

Final Report
Monitoring and Evaluation of P2K Study execution by the BPS
Submitted by Cecep Sukria Sumantri

Acknowledging the need to improve targeting performance, the Ministry of Planning (BAPPENAS) has asked the World Bank to provide technical assistance in exploring ways to devise a better household targeting system. The findings of this research will inform the government's decision to develop new methods to identify poor households eligible for a variety of assistance programs. In the first stage of research, the BPS and community facilitators studied several different methods of determining household eligibility for anti-poverty programs. The targeting methods include simplifying the process for determining eligibility (Proxy Means Test), decentralization of eligibility rules (Hybrid Method), and community inclusion in assessing eligibility.

This report is presented based on the monitoring and evaluation made on the execution of the study through direct observation, verification visit, checking the filled out questionnaire and brief interview with informants. The goal is to determine whether or not the study being conducted followed an established procedure.

A. Monitoring and Evaluation

The monitoring and evaluation of the study were conducted through observation, checking filled out questionnaire, verification, and brief interview. Observation was conducted both in the execution of the training of field staff and during the data collection activities of PMT and Hybrid method.

Verification was conducted by revisiting those households that had been interviewed. For this verification, I brought the filled out questionnaires and crosschecked every answer in the questionnaires with the real condition of the household respondents. To ensure this verification and also to make it approvable, I always had assistance by my

side. The assistants who accompanied me in this verification were the chief of the social section, coordinator of the regency statistic (KSK), supervisor (PMS), and even the enumerators themselves (PCS). The verification was conducted to sample of three to four households, and even seven households just to make sure.

I also conducted brief and unstructured interview with the village officers, the chief of SLS (*Satuan Lingkungan Setempat*), household respondents and the community where the study was being conducted. The goal of this brief interview was to examine how far the socialization of P2K study was being conducted and how far the respondents or the informants know about the study.

B. The area visited

The areas of P2K study that have been supervised in the monitoring and evaluation of P2K study are:

Training of Field Staff :

Training Observation in Pematang Siantar City and Serdang Bedagai Regency

Humbang Hasundutan Regency:

Interview Observation (Hybrid Method) : Enumeration Area (EA) 018

Verification (Hybrid Method) : EA 030.

Pematang Siantar City:

Verification (Hybrid Method) : EA 125, EA 151, EA 135, and (PMT Method) EA 121.

Interview Observation (Hybrid Method) : EA 133, EA 145, EA 146, EA 135

Bone Regency :

Verification (Hybrid Method) : EA 491, EA 521; and EA 517 (PMT Method)

Interview Observation (Hybrid Method) : EA 492

Tana Toraja Regency :

Verification (PMT Method) : EA 566, EA 557, and EA 576.

Serdang Bedagai Regency :

Interview Observation (PMT Method) : EA 090, EA 081, and EA 109.

Wonogiri Regency :
Verification (PMT Method) : EA 260, EA 258, EA 241 and EA 243

Purbalingga Regency:
Verification (PMT Method) : EA 177, EA 220, and EA 210

Makassar and Enrekang Regencies

C. Observation on Training of Field Staff

I observed the first day of the training by the BPS of Pematang Siantar City and training by the BPS of Serdang Bedagai regency. Both training lasted only for 2 days each. The training for the enumerators of the P2K study by BPS of Pematang Siantar city was attended by 32 participants. They consisted of 13 males and 19 female s with average age of 30 years old. There was no selection process for the recruitment of that field officer. They were recruited based on the listed of BPS enumerators who have been involved in every BPS data collection activities. According to the BPS staffs the selection of the trainee here was based on their ability and experiences in data gathering as the BPS partners.

After the opening ceremony of the training led by the chief of the PBS, it continued by giving the materials to the participants by the trainer. The explanation of the background study and its aims were given briefly since they were already mentioned in the manual. It was then continued by giving explanation on data gathering using PMT method and Hybrid method, and also on the activity of the community facilitator. These materials were particularly focused on the explanation of the technical method of PMT, and then carried on to the explanation of the questionnaire of UD format.

The materials given in the explanation of the questionnaire seemed to be arranged unsystematically. Although it was equipped with a projector to demonstrate the power points materials slide show which had been arranged systematically, it was not used as

reference in giving the, materials. This happened because the materials that had been delivered to the trainee were jumping around one to another as the trainer tended to respond every question from the trainee. That's what made not all of the materials to be discussed well.

While the explanation was being delivered, many of the participants questioned about the extreme things that was unlikely to occur in the field. In fact, the participants had not completely understood the substance and the technical method of PMT that would be conducted. Most trainees assumed that this study was the same as the previous PPLS activity that they had conducted before. On the other hand, they did not give much attention to the manual given to them. Similarly the trainer did not seem to read the manual either. Thus, some issues that had been already mentioned in the manual were still being argued in the training session.

