



Diploma Thesis Evaluation Form

Author: Laura Mangunda

Title: **Impact Evaluation Practices in Professionalized Development NGOs**

Programme/year: Mezinárodní vztahy (MV), 2025

Author of Evaluation (~~supervisor~~/second reader): Mgr. Jan Dostál

Criteria	Definition	Maximum	Points
Major Criteria			
	Research question, definition of objectives	10	9
	Theoretical/conceptual framework	30	25
	Methodology, analysis, argument	40	27
<i>Total</i>		80	61
Minor Criteria			
	Sources	10	9
	Style	5	4
	Formal requirements	5	5
<i>Total</i>		20	18
TOTAL		100	79



Evaluation

Major criteria:

I consider this thesis as a above standard work, I especially highly value the focus of the thesis, the issue of impact evaluation of professionalized development NGOs, which has not received sufficient attention in the research so far, therefore making the exploratory work into this area the main contribution of this thesis. I consider the proposition of examining the practices of impact evaluation of NGOs and the background knowledge that underlies them as a highly relevant research avenue, understudied by the existing literature and I think the author has done a good job in terms of analysing it.

However, there are several more or less critical comments. I see as the main shortcoming of the thesis the missing connection with the methodology described and the analytical part itself. The author claims to be performing two methods, namely the Directed Content Analysis (DCA) and praxiography. Although I do not have much experience with these methods (none in case of praxiography, but I have used content analysis), the analytical part seems to not apply especially the DCA of the documents of the 3 selected NGOs. I completely miss the coding process in the text, the analytical part seems to focus only on the interviews conducted with the NGOs representatives. What are the key concepts or variables identified as initial coding categories? I also did not find the comparisons of the frequency of codes, that the author should have found in the analysed documents. As the praxiographic research also was supposed to be based on the documents by the NGOs, their apparently missing examination in the empirical part undermines the findings of the thesis. The author seems to have a good understanding of them, based on the discussion of results and conclusion, which contains several generalized claims that unfortunately look they are not based on empirical evidence.

Secondly, the thesis seems to lack a link to a specific theory especially the DCA should have. The author (correctly) claims that this method is suitable for an analysis of text in connection with an existing theory. But what is the theoretical background behind impact evaluation of NGOs? What are the assumptions of the theory and the expectation, hypotheses resulting from it connected to the impact evaluation of NGOs? How are the coding categories connected to the existing theory and how the theory guides the discussion of findings? The committee should in my opinion ask the student in the defence on the coding process she employed in the thesis, the categories identified, its frequencies and also focus on the theoretical framework the student used for the content analysis and its connection with the findings.

Thirdly, as the author acknowledges, the analysis includes 3 Western based mid-size professionalized NGOs, but I also miss some comparative aspect in the analysis. What are the differences between these 3 cases in case of impact evaluation? As the appendix shows, the author has conducted 4 interviews, but I am not sure if that is enough to make



**FACULTY
OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**
Charles University

some generalized claims as the author does. The author does not mention the characteristics of the interviewees (mainly position in the NGO), the selection criteria used for the interviewees. I assume the author has selected these 3 NGOs out of thousands existing NGOs because of access to its representatives, this is a relevant fact, that should be acknowledged.

The final critical comment I have is to the author's apparent confusion over the difference between Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). In multiple places in the text of the thesis, the author has used the abbreviation OSCE instead of OECD. Given that OECD is a key organization for this thesis for its definition of the impact evaluation, I would expect the author to pay more attention to this. Moreover, as the frameworks for assessing development interventions are set by its Development Assistance Committee (DAC), I would also consider as useful if the author has provided some background on the organization, its structure, its role in development in general and also the DAC role specifically. I suggest that the committee ask the student a follow-up question on the OECD to verify the student's knowledge about the institution.

Despite these concerns, I still view this thesis as a good work, with clearly set out research questions, that are answered, the author has done an extensive review of the literature on NGOs and impact evaluation and has provided an interesting research, which has a potential to be further explored.

Minor criteria:

The author is using in the entire thesis references in a coherent manner, bibliography is included. The style and formal criteria meet all the necessary requirements for a diploma thesis. I appreciate that the author has included the number and type of analysed primary resources, but I would actually expect to see more, specifically the bibliographic entries for all the documents used for the empirical analysis (strategies, annual reports, learning documents/briefs, not interviews). Especially if the content analysis was performed, the links to the documents used should be included, as it is considered as a standard in the academic literature for replication purposes.

Assessment of plagiarism:

The plagiarism control did not reveal any significant similarities with a previous document (thesis, book, or an article), the thesis is an original piece of work and brings new findings to the field, that have not been published anywhere else.

Overall evaluation: 79 points



**FACULTY
OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**
Charles University

Suggested grade: C

Signature: