

The Recognition of Inter-Cultural
Difference in Federal Development
Assistance Evaluation

By

Morley Minuk

A thesis
presented to the University of Manitoba
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of City Planning
in the
Faculty of Architecture

Winnipeg, Manitoba 1987

(c) Morley Minuk 1987

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-37217-6

THE RECOGNITION OF INTER-CULTURAL DIFFERENCE
IN FEDERAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE EVALUATION

BY

MORLEY MINUK

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the degree of

MASTER OF CITY PLANNING

© 1987

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVER-
SITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to
the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this
thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY
MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the
thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or other-
wise reproduced without the author's written permission.

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis. I authorize the University of Manitoba to lend this thesis to other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

M. Minuk

I further authorize the University of Manitoba to reproduce this thesis by photocopying or other means, in total or in part, at the request of other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

M. Minuk

To Cindy for her patience, understanding, inspiration,
and tolerance.

I.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge and thank all of the individuals and organizations having contributed and supported me throughout my studies and research. This group includes Professors Carvalho, Rotoff, and Gerecke of the University of Manitoba Department of City Planning. Other past and present University of Manitoba faculty including professors Conner, Yarvin, Vitkin, and Churchland, I must recognize for their ideas and ever-lasting impressions. I must also thank both Prof. Ozay Mehmet of the Carleton University School of International Affairs and my classmate Freddie Currie for his inspiration despite the great expanse of time and space now between us.

My friends in the workforce including: Saul; Ken; Jim; Mark; and Karl all deserve special recognition for the sincere interest and concern they have always shown in my career and well-being.

Planners surveil. Closely, they will watch people, places, and even themselves in their efforts to affect positive change. Observation leads planners to interpretations and understandings of a given context. Unfortunately, one's ability to observe can be impaired by a number of influences. These influences may include false premises, too much or too little disinterestedness or blatant political-bureaucratic interference. These hindrances threaten a planner's interpretation and understanding and hence his efforts to affect change.

It is through the surveillance of themselves and their profession that planners may find resolve in their mission. Planners must scrutinize their techniques, assumptions, and approaches. The research at hand is concerned primarily with planners observing in this fashion. In its very narrow context it asks to what extent can planners rely on a given observational technique in a given context in their efforts to interpret, understand and affect change.

Planners as most other professionals, rely on tool, implements or instruments. They must ensure their instruments are able to contribute or yield the best possible outcome. Professionalism entails standards and their maintenance. By asking whether a

specific tool or approach is appropriate in a specific context, it is hoped that other planners will begin to ask this same question in their own context. Only through questioning, refining, and receiving new direction may planners maintain credibility.

At a more personal level, this thesis represents a blend of academic, professional, and personal experience. The study of city planning, work with provincial and federal governments, and travels abroad all provide inspiration to this thesis. Conjoining, applying and benefitting from these experiences are my purposes in writing. I feel fortunate that unlike so many others in the world today, I am able to concentrate on elements of my life that I enjoy. Through my efforts, I would hope that I can aid others in attaining similar pleasures.

	<u>Page</u>
I. Acknowledgements.....	iv
II. Foreword.....	v
III. Table of Contents.....	vii
IV. List of Tables.....	ix
V. Abstract.....	x
1.0. Introduction.....	1
1.1. Problem Statement.....	2
1.2. Study Method.....	4
1.3. The Federal Development Assistance Program.....	6
1.3.1. ODA Program Objectives and Description.....	6
1.3.2. ODA Program Policy Framework.....	9
1.4. International Development Agencies.....	10
1.5. Context for Planning and Evaluation in Government.....	15
1.5.1. Federal Approach to Evaluation.....	15
1.5.2. Links Between Evaluation and Planning.....	17
1.6. Planning, Evaluation, and Culture.....	19
2.0. Literature Review: Introduction.....	22
2.1. Inter-Cultural Understanding.....	22
2.2. Knowledge of Cultures.....	24
2.3. Implications for Planning and Evaluation Practice.....	34
2.3.1. Planning and Evaluation Cycles.....	35
2.3.2. The Use of Evaluation.....	37
2.3.3. The Quality of Evaluation.....	43
2.4. Practical Evaluation Examples.....	45
2.5. Emerging Responsiveness.....	50
3.0. Model Towards Improved Evaluation Information Quality and Usefulness.....	52
3.1. Model Components and Elements.....	52
3.2. Foreign Evaluation Professionals.....	53
3.2.1. Inter-Cultural Awareness.....	54
3.2.2. Obtaining Knowledge of Specific Cultures.....	54
3.3. Foreign Evaluation Professionals and Local Aid Beneficiaries.....	56
3.3.1. Definition of Needs and Problems Within Milieux.....	56
3.3.2. Definition and Execution of Evaluation Strategies.....	62
3.4. Model Application.....	64

