels, which creates ownership and trust (Ter Steege, 2011). This contradicts the accountability logic, which is about accountability and control. Accountability and control do not coincide with trust.

7. Conclusions, discussions & recommendations

This chapter presents the research conclusions and provides discussion points. Additionally, recommendations are made towards the SfD partnership and stakeholders involved in the organisations and implementation of programmes of the SfD Vital power of sport programme.

7.1 Conclusions

The conclusion is described based on the sub question, which leads to answering the main question of this study.

The main question of this study is as follows:

“How does the moving perspective influence the meanings stakeholders assign to the Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning strategy in the Sport for Development Vital power of sport programme, and what consequences does this have on the implementation of this Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning strategy?”

“What does Monitoring and Evaluation mean in the field of sport for development?”

The available literature shows various definitions towards monitoring and evaluation. These definitions differ from each other. On the one hand definitions are focused on regular, systematic and routine collection of data regarding proposed and agreed programme of action in order to judge the programme. On the other hand, M&E consists of a management system which is an ongoing tracking of implemented programmes in order to learn from previous experiences. The M&E strategy of the SfD Vital power of sport programme concurs with the latter definition.

This study has distinguished three different approaches towards M&E. These different approaches are: traditional M&E, PM&E and MEL. Traditional M&E is focused on accountability and transparency. Traditional M&E employs a top down approach, which means stakeholders do not feel the freedom to adapt changes during transitions, in order to increase the impact of the programme. Therefore, it is mainly driven by the donor and the collected information focused on meeting donor requirements. PM&E elaborates on traditional M&E. However, it differs on the fact it focuses on involving all stakeholders in the M&E process. PM&E assists both scientific and management aims as well as requiring opportunities for learning and collaboration among involved stakeholders. During the interviews, traditional M&E has been discussed, but the term PM&E has not been mentioned. The MEL approach will be explained in the next sub question. The meanings stakeholders assign towards traditional M&E are in line with the characteristics from the literature review. According to the theoretical framework traditional M&E can be defined as the accountability logic.

“What does Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning mean in the field of sport for development?”

In the literature review MEL is described as a participatory approach, which has combined traditional M&E, standardised M&E tools, with alternative and innovative M&E tools. MEL strives to gain insights on what is happening on and off the field at any time and learn from those experiences in order to increase the impact of programmes. MEL is an action-based learning approach. Action-based learning emphasizes learning which consists of questioning of structures and organisational practices. Moreover, it stimulates collective learning and reflection. It is important to learn from experiences and each other, because it broadens the existing knowledge

base and helps in creating more impact. Therefore, the focus in this strategy is on learning in order to make decisions based on local realities. Moreover, MEL is a bottom up approach. Therefore, stakeholders from all levels are asked to provide input towards MEL. This means that it creates ownership of the project by local staff, encourages learning across the board, and promotes downward accountability within the organisation.

The MEL strategy has been discussed during the interviews as well. The meanings stakeholders assign to MEL concurs with the explanation of MEL in the literature review. However, the respondents have some additions. In the first place, they have emphasised that they are now able to change or adapt programmes at any time instead of at the end of a programme. Moreover, they mentioned that MEL is more practical, more fun and it is about quality, which contribute to familiarising and successfully implementing MEL. According to the theoretical framework MEL can be defined as the learning logic.

"What does moving perspective mean?"

The moving perspective, in a broad sense, influences the movement of the SfD Vital power of sport programme from M&E to MEL. As stated in the literature review the moving perspective consists of the process in which stakeholders, both programme managers and implementers, provide each other continuous feedback on the way they believe MEL should be developed and implemented. All meanings assigned to the various underlying aspects within the transition define what meanings stakeholders assign to the overall programme developed during the transition. This continuous feedback and assigned meanings are important, because it extends the existing knowledge base and assists in implementing the new strategy. Another aspect regarding the moving perspective refers to the different sciences of philosophy. This study illustrates two paradigms: positivism and critical theory. Those paradigms can be applied to M&E and MEL. Consequently, the moving perspective has influence on the meanings stakeholders assign to MEL, which have consequences for the implementation of MEL.

Conclusion main question

"How does the moving perspective influence the meanings stakeholders assign to the Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning strategy in the Sport for Development Vital power of sport programme, and what consequences does this have on the implementation of this Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning strategy?"