The trainer did not explain about the proper sequence based on the questionnaire when he was explaining the questionnaire for UD format. The trainer jumped to Block III without explaining first Block I and II because he assumed that the trainees were already familiar with those two Blocks. In addition to that, the trainer did not explain about how to fill out the household ID, building numbers, and so on and detail explanation on the household concept, household head, and household members mentioned in the Block III were not given. In fact, the understanding of these concepts by participants seems to be inadequate. The unsystematic way of training positively correlated with the class room atmosphere where participants were allowed to smoke and to talk to each other freely that made the small room become unbearable.

During the training process, there were neither practice materials for simulation interview nor the final evaluation of the training. The BPS assumed that all participants had understood and grasped all the concepts in the questionnaire. Besides that, they

assumed that those field officer candidates of the P2K study were able to conduct interview as they had been working for the BPS for a long time.

In Serdang Badagai Regency, the training for the enumerator candidates was attended by 70 participants. The training itself was divided into 2 classes; Class A consisted of 40 trainee and class B consisted of 30 trainee. From all those trainings, there were two new field officers who had never been in any of BPS activities particularly in data gathering.

The same case as in Pematang Siantar City, the recruitment of the enumerator of P2K study in Serdang Badagai regency was without any process selection. I arrived at the Serdang Badagai training on the second day of the training. The training started at 08.30 AM, and they were discussing about the questionnaire of UD format.

The same situation happened here. There was not systematic explanation of every block. There were many concepts left unexplained, such as household concepts, household head, household members, working concepts, field of work and work status of the main occupation. Questions in the Blocks IV and V were not given adequate explanation. The trainer assumed that the trainee were familiar enough with the concepts in BPS, including concepts of assets.

The training mostly touched general technical issues and less emphasize on the substance of the questionnaire. This training also did not provide simulation interview for final evaluation. They also thought the questionnaire in P2K study is the same as those in PPLS questionnaire that they had done before and argued that all trainee had been involved in the previous BPS activities particularly in data gathering in the field, including PPLS, thus, they assumed all trainee had fully understood about those concepts.

After the training session ended, I asked some of the trainee concerning the concepts mentioned in the questionnaire. The result demonstrated that many of them had not understood yet, even the trainee who admitted that he has been working for the BPS since 1985 answered "no idea". Moreover, there were many of those field officer candidates who answered that they actually had no idea about those concepts, and many of them tended to say that they "forgot".

D. Socialization Process

The socialization of the study should be conducted along with the targeted village officers, village public figures, and the community lived in the enumerated areas. This is aimed to make better understanding on the purpose and the follow up of the P2K study. From some of those enumerated areas that I visited, it showed that the socialization arranged by the KSK was not sufficient, even there were some areas we found had no socialization at all. Almost all of the socialization process that had been arranged were only to the village officers level, while some chiefs of the SLS had not been informed yet. The socialization itself was only explaining the purpose of the P2K study. Most SLS chiefs had neither any information in detail about the follow up of P2K study nor the list of names of the poor households and Rp. 30.000 as the gift for the selected households.

The difference between those who had conducted socialization to the level of SLS and those who had not was obvious. There were close relationship between the KSK and the SLS chiefs (when assisting me in observation/verification) who had conducted socialization, particularly in the field. On the other hand, for the KSK (when assisting me in observation/verification) who had not yet conducted any socialization to the level of the regency or the SLS chiefs, they were obviously unfamiliar with the study areas listed

in the sample for the P2K study, and probably they did not know who the SLS chiefs of the area.

During my field visit I have brief interviews with the SLS chiefs and inquired about what they know concerning P2K study. I also asked if there were any BPS officers who had given explanation both on the purpose and the follow up of the study. The answer I received from them was uncertain and doubtful. They only knew that the study was to determine the poor households in their area. They had no idea concerning both the follow up and the gift that would be given to the selected households and had no idea about the complaint form either.

When I reconfirm my findings to the KSK responsible for the enumerated area, he replied that the socialization had not been completely conducted as they feared if they had given the socialization to community from the beginning, it would evoke anxiety in the community and other unexpected problems. He also replied that the socialization would be completely conducted if the names of the selected poor households have been released.

During my observation on interview conducted by the enumerator at respondent's household, it turned out that many interviewers did not start interview with explanation on the purpose of the P2K study in detail; half the number of enumerators that I observed only informed the households that the study was to determine the level of welfare and poverty. There was neither explanation about names of the poor household that will be published later nor the complaint form. Moreover, there were some enumerators who did not give any explanation at all. They only informed "We are the BPS partners and we will enumerate your household".

In the field, I also inquired some informants and household respondents concerning what they know about the P2K study. Some respondents answered only the purpose of

the study which was aimed to determine the poverty in their area and they had been expecting to get some aids. Respondent knew nothing at all about the follow up of this data collection. They only hoped for getting some helps from the government after they had been interviewed.

