

**NATIONAL EVALUATION OF
NEW DEAL FOR COMMUNITIES**

**KEY FINDINGS FROM THE SURVEY
OF BENEFICIARIES**

Cambridge Economic Associates Ltd

CEA

Cambridge Economic Associates Ltd
16 Tenison Avenue
Cambridge
CB1 2DY

Telephone: 01223 711887
Fax: 01223 711889

August 2005

CONTENTS

Section	Page
1. Introduction.....	1
2. A short review of beneficiary studies	2
3. The MORI approach to the beneficiary study	4
4. The beneficiary survey and attitudes to quality of life	7
5. A role for beneficiary surveys in project and programme monitoring.....	9
6. The contribution of the MORI beneficiary survey to the VFM exercise.....	11
7. A role for beneficiary surveys in considering community involvement in project design, implementation and community capacity building.....	24
8. Lessons learned	28

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This paper explores the contribution that beneficiary surveys can make to the evaluation of one of the Government's key regeneration initiatives, namely the New Deal for Communities. The NDC programme was launched in September 1998 as part of the Government's response to the Social Exclusion Unit's report 'Bringing Britain Together - a national strategy for neighbourhood renewal'. The programme sets out to "bridge the gap" between the most deprived neighbourhoods and the rest of England. It is part of a Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy to tackle the problems identified in areas where there are poor job prospects, high levels of crime, a rundown environment, and inadequate direction and co-ordination of the public services that affect it.
- 1.2 The NDC programme has been the subject of a major evaluation exercise since 2002 and part of this work has involved a Value for Money (VFM) exercise covering the periods 2003/04 and 2004/05. The VFM component has examined a number of NDC projects to assess the nature of their contribution to the regeneration of the NDC area. It has been recognised that a valuable part of the VFM work is to investigate the overall 'additionality' of the NDC activity and that as part of this it was important to assess the view of project beneficiaries. In order to do this between February and April 2005, MORI interviewed a total of 1008 beneficiaries of projects funded by the NDC programme. The principal objective was to add some quantitative data about project beneficiaries to the information already collected in a Work Book that provided the basic building blocks of the VFM exercise. Within that general context the research aimed to: assess the impact on individual beneficiaries of projects undertaken in NDC areas; and provide an indication of differences between projects and themes.
- 1.3 The key findings of the Beneficiaries Survey are set out in detail in a Report from MORI (MORI, Sheffield Hallam University,2005) there is no need to rehearse them again here. Our focus in this paper is on how the Beneficiary Survey can contribute to the National Evaluation of NDC as a whole, what in particular it can add to the VFM strand, and with both of these matters in mind, to offer a few suggestions on how any subsequent Beneficiary Study might be conducted.

2. A short review of beneficiary studies

- 2.1 A review of previous examples of beneficiary studies undertaken as part of the evaluation of Area Based Initiatives reveals a strong focus on how “satisfied” householders resident in a particular area were with various aspects of their accommodation, their access to essential services, social and cultural facilities, and with the quality and amenity of their immediate physical environment. In brief, the views of a sample of residents are taken as a baseline and the same questions are asked at the completion of the programme. The differences in levels of “satisfaction” are taken as an indication of the success or, indeed, lack of success of the programme taken as a whole in contributing to an environment in which residents are content to live, work and play. These early studies were sometimes quite difficult to undertake and a review of their application suggests that they were used as contextual and background material rather than being at the heart of the evaluation itself. Even after incremental refinements had been introduced to the sampling, questionnaire design, and data analysis there remained lingering doubts as to how the findings could contribute to programme evaluation considered in the round. For some critics they were seen as a “bolt on” to be given low priority in the allocation of funds. We are in no doubt that “traditional” beneficiary studies still have their place in programme evaluation. However, we must agree that, if beneficiary studies are to “pull their weight” and be considered integral to the evaluation exercise rather than a worthwhile supplement to it they must become better integrated into the evaluation process as a whole and, in particular, the estimation of the ‘additionality’ associated with the programme concerned.
- 2.2 A second type of beneficiary study has focussed on monitoring the success of a project during the course of its operation. The object has usually been to modify, where appropriate, aspects of its design and delivery in order that the project can achieve its aims and objectives more efficiently and effectively. Clearly, if those participating in the scheme are not having their private objectives met then the uptake of the offer will dwindle and the community benefits (positive externalities) sought by the funders, managers and community representatives will not emerge either. In that event the project will not achieve what was intended when it was approved for funding; and there will be concomitant disappointing consequences for the programme of which it is a part. Although it is now part of the conventional wisdom that beneficiary surveys should be incorporated at the outset into comprehensive regimes for project monitoring and evaluation, a review of major programmes for regeneration and social inclusion throughout the United Kingdom reveals that this is all too rarely the case.

- 2.3 Thirdly, we have noted a growing interest in the contribution which beneficiary studies can make to VFM evaluations. However, it would be fair to say that relatively little progress has, as yet, been made in travelling that route. It is for that reason that, in this paper, we pay particular attention to the contribution which the data collected by the MORI study can make to the NDC VFM evaluation. As a start in that process, it is worth reminding ourselves that, in principle, evaluations set out to establish whether a programme, and/or each of its constituent projects, was “worthwhile” given the resources expended on it. However, whether a particular project is judged to be “worthwhile” depends on what those engaged in it saw as their objective in becoming involved. Thus, for instance, success for a funding body (e.g. NDC) may be judged by obtaining value for money; but success for those managing the project (e.g. as employees or community activists) may be seen by them in terms of career continuity/advancement or, more altruistically, continuing the project to serve the needs of a deserving group. These measures of success will differ from the assessment of the beneficiaries of the project. They will have participated for a variety of reasons each personal to themselves and their particular view of how participation could contribute to their own aspirations and life targets. In this context it is also worth remembering that the beneficiaries of a project are not necessarily co-terminous with either the community at large; or with that section of it who were “consulted” at the planning stage or who may have participated in directly or indirectly in its management. The successful collection of reliable data by questionnaire about whether a project was “worthwhile”, the subsequent analysis of the data collected, and the drawing out of relevant findings must bear in mind the objectives of the particular individual to whom the questions are addressed.
- 2.4 Traditional VFM exercise is strong in its identification of project outputs which emerge shortly after the expenditure of the allocated funds. For obvious reasons, it is considerably weaker in identifying, let alone quantifying, project outcomes which may be diffuse, long in the gestation, and sometimes attended by unintended consequences. One of the measures of whether the portfolio of projects which, taken together, form the programme of NDC interventions in an area should be measured a success is whether, when these selective interventions have been withdrawn there is sufficient momentum for the neighbourhood to continue on its way to “bridging the gap” between the life style and life chances of its residents and those of the rest of the country. Previous research suggests that a powerful driver in the process is the contribution of community leaders who emerge as role models and initiators of change. Related to this is the emergence of, and/or reinforcement of, a community spirit amongst those who recognise that by working together there are possibilities for improving their neighbourhoods as places in which they and their families can lead more satisfying lives. These outcomes are not easily drawn out in a VFM strand which, typically has a relatively short time horizon. Any information which reduces that risk is to be welcomed.

