

E-motive

“Learning from the South- Global education”

Final report - summary

Most Significant Change evaluation 2016



Amsterdam, 05-05-2016

Talent Nyathi, Blanca Diego, Rosien Herweijer, Bob van der Winden

Emotive- Final report - MSC Evaluation 2016

Executive Summary

Key Findings

In Emotive there is significant so-called triple loop learning: learning that not only results in people doing things differently (first loop) or rethinking and reframing how things are done and creating new knowledge (double loop) but in many instances the exchange and learning process transforms the way people look at issues and approach problems. In Emotive learning seemingly starts with knowledge exchange, but there is more to it: Emotive manages to link people to each other who are prepared to 'suspend existing perceptions and power relations' (Scharmer, Theory U) in order to learn. Then Emotive in the exchanges induces real reflection by very different partners about very different 'bodies of knowledge' in a way that resembles 'emotional intelligence' (as described by Goleman). Finally, as one of the participants named it, it becomes 'Transformation Through Collaboration'¹. Exchanges undertaken in the context of the Emotive programme have generated rich mutual learning leading at times to significant transformation at individual and organisational level.

Learning in layers

The power of Emotive is that *learning* is a multidimensional layered process in which key elements come together in [The Emotive Approach](#). When all layers are present, one is most likely to see outcomes and even impacts.

1. In its very essence Emotive challenges prejudice as to who is knowledgeable and enables change makers to tap into *different bodies of knowledge as they exist globally*;
2. Emotive gives their participants a 'life changing experience' as the exchange with other professionals globally not only provides exposure to the knowledge and practices in these different bodies of knowledge, but also triggers reflection upon oneself and one's organisation and environment.
3. Emotive exchanges involve, often close, *collaboration*, in which new ideas come to fruition and in many cases *new knowledge* is created leading to genuine *transformation*, both of knowledge as of people
4. Emotive exchanges actively trigger *nursing of new knowledge in practice*, particularly when the participants share concerns or when solutions have strong impacts quite a few are managing to find resources to put what they learned into practice
5. Some of the Emotive exchanges lead to *spin-off activities*, triggering multiplier effects when projects that have delivered new knowledge are brought to scale by their participating organisations, also including and influencing *policy makers* in order to embed the newly found applications in society.

The evaluation also found that:

6. The *On-line Platform* is welcomed by the great majority of respondents as complementary to the actual practice, but cannot substitute the 'skin to skin' exchanges (as it was called in the discussion between Spanish participants on 11 April 2016). Exchanges are about seeing and hearing the story of the other, which provides *bonding*. Seeing the other and recognizing yourself in the other makes it really possible to break the dominant narratives and power relations. On-line contact will then share information and keep the spirit alive. This finding is in line with the findings of Utrecht University.
7. We concluded that women are in the majority in E-motive exchanges: although we did not research this in particular it's an important issue for further thinking: can the majority of women in E-motive be linked with the content of the programme (since it is not an intentional effect) and is this an indication that women are more powerful in bringing about social (political) transformations through collaboration?

¹ Chen Alon, participant in one of the Emotive exchanges

Example of the Emotive Approach

A relatively easy example to explain our theoretic approach is the project 'Healthy Cows, Healthy Food'. To start with: the project grew endogenously, there was a group of veterinarians internationally willing to exchange ideas, based on the needs of the sector to reduce the use of antibiotics in dairy farming. Emotive could support this group by funding exchanges with India and matching them with likeminded farmers and veterinarians in Uganda and Ethiopia as well (layer 1). Veterinarians testify that *only in the exchange* they really started to believe that (partly) use of herbal medicine was possible to achieve this goal, later extended with crossbreeding cattle, lessons learned from Uganda and Ethiopia (layer 2). The multiple exchanges led to development of new knowledge through collaboration: *transformation*, layer 3), 'crossing' the knowledge from India and Africa with the milk quality system from Holland. That knowledge is now put into practice: farmers and veterinarians from all countries now are experimenting on a small scale with a combination of all (partly indigenous) treatments (layer 4). As soon as these experiments bear fruit the *fifth layer- spin off* can come into being, potentially profoundly changing the *thinking and systems* of cattle care.

