

# Inclusiveness and Social Justice in Evaluation: An Evaluability Assessment

Gatdet Gabriel Matut Maliah<sup>1</sup>, Isaac Odhiambo Abuya<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Management Science & Project Planning,  
Faculty of Business and Management Sciences, University of Nairobi

**Abstract** – Kenya is a multi-ethnic and culturally diverse society that has witnessed conflicts arising from this ethnic and cultural diversity. The country's politics is tainted with ethnic sentiments and politically induced disharmony. This paper used evaluability assessment to determine whether two issues identified in the Kenyan Cohesion and Integration Policy as threats to building a unified nation are evaluable, feasible and of use to achieve the policy's objectives. The feasibility study, better known as an evaluability assessment, confirms that these two issues can be evaluated and can help policymakers and practitioners to achieve the country's dream of building one cohesive nation that is proud of its diversity. Based on the discussion in this paper, it is advised that Kenya uses the evaluability assessment to provide short-and long-term outcomes that might be examined to measure efficacy and save superfluous or poorly conceived full-scale evaluations. The evaluability assessment method could be used in other, well-established programs related to the Kenya National and Integration Policy with a variety of stakeholders to foster new thinking and the potential for more focused and effective evaluations, even though there may be variations between programs and it is still unclear how generalisable these results may be. The next step would be to continue with an evaluation based on the results of this evaluability assessment and to continue refining the logic model with input from the participants.

**Keywords** – Evaluability Assessment, Inclusivity, Social justice, Ethnicity, Diversity, Antagonism, National Cohesion, Inequity, and Integration.

## I. Introduction

Evaluation of the potential effectiveness of a policy's objectives is critical to demonstrate how the policy works. The assumption is that better-formulated policies are a precursor to better results. In this regard, an evaluability assessment is increasingly used as a quality assurance tool for good program design. According to Wholey (2004), the tool helps managers to bring early corrections and adjustments to program design and implementations as needed. Put differently, evaluability assessment, also known as exploratory evaluation (Leviton et al., 2010), pre-evaluates a program or policy to identify whether policy evaluation is justified and feasible, and subsequently maximize the chances that any subsequent evaluation of the program or policy will result in useful information. However, such evaluations are not only expensive but can also focus on unrealistic targets with no theoretical foundations, especially where there is pressure to show effectiveness (Belford et al., 2017). It is thus

important to making that conducting a program evaluation is going to be a worthwhile endeavor. This paper discusses how the evaluability assessment can be applied to the Kenya National Cohesion and Integration Policy. Although Kenya is a single and large nation, this policy acknowledges the composition of many ethnic groups that require making objective contributions to all matters of governance and leadership, despite their different cultural practices.

The policy is a blunt recognition that Kenya has many communities with diverse cultural practices and as many political affiliations, that require a common rallying strategy to enhance cohesion amongst and across them. In this regard, the policy identifies eight threats to national cohesion and integration, and indeed inclusiveness and social justice. This paper, however, focuses on two threats that evaluability assessment can address. These are the primacy of ethnic identity over national identity and citizenship; and the inequitable distribution of opportunities and public resources. This aligns well the policy aim to, inter alia, identify, understand, and address the historical and contemporary causes of weak national cohesion and integration that have held Kenya from moving forward.

## II. Objectives

This paper discusses how evaluability assessment can benefit the Kenya National Cohesion and Integration Policy. More subtly, it illustrates how evaluability assessment could be used to determine:

1. Whether it is possible and desirable to evaluate primacy of ethnic identity over national identity and citizenship in Kenya for inclusivity and social justice
2. Whether it is possible and desirable to evaluate inequitable distribution of opportunities and public resources in Kenya for inclusivity and social justice

## III. Methodology

This paper covers academic publications based on theoretical and empirical findings on the concept of evaluability assessment. The researcher identified these publications through an electronic searching strategy from popular and reputable databases with readily available science and social science literature. The researcher initially used broad search and selection criteria to allow for as many results as possible, including but not limited to words that may be used interchangeably with evaluability assessment, such as exploratory assessment. However, unsuitable articles were excluded. The researcher carefully noted and documented the record of results.