The SfD Vital power of sport programme attempts to move from M&E to MEL. According to the theoretical framework M&E and MEL are seen as the accountability logic and the learning logic. Since the SfD Vital power of sport partnership has experienced shortcomings within the accountability logic, they have decided to develop a new strategy, in this study the learning logic. This development is a result of internal pressure. According to the literature it is possible to change logics. Actors who notice shortcomings in a dominating logic, the accountability logic in this case, are more aware of the possibilities of changing to a more suitable logic. However, the success of the implementation of this new logic, the learning logic, depends on the actors and organisations within the partnership. It is a complex process, because the SfD Vital power of sport operates in a complex and dynamic field. Stakeholders are influenced by the moving perspective, which has been described as the process which influences the perspectives from both stakeholders and the environment during the transition. Stakeholders' perspectives towards MEL are influenced, because they constantly provide each other with feedback during the transition process. Therefore, everything that happens during the transition has an influence on the meanings stakeholders

assign to MEL. Moreover, it has an influence on the behaviour of stakeholders as well since the accountability logic has been described as a top down approach stakeholders have a passive attitude towards accountability and therefore the accountability logic. The opposite is true for the learning logic, because it is a bottom up approach and encourages input from the field. Even though the learning logic provides the space to deliver input, in practice stakeholders show a passive attitude towards M&E activities. Since the dominant logic has been embedded for a long time, this attitude is not changed in one day and will be a lengthy process. Moreover, the respondents have mentioned several consequences towards MEL, which are divided in challenges and opportunities. Despite those consequences, the respondents believe that MEL is adaptable in the field. However, some of them are not sure the accountability logic will be replaced by the learning logic. Other stakeholders even mentioned that the accountability logic is conditional to the learning logic.

In addition, the movement from M&E to MEL is not only about a strategy change, but requires a paradigm shift as well. This study shows that M&E is comparable to positivism and MEL to the critical theory paradigm. This means that the movement requires stakeholders to be aware of two different paradigms. This can affect the implementation of MEL. According to this paradigm shift, the accountability logic still prevails, because the SfD Vital power of sport programme still uses vocabulary, which links to the positivism paradigm. According to the document analysis one of the goals of M&E is to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of programme implementation. Regarding this goal, the SfD Vital power of sport programme uses the words 'effectiveness' and 'efficiency' in the new MEL strategy. The results show that the respondents mentioned those words as well. However, both terms are central in NPM. Since this study links NPM to traditional M&E, NPM can also be linked to positivism. It is relevant to be aware of this, because if the SfD Vital power of sport programme desires to move to MEL, a paradigm shift is needed. This includes stakeholders using different wordings.

Moreover, the results show that you cannot learn on your own. According to the information local partners have provided a MEL meeting was held within their organisations in order to involve their teams. This means that learning together is needed. This concurs with the fact that if you want to apply a incorporate logic you have to get everyone involved, otherwise it is impossible to change attitude and behaviour.

Summing up, and at the same time returning to the point made at the outset of this study, the SfD Vital power of sport programme attempts to move from M&E to MEL. However, this research shows it is not a change from M&E to MEL, but it is about two different logics that should exist side by side for the time being. This view is supported by the fact that stakeholders believe that the logics complement each other. The stakeholders believe that the logics are complementing each other, because they believe that quantitative information is conditional to qualitative information. In other words, they say that quantitative information requires numbers, which provides an overview of the work they do. Qualitative data provides more in-depth information and gives insights in which extend the programme has impact in order to improve the programme and increase the impact of the programme at any time. However, this study also brings forward that the two logics conflict with each other on some elements. At the moment, the accountability logic still prevails, because the SfD Vital power of sport programme just started developing the new strategy towards M&E. Therefore, they still have to deliver reports, which meet the donor requirements. Moreover, the midterm evaluation and final report will be assessed on the proposed indicators of the theory of change. This contradicts the learning logic, which allows

stakeholders to change or adapt activities during the programme. Another aspect that conflicts refers to trust. The learning logic involves all stakeholders of all levels, which creates ownership and trust. This contradicts the accountability logic, which focuses on accountability and control. Accountability and control do not coincide with trust.