3. The MORI approach to the Beneficiary Survey

The approach to project selection

- 3.1 The beneficiaries survey undertaken by MORI encompassed some 1008 beneficiaries drawn from projects which were included within the original 117 analysed in the “micro” element of the VFM exercise. The themes used for sampling and analysis were the same as for the VFM analysis. They reflected the key outcome areas pursued through the NDC programme: Community Development, Community Safety, Education, Health, Housing, and Physical Environment; and Worklessness. The table below provides a brief description of each of the 17 projects to which MORI refer at page 11 of their Report. For convenience we have grouped them in accordance with the 6 themes previously identified in the VFM exercise. Inspection of the data reveals the variety of the projects sampled and the numbers of interviews completed.

Table 1: Description of projects			
Ref	Interviews Completed	Project Name & NDC/Local Authority Area	Description (Problems, Aims/Targets)
WORKLESSNESS (4)			
063	30	Business Development: Preston Road NDC/Kingston upon Hull	Provides advice, support and financial assistance to residents wishing to start their own business.
076	41	OPPCOM – Employment & Enterprise Agency: New Cross Gate/Lewisham	High unemployment; low skills, self-employment, and no local support for job seekers or new business start-ups. OPPCOM provides: employment support; employability training; business support; and a social enterprise service. (Business support works with Town Centre Manager to provide holistic support).
085	92	Elite: West Ham and Plaistow/Newham	Aims to get local residents into employment, and create permanent jobs through self-employment and Residents Services Organisations. Provides an integrated employment and advice service to those most disadvantaged in the labour market: socially excluded long-term unemployed.
102	69	Jobnet: Burngreave NDC/Sheffield	Provides a job a quality job search facility in an area of high unemployment, low income, low educational attainment, with a large proportion of disaffected young people. Provides advice, guidance and training all with a view to reducing levels of unemployment.
EDUCATION (5)			
047	24	The Bridge Community Education Centre: eb4U/Brighton and Hove	In an area where there is a low level of educational and skills attainment and traditional Further Education Colleges are perceived as remote, the aim is to improve community education for adults and children through the provision of a facility which provides a programme of leisure and interest based courses in an “informal” atmosphere.
057	17	Primary School Improvement Programme: Shoreditch/Hackney	A holistic project that seeks to raise levels of attainment through 4 elements: out of hours learning (includes breakfast club and emphasis on punctuality); work related learning; reading and maths recovery; parental partnerships (support of families for children’s education).

068	54.	Community Learning Centre, Cadbury Coll: Kings Norton/Birmingham	In an area characterised by low basic skills, low self esteem, high unemployment, lack of qualifications and disaffection towards education the project is to build a learning centre which will provide courses and childcare for residents in the NDC and the wider community.
079	10	Vocational Curriculum Development: Luton Marsh Farm/ Luton Borough Council -	The aim is to develop and deliver a range of vocational courses that will enhance the learning experience of pupils demotivated by an academic approach and lead to NVQs closely linked to specific sectors of the local labour market.
101	71	Burngreave Community Learning Campaign	
HEALTH (2)			
064	35	Child Dynamix(childcare):Preston Road Hull	Aims to provide support for development of young children through assistance with speech language and literacy. Provides childcare facilities to assist parents to return to work and facilities to assist parents to return to work.
071	15	CHOW: Clapton Park Project/Lambeth	Community Health Outreach Worker co-ordinates joint working of residents, community/voluntary sector and mainstream providers in delivery of sustainable health and social care programme. Including development of health strategies and policies.
CRIME/SAFETY(2)			
021	66	Marsh Farm Reducing Burglary Initiative: Luton	Aims to identify and upgrade the security of some 1600 vulnerable properties in 24 months and thus reduce the number of burglaries (25%)and fear of burglary thereby improving the quality of life for residents of the estate
072	25	Neighbourhood Wardens: Clapham Park Project/Lambeth, London	The area suffers from: fear of crime, drug use/dealing, prostitution, abandoned vehicles, fly tipping, robbery, burglary, and poor performing service providers. The wardens (12 FTE) patrol to be "the eyes and ears of the community" linking to other services, and reporting incidents
HOUSING AND THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT (1)			
084	152	Peer Education Homelessness: Newcastle/Newcastle City Council	A number of young people formally classified as homeless find themselves rehoused in multi-storey blocks. Independent Living Newcastle supports a group (16-25) with experience of homelessness to develop and deliver a programme of peer education to 13-19 year olds.
COMMUNITY CAPACITY BUILDING (3)			
055	81	Eastserve (Phase 2):Beacons Partnership (East Manchester)/Manchester C.C	Enables 24hr electronic access for 3,500 residents via the internet from homes and community centres to community focussed public, voluntary and commercial services. It provides ICT equipment, training, connectivity, and participation on the Eastserve.com website.
065	16	Community Chest :EC1 New Deal/London Borough Islington	In an area with low levels of volunteering, little in the way of access to funds and few opportunities for self-help, Community Chest is a fund which provides funding up to £4k for small projects or items of equipment for community and voluntary organisations.
092	47/	Sports Activities Fund: Hathershaw and Fitton Hill/Oldham	Community Sport Development Officer to deliver a programme of community based sport development through improved facilities. Support groups and clubs, engage local people as volunteers, all to encourage participation in increased physical activity.
<i>Source: CEA</i>			