A participant in the local discussion of Netherlands' partners (on 15 April 2016) summarized it broader as follows: "E-Motive is using layers of learning **and layers of change: diverse methods** in education, community building, collaboration, interaction, exchange, co-learnings, dialogue, arts, politics, and advocacy come together **in diverse areas**: academy, activism, community, politics **on different levels**: personal, organizational/community, movement, government, society and even global change"

Theories of learning and change and the Emotive Approach

"We do not learn from experience... we learn from *reflecting* on experience." (John Dewey, 1933²). Reflection is an ever-present element in Emotive. Not only self-reflection triggered by the exposure to knowledge and other ways of doing things, but also by being looked at by others, by being mirrored. Above all Emotive exchanges are a safe space for such reflection. In order to come to such deep reflection Emotive manages to fulfil the conditions as developed in 'organisational learning' theories (Theory U, as developed by C.O. Scharmer³). According to Theory U a first step towards change is *suspending*, creating a space for different perspectives. Emotive started as 'Reversed development cooperation' and part of its DNA is this 'suspending' of existing perceptions and power relations ('knowledge comes from *civilized countries in the North*'). Notably, while, several significant Emotive stories describe subsequent Theory U-stages as are *observing* (attending with your mind wide open and being aware of assumptions), *sensing* (connecting with your hart), *presencing* (connect with what is emerging from within), *committing* to make something happen, *prototyping* and *realising*, few elaborate on the initial step of *suspending* which seems to be implicit (so we conclude it's *entrenched* in Emotive). Finally the 'way how', the intensive learning process taking place in Emotive fits with Goleman's (1995⁴) theory of 'Emotional Intelligence'. Many of the significant stories and key findings from this E-motive evaluation mirror Goleman's theory in practice:

Self-awareness: Creating physical spaces described by participants as 'skin to skin' platforms 'exchange programs' that inspired participants to see, be, and act differently 'a new consciousness'.

² Dewey, John [1933] *How we think: a restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin

³ Scharmer, C.Otto (2005) *Presence: An Exploration of Profound Change in People, Organizations, and Society*, co-authored with P. Senge, J. Jaworski, and B. S. Flowers

⁴ Daniel Goleman (1995) : *Emotional Intelligence*. Bantam books

Motivation: connecting action with passion: Search, identify and connect local innovations with propensity for both local and global solutions.

Skilled Relationships: Narrow the distance and support community exchange of information through online platforms.

Empathy with others: Transformation through collaboration ‘nurturing’ demonstrated by e.g. the Theatre of the Oppressed exchanges.

Triple loop learning

As far as *organisational learning* is concerned, Emotive exemplifies *triple loop learning* (Kolb, Argyris, Flood, Snell, Dixon). The loops are not a mechanical, sequential process: in Emotive all the loops happen mostly at the same time.

The theory of triple loop learning says that *single loop learning change takes place* when existing knowledge is acquired and applied to a new case or context, *double loop learning* happens when the application of that knowledge leads to reflection and generates *new knowledge* to tackle *existing (perceived) needs*; in the *third loop* the reflection on the learning leads to new perceptions of needs and problems, mind sets are being challenged and the learning transforms *organisations* (and sometimes even societies).

A lot of Emotive exchanges show double loop learning often in a process of *mutual learning* in which *new knowledge* is created and nursed to the stage where it can be applied in practice in the participating *organisations*. However, in several cases one can see triple loop learning in Emotive takes place, *profound existential change* where “the fullness and deepness of learning about the diversity of issues and dilemmas faced, by *linking together* all local units of learning in one overall learning infrastructure ...” (Flood & Romm, 1996⁵) is taking place. This is for example visible in projects (or rather said sub-programs) as ‘Healthy Cows’ and ‘Deepening Democracy’, but not yet explored to the full in the overall Emotive programme.