A comprehensive search strategy was employed across two electronic databases selected to identify potential and relevant studies. These databases include Google Scholar, JSTOR, SAGE, and ELSEVIER. A narrative analysis of all reviewed articles was undertaken to understand how authors construct stories and narratives from their study participants' own personal experiences. Along the same vein, content analysis was used to identify repeating themes and patterns in the selected studies. According to Saunders et al. (2009), content analysis helps determine the availability of certain words or concepts within texts or sets of texts. The meanings and relationships of the above keywords as well as search strings were quantified and analysed after which inferences about their relevance were made accordingly.

#### IV. Literature review

##### **Possibility and Feasibility of Evaluating Primacy of Ethnic Identity over National Identity and Citizenship**

Evaluability assessment would determine whether primary of ethnic identity over national identity and citizenship impedes national cohesion and integration in Kenya. As a collaborative approach, evaluability brings together researchers, relevant policymakers, and practitioners to co-produce a theory of change. By bringing all stakeholders in an intervention together, evaluability assessment aims to come up with an evaluation approach that is based on stakeholders' shared understanding and perhaps most importantly, takes into account local issues to give decision-makers useful information. Brunner, Craig and Watson's (2019) study, confirmed this assertion. Brunner and colleagues used evaluability assessment to develop and suggest an evaluation for a community program known as Thriving Places. Thriving Place is an area-based approach that aims to tackle deprivation in Scotland's Glasgow. The researchers used ex-post interviews with sampled study participants, along with contemporaneous data.

Brunner et al.'s (2019) findings demonstrated that evaluability assessment enabled public service practitioners to work together in defining the initiative's aims and objectives, identifying activities, and ultimately developing a workable evaluation framework. The study shows that the evaluability assessment process allows relevant stakeholders at all levels to identify activities that need to be evaluated and subsequently co-produce the theory of change built through the evaluability assessment. This allows practitioners to develop recommendations relevant to the implementation of a program or policy, which take into account available resources and data for evaluation.

However, Brunner et al.'s (2019) study, while important to the current effort, is not immune to criticism. The researchers failed to show how evaluability assessment facilitators could gain the support of strategic leaders to avoid constraining the benefits of the evaluability assessment. For instance, Brunner and fellow researchers expected active participation of the Community Planning Partnership, especially in facilitating the dissemination of the theory of change to workers who were not directly involved in the evaluability assessment, and that these leaders would use position and authority to implement the

recommendations of the evaluation. This critical leadership participated reluctantly. This left some officers uncertain of the next steps to follow.

Community Planning Partnerships take a leading role in any reform initiative in Scotland. They are charged with the responsibility of ensuring that local public services, the private sector, the third sector, and the community at large develop a shared vision for their area, and work in partnership to implement this shared vision. In this regard, the failure of this leadership to emerge clearly in the context of evaluability assessment recommendations highlights a critical challenge for evaluability assessment facilitators in comparable contexts. Evaluability assessment benefits can only be felt when key stakeholders take ownership of outcomes, be it in ostensibly collaborative contexts or otherwise.

At worst, the failure to secure onward leadership could breed the perception of evaluability assessment as a waste of policymakers' time. This suggests just like clarifying the purpose and limits of the evaluability assessment itself, gaining clarity on post-evaluability assessment leadership by the commissioning body is as important. Nonetheless, Brunner et al.'s (2019) study demonstrated that the evaluability assessment process allows relevant stakeholders to identify activities for evaluation and subsequently co-produce the theory of change built through the evaluability assessment. However, the question that begs is how did Brunner et al., (2019) managed to successfully use evaluability assessment in this type of multi-agency environment of a community setting? Brunner and colleagues managed to do this because they facilitated collaboration between a wide range of operational and strategic workers from various public services and the third sector.

In so doing, they ensured that the evaluation method worked to determine the worth, merit, and value of things that those involved consider relevant to the management and implementation of the Thriving Places initiative. They were able to achieve this by facilitating collaborative work among people who can openly discuss their own ideas to develop a shared understanding Thriving Places initiative, and perhaps most importantly, the evaluation process itself. Apart from getting people to work together to identify pressing issues, Brunner et al., (2019) adopted a deliberative process through evaluability assessment to move evaluation from the periphery right into the heart of the 10-year Thriving Places program. Thanks to evaluability assessment, the Thriving Places initiative's ownership principles, results, and evaluation were shifted away from a high-power, top-down approach and being managed at the senior level to, instead, being co-produced by frontline operational and strategic officers together. To this end, it can be seen that this evaluability assessment serves as a typical example of modern political and values context for reforms in the public sector and collaborative governance structure in which power is deliberately channelled to enhance collaborative activity. Brunner et al.'s (2019) deliberative processes and active facilitation demonstrate how evaluability assessment can actively support this transition. This also has twin benefits, at least from a practical perspective. First, the evaluability process is likely to reduce evaluation errors. Second, it is also likely to reduce the possibility