- 3.2 The MORI Beneficiary Survey used a questionnaire that was specifically designed to capture key evaluation evidence relating to additionality and outcome impact as described later in this chapter. The workbooks sought evidence on the resident's appreciation of the quality of life and their general satisfaction with the NDC area, their involvement with the project and what they felt the NDC programme had been able to achieve. There were also questions that probed on a *theme by theme basis* how the project had changed the status and improved the quality of life of the resident, whether they believed this to be additional and where, if at all, they felt that they might have acquired access to similar provision either in or outside of the NDC area. The questions enabled an in-depth analysis of how the project had been able to change the status of the resident and what were the implications for key outcomes.
- 3.3 Considerable care was taken in the preparation of the workbook with particular attention paid to customising the questions theme by theme. However, there are some lessons to be learned. Thus, for instance it can be readily seen from the above table that each of the projects from which the 1008 beneficiaries were drawn set out to address a different problem. We recognise that the general contexts for their answers are set by the differing questions posed for beneficiaries in each of the 6 themes and there are thus numerous matters that are particular to the design of each particular project. These include: how the beneficiary became involved; the ease of accessing relevant information; the nature, extent, frequency, and length of the involvement; and how, from the beneficiaries' point of view, the project might be improved. The administration of the questionnaires and the subsequent analysis of the data collected has revealed matters to which attention should be paid in the conduct of future beneficiary surveys. The key to getting the most from beneficiary surveys is to ensure that it is possible to tease out issues that can be considered general to the delivery of initiatives in a particular thematic area whilst at the same time probe for those findings that relate more to the specific design of the project being assessed.

4. The Beneficiary Survey and Attitudes to Quality of Life

- 4.1 The beneficiaries were asked questions about their general attitudes towards their local area and about their quality of life. This was very much in tune with the first and earliest type of beneficiary surveys to which we drew attention in our short review. All 1008 respondents were asked whether, over the past 2 years, they felt that their area had got better or worse as a place to live and to give reasons for their views. The findings were reported at an aggregate level and comparisons drawn with all households in the NDC area and, where possible, all households in England.
- 4.2 All respondents were asked how satisfied or dissatisfied they were with the area in which they were resident and it was possible to compare the results with all NDC residents (through the NDC Household Survey 2004) and with all households (through the 2002/3 Survey of English Housing). It was found that 66% of beneficiaries were very or fairly satisfied with their area as a place in which to live while 21% were fairly dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. These figures compare with 66% and 24% for residents of NDC areas taken as a whole and with 86% and 9% for England as a whole. The high level of satisfaction recorded for the country as a whole corresponds well with previous surveys in which a similar question was asked; and it is not surprising to find those living in areas identified through incidence of multiple deprivation and environmental degradation are less satisfied than those living elsewhere.
- 4.3 The information on whether beneficiaries (51%) and NDC residents as a whole (38%) felt that their area was changing for the better was interesting as an indicator of whether progress was being made in “bridging the gap”. However, the reasons recorded were those given spontaneously to the interviewer and there is little new to be learned from the findings that crime in all its forms and the general appearance of the vicinity are critical factors in determining whether residents are more or less satisfied with the environment in their immediate neighbourhood.
- 4.4 All beneficiaries were asked to provide a view on their quality of life defined as: standard of living, your surroundings, friendships, and how you feel day-to-day. It is heartening to find that some 75% felt that their quality of life was very good or fairly good and this compared with 78% of NDC households as a whole. Unfortunately, there are no figures for England from the Survey of English Housing, which would enable a comparison to be made between the views of residents in deprived areas and those in the rest of the country.

- 4.5 We recognise the value of ascertaining the views of the residents of the deprived neighbourhoods which are the focus of the initiatives which are funded by NDC. Nevertheless, in our judgement, while this material is interesting as background to an evaluation it can be little more than that. The critical point is that it is based on establishing views about circumstances “before and after” the application of the projects incorporated into NDC programme rather than circumstances “with and without” these interventions.
- 4.6 In taking matters forward, the research team are fortunate in having a body of secondary data provided by the SDRC at Oxford University and future work will enable an analysis of whether or not the “gap is being bridged” in each of the NDC areas. Of course, it is overly simplistic to assume that convergence with the area in the vicinity of the NDC partnership area or with the country as a whole is an indication that the portfolio of NDC programmes and projects has been a success. Similarly it is simplistic to conclude that a widening divergence is indicative of failure. What matters is the counterfactual ie what would have happened in the absence of the application of the NDC programme of initiatives.

5. A Role for Beneficiary Surveys in Project and Programme Monitoring

5.1 As we noted earlier in our short review, it is now a part of the conventional wisdom that appropriate procedures for project monitoring and evaluation should be thought through at the design stage and put in place as integral part of the management of a project. They serve not only as aids to efficient and effective implementation but also as a mechanism for learning lessons for future activity. The NDC programme requires that there be detailed monitoring of project expenditures and this feature of the sample of projects used in the beneficiary work reported here was examined. The results are set out in Table (2) below.

	Primary theme						
	Community development	Community safety	Education	Health	Housing & physical environment	Workless-ness	All themes
Base Projects	15	12	15	9	10	17	78
Regular expenditure returns	14 (93%)	12 (100%)	12 (80%)	9 (100%)	10 (100%)	16 (94%)	73 (94%)
Regular output returns	13 (87%)	12 (100%)	12 (80%)	9 (100%)	10 (100%)	16 (94%)	72 (92%)
Regular beneficiary surveys	6 (40%)	3 (25%)	7 (47%)	6 (67%)	4 (40%)	9 (53%)	35 (45%)
Other	7 (47%)	4 (33%)	7 (47%)	3 (33%)	3 (30%)	7 (41%)	31 (40%)
Not stated	-	-	-	-	-	1 (6%)	1 (6%)

Source: CEA from project evaluation workbooks
 Note: multiple responses allowed – columns do not sum to 100%

5.2 This evidence indicated that only 45% of all projects sampled were monitoring project implementation by way of regular beneficiary surveys: Community Safety was recorded at only 25% with Health the highest at 67%.

5.3 In the MORI Survey beneficiaries were asked a series of questions about their involvement with the project under scrutiny. Faced with an array of different projects an attempt was made by MORI to place them within one of 3 classes: A-where a beneficiary actively sought help or advice; B-where a beneficiary was the recipient of a one off project which would have happened any way; and C-where a beneficiary took part in a project as part of longer term contact with a service provider. In accordance with that classification, not all respondents were asked the same questions. We have carefully

considered the information collected on: sources of information; reasons for getting involved; the application process; and contact with project workers. We are driven to the conclusion that although of background interest this information is of relatively limited value in the evaluation process itself.

- 5.4 From our inspection of the material collected we conclude that the responses have to be considered in relation to the *specific* problem that the project sought to address and the particular way it went about recruiting persons likely to benefit from its operation. The responses are project specific and because of their variety do not, in most cases, lend themselves easily to aggregation. This needs to be considered in the design of beneficiary survey questionnaires in the future.