To conclude, the accountability logic and learning logic should exist side by side. However, as long as the accountability logic is prevailing, the logics are conflicting rather complementing each other.

7.2 Discussion

This paragraph includes a reflection on the research process. The researcher focuses on the progress of the research process and the findings. Moreover, this paragraph describes research limitations and suggestions for follow-up research.

The researcher has benefitted from the co creation meeting, which took place in the Netherlands. In the first place, it enabled the researcher to do participative observation. Secondly, it represented an advantage, because it provided the researcher with the possibility to meet local stakeholders in real life. Consequently, it was easier to get in touch with them in order to plan interviews afterwards. The local stakeholders, who had participated in the co creation meeting, were very helpful. Additionally, local partners who did not participate in the coc creation meeting were asked to participate in this study. However, due to the fact that the researcher had not met these local partners before they were less likely to respond and participate in the study: only a few of them responded and were willing to be interviewed. Due to this, it was easier to plan interviews with local stakeholders who the researcher had met before the interviews. Although it was an advantage that the researcher met most of the respondents before the interviews, it could potentially have affected the results. Due to this, the respondents might not have felt free to be completely honest. Consequently, they could have given social desirable answers. For example, the results show that actors on a local level are already learning, although it is not explicit. However, the SfD Vital power of sport management assumed that learning did not happen on a local level yet. Since the researcher was not able to conduct field research, it is questionable whether the responses of the local stakeholders are social desirable or not. Therefore, this limits this study. Due to this, the researcher recommends doing further research by applying ethnographic research. This means that a researcher conducts long term research using participative observations and in-depth interviews. This enables a researcher to discover what is happening on a local level.

Moreover, the researcher has attempted to involve stakeholders of all levels in this study. However, the MFA, which is the funder and therefore an important stakeholder has not been interviewed. The researcher was not able to do an interview with the funder, because it would have influenced the relationship. Therefore, the researcher recommends conducting further research in order to involve the funder as well.

Another critical note deals with the limitation of the institutional logics perspective. The institutional logics perspective takes a neutral position towards power relations. Due to this, this research did not focus on power relations. However, power relations could be part of applying different logics or paradigms. Therefore, the researcher recommends conducting further research to discover the role of power relations and what consequences power relations might have on changing an embedded strategy.

The last limitation states that this research has been done involving one single country. An interpretative research approach has been employed, which means that it is difficult to apply the outcomes of this research to other countries. This means that the results

could be context or country specific and through conducting this research in other countries more information and data could be collected in order to proof the findings to be generalizable. Moreover, it would be interesting to discover how stakeholders from countries, who did not participate in the co creation meeting and this moving process, assign meanings towards MEL. The results can differ, since those stakeholders are not familiar with the MEL strategy yet. These understandings can help the Sfd Vital power of sport programme in improving the MEL strategy.

7.3 Recommendations

This paragraph states the recommendations towards implementing the MEL strategy.

The first recommendation to the Sfd Vital power of sport programme contains involving MFA in this process. Although the respondents have mentioned that they notice a shift at the donor side, this study did not involve the donor. It is necessary to involve the funder, because it is an important stakeholder in the Sfd Vital power of sport partnership and institutional field. The accountability logic and learning logic conflict on the fact that the partnership should still deliver extensive reports, which take a lot of time and are often read, but not used in order to learn. Therefore, the MFA plays an important role to move from a focus on accountability to a focus on learning, because this study concludes that the accountability logic and learning logic should exist side by side. At the moment, the accountability logic is dominant, which means that it is impossible to exist side by side in order to complement each other. The researcher recommends inviting MFA during a follow up meeting in order to inform MFA about the process so far. Moreover, the local partners, the Dutch partners and MFA should discuss the stumble blocks together in order to improve the implementation of the MEL strategy

The second recommendation focuses on the opportunity of employing an online platform. An online platform provides the Sfd Vital power of sport programme with the opportunity to monitor, document and share data, knowledge and experiences. The online platform was also suggested by the co creation participants during the co creation meeting. However, a side note is that a platform does not guarantee success. It depends on the information and effort stakeholders put in the platform as well as the usability of the platform. This means that the platform needs to be easily useable and accessible for everyone. Moreover, prior to implementing an online platform it is important stakeholders have a clear overview of what they want to monitor and evaluate. This is important in order to be able to design a tailor-made platform. In appendix 9.5 an overview of four different platforms is given. The researcher recommends choosing one of those platforms.