Recommendations

The importance of the lessons learned in Emotive should not be underestimated. This report gives a host of examples. But what can in our opinion be learned by Emotive?

1. The development over the years (starting with ‘reversed development cooperation’ in 2006) of Emotive has become an intrinsic part of its DNA. The original premise – actors in the North can benefit from knowledge in the South – has become an intrinsic part of its DNA in the sense that Emotive challenges assumptions about knowledge and disrupts relations of power based on those assumptions. This facilitates and leverages a (mutual) learning process. Particularly the fact (already mentioned) that participants ‘from the Global North’ engage in exchanges with an *open mind* and not hampered by a ‘we know it all’ framework is important. This open attitude sparks off another ‘aha moment’ at the other side of the equation, the participants from the ‘Global South’: ‘aha, these guys are really coming to learn here, and are not trying to teach us another lesson ... again...’, thus breaking age old prejudices on both sides
2. Emotive has produced numerous unexpected outcomes in part because the Consortium partners acknowledged the knowledge power of exchanging partners and acted as a facilitator, pointing towards interesting solutions but did not act as a ‘clearing house’; Also, exchanges turned out to be richer in their layering when they were not driven by the Consortium but by change makers themselves.
3. Not every exchange will transform the world. Maintaining of an array of different projects (small and large), *driven endogenously* by the participants themselves, is

⁵ Flood, Robert & Romm, Norma (1996) *Diversity Management: Triple Loop Learning*, Wiley

important: this is so to say *the incubator* of Emotive, where knowledge can originate from within and grow in the ‘nurseries’ is important. Emotive could support roll-out in different ways of projects brought to maturity but only focusing on the ‘A-team’ and pick those projects that are fundable (e.g. by Oxfam Novib) is dangerous, because Emotive might be bereft of their foundation, the seeds and surprises that populate the nursery.

4. Projects in the phase of ‘spin-off’ can be brought to scale in different ways. It’s important to also allow the different projects to find their own *organisational structures* (e.g. cooperatives, associations, social enterprises) to fulfil their potential – a ‘one size fits all’ will prevent natural growth of the different projects: And, for the Emotive consortium and team the next challenge will be to *learn to let go* (its babies)...
5. The *third loop of learning* can only be closed by *learning about the learning* as well: Emotive can use its network and organise workshops / Emotive days that focus on the ‘model’ of learning developed in Emotive, in the first place for its own participants: this approach will bridge the power barriers and build *deep democracy* also amongst the stakeholders. Here the Netherlands forum advised to facilitate this by choosing specific and concrete goals in this respect, facilitating translations (languages are a challenge); sharing more stories (including moments/spaces of transformation); interacting regularly and combining on line with offline.
6. Time lines; Transformation is a process. The E-motive projects are set within limited time frames. Some of the exchange programs needed more preparations in order to ensure success. E.g. the Kwanda exchange between South Africa and the Netherlands was a lesson that it’s important to explore favourable legislative conditions before a project starts. E-motive (as a whole, including the consortium partners) is strategically positioned to lobby legislatures should need arise.

Evaluation

The Emotive programme exists for over 10 years now, having finalised a 3-year EU-funded project in January 2016, to be evaluated. E-motive wrote a tender and chose **BWsupport** to undertake this evaluation, with a team of 4 international consultants: Dr. Talent Nyathi (based in South Africa, director of Training for Transformation), Blanca Diego (based in Santander, Spain, with over a decade of teaching – and learning – experience in Latin America and Africa), Rosien Herweijer, MSC (based in Brussels and organisational learning specialist) and as the lead evaluator Bob van der Winden, MA, methodologist specialised in evaluation (short CV’s in the annex). We facilitated this evaluation in a participative, creative way, using the **Most Significant Change methodology**. In a program like E-motive, which has been researched thoroughly it was not easy to add value in an evaluation. However by making an extra effort to get the evaluation needs clear (in the inception phase including kick-off meeting) we trust we tackled this problem. The **end product of the evaluation** (next to this more formal report) is an array of 50 interviews with important stakeholders, that in itself can be read as examples for future deliberations, but also instructs our conclusions in a transparent way: all transcriptions of interviews are in the annex of this report.