6. The Contribution of the MORI Beneficiary Survey to the VFM Exercise

6.1 This section discusses evidence from the beneficiary survey that helps with understanding the nature of the problems which the residents in NDC areas experience and how NDC initiatives have helped to overcome them.

Barriers to Achievement

6.2 A principal objective of NDC projects is to assist participants in the various offerings to overcome barriers to achieving their own personal aims and objectives and thereby improving their present quality of life and their life chances in the future. With this in mind respondents were asked a series of questions about what they saw as the obstacles currently in their way to a better future. The questions asked were different for each theme. In the interests of brevity we pick out worklessness from the 6 themes as a useful example. For projects designed to tackle worklessness, the beneficiaries survey began by asking about the barriers that had prevented project participants from getting the type of work that they want. A similar question had been asked of NDC residents who were unemployed and seeking work as part of the national evaluation's household survey.

Table 3: Barriers to employment (worklessness projects only)		
<i>CQ7: What, if anything, is stopping you from getting the type of work that you want?</i>		
<i>Bases: All who are registered unemployed or are not registered unemployed but are seeking work: Beneficiaries (68), Household (1,905)</i>		
	NDC Beneficiaries involved in Worklessness projects	NDC Residents
	%	%
I do not have sufficient skills and experience	21	10
I do not have sufficient qualifications	15	11
No jobs available	12	10
No suitable jobs available	4	19
Too little information on what is available	3	1
Long standing disability, illness or infirmity	3	5
Want to look after children	3	0
No reason	0	17
None/Nothing	5	0
Other	14	8
Don't know/not stated	18	3

Source: MORI

- 6.3 Table (3) above compares the results for the project beneficiaries and unemployed NDC residents overall. It shows quite clearly that the key barriers to employment identified by project beneficiaries were a lack of skills and experience (21%), lack of qualifications (15%) and a lack of jobs (12%). Project beneficiaries were twice as likely as unemployed NDC residents to cite lack of skills and experience as a barrier to employment, and they were a third more likely to cite a lack of qualifications as a barrier. Only 4% of project beneficiaries felt that no suitable jobs were available, compared with 19% for unemployed NDC residents. We draw two possible conclusions from this. The first, is that project participants were, by dint of being participants in the NDC intervention, more self-aware about their skills and qualification deficit compared with the jobs available, than were unemployed residents generally. A second conclusion might be that the worklessness projects were well-targeted on those participants with the most severe skills and qualifications deficit.

Changes in Life Style and Life Chances brought about by Involvement in the NDC Project

- 6.4 The Beneficiary Survey went on to identify, in the opinion of participants, what changes had been brought about by their involvement in the project.

Worklessness

- 6.5 In relation to worklessness projects, we can infer from the results in Table 4 below that 43% of respondents considered that they had experienced some positive change as a result of their involvement (100% minus 25% saying none/nothing and 32% don't know). Of all beneficiaries of worklessness projects, 8% said they had benefited from good sources of support, advice and information, 7% felt they had more involvement in the community, 6% felt more confident, and 5% said that they were employed or had a job at the time of the survey.
- 6.6 However, It is perhaps surprising, and rather disappointing, that so few of the beneficiaries (only 3%) said that their involvement in the project had helped them to find a job, and similarly only 3% said that it had helped to improve their prospects.

Table 4: Perceptions of project-induced benefits – worklessness	
<i>CQ33: Overall, thinking back to before your involvement with [PROJECT NAME], in your opinion, have any changes occurred as a result of your involvement in [PROJECT NAME]? What are these changes? What else?</i>	
<i>Base: All involved in worklessness projects (262)</i>	
	%
Good sources of support/Advice/Information	8
I have more involvement in the community	7
More confident	6
I am now employed/Have a job	5
Help to find a job	3
Increased prospects	3
More training opportunities	2
Better education	2
More aware of the regeneration of the area	2
More contacts	2
Other	7
None/nothing	25
Don't know/not stated	32
<i>Source: MORI</i>	

- 6.7 *Health*
- Beneficiaries' of the health projects included in the sample were less likely to report benefits from project involvement than worklessness. Table (5) below shows, we can infer that only a third of those involved identified some positive change from their involvement (100% minus 27% none/nothing and 40% don't know). Here, 8% said that they were fitter/healthier/more active and 5% felt they had benefited from good sources of support, advice and information. Some 5% felt they had more involvement in the community while 4% felt they had improved their skills.

Table 5: Perceptions of project-induced benefits – health	
<i>DQ35. Overall, thinking back to before your involvement with [PROJECT NAME], in your opinion, have any changes occurred as a result of your involvement in [PROJECT NAME]? What are these changes? What else?</i>	
<i>Base: All involved in health projects (96)</i>	
	%
Fitter/healthier/more active	8
Good sources of support/Advice/Information	5
I have more involvement in the community	5
Improve my skills	4
More confident	2
People getting on better with each other	2
Other	12
None/nothing	27
Don't know/not stated	40
<i>Source: MORI</i>	

6.8 It is difficult to draw any conclusions from these findings, because only two health projects were covered by the beneficiaries survey, and these had quite different objectives. One provided speech therapy/literacy support as part of child care, while the other sought to co-ordinate and improve health improvement initiatives.

Housing & Physical Environment

6.9 Only one housing and physical environment project was included in the beneficiary survey sample, and this was a peer education project focused on homelessness young people who were re-housed and given dedicated advice and support.

Education

6.10 Table (6) below suggests a fairly high level of project-induced change for education projects , with 47% identifying some form of positive benefit from the project (100% minus 24% none/nothing and 29% don't know).

6.11 The most significant reported benefit was improved confidence (18%) followed by more involvement in the community (13%) and helping the beneficiary to improve his/her business (13%). Some 12% were more aware of the regeneration of the area. These are relatively positive results, compared to the findings in the themes above. However, in relation to what might be described as hard outcomes, only 8% said they felt they had better education as a result of the intervention, 7% reported that the support had helped them to get job interviews, and 6% said their prospects were improved.

Table 6: Perceptions of project-induced benefits – education	
<i>FQ29. Overall, thinking back to before your involvement with [PROJECT NAME], in your opinion, have any changes occurred as a result of your involvement in [PROJECT NAME]? What are these changes?</i>	
<i>Base: All involved in education projects (184)</i>	
	%
More confident	18
I have more involvement in the community	13
Has helped me to improve my business	13
More aware of the regeneration of the area	12
Better education	8
Helped me to get job interviews	7
Increased prospects	6
Good sources of support/Advice/Information	6
I have learnt a lot about the job market	5
Better off financially	5
Other	11
None/nothing	24
Don't know/not stated	29
<i>Source: MORI</i>	

Crime and Safety

6.12 Beneficiaries to crime projects tended to agree that the project had helped to both reduce crime in the area and help other residents in the area, although responses to this were very low.