4.0	Research Findings.....	65
4.1.	Foreign Evaluators and Local Beneficiaries.....	66
4.2.	Areas Where Problems of Inter-Cultural Differences Arise.....	71
4.3.	Definition and Execution of Evaluation Strategies.....	75
4.3.1.	Information Gathering.....	76
4.3.2.	Information Sources.....	77
4.4	Relationships to the Proposed Model	78
5.0	Conclusions and Prescriptions.....	81
5.1.	Recognition of Inter-Cultural Difference In Evaluation.....	81
5.2.	Prescriptive Measures.....	83
5.2.1.	Evaluation Policy Implications.....	84
5.2.2.	Development Assistance Policy.....	86
5.3.	Professional Planning Implications.....	86
6.0	Bibliography.....	89

Appendices

A.	Questionnaire Survey Method.....	92
B.	Questionnaire Form and Raw Survey Scores.....	97
C.	SPSSX Log File.....	99

IV.

LIST OF TABLES

1.0	Summary of Evaluation Activities in Major Federal Agencies Participating in ODA Program.....	18
2.0	IDRC Planning and Evaluation Cycle.....	36
3.0	Model Towards Improved Evaluation Information Quality and Usefulness in an Inter-Cultural Setting.....	53
4.0	Uses of Local Knowledge: Areas Where Evaluation Information Quality and Usefulness Can Be Improved....	67
4.1	Potential Areas of Inter-Cultural Differences In the Conduct of International Evaluations.....	72
4.2	Cross-Tabulation of Problem Areas Perceived By Years of Evaluation Experience.....	73

This thesis entails a study of inter-cultural difference as a factor in development assistance evaluation studies. Inter-cultural understanding is presented as an essential requirement for the conduct of evaluation studies in an inter-cultural setting. This understanding is defined as the acceptance of the vast differences between people and cultures coupled with an admission of the limitations of outsiders in acquiring adequate knowledge of other cultures to facilitate meaningful practical activities. The recognition of this limitation leads one to the conclusion that the beneficiaries of development assistance are the best ones to evaluate development assistance. At best, outside or foreign evaluators may act as facilitators or trainers of indigenous personnel.

Within the context of a model proposed for the improvement of evaluation information quality and usefulness in an inter-cultural setting, a questionnaire survey of Canadian international evaluation professionals was conducted. The survey examined various dimensions of foreign versus local evaluator involvements in development aid studies. The survey results indicated foreign evaluators placed great emphasis on the acquisition and use of their own personal knowledge of milieux in the conduct of studies. They did not accept that local beneficiaries must control and manage the conduct of

evaluation studies in an inter-cultural setting. These professionals were willing only to accord team member status to local beneficiaries in the conduct of studies. From the definitions used in this thesis, Canadian international evaluation professionals accept the realities of inter-cultural difference but do not recognize them for their full import. The outside evaluator relying primarily on personal knowledge of milieu while refusing to accept local aid beneficiary control over evaluation studies, is over-estimating his or her ability toward meaningful practical activity in an inter-cultural setting.

Prescriptive measures focus on human resource development responsibilities of government central agencies and professional evaluation groups in re-orienting the role of evaluator from that of researcher to that of trainer. Planners are admonished to verify inter-cultural appropriateness of evaluations when calling upon them in their decision-making activity. All concerned parties must participate in actions towards reducing dependencies and increasing skills and autonomy for developing nations.

"There are so many ways to understand- - one for every woman, child, and man."

-B. Cockburn

Chapter 1

1.0. Introduction

This thesis entails the study of inter-cultural difference as a factor in Canadian development assistance evaluation studies. It is maintained that by the very nature of the donor-recipient relationships in development assistance activity, these evaluation studies depend on inter-cultural understanding.¹

The purpose of this thesis is to raise awareness levels of planners and evaluators of the difficulties and complexities of work in an inter-cultural setting. It seeks to stress that the problem of gaining adequate knowledge of other cultures is paradoxical and not to be under-estimated. The reality of our ability to see the world through the eyes of an individual from another culture may conflict with our preconceived notions of what is reasonable or possible in that regard. Differences between cultures can be vast and bridges to help us resolve these differences may not always be available. The recognition of inter-cultural difference is no more than the admission of our limitations in understanding other cultures.

¹ M. Merryfield, "The Challenge of Cross-Cultural Evaluation," in M. Patton, Culture and Evaluation, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1985, p.4.

1.1. Problem Statement

While agreements or concurrences occur between individuals, rarely do we find between them shared identical views. Between two individuals of distinct cultures or between entire cultures themselves, identical views become even more rare. Vast differences exist between the ideas, values and norms of peoples and cultures. One's personal cultural knowledge, can lose its applications in an inter-cultural setting; it may be inappropriate as criteria for explanation of another cultural system. As we accept and recognize the cultural differences around us, there will be no easy resolutions towards successful practical inter-relation and exchange between members of different cultures.