The actual EU-funded **E-motive program under evaluation**: “Learning from the South- Global education” is implemented from out of three countries: the Netherlands, Spain and Poland with their respective international partners. The overall goal is to implement a new type of South/North cooperation based on **mutual learning, equality and shared responsibilities**. The **consortium** of the programme consists of Oxfam Novib, NCDO (both Netherlands), Stowarzyszenie Jeden Swiat (Poland) and Coordinadora de ONGD-España (Spain).

The **purpose of the evaluation** is twofold: accountability and learning, giving specific advice as well on the learning that took place in the programme.

In this final report the research questions as well as the domains of change are formulated, the interviewees and topic questions for MSC interviews are described as well as the process of the evaluation (2 forums, 4 skype meetings, video, final stakeholder meeting) and finally the way we constructed our findings, our conclusions and recommendations.

The target group of the evaluation were experts of civil society organizations in the Global South and in Spain, Poland and the Netherlands as well as their international partners in the 'Global South', including Emotive staff and coordinators as well as (former) researchers of the program.

Research Questions

In the Terms of Reference of the EU project, the following research questions were formulated

1. Is E-motive transferred to Spain and Poland? (Lessons to be drawn for a future European Covenant)
2. To what extent is public awareness of global interdependencies and the effectiveness of development cooperation in addressing common global issues increased?
3. *Assessment of the outcomes of objective 1 and 2:* Assessment of the outcomes and the quality of the program from the perspectives of Efficiency, Effectiveness, Relevance and Sustainability.
4. What were the successes, the failures and lessons learned in the cooperation? (**Mutual learning, the 'E-motive-method'**)

Recently in 2014/15 a monitoring exercise was conducted by the EU in all three countries – **ROM report**. There is also research done during the 3 year program in the three countries on the objectives during the E-motive exchanges (by NCDO / Kaleidos and University of Utrecht). The **desk study** started with the existing evidence (annual reports, proposal, etc.) and from there all available research reports (e.g. from Kaleidos, University of Utrecht, ROM) were included.

Most Significant Change (MSC) approach

The most Significant Change approach is a dialogical, story-based technique⁶, based on responsive, constructivist evaluation - and qualitative social research - methodologies. The approach involves the *collection and participatory interpretation* of 'stories' about change, rather than predetermined indicators: central aspect is the deliberation and dialogue in the process of selecting significant changes. In this case we used compilations of interviews to discuss the gathered stories, these are available as an annex to deliver a description as *thick* as possible.

Forum groups and National Stakeholders' meeting.

A core item of the MSC method is the participative discussion and selection of elicited stories. In this assessment we facilitated 2 discussion forums in 2 different countries: Netherlands and Spain. Furthermore we organised 4 skype discussions on the collected 'stories': in Poland, South Africa, Mexico and on the level of the consortium. The discussions in these forums were reported to and discussed in their turn by the international stakeholders' forum on 20 April 2016 in The Hague, Netherlands. The report contains the content of all these discussions.

The role of the evaluators in this participative method is not only (but indeed mainly) *facilitative*: the forums selected 20 out of the 50 stories (as Most Significant for the learning process). These stories were discussed in 5 groups in the final stakeholders' meeting, together with the hypotheses (based on our theoretical arguments) of the evaluators in order to verify those. The evaluators however are fully responsible for the final conclusions and recommendations.