Community capacity

6.13 Perhaps inevitably, given the breadth of activities covered within the community capacity building theme, the beneficiaries survey covered three quite diverse projects: an electronic access to information project, a community chest project (small grants to support the development of community and voluntary sector activity) and a sports development project.

6.14 Table (7) below shows that 40% of project beneficiaries reported some positive change as a result of their involvement (100% minus 20% none/nothing minus 40% don't know). The most-reported change was greater involvement in the community, cited by 11%. Some 5% felt more aware of the regeneration of the area, 4% identified improved facilities, and 4% identified improvements for young people. However, only 4% said they were aware of the schemes/projects available in the local area. Notwithstanding the diversity of the projects sampled, and as with some of the other findings reported above, we find the level of project-induced change to be somewhat limited, and below our expectations.

Table 7: Perceptions of project-induced benefits – community capacity building	
<i>HQ36. Overall, thinking back to before your involvement with [PROJECT NAME], in your opinion, have any changes occurred as a result of your involvement in [PROJECT NAME]? What are these changes? What else?</i>	
<i>Base: All involved in community capacity projects (169)</i>	
	%
I have more involvement in the community	11
More aware of the regeneration of the area	5
Improved facilities	4
The youths are benefiting	4
Awareness of schemes/Projects which are available	4
More training opportunities	3
Good sources of support/Advice/Information	2
Better education	2
Help to find a job	2
Better off financially	2
Other	10
None/nothing	20
Don't know/not stated	40
<i>Source: MORI</i>	

- 6.15 As a final observation on this data, we can readily appreciate the need to customise by theme the questions concerned with barriers to individual achievement, and with beneficial changes. However, the problem remains that they are relevant only to the project within which the beneficiary was a participant. Thus, for instance, the fact that only 2% of those on worklessness projects have become more aware of regeneration projects in their area should come as no surprise if this was not one of the aims of the projects on which the respondents were engaged. Similarly, the finding that only 2% of those involved in projects designed to improve community capacity find themselves better off financially could be misleading and certainly should not be taken as a measure of the success or otherwise of the projects within the theme. The outcomes from these projects are typically diffuse and appear only in the longer term. Thus, the results generated by these questions must be interpreted with such care.

Aspirations of Beneficiaries and their Judgement of what they Personally Achieved

- 6.16 In beneficiary surveys, as in other components of an evaluation, it is important in the questionnaire, and in its subsequent analysis, to distinguish between: what the beneficiary planned to achieve (as an aspiration, objective or target); what was actually achieved; and what would have happened in the absence of the particular project on offer. Thus, for instance, a beneficiary may well have an overly optimistic view of the outcome (eg well paid full time employment) which will emerge from participation in a worklessness project and consequently judge it a failure when by other standards his/her participation could be judged a success (eg in terms of value added to his/her knowledge/skills base).
- 6.17 As an illustration of the difficulties to be encountered we set out below in Tables (8-10) the answers received to the same question posed to beneficiaries of projects in 3 of the themes. The questions were: *“What were you hoping to achieve as a result of the help you received from [PROJECT NAME]?”*; and
- 6.18 *“So far, what, if anything, would you say you have achieved as a result of the help you received from [PROJECT NAME]?”*

Table 8: Hoping to/have achieved responses – Worklessness (%)		
<i>Base: All those involved in worklessness projects (262)</i>	Hoping to achieve	Have achieved
	%	%
A job/Got a job	59	28
New business start-ups/advice	11	4
Improved possibility of getting a job in the future	10	10
Information/advice/guidance on better, higher paid jobs; how to improve skills etc	10	11
CV & interviews preparation	7	13
Have received job training	6	8
Other	24	30
None of these	1	17
Don't know/not stated	4	8
<i>Source: Derived from MORI</i>		

Table 9: Hoping to achieve/have achieved responses – Education (%)		
<i>Base: All those involved in education projects (184)</i>	Hoping to achieve	Have achieved
Qualifications	20	18
Increased chance of getting a better job	15	3
Increase confidence/aspirations	13	17
Information/advice/guidance on better, higher paid jobs; how to improve skills etc	10	13
Have found a job/employment	8	7
Adult/higher education	7	2
Other	19	19
None of these	2	18
Don't know/not stated	29	16
<i>Source: Derived from MORI</i>		

Table 10: Hoping to achieve/have achieved responses – housing & physical environment		
<i>Base: All those involved in education projects (184)</i>	Hoping to achieve	Have achieved
Improvements in quality of life	3	6
More/improved street lighting	3	3
Tackled poor environment	3	2
Improved housing maintenance	3	1
Created a place where people choose to live/attract new residents into the NDC area	2	3
Improved ugly derelict land	2	0
Other	20	28
None of these	17	10
Don't know/not stated	62	53
<i>Source: Derived from MORI</i>		

6.19 Initial inspection information of the above suggests a strong correlation between what beneficiaries hoped to achieve from their participation in the project and what they actually achieved. However, a closer inspection confirms some significant differences. Thus for instance, in the worklessness theme while 59% hoped to secure a job only 28% were successful. A similar disappointing outcome was recorded in the education theme where 15% entered onto the project to improve their chances of a better job but only 3% were successful in that aspiration. Surprisingly, 29% apparently could not or would not state why they participated in the educational project. The results for those involved in housing and physical environment projects are also difficult to interpret. Thus for instance, some 53% of the respondents could not say how the project had benefited them.

The Usefulness of the Project as Assessed by the Beneficiary

6.20 A further critical test of whether a project should be assessed as “worthwhile” is whether the beneficiary, on reflection and from his/her point of view, found participation to have been useful. Table (11) below we set out in summary the answers provided to MORI on the usefulness of the projects in which the beneficiaries took part.