The third recommendation is about spreading the MEL message. As previously stated it is important to involve all actors of the institutional field in order to move a prevailing logic. Therefore, the MEL message should be spread to the other uninformed partner countries. The best way to do involve these countries is by taking an innovative approach fitting the values of the learning logic. For example, the Sfd Vital power of sport programme could hire a communication consultancy firm to design an explanatory video on MEL in order to communicate and share knowledge and experiences.

8. Bibliography

- Alender, B. (2016). Understanding volunteer motivations to participate in citizen science projects: a deeper look at water quality monitoring. *Jcom-J.Sci.Commun.*, 15:3.
- Alexander, J. (2000). Adaptive Strategies of Nonprofit Human Service Organizations in an Era of Devolution and New Public Management. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 10:3 pp. 287-303
- Amsterdam, van N. (2016, 25 April). *Hoorcollege Kwalitatief sportonderzoek Denken en Doen*. [PowerPoint]. Consulted via, https://uu.blackboard.com/webapps/blackboard/content/listContent.jsp?course_id=_104337_1&content_id=_2159153_1&mode=reset (10-06-2017)
- Arkesteijn, M., Mierlo, B. van, and Potters, J. (2007). *Methoden voor monitoring en evaluatie van innovatieprojecten [Methods for monitoring and evaluation of innovation projects]*. Lelystad, Praktijkonderzoek Plant en Omgeving BV.
- Armytage, L. (2011). Evaluating aid: An adolescent domain of practice. *Evaluation*, 17:3, pp. 261-276
- Boeije, H. R. (2005). *Analyseren in kwalitatief onderzoek: denken en doen*. Den Haag: Boom onderwijs
- Blann, K., and S. S. Light. (2000). *The path of last resort: adaptive environmental assessment and management (AEAM)*. Adaptive Management Practitioners' Network, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Bradley, J. E., Mayfield, M. V., Mehta, M. P., & Rukonge, A. E. (2002). Participatory evaluation of reproductive health care quality in developing countries. *Social Science & Medicine*, 55(2), pp. 269–282.
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burnett, C. (2001). Social impact assessment and sport development. *International review for the sociology of sport*, 36:1, pp. 41-57
- Calhoun, C., J. Gerteis, J. Moody, S. Pfaff, & I. Virk (eds) (2012). *Contemporary Sociological Theory* (3rd edition). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Coalter, F. (2006). Sport in development: process evaluation and organisational development. In: Y. vanden Auweele, C. Malcolm & B. Mulders (eds). Sport and development.
- Coalter, F. (2007). A wider social role for sport: Who's keeping the score? London: Routledge.
- Coalter, F., & Taylor, J. (2010). Sport-for-development impact study. London: Comic Relief, UK Sport and International development through Sport. Stirling: University of Stirling

Collins, H. (2010) "Creative Research: The Theory and Practice of Research for the Creative Industries". *AVA Publications*

Danielsen, F., Burgess, N. & Balmford, A. (2005). Monitoring matters: examining the potential of locally-based approaches. *Biodivers. Conservation*, 14, pp. 2507-2542

DiMaggio, P.J. & W.W. Powell (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review* 48, pp. 147-160

Edun, A. (2000). The role of evaluation in accountability in donor-funded projects. *IDS Bulletin*, 31(1), 48-52.

Edwards, M. (2015). The role of sport in community capacity building: An examination of sport for development research and practice. *Sport Management Review*, 18, pp. 6-19

Eekeren, F. ter Horst, K. & Fictorie, D. (2013). Sport for development: *The potential value and next steps Review of policy, programs and academic research 1998-2013*. 's-Hertogenbosch: NSA International, KNVB, Right To Play Netherlands.

Elsendoorn, H., van Kempen, P., Rijnen, B. & Teeuwen, D. (2007). *Lessons Learned. Greater effectiveness with knowledge and tips gleaned from sports and development cooperation in practice*. Badhoevedorp: The Association

Elzen, B., and Wieczorek, A. (2005). Transitions towards sustainability through system innovation. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* 72(6): 651-661.