of misunderstanding among practitioners, and cross-purpose working in the field. Consistent with Brunner and colleagues, D'Ostie-Racine et al., (2013) reported similar findings in their related study. D'Ostie-Racine and colleagues focused on the progressive evaluation strategy of a West-Africa-based humanitarian Non-Governmental Organisation.

Using Wholey's (2004) evaluability assessment framework, the researchers were able to conduct an evaluability assessment that enabled them to clarify with the organization's evaluation partners the intention of their evaluation strategy, and perhaps most importantly, to design a program logic model. The evaluability assessment confirmed the plausibility of the objectives of the evaluation strategy, and the accessibility of relevant data, as well as, the utility for the target users of evaluating both the conditions that foster evaluability use and the evaluation strategy (D'Ostie-Racine et al., 2013). This exceptionally-timed article provides an opportunity to critically analyse the use of evaluability assessments in the context of a humanitarian non-government organization's commitment to political actors and evaluators. However, one concern about D'Ostie-Racine et al.'s (2013) findings revolve around the role of external evaluators in the organization and the issue of objectivity. An evaluator's role changes based on evaluation goals. For instance, evaluators serve as judges when the evaluation goal is to determine the global value of a given program.

However, when the evaluation goal changes to say help improve the program, an evaluator's role act as an advisor. Both roles apply in the context of the exemption program, and D'Ostie-Racine et al.'s (2013) evaluators had negotiated a combination of these mandates. In this study, the relationship between other evaluation partners and the external evaluator can be traced back to 2007. This may influence (D'Ostie-Racine et al., 2013) results by limiting the open expression of any disapproval or discomfort among evaluation partners, or generally toward evaluation. Therefore, D'Ostie-Racine et al.'s (2013) interviews may be tainted by a normative discourse. Nonetheless, the study shows that an evaluability assessment can be used to determine program or policy intent. In the case of the Kenya National Cohesion and Integration Policy, although the primacy of ethnic identity over national identity and citizenship is not explicitly stated in the policy goals from the start, a consensus among researchers is that it is one of the threats behind national cohesion and integration in Kenya.

The primacy of ethnic identity over national identity and citizenship impedes Kenya's quest for national cohesion and integration. Politicians have strategically segmented the country along ethnic tribes and tribal interests at the expense of a unified nation. Fjelde and Höglund (2018) traced how political elites mobilized divisive ethnic issues to secure the political kingdom and economic resources during the era of single-party rule, and perhaps more notably, to perpetuate the culture of exclusionary identity formation and ethnic voting. They focus on the 1992 elections, and analysis of subsequent elections to show how these historical legacies played an influential role in shaping incentive structures and opportunities for political leaders in the transition period to multiparty rule, and subsequently underpinned competition

among political elites, as well as, mass electoral conduct. In summary, the duo finds that these historical patterns increased the stakes in political contests and precipitated the use of violence to intimidate opponents as Kenya introduced competitive electoral processes. More subtly, Fjelde and Höglund (2018) depict Kenyan politics as a battle between ethnic Big Men with the ability to whip emotion and mobilize their ethnic bases.

Along the same vein, the ability of the successive generations of the Odinga family to command the loyalty of the Luo community, and the Kenyatta family's ability to rally the support of Kikuyus, means that Kenyan politics is also seen to be dominated by a small number of dynasties. Ethnic leaders often camouflage their interests in nationalistic or ethnic terms, such as protecting themselves from another ethnic group or advancing the interest of their own people. They use such terms to galvanize their ethnic bases and strengthen their pursuits and get political authority over their supporters. In Fjelde and Höglund's (2018) view, Kenyan politics is nothing but an "ethnic census" (p.41). Power is secured by the president's own ethnic group who use it to their own advantage. This explains the winner-takes-it-all approach of political elites (Bedasso, 2015). Both Bedasso (2015) and Fjelde and Höglund (2018) agree that since the political elites have successfully managed to convenience a large number of citizens that losing power equates to losing access to resources, the stakes of political competition are often high. As a result, people would rather stick together along ethnic lines, rather than lose resources, often described as the "national cake."