	Community development	Community safety	Education	Health	Hous'g & Phys Env't	Worklessness
Very useful	50%	31%	60%	29%	15%	57%
Fairly useful	35%	20%	27%	34%	22%	28%
Not very useful	8%	10%	2%	3%	12%	4%
Not at all useful	2%	9%	1%	2%	12%	6%
No opinion/not stated	5%	30%	10%	31%	39%	6%

Source: Derived from MORI

6.21 Superficial inspection suggests a clear league table with education, worklessness and community development projects rated highly and housing and environment, community safety and health projects less worthwhile. However, closer inspection reveals that the latter group had a considerable percentage of respondents who held no opinion or who did not state one. In seeking an explanation we have considered the question posed for each of the 6 themes:

1. *Community Development:* Please tell me how useful, if at all, the involvement with (project name) has been for you personally (so far)
2. *Community Safety:* Please tell me how useful, if at all, the (project name) has been for you personally (so far).
3. *Education:* Please tell me how useful, if at all, the help from (project name) has been for you personally overall?

4. *Health*: Please tell me how useful, if at all, the health related help you have received from (project name) has been for your personal health overall (so far).
 5. *Housing and Physical Environment*: Please tell me how useful, if at all, the (project name) has been for you personally (so far).
 6. *Worklessness*: Please tell me how useful, if at all, the employment related help you have received from (project name) has been to you personally (so far).
- 6.22 It is clear that the questions posed were framed in a similar style with differences intended to reflect the focus of each of the 6 themes. However, there are some important variations which, it would appear, have influenced the responses. Thus, for instance, it is relatively easy for a participant in a worklessness, or an education, or a community development project to respond to the question posed to beneficiaries within that theme. It is much less easy for projects falling within the other 3 themes. The no opinion/not stated figures are large: Community safety (30%), Health (31%) and Housing and the physical environment (39%); and this has an inevitable impact on the percentage of responses stating the participation in the relevant project to have been useful to varying extents.
- 6.23 Leaving these matters to one side for the moment, it should come as no surprise that a beneficiary would judge a project as a failure if his/her particular objectives were not achieved. It is perfectly possible that at the same time there is a consensus amongst, say, managers and NDC staff and community groups that the project has been a success judged from their perspectives and in terms of their objectives. We should expect that; and we should not necessarily be persuaded that the project was ultimately not worthwhile by an adverse view even if it came from a considerable number of the beneficiaries.
- 6.24 Neither would it be surprising if beneficiaries were to be looking for immediate, readily recognisable results, and judge their participation in a project to be a failure if these were not immediately achieved. However, for some health projects (eg smoking, diet) it is accepted that sustained results generally only emerge in the longer term and as a result of cumulative exposure to the appropriate message. The project may be judged quite properly as a success because it should be viewed as a stepping stone along the road rather than a magic bullet. In housing and the physical environment, the project outcomes may be diffuse and not readily recognisable. Indeed, the beneficiaries may not be active participants at all in the project, and they may even be unaware that it is on-going. In those circumstances they are in a poor position to comment on its usefulness and contribute to a VFM evaluation exercise.

Assessing access additionality from the beneficiary survey

- 6.25 During an earlier phase of the NDC Value For Money work we noted that we believed that establishing *access additionality* was an important evolution of the traditional approach to additionality in evaluation work. This was because it helped to establish how well area-based initiatives actually helped to focus service delivery on those in need in deprived areas.
- 6.26 We have examined two sources of evidence in coming to a view on access additionality: the results from the project evaluation workbooks, drawing on views of project managers and others associated with the project's delivery; and the views of project beneficiaries from the MORI Beneficiary Survey.
- 6.27 The approach adopted to assess the additionality of NDC project based activity is described at length in the NDC Value for Money Report (FFF). A central component of the approach was the use of a Workbook that was used to establish the views of Project Managers as to whether, in the absence of the NDC project, beneficiaries could have accessed similar or less suitable provision within or outside the NDC area.
- 6.28 Certain key assumptions have been made (displayed in Table (12) about the access additionality weights that should be applied to each form of response that was received. Where it is considered that beneficiaries could have accessed similar services elsewhere in the NDC area, this was treated as "deadweight", i.e. there is considered to be no access additionality at all. We gave responses a weight of 25% where beneficiaries could have obtained similar support from sources outside the NDC area. Although, in theory, there would have been similar resources available, the fact that they were outside the NDC area might have deterred a minority of NDC resident users from accessing them. We gave an access additionality weight of 33% for those that could have obtained less suitable support within the NDC area in the absence of the NDC-funded project. Because it was in the NDC areas, and in the absence of any information about the alternatives, we adopted the realistic assumption that it would have been adequate in only 67% of cases.
- 6.29 Table (12) shows the analysis of the responses from project managers from the 2004/05 sample, using a single line of questioning for all themes. It suggests that the project managers believe that

	Community development	Community safety	Education	Health	Housing & physical environ't	Workless-ness
Projects responding	15	12	15	9	10	17
<i>Proportion of beneficiaries that could have accessed(weighted)</i>						
a) Additionality	100	100	100	100	100	100
Minus b) Other similar provision in the NDC area - 100% deadweight at NDC level thus proportion responding multiplied by 1.0)	3.5	24.3	7.9	2.2	8.6	0.94
Minus c) Other similar provision outside the NDC area (75% deadweight at NDC level and thus proportion responding multiplied by 0.75))	1.7	0.0	14.4	1.3	3.8	5.1
Minus d) Less suitable provision in the NDC area (67% deadweight at NDC level and thus proportion responding multiplied by 0.67)	17.0	18.9	4.0	11.9	33.5	28.7
Overall access additionality (a minus deadweight i.e.(b)+(c)+(d))	78	57	74	85	54	65
<i>Source: CEA; analysis of project evaluation workbooks</i>						

6.30 The NDC projects have been able to improve access but that the degree of success varies considerably by theme. An alternative view of access additionality comes from beneficiaries themselves, and the MORI Beneficiary Survey was used to ask beneficiaries what they would have done in the absence of the NDC project. Table (13) presents evidence from the Beneficiary Survey that enabled a beneficiary based view of additionality to be derived.