Estrella, M. (2000). *Learning from change*. In M. Estrella, et al. (Eds.), *Learning from change: Issues and experiences in participatory monitoring and evaluation*, pp. 1-14. London: Intermediate Technology Publications Ltd.

Estrella, M. & Gaventa, J. (2000). *Who Counts Reality? Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: a Literature Review*. Institute of Development Studies, Brighton, p. 71

Geuss, R. (1981). *The idea of a critical theory: Habermas and the Frankfurt school*. New York: Cambridge University Press

Friedland, R. & Alford, R. (1991). Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices, and institutional contradictions. In W.W. Powell en P. J. DiMaggio (eds.). *The new Institutionalism in organizational analysis*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press

Harris, K. & Adams, A. (2015). Power and discourse in the politics of evidence in sport for development. *Sport Management Review*, 19, pp. 97-196

Hartmann, D. & Kwauk, C. (2013). Sport and development: An overview, Critique, and Reconstruction. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 35:3, 284-305

Hatry, H. P. (1999). *Performance measurement: getting results*. Urban Institute Press, Washington, D.C.

Hayhurst, L. M. C., & Frisby, W. (2010). Inevitable tensions: Swiss and Canadian sport for development NGO perspectives on partnerships with high performance sport. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 10(1), pp. 75-96.

Holte-McKenzie, M. Forde, S. & Theobald, S. (2006). Development of a participatory monitoring and evaluation strategy. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 29, pp. 365-376

Houghton, T. (2011). *Does positivism really 'work' in the social sciences?* Consulted via, <http://www.e-ir.info/2011/09/26/does-positivism-really-'work'-in-the-social-sciences/> (13-06-2017)

Johnson, G. (1992). Managing strategic change – Strategy, Culture and Action. *Long Range Planning*, 25, pp. 28-36

International Sports Alliance, KNVB WorldCoaches & Right To Play The Netherlands. (ISA, KNVB & RTP). (July 2015). *SportforDevelopment.nl 2016-2020 Vital power of sport*. 's-Hertogenbosch: ISA, KNVB & Right To Play Netherlands.

International Sports Alliance. (ISA). (n.d.). Over sportontwikkeling. Consulted via, <http://www.sportdevelopment.org/home/over-sport-ontwikkelingssamenwerking/> (13-06-2017)

Kal, D. (2011). *Kwartiermaken, werken aan ruimte voor anders-zijn*. Kenniscentrum Sociale Innovatie Hogeschool Utrecht. pp. 31-38

Kay, T. (2012). Accounting for legacy: monitoring and evaluation in sport in development relationships. *Sport in Society*, 15:6, pp. 888-904

Knoops, C. (2010). *Verslaggevingstheorieën: Een wetenschapsfilosofische analyse*. Proefschrift Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam

Kramer, S. (2015, 4 May). *Hoorcollege Methoden van kwalitatief onderzoek in Bestuurs- en Organisationswetenschap*. [PowerPoint]. Consulted via, https://uu.blackboard.com/webapps/blackboard/content/listContent.jsp?course_id=_95115_1&content_id=_1853085_1&mode=reset (10-06-2017)

Levermore, R. (2008). Sport: a new engine of development? *Progress in Development Studies*, 8:2, pp. 183-90

Levermore, R. (2011). Evaluating sport-for-development: approaches and critical issues. *Progress in Development Studies*, 11:4, pp. 339-53

Lyras, A. & Welty Peachey, J. (2011) Integrating sport-for-development theory and praxis. *Sport Management Review*, 14:4, 311-326

Maclay, C. (2015). Management not models: adaptability, responsiveness, and a few lessons from football. *Development in Practice*, 25:1, pp. 42-57

Manning, N. (2001). The legacy of the New Public Management in developing countries. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 67, pp. 297-318

Mierlo, B. van & Regeer, B. (2010). Reflexive Monitoring in Action. A guide for monitoring system innovation projects.

Mierlo, B. van, Arkesteijn, M., and Leeuwis, C. (2010). *Enhancing the Reflexivity of System Innovation Projects with System Analyses*. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 31(2): 143-161.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs. (2013). *A world to gain: A new agenda for Aid, Trade and Investment*. Den Haag: Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Oakley, P. (1988). Conceptual problems of the monitoring and evaluation of qualitative objectives of rural development. *Community Development Journal*, 23, pp. 3–10.

Partos (2016). Towards improved use of monitoring data. *The Spindle*.

Pawson, R. & Tilley, N. (1997). *Realistic evaluation*. Sage Publications.

Reay, T., & Hinings, C. B. (2005). The recomposition of an organizational field: Health care in Alberta. *Organization Studies*, 26:3, 351-384.

Reynolds, M. & Vince, R. (2004). Critical Management Education and Action-Based Learning: Synergies and Contradictions. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 3:4, pp. 442-456

Roest van der, J.W. (2015). *From participation to consumption: consumerism in voluntary sportclubs*. Enschede: Ipskamp Drukkers.

Russel, J., Elton, L., Swinglehurst, D. & Greenhalgh, T. (2006). Using the online environment in assessment for learning: a case-study of a web-based course in primary care. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31:4, pp. 465-478

Schulenkorf, N. (2012). Sustainable community development through sport and events: A conceptual framework for Sport-for-Development projects. *Sport Management Review*, 15, pp. 1-12

Scott, W.R. (2008). Approaching adulthood: The maturing of institutional theory. *Theory and Society* 37, pp. 427-442

Scott, W.R. (2014). *Institutions and Organizations: Ideas, Interests, and Identities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Scott, D. & Usher, R. (1996) *Understanding Educational Research*. Londen: Routledge.

Selznick, P. (1957). *Leadership in Administration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Shah, M., Kambou, S., Goparaju, L., Adams, M. & Matarazzo, M. (2004). *Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation of Community- and Faith-based Programs*. CORE Initiative.

Skille, E. (2011). The conventions of sport clubs: enabling and constraining the implementation of social goods through sport. *Sport, Education & Society*, 16(2), pp.241-253.

Skille, E. (2011). The conventions of sport clubs: enabling and constraining the implementation of social goods through sport. *Sport, Education & Society*, 16(2), pp.241-253.

Soulé, Michael E. (1986). What is Conservation Biology? *BioScience*. American Institute of Biological Sciences. 35-11: 727-34

Sportanddev.org (n.d.). *Monitoring and evaluation (M&E)*. Consulted via, <https://www.sportanddev.org/en/toolkit/monitoring-and-evaluation-me> (05-27-2017)

Steege, ter M. (2011). *Top-down, bottom-up, ontwerpen of ontwikkelen?*. Consulted via, <https://transitiemanagement.wordpress.com/2011/06/06/top-down-of-bottum-up-en-ontwerpen-of-ontwikkelen/> (05-27-2017)

Stem, C. Margoluis, R. Salafsky, N. & Brown, M. (2005). Monitoring and Evaluation in Conservation: a Review of Trends and Approaches. *Conservation Biology*, 19:2, pp 295-309

Suddaby, R., & Greenwood, R. (2005). Rhetorical strategies of legitimacy. *Administrative science quarterly*, 50: pp. 35-67

Terry, L. (1998). Administrative Leadership, Neomanagerialism, and the Public Management Movement. *Public Administration Review*, 58:3, pp. 194-200

Thornton, P.H. & Ocasio, W. (2008). Institutional Logics. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin Andersson & R. Suddaby (eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*, pp.99-129. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Thornton, P., Ocasio, W. & Lounsbury, M. (2012). *The institutional logics perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tones, K. & Green, J. (2004). *Health Promotion: Planning and Strategies*. SAGE Publications: London

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2009). *Handbook on planning, monitoring and evaluation for development results*. UNDP.

Verbrugge, L. Ganzevoort, W. Fliervoet, J. Panten, K. Van den Born, R. (2017). Implementing participatory monitoring in river management: The role of stakeholders' perspectives and incentives. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 195:1, pp. 62-69

Vermeulen, P. (2012). Omgaan met institutionele complexiteit. *Management & Organisatie*, 5, pp. 5-21

Villaseñor, E. Porter-Bolland, L. Escobar, F. Guariguata, M. & Moreno-Casasola, P. (2016) Characteristics of participatory monitoring projects and their relationship to decision-making in biological resource management: a review. *Biodivers. Conserv.*, 25, pp. 2001-2019

Vincke, J. (2007). *Sociologie Een klassieke en hedendaagse benadering*. Gent: Academia Press.

Vogel, I. 2012. *Review of the Use of 'Theory of Change' in International Development*. London: DFID.