Divisions in Kenyan society are further heightened by controversial and heated elections, which further strengthen ethnic identities. The net effects are ethnic stereotypes and prejudices against other ethnic groups, which are then seen as a productive ground for the elite political class. The deep-seated effect of this negative ethnicity is that the country has been turned into more of a segmented ethnocracy and autocratic nation, whereby political leaders from particular ethnic groups deliberately divide the nation along ethnic lines and tribal interests at the expense of unified and holistic nation. However, while Nyabira and Ayele (2016) support Fjelde and Höglund's (2018) observation that the politics of negative ethnicity impedes social cohesion and integration, they go ahead to discuss the role of class (elite cohesion) in creating antagonism and competition.

More specifically, Nyabira and colleague argue that although ethnicity directly influences Kenyans voting patterns, what determines whether the country is politically stable or not is the degree of cohesion among political elites. For these researchers, elites collude to preserve their privileges. According to Nyabira and Ayele (2016), Kenya enjoyed relatively long periods of political stability between the 1970s and early 1990s because of the willingness of elite groups from different ethnic backgrounds to put aside their differences. They would use their influence to demobilize movements and militia groups of young men that might have otherwise challenged the status quo. Both Fjelde and Höglund (2018), and Nyabira and Ayele (2016) agree that members of political elites would do this to protect a highly unequal economic and

political system on which their privileged positions depend. Political instability and violence come to the fore, as they did around the 2007 and 2017 general election elections.

### **Possibility and Feasibility to Evaluate Inequitable Distribution of Opportunities and Public Resources**

Like in the first issue, inequitable distribution of opportunities and public resources is not explicitly identified as a goal in Kenya's national and integration policy, an evaluability assessment can help determine whether it is evaluable. In more traditional approaches to evaluation, evaluations are about looking backward to steer forward better (Vedung, 2017). However, Brunner et al.'s (2019) study demonstrated that evaluability assessment could be used to develop an evaluation method for a complex, area-based community improvement initiative that not only looks forward but also shapes the policy and the Thriving Places program. In the same spirit, Leviton et al., (2010) demonstrated how evaluability assessment could be used to cost-effectively assist the planning and assurance core functions.

A deeply ingrained national cohesion and integration policy at all levels is the use of aims and objectives for planning. Accordingly, one of the objectives of this policy is to identify, understand, and address the historical and contemporary causes of weak national cohesion and integration. Evaluability assessment can disclose whether or not the assumptions behind this objective are plausible, and whether there is a disagreement about such assumptions. One of the priority areas of policy intervention is promoting national unity in cultural diversity by managing ethnic and socio-cultural diversity. According to Mbuthia (2020), when the construction of cultural identity is inclusive, the members of the involved identity groups focus on their similar identifier values. On the other hand, when such construction is exclusive, the identity groups involved focus on their differentiating identifier values so as to exclude others from the perceived identity.

Kenya's construction and ascription of her identity have often taken an exclusionary perspective. A number of communities in Kenya seem to perceive themselves as more entitled to own, belong to, and lead Kenya, while others have felt marginalized by the state. This has led the marginalized to lose their sense of belonging as Kenyans. A case in point is during Jomo Kenyatta's reign in power when the Gikuyu-Embu-Meru Association (GEMA) communities were perceived to enjoy and display a great level of identification with the state. Tables would later turn during President Moi's tenure when the Kalenjins were perceived to replace the GEMA communities in accessing the state opportunities and resources. Meanwhile, Luo and several other communities continued perceiving themselves as being marginalized. In an important study to this effect, Wahiu (2018) analyses how the ethnic factor has influenced the distribution of government and civil service jobs in Kenya. The study established that the country's big five ethnic groups accounted for roughly seventy percent despite the 2010 constitution requiring the civil service to reflect the country's ethnic diversity.

According to the 2019 national census (as cited in Mbuthia, 2020), the big five ethnic groups are the Kikuyu (8.1M), Luhya (6.8M), Kalenjin (6.3M), Luo (5.0M), and Kamba

(4.6 M). Wahiu's (2018) findings are a testament that the inequitable distribution of opportunities and public resources can be evaluated to determine its role in threatening national cohesion and integration in Kenya. Skewed allocation and plunder of government resources are to blame for negative ethnicity and cyclic post-election violence. Ethnic antagonism is brought about when some Kenyans feel left out.