	Similar services in LA	Similar services outside LA	Less suitable in LA	Less suitable outside LA	Accessed nothing	Would have taken longer	Lower quality
Worklessness							
<i>tot usable responses</i>	189	192	182	185	191	181	172
strongly agree	26	27	32	19	18	44	38
tend to agree	26	32	36	35	19	24	26
Tend to disagree	24	18	16	24	27	14	22
strongly disagree	24	23	15	22	36	17	15
Agree	52	59	68	54	37	69	63
Disagree	48	41	32	46	63	31	37
Health							
<i>tot usable responses</i>	91	94	77	80	85	63	44
strongly agree	21	11	27	15	14	52	34
tend to agree	32	34	14	21	40	19	41
Tend to disagree	31	46	47	44	32	17	5
strongly disagree	16	10	12	20	14	11	20
Agree	53	45	42	36	54	71	75
Disagree	47	55	58	64	46	29	25
Education							
<i>tot usable responses</i>	222	218	195	200	198	199	154
strongly agree	17	17	33	21	33	50	43
tend to agree	26	20	31	31	22	26	29
Tend to disagree	26	24	24	25	23	13	19
strongly disagree	32	39	12	24	21	12	9
Agree	43	37	64	52	56	75	71
Disagree	57	63	36	49	44	25	29

Crime							
tot usable responses	27	24	13	12	21	19	10
strongly agree	7	0	15	0	19	47	40
tend to agree	44	46	15	0	24	26	0
Tend to disagree	7	17	31	42	24	0	20
strongly disagree	41	38	38	58	33	26	40
Agree	52	46	31	0	43	74	40
Disagree	48	54	69	100	57	26	60
Community Capacity							
tot usable responses	96	102	86	87	95	90	74
strongly agree	18	15	19	13	17	48	27
tend to agree	31	35	30	33	27	36	42
Tend to disagree	30	24	34	26	21	8	12
strongly disagree	21	26	17	28	35	9	19
Agree	49	50	49	46	44	83	69
Disagree	51	50	51	54	56	17	31

Source: CEA

6.31 The views of the beneficiaries are most interesting. The strongly and tend to agree have been added together to provide a broad summary. They reveal that many respondents believe that the NDC projects have made a contribution to access but that the extent to which the beneficiaries genuinely believed that they are wholly additional (and thus not 'deadweight') varies considerably by theme. Moreover, many respondents felt that the projects contribution was to improve the quality of the service, or reduce the time it would have taken to get it. And, in general respondents were often of the view that they could acquire similar service provision either from elsewhere in the NDC or directly outside-a view not so readily shared by project mangers. The responses were weighted together using the weights described in table (14) below.

Table 14: Access additionality of NDC projects - estimates derived by theme from beneficiary survey results (2004/5)						
	Community development	Community safety	Education	Health	Housing & phys env**	Workless-ness
Beneficiaries responding (weightd)	175	88	264	130	Na	219
Proportion* of beneficiaries (weighted)						
Would not have accessed any services/projects (multiplied by 1.0) %	44	43	56	54	Na	37
It would have taken longer to access services/projects (multiplied by 0.25) %	21	19	19	18	Na	17
The help would have been of a lower quality (multiplied by 0.33) %	23	13	23	25	Na	21
Overall access additionality	88	75	98	97	Na	75
<i>*Proportions of those who 'agree' with statement (i.e. strongly agree and agree). ** Results not available.</i>						
<i>Source: CEA; MORI beneficiary surveys</i>						

Producing an overall estimate of project additionality

6.32 The views from the Project Managers and the MORI Beneficiary Survey have been combined in the NDC VFM work to arrive at an overall additionality estimate. Because of the two sources of evidence available on access additionality (projects and beneficiaries) an average was taken of the results from the two sources discussed

above. The mid-point between the gross additionality of NDC funding support and the access additionality average to arrive at an overall estimate of project additionality as shown in Table (15).

Table 15: Overall additionality of NDC projects - responses and estimates derived – by theme						
	Community development	Community safety	Education	Health	Housing & physical environ't	Workless-ness
Gross additionality						
a) Gross additionality of NDC support from project managers (Figure 7.2)	92.4	77.7	82.9	82.1	71.6	93.8
Access additionality						
b) Average of access additionality between beneficiary results and project manager feedback (Figures 7.3 and 7.4)	78 to 88 = 83	57 to 75 = 66	74 to 98 = 86	85 to 97 = 91	54 (no beneficiary data)	65 to 75 = 70
Overall additionality						
Overall additionality – mid-point between gross additionality and access additionality	87.7	71.9	84.4	86.6	62.8	81.9
<i>Source: CEA</i>						

6.33 Overall, gross additionality is judged to be highest for projects in the **Community Development** theme (87.7%) followed by **Health** (86.6%), **Education** (84.4%), **Worklessness** (81.9%) and **Community Safety** (71.9%). **Housing & Physical Environment** projects emerged with the lowest overall additionality (62.8%).

7. A Role for Beneficiary Surveys in Considering Community Involvement in Project Design, Implementation and Community Capacity Building

7.1 The beneficiary survey also contains evidence that can contribute to other areas of interest to the National Evaluation of NDC other than direct VFM issues. These include community involvement in project design and implementation and community capacity building.

Community Involvement in Project Design and Implementation

7.2 Each respondent within each theme was asked the same question in relation to community involvement. The results for worklessness, community projects, and housing and physical environment were provided in a comparable form by MORI. They are set out below (Table (16)) together with a commentary summarising what we know about the other 3 themes.

Table 16: Community Involvement				
<i>Base: All who say the local community have been involved in designing, setting up or running the project</i>	Workless-ness	Community projects	Educ-ation	All beneficiaries
	%			%
Attending/consulting about the project	29	48	35	36
Setting up the project	22	19	22	20
Local community groups advising people	22	15	22	19
Funding the project	15	7	10	10
Other	13	10	0	11
Don't know/not stated	30	25	23	38
<i>Source: MORI</i>				

7.3 **Worklessness:** 29% of beneficiaries felt that the local community had been consulted about the project at its inception and 22% thought the community had been involved in setting it up. 30% either did not respond to this question or did not know. Although this last percentage is disappointingly large it is less than that recorded by beneficiaries of projects as a whole.

7.4 **Community Projects:** It is encouraging, if not unexpected, that community projects have the best record across the themes for the local community attending meetings and being consulted about the project. It is also encouraging that only 25% did not respond, or did not know what the nature of community involvement had been.