Waardenburg, M. (2016, 15 February). *Hoorcollege Sportontwikkeling en beleidsconsequenties*. [PowerPoint]. Consulted via,

https://uu.blackboard.com/webapps/blackboard/execute/content/file?cmd=view&content_id=_229_4150_1&course_id=_104275_1 (01-05-2017)

Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in Organizations*, London: Sage.

Win, E. (2004) "If It Doesn't Fit on the Blue Square It's Out!" An Open Letter to My Donor Friend'. *Inclusive Aid. Changing Power and Relationships in International Development*, ed. Leslie Groves and Rachel Hinton, 123-7. London: Earthscan

Zucker, L. (1977). The Role of Institutionalization in Cultural Persistence. *American Sociological Review*, 42:5, pp. 726-743

9. Appendix

9.1 Topic list

- Background information respondent
 - o Position respondent
 - o Tasks respondent
 - o Personal Experiences with M&E
 - o What does M&E mean for you?
- Background information organisation
 - o Role of organisation in SfD programme
 - o Goal organisation
 - o Organisation activities
 - o Experiences with M&E
- Current M&E strategy
 - o How do you organise M&E?
 - o Do you have responsibilities relating to M&E in your organisation? Yes, what kind of responsibilities? No, who has responsibilities relating to M&E?
 - o Why are you monitoring and evaluating like that?
 - o For whom are you monitoring and evaluating and whom benefits from it?
 - o Are there strengths and/or weaknesses of the methods you are using? Yes, which one?
- Moving perspective M&E strategy / MEL
 - o Would you like to improve your monitoring and evaluation methods? And what?
 - o Interviewer explains the movement from ME to MEL → What do you think of learning approach within M&E?
 - o What are your expectations of a learning approach?
 - o How achievable is a learning approach?
 - o What are your own interests towards MEL?
 - o What do you need to learn in practice?
- Co creation
 - o What were your expectations?
 - o What did you do afterwards?
 - o Did you do something different? How did you do something differences?
 - o Do you notice changes in your daily activities as a result of the Co Creation? Yes, why and how? No, why not and what can be the reason?
 - o Did you have other expectations after the Co Creation?
 - o Did your colleague inform you about his/her participation at the Co Creation meeting in November last year?

9.2 Coding tree

Open codes	Topics	Axial codes
Accountability Budget Action after co creation Alternative M&E Tools Analyse Beneficiary M&E Capacity Challenge Changing M&E Civicus Co creation Communication Context Culture M&E Current M&E Data collection Developments in M&E Difference between MEL and M&E Disadvantages of M&E tool Distance Division of roles Documentation Donor Exchange Expectations co creation Experiences External evaluation Focus group Follow up co creation Football for water Fun IATI Impact meting Implementing MEL Interviews Learning Learning cycle Learning experience Learning organisations Learning outcomes co creation M&E officer Meaning of M&E	M&E Tools Opportunities Challenges Co creation	M&E <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accountability • Beneficiary M&E • Changing M&E • Developments in M&E • Difference between MEL and M&E • Implementing MEL • Learning • Meaning of M&E • Moving perspective • Numbers • Quantitative data • Relevance local level • Traditional M&E Tools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative M&E tools • Current M&E • Data collection • Disadvantages of M&E tool • Focus group • Interviews • Questionnaire Opportunities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current M&E • Documentation • Donor • Exchange • External evaluation • Learning • Learning outcomes co creation

<p>MEL team MFA Needs in practice Moving perspective Numbers Objective Observation Opportunity Organisation Organisation M&E Overall goal organisation Platform Position respondent Quantitative data Questionnaire tools Reason M&E Relevance local level Reminder Reports SfD partnership Sharing information Shortcoming Spindl Strategic Struggle Success stories Suggestions Tasks ToC Time Traditional M&E</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MFA • Needs in practice • Opportunity • Platform • Reminder • Suggestions <p>Challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity • Challenge • Communication • Division of roles • Expertise • Follow up co creation • Fun • Organisation M&E • SfD partnership • Struggle • Time <p>Co creation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co creation • Expectations co creation • Follow up co creation • Learning cycle
--	--	--