### **V. Discussion**

Based on the reviews above, the privacy of ethnic identity over national identity and citizenship can be evaluated to achieve the goal of a cohesive nation that is proud of its diversity. A consensus among researchers is that the political landscape is deeply ethnicised to the disadvantage of national unity. Once Kenya's political elites successfully secure control over their respective ethnic groups, they define a particular cause based on their interests to which they rally the community using ethno-regional political parties or coalitions whose formation is spearheaded by the same leaders. This is well-espoused by Mbuthia (2020) in great detail. During the electioneering period, these political elites use their communities' support as political currencies to negotiate for state positions and power with other elites who have equally used their communities' support to bolster themselves to the national, or sub-national political leadership. During the elections period, they mobilize and manipulate their communities to associate or disassociate themselves with particular communities and the state depending on whether or not the association is perceived to meet the leaders' and the concerned communities' ethno-political interests. In consistency with the observation by Mbuthia (2020), this ethno-political mobilization often involves depicting perceived rival communities in a humiliating and derogatory manner. This ethno-political mobilization did not start today. It dated back to the colonialism era and was perfected by political leaders who succeeded the British colonialists.

After KANU won the 1963 election, Kenyatta became the prime minister. He immediately embarked on a process of dismantling majimboism and centralizing power around himself. National institutions were deliberately weakened as poverty, abuse of human rights, and corruption all combined to reduce the State's legitimacy. Kenya's heritage-making was not spared by the effects of centralization and poor governance of the country by the political elites. The President's persona controlled what was to be heritagised. This, in other words, means that national monuments and imagery came to represent not the common identity and memory of Kenyans but the authority of the president. Kenyatta would antagonize Odinga and the Luo community, with whose support he had clenched the country's leadership. His ethnicization of Kenyan politics was seen when he would turn to his larger backyard of Mt Kenya region where he engineered the invention of GEMA, a mega ethno-regional association. He used this ethnic association to seek loyalty from the members of the composite communities using clientelism and political patronage. His intention behind the GEMA was a strategic reinvention of an ethnic coalition that felt a big entitlement to the state based on their claim of having been at the forefront of the fight for the country's independence. Steered by a clique

of powerful Kikuyu political elite from Kenyatta's backyard in Kiambu, GEMA would be used to rally Kikuyu and their cousins the Meru and the Embu to ensure that presidency or 'Uthamaki' would not leave the 'house of Mumbi' or the Kikuyu community. In return for their royalty, Kenyatta's cronies were rewarded with government contracts, (public) land, and jobs. This was followed by state negligence of ethnic groups that they considered their political rivals, notably the Luo Nyanza, development-wise. As the National Cohesion and Integration Policy point out, although the Sessional Paper No. 10 of 1965 was introduced to reduce nationwide poverty, ignorance, and disease, the reality is that it was used to direct most of the development efforts to the central region, Kenyatta 'backyard'. This left the Luo and other Kenyan communities with no option but to perceive the Kikuyu as the benefactors of Kenyatta's favouritism. The Kikuyu, on the other hand, perceive the Luo as potential snatchers of Kikuyu's God-given right to the country's leadership. It is here that animosity between the two most populous communities, which became the 'thermometer' that would act as the country's political temperature gauge for many years (Mbuthia, 2020).

President Daniel Arap Moi would also come in 1978 to perpetuate what his predecessor had initiated. In fact, he declared that he would follow Kenyatta's Nyayo (Kiswahili for footsteps), and what followed was the invention of Nyayoism as his nation-building philosophy. This philosophy was based on the tenets of peace, love, and unity. However, as scholars such as Mbuthia (2020) rightly observe, behind the nation-building rhetoric of peace, love, and unity, President Moi followed Kenyatta's footsteps of perpetuating political power centralization, corruption, suppression of democracy, ethnic patronage, and weakening of state institutions. This further dwindled state legitimacy and opportunities for cohesive Kenyan nationhood. As such, through evaluability assessment, one can see that primacy of ethnic identity over national identity and citizenship is an impediment to achieving Kenya's dream of building national cohesion and integration.

