

# A. Adoption



PETER SCOTT/PROVECHO RESEARCH CENTER

## What does this type of evaluation tell us?

Evaluating adoption attempts to answer some of the most basic questions about the implementation of an intervention. It aims to determine the number of households or persons reached by a given project or programme and whether the intervention has been adopted by users as expected. It could also consider who (e.g. which socio-economic group) has adopted the intervention, and whether people are likely to continue using it.

Most interventions, including those based exclusively on the promotion of an improved cooking stove, require users to change the way they cook or use fuel. This is particularly true for interventions that attempt to change behaviour, such as drying of wood, pre-soaking lentils and beans or keeping children away from the kitchen during cooking. Adoption evaluation can be applied to all types of intervention.

One vital element of intervention evaluation is considering the extent to which the priorities of beneficiaries have been met. Adoption evaluation implicitly considers this, as it is beneficiaries that decide whether or not to adopt, and continue to use or apply, technologies and behaviours.

## Key questions

- How many households have adopted the intervention? Why/why not? How many still rely on traditional practices?
- To what extent have households adopted the intervention (e.g. percentage of time/occasions when improved versus traditional practices are used, including technology, maintenance and other behaviours)?
- For how long have interventions been maintained? What barriers exist to their continued use? (This should capture maintenance issues, such as availability of spare parts, expertise, time availability and cost.)
- To what extent did the intervention reach its target audience (e.g. percentage of different socio-economic groups which adopted the intervention)? What barriers exist to a more widespread adoption?
- Have appropriate behaviours (e.g. moving children outside during cooking, using pot lids) been adopted to support new technologies/housing designs?
- What additional unplanned impacts have resulted from the intervention?









## What are the challenges?

Determining whether an intervention has been fully or only partly adopted can be challenging. An example would be examining the extent to which cooks replaced polluting cooking practices (e.g. open fire, traditional stove) with improved stoves and/or complementary cooking devices (e.g. hayboxes, pressure cookers). Is it a total replacement, or are both used simultaneously, do the seasons determine which device is used, and what are the implications for the impact of the intervention?

## Available methods

This aspect of evaluation is relatively easy to conduct and represents standard practice in reporting the success of a project or programme, for example when reporting back to a funding agency. Available methods to evaluate adoption are listed in Table 3.

**Table 3 Evaluating adoption**

| ID                         | Method   | Organization          | Relevant section of method   | Rating  |
|----------------------------|--|-----------------------|--|---|
| <b>Recommended methods</b> |  |                       |  |   |
| A1                         | Demographic and Health Surveys   | USAID/ORCMacro        | Questions on fuel type, stove type and cooking location  |    |
| A2                         | World Health Survey  | WHO                   | Questions on fuel type, stove type and cooking location, and heating practices   |    |
| D7                         | Household energy practices, indoor air pollution and health perceptions survey | Winrock International | Questions on cooking practices (Section B), technology (Section C) and fuel use (Section D), enumerator observation form (Section F) |   |
| <b>Additional methods</b>  |  |                       |  |   |
| D4                         | Indoor air quality post-monitoring questionnaire                               | TERI/HEED             | All  |    |
| Y4                         | Measuring successes and setbacks   | GTZ/HERA              | Monitoring and evaluation with users (Section 4.3)   |    |
| Y5                         | Methodology for participatory assessment                                       | ARECOP                | Section C  |   |

A – Adoption; B – Market development; C – Performance; D – Pollution levels and personal exposure; E – Health and Safety; F – Time and socio-economic impacts; G – Environmental impacts; Y – Generic methods.