E. Process of data Gathering Using PMT Method and Hybrid Method

The monitoring and evaluation activities in the process of data gathering using PMT and Hybrid method are through observation, checking the completed questionnaire, and revisit the household to verify if the interview were really conducted. The findings that described here are the interview procedures and the data gathering itself.

Interview Procedures

The procedures of P2K study obliged the interview to be conducted in pairs (2 enumerators for each selected household). The observation result from the field demonstrated that some enumerators worked in pairs (ea 492, 133, 018, 145, 146), while others did not (ea 135). During verification of the enumerated areas, I found that some households were visited by only one enumerator (ea 030, 135, 151, 121, 125, 491, 521, 517, 566, 557, 576, and 243).

I observed enumeration area 492 where two enumerators visited one household. The process lasted ideally and harmoniously because both of them helped each other to fill and complete respondent's answer. However, unfortunately they split and worked on their own ways in conducting interview for other enumeration area.

Some of the interviewers that I met in the field said that they conducted pair interview not for all the selected households. Some said that they would not conduct interview as in pairs if households were close to each other, however they would be working in pair again if the household locations were far apart (from the informant of Rantepao-Bone).

Another enumerator said that the reason why they split and worked on their own (not in a pair) was to get the interviewer done more quickly. Another factor that made the enumerators do not work in pairs were the remote area and the bad condition of the road which was hard to reach.

The presence of the supervisor when assisting a team in gathering the data (interview) did not guarantee that the interview would be conducted in pairs since there are findings in some enumerated areas which had supervisor yet interview were still conducted not in pair. To my surprise, the supervisor did not take any action or to correct them although they knew about those misbehaviors (ea 521,117,243). However, based on the observation and verification result, the interviews were conducted in pair and followed the procedure whenever I observed them.

Interview of format ID

In this section, we will reveal some findings based on the observation and verification of the interview on format ID. The observation resulted a case that there were some teams who had filled the Blocks I, II and III before the interview were conducted (ea 492, 018). However, some teams conducted the interviews by following the procedures.

The reason why the enumerator filled the Block III before interview was because they had already known all the community who lived there. However, when the interview were conducted, I questioned them concerning the names of the household members and also reconfirmed the information filled in the questionnaire with the real condition, it turned out that there were several names that did not belong to certain households. Besides that, there were many mistakes in Blocks III, particularly on questions number 12,13, and 14.

Based on the observation I found that the understanding of the substance for Block III were not adequate, particularly for the concepts of household, household member, and occupation (Block III, number 12, 13, and 14). Beside the lack of understanding from the enumerator, the ability to explore the information (probing) from respondent's answers were not adequate as well. The verification results showed even clearer about the lack of understanding of the enumerators concerning these concepts. The findings from the verification are error in listing names who does not belong to the household anymore (block III, number 2), and not listing names of new member of the household (ea 566, 557, 210).

The problems found were mostly from the questions in Block III number 12 (concerning working for the last one month), 13 (what field of business from the main job), and 14 (the status/position of the main job). For the detail questions number 12, it is obviously seen in the verification result that many household members (ART) who had not working for the last one month, yet they recoded as working, and vice versa (ea 517, 491, 121, 135).

Other mistakes that often occurred in Block III are question number 13 and 14. The mistakes occurred because the enumerator chose the wrong kind of business field and the status of the main job. The enumerators did not really probe the answers from respondent well.

The verification result on Block IV questions revealed that there were many data in the questionnaire that did not match with the real condition of the household. There are many questions in Block IV that were not asked to the respondents. When this case was being reconfirmed to the assistant of the verification, he replied that those questions must have been asked, but with different way that would be understood easily by respondent. However, there were some assistants who were surprised to find

out the verification result concerning numbers of questions in Block IV that were not asked.

The verification result of the Block V is almost the same as those in Block IV where there are many information in the questionnaire that do not match with the real situation of the respondents. This errors is because of the weak understanding concerning the concepts of asset and also the lack of effort from the enumerator to probe the answers from respondents. This finding is based on the verification result of the interviews conducted in ea 018, 145, 146.

The other factor of these inconsistency of data is that many enumerators did not conduct interview at the household with the respondent directly. Interview was conducted with the child of the respondent who was under 16 years old (ea 576). During the verification process, we also found questionnaires which are fully filled. However, after the related respondent was being confirmed during verification, he admitted that he had never been interviewed before (ea 566).

F. Process of data entry

The process of data entry is managed by the BPS staff, and we also see that the editor already familiar with the data entry activity. The editor always marks every questionnaire which has been processed further in computer data with "sudah entri" and put sign on it. The problem on this data entry is the frequent updating of the program that made data entry process seem to be slow. The problem of data entry program that I found are the in section 8 block III format UD questionnaire, where there are no code for duplicate household, unknown household, and some cases where code 2 to be used if modification is to be made or adding names of the head of household or the spouse.the solution to this problem that were done were as follows.