9.3 Coding process

Quote	Open code	Axial code
<p>“My expectation, one was to have a very simple, that realized how simple it can become to process monitoring, evaluation and learning. I wanted to have a formula that is more simple to communicate and implement. So that is what I was exactly looking at.”</p>	Expectations co creation	Co creation meeting
<p>numbers are important, because they also give you the statistics they give you the general overview of the people who you are impacting.</p>	Numbers	Monitoring & Evaluation
<p>I don't think it is hard to share, but the other thing is uhm what to share. If you find a better platform, without a lot of costs, it will be more fun and easier. You want to share, but the way of sharing and how to share it.</p>	Platform	Opportunities

9.4 Observation notes

What do I see?	What do I hear?	Interpretation
The participants are listening to Niek, one of the facilitators of the meeting.	Facilitator: Who wants to start sharing his or her expectation of the co creation? Participant: Yes, I want to! Facilitator: Thankyou, can please come forward? Participant: Yes.	The facilitators and participants are excited to start the two days meeting.
The participants are writing key notes down, while the facilitator is explaining the first phase of the MEL cycle	Participant: What is the best way to document our observation? Facilitator: We will discuss this in groups of three and in 20 minutes we will discuss them all together. Does that work for you? Participant: Yes, thanks.	The participants are interested in using the proposed learning cycle.
The participants are developing a future path together. They are discussing what is needed to follow up this process. They start in mixed groups of three. So one person from each country. That means every group has someone from Mali, Kenya and the Netherlands.	Participant 1: What do you think is needed on local level to implement this strategy? Participant 2: I think a simple guide which can be used on and off the field. Participant 1: How is going to use that guide? Participant 2: It should be useful for everyone in the organisation	Participants are willing to follow up the MEL process.

9.5 Overview platforms

	UP SHOT	SINZER	AKVO	KOBO TOOLBOX
ONLINE/OFFLINE COSTS	Online Annual fee: >1000 GBP Consultancy fee: 540 GBP/day (2-4 days needed)	Online License: > €500 Tailor-made design: €2500 Consultancy: €100/hour	Online and offline AKVO flow: Is priced according to the number of survey forms submitted 4000 surveys: €3960/year 10000 surveys: €6000/year AKVO RSR: Is priced according to the number of projects hosted: 20 projects: €2800/year 50 projects: €4500/year	Online and offline Free
IATI COMPLIANT	Not yet	Not yet, are willing to design	Yes	Unknown
EXPORT RESULTS IN EXCEL AND WORD LANGUAGE	Yes English Welsh Portuguese Spanish (Possibilities to translate into French)	Yes English (Possibilities to translate into French)	Yes English French Spanish Portuguese Bahasa Indonesia Vietnamese	Yes English (Questionnaire can be designed in any language)
FEATURES	<p>Manage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -record details about participants -see current, past and future activity -stay up-to-date with tasks -link work with outcomes -collect information using a smartphone or tablet <p>Monitor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -define measures of success and view live progress -view dashboards and maps -see progress against organisational strategies -generate statistics <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -survey participants -record outcomes achieved -demonstrate impact -store photos and videos -timeline to show participants 'journeys' 	<p>-manage data and save time</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -involve stakeholders to collect data -show results -analyse results <p>-customise to organisation needs: create accounts for customers, business units or funds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -multiple frameworks available: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> strategic impact framework (SIF) social return on investment (SROI) social cost benefit analysis (SCBA) 	<p>AKVO RSR:</p> <p>Communicate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -show the scope and range of your work on your website <p>Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -show your results online <p>Monitor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -structured stream of information and data about progress, results, value for money and workflow -projects online -view and export project data -monitor progress -track results -your website or a new site -rich information -live updates -data sharing -project hierarchies -desk or field <p>AKVO Flow:</p> <p>Capture:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -surveys -geo-tagged information -images -data <p>Monitor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -return to data points and update them <p>Coordinate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -collaborative online workspace -works anywhere -accurate -online workspace -diverse data -monitoring features -scalable -manage roles and surveys -interoperable -secure (SSL) -reports and visualisations -geographic shapes 	<p>Build forms and reuse questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -surveys -question library -powerful and compatible <p>Collect data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -online and offline -in any language -android/iOS/many other devices -data integrity -easy synchronisation <p>Analyse and manage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -quick analysis -mapping -downloading data