- 7.5 **Education:** The responses from beneficiaries of projects within the Education theme are broadly in line with those of beneficiaries within all of the themes taken as a whole.
- 7.6 **Health:** Slightly more beneficiaries involved in health projects than overall believe their local community has been involved in designing, setting up or running the project (42% versus 35%). 11% say it has had no involvement while 47% do not express an opinion (don't know/not stated). Health beneficiaries think their local community has mainly been involved attending/consulting about the project (32%) and setting up the project (23%), broadly in line with beneficiaries as a whole (36% and 20% respectively).
- 7.7 **Housing and Physical Environment:** Local community involvement in the project is felt to focus on setting up the project and attending or consulting about the project, and these findings are in findings in line with the other five themes.
- 7.8 **Crime:** 26% of beneficiaries within the crime theme think their local community has been involved in designing, setting up or running the project. This figure varies from 36% among those belonging to Youth Activity and Support programme to 17% among beneficiaries involved in Marsh Farm. Overall, 14% say there has been no local community involvement in the project.
- 7.9 It was clear in carrying out this summary discussion that some individual respondents were not particularly well placed to establish accurately the nature and extent of community involvement in their project. However, in this area of endeavour what matters is not only whether the community has actually been involved but also, and at least of equal importance, whether individuals think that their community has been an active participant in making things happen for the better in their lives and in their vicinity. A feeling of community ownership of the project is a powerful incentive to protect its achievements. Experience also suggests that a feeling that the community has been an active participant in "turning round" the fortunes of a deprived area can be a potent force in promoting "social inclusion" and providing a fertile context for further initiatives whether community based or promoted from elsewhere.

The Role of the Participation in the Project in Community Capacity Building

- 7.10 In our introductory review we identified a further area of the NDC evaluation process to which a beneficiary survey can make a helpful contribution: community capacity building. Experience suggests that a key ingredient of self-sustaining progress in neighbourhood regeneration is the emergence of leaders from within the community itself able and willing to shoulder responsibility and seek out the way forward. Although there were a clutch of projects which were designed specifically to encourage community capacity building we take it as given that it was an objective of all projects, implicit if not explicit, that on their completion the residents of the neighbourhood would be in a better position to recognise, meet and overcome the challenges presented by the

problems remaining in their area. Table (17) below demonstrates that involvement with an NDC project has had beneficial impacts in that general area. Taking the beneficiaries as a whole, there were substantially more in agreement than disagreement that: participation had increased awareness of community activity (60%: 12%); participation had boosted the individual's self confidence and self esteem (58%: 13%); improved services in the local area (58%: 10%); helped the personal development of those charged with running the project (53%;12%); and increased the beneficiary's participation in community and voluntary activities (42%; 23%). In connection with that last finding it is interesting, but perhaps not surprising, to note that the figure rises to 53% amongst those who were engaged on a community capacity project.

Table 17. Involvement in project.				
<i>JQ5.</i>				
<i>To what extent do you agree or disagree that your involvement in [PROJECT NAME] has...?</i>				
<i>Base: All (1,008)</i>	Agree	Neither/ nor	Disagree	DK/Not stated/ Not applicable
	%	%	%	%
Increased your awareness about the work of community and voluntary based groups and activities in general	60	12	12	16
Boosted your self-confidence and self-esteem	58	11	13	16
Improved the quality of services in your local area	58	13	10	19
Helped the development of member of [PROJECT NAME] to deliver services and run activities	53	14	12	31
Increased your involvement in your local community or voluntary organisation	42	16	23	19
<i>Source: MORI</i>				

- 7.11 With these positive findings in mind, it is disappointing that more beneficiaries did not turn out to vote in the last election of Board members for their local NDC. A roughly equal proportion of beneficiaries and residents – about a quarter – say they managed to vote. Of course this, is much in line with the current turn out for local elections in many parts of the country. It is interesting to note that voting was particularly high among elderly beneficiaries (40%) and those involved in community capacity projects (44%).
- 7.12 It is a feature of “social exclusion” that persons feel, and in fact are, relatively isolated from other groups not only in the rest of the country but also in their own vicinity. Accordingly, it is encouraging as table (18) below records, that all beneficiaries felt that they had become more a part of the local community as a consequence of participation in their particular project. Only 39% of NDC residents felt a part of the local community compared with 58% of all beneficiaries and 71% where community capacity building was a specific objective.

Table 18: Part of the community.			
<i>HQ1 & JQ1</i>			
<i>Overall, to what extent do you feel part of the local community? Is that...</i>			
	All involved in community capacity projects	All beneficiaries	NDC Household Survey
<i>Base:</i>	<i>(169)</i> %	<i>(1,008)</i> %	<i>(19,633)</i> %
A great deal	35	25	8
A fair amount	36	33	31
Not very much	18	27	35
Not at all	6	7	24
Don't know	2	4	2
Not stated	2	3	0
A great deal/fair amount	71	58	39
Not very much/not at all	24	34	59
<i>Source: MORI</i>			

8. Lessons learned

8.1 This Paper has explored some aspects of the contribution which Beneficiary Surveys can make to the National Evaluation of New Deal for Communities. Although we have looked briefly at its role in establishing their attitudes to quality of life in their area, and also at the role of the information collected in project monitoring and evaluation our principal concern has been to examine extent to which the MORI survey work can contribute to the VFM exercise. We are in no doubt that “traditional” beneficiary surveys have their place in programme evaluation. However, we conclude that, if beneficiary surveys are to “pull their weight” and be considered integral to the exercise, then there are a number of areas that require very careful attention. These include:

- Issues around how well the “traditional” aspects of beneficiary surveys which focus on resident satisfaction with the area in which they live sit with questions about the particular project in which they have been participants. It is important to keep the two aspects of a beneficiary survey quite separate.
- Beneficiary surveys have a valuable role to play in monitoring the progress of projects and the programmes of which they are constituent parts. It is important to know whether projects are having an impact on the problems of multiple deprivation and social exclusion in their neighbourhoods. Beneficiary surveys can also make a useful contribution to VFM exercises but the views of respondents have to be interpreted with considerable care.
- As we have emphasised throughout this paper, the data collected by a beneficiary survey is provided by persons who have a different perspective from those questioned in a conventional VFM exercise. Those who have participated in/been a beneficiary of a single project have a different viewpoint from those tasked with its management and delivery. In all but the most exceptional cases the respondents will have no experience, knowledge or understanding of any aspect of the NDC programme beyond their own personal experience. Therefore, any view elicited from them, or which they volunteer, on other matters, including whether the project improved the area as a whole, and by implication was value for money, has to be treated with caution.
- Only when the particular problem which the project seeks to address is specified can sense be made of many of the responses to the questions posed to beneficiaries.

Many of these responses do not readily lend themselves to aggregation and it is here that considerable caution needs to be exercised.

- There is value in establishing the aspirations of beneficiaries and their perception of what they have gained from their participation. However, in this area as in all others, there is a requirement that the questions posed are well framed and, thereafter, the answers are subject to careful consideration before findings are made.
- Beneficiary surveys have a role to play in the forecasting the nature and extent of outcomes which may be long in gestation and diffuse in their appearance. While what can be expected should not be exaggerated they can make a valuable contribution to what is, at this stage, more of an art than an exact science.