Duplicate household: The code for the interviewed household is 1(found), while the code for duplicate household is 7 (joined), where in fact the concept between joined household and the duplicate household is totally different.

Unknown household: the code for the unknown household is 5 (wrong address).

Option code 2 (found, yet different name of head of household) used for several circumstances that makes code 2 is not a unique code anymore and even t is not appropriate to the answers meant in the questionnaire. Code 2 is used for cases such as :

- HH found, HH head name is correct, with only miswritten name.
- HH found, HH head name is totally different.
- HH found, HH head name is correct, yet spouse is wrong.
- HH found, HH head name is correct, yet spouse is mistakenly written.

The point is that every time there is one or more different characters or letters in the HH head or spouse's names, it should use code 2, regardless the HH head or spouse is correct or not.

Still concerning the code 2 above, in the observation of the data entry, there are findings that the editor did not revise the data in the questionnaire so that the data in the computer file is different from the data in the questionnaire. For instance the name of the household head is the same, but his wife's name is different; this case is coded with 1 in the questionnaire, but it must be changed into 2 in the process of data entry because every change must be coded with 2 for both household head and the spouse.

G. Closing and Suggestion

The monitoring that has been conducted over the activities from the execution of the enumerator training to the data entry has brought about several findings that suggest

the study execution needs to be improved. Using the enumerators of the BPS partners for P2K study is an advantage since they have already known at least the survey procedures and some of the concepts. However, the procedure established both for the enumerator training and supervising during the data gathering should be strictly adhered in order to have good quality of enumerators. It can't be denied that field workers are the most important determining factor in obtaining good quality data. During the study execution supervisor played a major role and also as a key factor to make sure that the established procedure is followed properly.

Here are a number of suggestions concerning the execution of the monitoring of P2K study:

Questionnaire:

There was no information about the time of interview both in the questionnaire of formats UD and ID. In fact, this kind of information is very important to find out the performance of the enumerators and also to find out the problems occur in the field. In addition to that, this information can be used as a control for the supervisors when they do verification.

In the questionnaire of format UD, Block III, number 8, there was no option suitable to some problems found in the field such as unknown household, duplicate household, the correct name of the HH head but wrong name of the spouse. Even lacks only one or more letter needs correction. This case is likely to occur in a survey and can be solved by making errata to accommodate all the cases occurred in the field and every answer should have a unique code.

Questionnaire format ID, Block V needs additional question concerning the other assets. This is aimed to accommodate assets with economical values owned by the

selected HH that has not been asked yet, such as fish farming in Purbalingga, wood plantation in Wonogiri, clove plantation in Bone, and coffee farming in Humbang Hasudutan.

Recruitment and Training of the Field Staff

Selective recruitment of the field staff is a must in order to obtain people who fully meet the standards or criteria based on the study that will be executed. Recruitment of reserve of field staff is necessary so that there will be competition among the trainee during the training process which then turn into self awareness to do the best of their performance in order to be selected and participate in the study.

An integrated method in the training is also necessary, whether theory, practical, and evaluation. The theory should be delivered clearly and systematically by following the plot and sequence of the questions mentioned in the questionnaire.

Exercises and problem solving examples that usually occur in the field are also necessary. It is important to inform the trainee about how to probe the answers of the respondents both theoretically and practically. Thus, interview practice for the field officers is absolutely needed in training process. This practice can be conducted by both demonstrating the method of the interview, role playing or round robin, in pair or in group. Interview practice allows the supervisor to see the ability of the field staff, their understanding of the substance, interview method, and ability to probe the answer of respondents.

At the end of the training, selection and evaluation over the trainee needs to be arranged so that field staff who have ability and understanding of the substance and meet the determined criteria can be selected..

Data Gathering

During the data collection, observation of interview, checking, and verification of the interview result are definitely necessary. Those three activities are essential to attain the ideal quality of the data that is expected. Observation is essential as it allows the observer to find out the weakness of the interview and also help them to explore deeper answer from respondent.

Meanwhile, verification needs to be done to find out the performance of the enumerators. Besides that, verification can tell the supervisor if the enumerator did come to the selected household, if the questions have all been questioned, and if the data in the questionnaire is accurately coded.

During the data collection, all the supervisors should actively conduct observation, checking, and verification of the questionnaire carefully. The execution of the supervising must be done as well as possible to make sure all the procedure is followed properly.

Data Entry Program

The trial program or the debugging for the data entry program is absolutely needed. The purpose is to lessen the mistakes and the incompleteness of the program in accommodating the diverse cases from the field.