<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Resources/ Capacity Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Questionnaires, surveys, checklists | When need to quickly and/or easily get a lot of information from people in a non-threatening way. | • Can complete anonymously  
• Inexpensive to administer  
• Easy to compare and to analyze  
• Can administer to many people  
• Can get lots of data  
• Can be adapted into many forms (online, paper, verbal)  
• Many sample questionnaires already exist (but you may still need to adapt them) | • Might not get careful feedback  
• Question wording can bias respondent’s answers  
• Impersonal  
• Doesn’t always get the full story  
• Adapting existing surveys takes time | Low |
| Interviews               | When you want to fully understand someone’s impressions or experiences, or learn more about their answers to questionnaires | • Get a full range and depth of information  
• Develop relationships with stakeholders  
• Can be flexible | • Can take a lot of time  
• Can be hard to analyze or compare  
• Can be costly  
• Interviewer can bias responses | Moderate-High |
| Document review          | When you want an impression of how strategy operates without interrupting strategy; from review of applications, finances, memos, minutes, etc. | • Get comprehensive and historical information  
• Doesn’t interrupt strategy or stakeholder’s routine in strategy  
• Information already exists | • Often takes a lot of time  
• Information can be incomplete  
• Need to be clear about what you are looking for  
• Not flexible means to get data; data is restricted to what already exists | Moderate |
| Observation              | To gather accurate information about how a strategy actually operates, particularly about processes | • View operations of a strategy or a PSC (Prevention Systems Capacity) as they are actually occurring  
• Can adapt to events as they occur | • Can be difficult to interpret seen behaviors  
• Can be complex to categorize observations  
• Can influence behaviors of strategy participants  
• Can be expensive | High |
| Focus Groups             | Explore a topic in depth through group discussion, e.g. about reactions to an experience or suggestion, understanding common complaints, etc.; useful in evaluation and marketing | • Quickly and reliably get common impressions  
• Can be efficient way to get much range and great depth of information in a short time  
• Can convey key information about strategy | • Can be hard to analyze responses  
• Need a good facilitator for safety and closure  
• Difficult to schedule 6-8 people together | Moderate-High |
| Case studies             | To fully understand or depict stakeholder’s experiences in strategy, and conduct comprehensive examination through cross comparison of cases (if cases are comparable) | • Fully depicts stakeholder’s experience in strategy input, process and results  
• Powerful means to portray strategy to outsiders | • Usually quite time consuming to collect, organize and describe  
• Represents depth of information, rather than breadth. | High |
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### Examples of Data Collection Methods

#### Pros and Cons of Quantitative Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You can collect a wide variety of information quickly</td>
<td>You may miss out on a more in-depth understanding of what you are studying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides a quick “snapshot” of results for busy decision makers</td>
<td>Does not enhance the information shared with decision-makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You can do statistical analysis that predict changes</td>
<td>Statistics are not always feasible or appropriate for program evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics are seen as credible data to decision makers</td>
<td>Does not allow for community knowledge to be shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools may already exist that have been tested and ‘validated’ for use in research studies</td>
<td>Data collection tools (sometimes) are not easy to develop or adapt and may not be culturally appropriate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Pros and Cons of Qualitative Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You gain a more in-depth understanding of what you are evaluating</td>
<td>Can be resource-intensive and time-consuming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance the information shared with decision makers</td>
<td>Data collection requires more staff training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection tools are (usually) easier to develop</td>
<td>Data analysis may require more staff training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows more community knowledge to be shared</td>
<td>Subject to misinterpretation (Quantitative methods are not immune to this, however)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be more culturally appropriate</td>
<td>May be so specific that it is hard to draw broad conclusions across populations or contexts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>