#### **Possibility and Feasibility to Evaluate Inequitable Distribution of Opportunities and Public Resources**

Besides, the findings in the previous section confirm that the inequitable distribution of opportunities and public resources can be evaluated toward the ambitious goal of achieving a unified nation. It was found that government jobs, opportunities, contracts, and even (public) land have largely been distributed among the big five ethnic groups at the expense of other Kenyans. As Mbuthia (2020) points out, the favour that members of the big five ethnic groups get in getting national resources and opportunities at the expense of other communities is because of their numerical strength and the ethnicized Kenyan politics. In such political systems, political parties are often seen as nothing more than ethnic enclaves, while elections are commonly considered as a measure of the numerical strength of ethnic groups. The political elites' clients, better known as the ethnic masses, often engage in elite-instigated ethnic violence in the expectation that their masters (ethnic big men) will reward their allegiance by sharing with them the collective pie, which is viewed in terms of access to state resources, opportunities, and jobs

(Mbuthia, 2020). This trend is a threat to national cohesion and integration in Kenya because the ethnic big men, who have successfully secured control over their respective ethnic groups, get into politics in search of power and resources. Communities on the other side derive a feel-good effect by supporting one of their own.

This ethnic organization gives the political direct access to the means of violence, which they manipulate to safeguard their interests. They take advantage of state institutions' inability to effectively prevent or stop social anarchy, the political elites use the threat of violence to bargain with competing elites for access to power and resources (Mbuthia, 2020). A case in point is the 2018 Raila-Uhuru pact. Despite the swearing-in of President Uhuru Kenyatta, there were continued violent political confrontations that threatened key democratic actors including civil society, courts, and journalists. Raila would mobilize his support base every Monday to confront Uhuru's security apparatus. The confrontation would always result in a bloodbath. The violence was blamed on ethnic animosities and a disputed presidential election replete with rigging claims. In March 2018, Uhuru and his arch-rival Odinga surprised their supporters when they came out in public to shake hands and agreed to work together. However, this was not the first time the country was witnessing a political pact among rival political elites agreeing to work together. Political pacts have been a common trend among Kenya's political elites throughout the post-colonial period. For instance, Odinga had made one with former president Mwai Kibaki following ethnic clashes over the 2007 presidential election results. Both Odinga and Kenyatta had concluded political pacts before. Uhuru won the 2013 elections after forming an alliance with William Ruto, his former rival. To this end, it can be seen that when violence causes a mutual threat to the competing elites' interests, the political elites' resort to intra-elite pacts or agreements in which they negotiate and redistribute powers and privileges among themselves as they maintain control over their clients, ethnic masses.

Promulgation of the 2010 Constitution, and more especially the devolved government units Kenyans significantly distributed a significant amount of powers, functions, and resources from the central government to the forty-seven county governments. The Constitution spelt a lot of implications on the creation and expression of nationhood and national identity both at the national and county levels. It seeks to establish Kenyan nationhood that is based on the concepts of universality and multiculturalism in the post-devolution era. In the reality, however, the initiatives geared towards the establishment of such nationhood have historically been hampered by what Mbuthia (2020) insists to be negative ethnicity. In this regard, the Kenya National Cohesion and Integration Policy recommend that Kenya should manage ethnic and socio-cultural diversities by, for example, strengthening institutions that promote and enforce zero tolerance to negative ethnicity, be it from politicians or otherwise. Other suggestions are including content on positive ethnicity in the school curriculum.

A curriculum transformation can be a tool Kenya uses to challenge and dismantle structural injustices toward the goal

of equity of access and outcomes. An evaluability assessment, and more specifically a transformative paradigm, demands a 'reframing' of the curriculum. A number of strategies can be used to this effect. Some of the strategies to this effect require the government to review the fitness of the school curriculum for the pluralist society that is Kenya; adjust the scale of the ethnicity problem; question current boundaries between mainstream students and others, and interrogate assumptions informing the norms of the curriculum. A transformative framework is relevant to national cohesion and integration a curriculum transformation with parity participation is both a justice issue and an ethical responsibility that requires political and practical participation of those affected. Taking an activist stance in promoting social justice, evaluability assessment, especially a transformative approach, would require that the government dismantles the power relations, cultural hegemonies, and social hierarchies that currently underpin the canons, the assumed values, and norms of inherited curricula. Consequently, educators can set up progress to reimagine more inclusive ways for stakeholders to participate in the school curriculum and pedagogic practices.