⁶ Developed by Jessica Dart and Rick Davies (see: www.mande.co.uk; and *Most Significant Change Guide* – Dart & Davies)

Desk study

The desk study (including the numerous research reports, multimedia reports (videos of activities, exchanges, findings, etc.), and interview with the author of the ROM report) led us to the renewed conclusion that this evaluation (hardly one year after the ROM) cannot add much to the conclusions of the EU-team in the ROM-study. So we consider our research questions 1, 2 (partially) and 3 (congruent with Specific Objectives 1 and 3 from the ROM report) answered positively by the desk study (namely the ROM report). On the other hand research question 2 ('To what extent is public awareness of global interdependencies ... in addressing common global issues increased?') was clearly answered in the Kaleidos research. So also this question was answered in the desk study.

Mutual Learning: For our research question 4, the ROM report concludes (corroborated by the Kaleidos report): 'In spite the obvious wealth of information that can be found in other countries, even when they are less developed than those of the traditional north, very little has been done to institutionalise and organise a transfer from South to North.' This leads us to a focus on Specific Objective 4 (mutual learning) of the project in order to learn more about the E-motive-method and so contribute to the E-motive project with this evaluation. However: we also noted (in the list of persons interviewed) that the ROM study did not interview Southern Partners. This then became the second focus of this evaluation, so our study was focusing on **Mutual Learning methods between Southern and Northern partners.**

Emotive Going Global:

Apart from the (rightfully asked) obvious questions on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, we added the question: **What are the 'online' possibilities for E-motive?** Hence we paid specific attention to online activities in the past and gather stories from people who are working on or planning for this aspect, as well as the *pilots* studied by the University of Utrecht.

Domains of Change

We derived the following Domains of Change from the research questions and desk study:

1. **The 'interface' between Southern and Northern partners:** What are the 'lessons learned' from Southern partners? What are the stories of 'reverse development education'? But first and foremost: In how far was learning **mutual**? Did partners from the Global South (also) find solutions to their problems? Is the **'success'** partners are talking about, a success for all? Are there stories of 'synergies'? Did capacity grow on both sides? What was the learning methodology?
2. Did partners from North or South become real **drivers of change**? And on what level? (Local, National, International?) In other words: did the project not only bring **outputs** (learning), but also **outcome** (something was done with the lessons learnt), and even some **impact** (change in society)?
3. What is the value of the answers on domains 1 – 2 for E-motive's actual **EKG** (Emotive Going Global) discussion? What was the result of **on-line efforts** in the framework of domains 1 – 2 and how could this be applied in EKG?
4. Any other (unexpected) changes e.g. are there any **'negative stories'** – where transfer did not work or even worked aversely ('do no harm principle')?

Evaluation overview

1. Desk study – programme and other relevant documents (March 2016)
2. Inception report after kick-off workshop (Netherlands, 15 March)
3. Evaluation research done by the evaluators in Poland (Rosien Herweijer); Spain (Blanca Diego, Bob van der Winden), Netherlands (Talent Nyathi and Bob van der Winden). Partners

in the Global South were generally interviewed by the same evaluators that interviewed their counterparts in Europe. All MSC interviews are on paper, with transcript / summary.

4. In the practical evaluation we made **50 interviews** (11 in Poland including their southern partners, 10 in Spain, 22 in The Netherlands, 7 with the consortium partners) with 60% women, 40% Southern Partners
5. Two face-to-face forum groups with stakeholders, 4 skype discussions on the collected stories. MSC stories were provided shown on paper and discussed / rated. These forums selected 20 of the 50 stories as **Most Significant for the learning process in Emotive**. Reports from these forums were shared by video interviews in the stakeholder meeting.
6. Based on this selection and discussions the evaluators formulated their hypotheses about the learning process in Emotive, to be verified in the stakeholders' meeting.
7. Final international stakeholder meeting (in Netherlands, 20 April 2016): based on 20 MSC stories and discussions in the country meetings, as well as hypotheses of the evaluators.

Conclusions, answering the research questions

1. Transfer to Spain and Poland

The Emotive approach was successfully transferred to Spain and Poland. The enthusiasm in both countries is still there, and several of the exchanges set in motion in the framework of this project are now extended, even without financial support of Emotive (sustainability). We agree with the ROM report that the intervention logic is adequate and it has been successfully adopted by the partners in Spain and Poland. Furthermore the Spanish Consortium Partner will join the next stage of Emotive, now *under construction*.

2. Public awareness of global interdependencies

This remains a point of discussion: All in all the **direct** scope of influence of Emotive (including all exchanges and Emotive days) can reach up to approx. 1.000 persons. For these directly involved people the acknowledgement, caused by Emotive, of existing wisdoms in the Global South is without any doubt. They have – because of the ‘transformation through collaboration’ a profoundly different conception of the Global South than before. This is radiating from each and every interview we made. The organisations they work in, however, were not part of this research, so it is difficult to say something final about further reach in the organisations, although we can assume that organisations applying *new knowledge* from the Global South will also realize that globalization is here to stay and old-times thinking is not fruitful anymore. Roughly the amount of people will multiply by a factor 10 counting in organisations. This is still ‘a drop in the ocean’ in this respect. Our recommendation is to work further on the ‘fifth layer’ of learning (spin offs) in order to have further reaching influence in the way people look at the Global South, but its effect will always be limited: in our view Emotive is rather about learning than about *preaching the gospel* of global citizenship.

3. Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency and Sustainability

Relevance

Our conclusions from the 50 interviews corroborate the ROM-report conclusions stating that ownership is high: Participation is highly enthusiastic, a factor that has contributed to the success of the implementation. At the same time the research done by Kaleidos and Utrecht show that specified goals are reached and make useful recommendations for the future, that would be worthwhile to follow up in the upcoming process of *rethinking* Emotive for the coming years.

Effectiveness

In the application the project stated specific objectives. We conclude with ROM report that the quality of the outputs has been confirmed with all stakeholders involved in the three countries. There is a widespread satisfaction and recognition of the project at all levels and all stakeholders. At the same time ideas and solutions brought from the Global South were useful and served the purpose of attaining project objectives, including empowering stakeholders at grassroots' level.

Efficiency

Emotive is – for the amount of participants and results – a project providing a satisfactory level of cost versus benefit, mainly because of decentralisation and adaptation to local circumstances. We agree with the Rom report that inputs and outputs have been provided on time. The amount of resources allocated is congruent with the project's stated goals.

Monitoring (e.g. the research done by Kaleidos and Utrecht) is on an unprecedented level and provided a lot of input for this evaluation. We can recommend this way of working to any development related project!

Sustainability

Even more so than at the time of the ROM research the sustainability of Emotive has a positive outlook. 'All over the show' we encountered participating partners who are preparing for applications or by now have received individual funding in order to move on with the exchanges, up to generating spin-off. In Spain smaller funding is on its way for specific activities in the project and the Coordinadora has joined designing the new (upcoming) phase of project development. University of Utrecht is firmly supporting the new phase as well. In Poland all but one of the exchanges have secured funding for a continuation of the project. Finally Oxfam Novib still gives the project a high priority. Also replication of the methodology is now public and specific attention to the 'spin off' layer of learning will generate 'circles of learning' that will push implementation of generated ideas, even without funding.

4. Mutual learning (the 'E-motive-method')

The learning in Emotive is about 'Transformation through Collaboration' The power of Emotive is exactly the mutual *layered learning* with elements that come together in the [The Emotive Approach](#) – see our key findings in the beginning of this summary.

Finally, we would like to use this opportunity to thank all those who so generously answered our questions and especially Carin Boersma and Bea Stalenhoef whom we harassed many times for the empty-est report, discussion etc. Thanks for your patience!

Amsterdam, 5 May 2016

BWsupport,

**Ntombi-Talent-Nyathi,
Rosien Herweijer,
Blanca Diego,
Bob van der Winden**