## VI. Recommendations

Kenya is a multi-ethnic and culturally diverse society that has witnessed conflicts arising from this ethnic and cultural diversity. The country's politics is tainted with ethnic sentiments and politically induced disharmony. This paper used evaluability assessment to determine whether two issues identified in the Kenyan Cohesion and Integration Policy as threats to building a unified nation are evaluable, feasible and of use to achieve the policy's objectives. These are; the primacy of ethnic identity over national identity and citizenship; and the inequitable distribution of opportunities and public resources. The feasibility study, better known as an evaluability assessment, confirms that these two issues can be evaluated and can help policymakers and practitioners to achieve the country's dream of building one cohesive nation that is proud of its diversity.

Scholars describe relations among some ethnic communities in Kenya as deep suspicion and animosity, which heighten during election periods the worst being the 2007-2008 post-election violence. This was so largely because a few individuals hailing from a few ethnic communities dominated the political structures and economic resources to the exclusion of other communities, both before and after Kenya became an independent country. Inequalities along ethnic lines are an important factor and ethnic antagonism and competition have been particularly acute surrounding elections. Power centralization, ethno-political manipulation, manipulation of national heritage-making, and stifling of the media by the political elite denied Kenyans the opportunity to engage in the collective imagination of a common national identity and destiny. This resulted in the enhanced primacy of ethnic nationalism, which gained more prominence after the fallout between Kenyatta and Odinga.

The lack of a sense of common nationality caused various communities to crystallize around their ethnic identity. Ethnicity, therefore, gained high social relevance as the different communities consciously aligned their socio-

political actions to their ethnicity. Although the 2010 Constitution and more particularly, the developed units, sought to establish Kenyan nationhood that is based on the concepts of universality and multiculturalism in the post-devolution era, the reality is that the initiatives geared towards the establishment of such nationhood have historically been hampered by negative ethnicity. A strong nation cannot develop in this way. As such, Kenya must deal with these two issues in the Kenya National and Integration Policy to achieve its dream of building one nation united in its diversity.

Based on the discussion in this paper, it is advised that Kenya use the evaluability assessment to provide short- and long-term outcomes that might be examined to indicate efficacy and save superfluous or poorly conceived full-scale evaluations. The evaluability assessment method could be used in other, well-established programs related to the Kenya National and Integration Policy with a variety of stakeholders to foster new thinking and the potential for more focused and effective evaluations, even though there may be variations between programs and it is still unclear how generalisable these results may be. The next step would be to continue with an evaluation based on the results of this evaluability assessment and to continue refining the logic model with input from the participants.

## Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

## Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for this article's research, authorship and/or publication.

## References

- Bedasso, B. E. (2015). Ethnicity, intra-elite differentiation and political stability in Kenya. *African Affairs*, 114(456), 361-381.
- Belford, M., Robertson, T., & Jepson, R. (2017). Using evaluability assessment to assess local community development health programmes: a Scottish case-study. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 17(1), 1-12.
- Brunner, R., Craig, P., & Watson, N. (2019). Evaluability assessment: An application in a complex community improvement setting. *Evaluation*, 25(3), 349-365.
- D'Ostie-Racine, L., Dagenais, C., & Ridde, V. (2013). An evaluability assessment of a West Africa based non-governmental organizations (NGO) progressive evaluation strategy. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 36(1), 71-79.
- Fjelde, H., & Höglund, K. (2018). Ethnic politics and

elite competition: the roots of electoral violence in Kenya. *Violence in African Elections: Between Democracy and Big Man Politics*, 27-46.

Leviton, L. C., Khan, L. K., Rog, D., Dawkins, N., & Cotton, D. (2010). Evaluability assessment to improve public health policies, programs, and practices. *Annual review of public health*, 31(1), 213-233.

Mbuthia, D. (2020). The challenge of negotiating between national and sub-national identities through heritage-making in post-devolution Kenya: with the example of Mukurwe wa Nyagathanga cultural site (Doctoral dissertation, Université de Pau et des Pays de l'Adour).

Nyabira, B. C., & Ayele, Z. A. (2016). The state of political inclusion of ethnic communities under Kenya's devolved system. *Law, Democracy & Development*, 20, 131-153.

Saunders, M., Lewis, P., Thornhill, A., & Wilson, J. (2009), "Business research methods." *Financial Times*, Prentice Hall: London.

Wahiu, W. (2018). Who belongs in the Civil Service? Ethnicity and discrimination in Kenya's civil service. *Ethnicity and Politicization in Kenya*, 79-97.