Cultures differ and one's personal cultural perspectives influence one's understanding and knowledge. Whether and how we can truly acquire common or shared knowledge must be questioned. The complexities and difficulties posed by these questions ought not to be under-estimated. Such knowledge may not always be attainable. It may be only an ideal. Certain differences may be irreconcilable. Practitioners, such as planners and evaluators of development aid activities, must account for and be aware of these possibilities.

Whether and how we can approach different cultures pose unique

planning problems in an international context. Planning decisions require information bases. They demand clear information on what has occurred in a given circumstance before a decision on what ought or ought not to occur can be made. While our information may be timely and rigorously derived, it is of no value if it is inaccurate² or culturally biased.

Among government and private sectors, formal evaluation is presented as a tool or means to provide planners with information leading to decisions on changes or shifts in a resource base. Planning, as forward thinking, may use evaluation to yield information in the judgement of decision alternatives. Given increased growth in the levels of Canadian aid and technical assistance transferred to developing nations, evaluation study has been applied in an effort to improve program effectiveness and management accountability. Given the donor-recipient relationship of these programs, their evaluations require and depend on inter-cultural understandings.³ Shared or common and unique views and expectations of programs all carry weight in international evaluation studies. Giving recognition to inter-cultural

² F. Graves, "Towards Practical Rigour: Methodological and Strategic Considerations for Program Evaluation," in Optimum, Volume 15-4, 1984.

³ M. Merryfield, 1985, p.4.

differences will necessitate methodological sensitivities in the evaluation of programs or projects in developing countries.

1.2. Study Method

At the outset, material is provided to better familiarize readers with the activities and agencies under Canada's Official Development Assistance (ODA) Program. The context for planning and the use of formal evaluation in the ODA program are considered. Philosophical as well as practical connections between planning, evaluation and culture are explored.

A review of literature relevant to this thesis and the domains of development planning and evaluation is then conducted. The review outlines what is meant by the notion of inter-cultural understanding. It explores theoretical attempts to explain how we may begin to attempt acquiring knowledge of other cultures. Inferred practical difficulties and possibilities for planning and evaluation towards the improvement of evaluation information quality and usefulness are equally treated.

In view of the practical difficulties and possibilities emerging out of the literature review, a model towards the improvement of evaluation information quality and usefulness in an inter-cultural setting is presented. The model indicates specific considerations for the input of foreign or outside

evaluators and as well as for local aid beneficiaries. Potential methods for minimizing evaluation difficulties towards the overall improvement of evaluation information quality and usefulness are presented.

Given the concerns or actions proposed by the model for improved evaluation information quality and usefulness and the manner in which inter-cultural differences may influence or challenge the conduct of development assistance evaluations, a mail-out questionnaire survey of international evaluation professional was conducted. This vehicle solicited from international evaluation professionals, both within and outside government, views on the importance and uses of their knowledge of milieux in international evaluations; views on local beneficiary involvement; views on specific areas where problems of inter-cultural differences can re-orient thinking in the course of evaluation studies. As well, it examines approaches towards improved evaluation information quality and usefulness. Technical details of the survey may be found in the Appendices.

As a synthesis, the study flags for planners and evaluators potential measures to overcome problems of inter-cultural differences as they may arise in international evaluations. Policy prescriptions, in view of current federal evaluation approaches and development assistance activities, are presented in view of significant study findings. Professional planning

implications are treated as well.

1.3. The Federal Development Assistance Program

The purpose of this section is to provide the reader with a general outline of the objectives and components of Canada's Official Development Assistance (ODA) program. The specific concerns of the ODA program are related to overall political and policy framework within which the program operates.

1.3.1. ODA Program Objectives and Description

The objective of Canada's Official Development Assistance (ODA) program is the improvement of economic and social conditions in developing countries.⁴ At present Canada commits 0.5 per cent of the gross national product to official development assistance; it is committed to 0.6 per cent of GNP by 1995 and 0.7 per cent of GNP five years later.⁵ The current 0.5 per cent commitment translates roughly into \$324 million spent on ODA. Since 1981, Canada has spent approximately \$8.7 billion

⁴ "Competitiveness and Security: Directions for Canada's International Relations." Presented by the Rt. Hon. J. Clark, Ottawa, 1985. Un-numbered table.

⁵ Speech by Joe Clark, Secretary of State for External Affairs, on Canada's Official Development Assistance, February 28, 1986, p.1.

on ODA; over the next five years it expects to spend \$13.6 billion. The linking of ODA and GNP is called formula funding which is to say that as GNP grows so does the amount Canada commits to ODA. The consequences of formula funding are best illustrated by the 1984 \$120 million drop in ODA as the deficit inhibited national economic growth potential.

Canada's approach to international development has come to assume various concerns including:

NON-GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATIONS: The 8.7 per cent of ODA for non-government organizations is double the proportion supplied by certain Scandinavian NGO's; and triple the percentages of Australia, New Zealand, and Belgium.⁶

TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT: These concerns are combined and built on the needs and commitment of the Canadian private sector.⁷ Trade is promoted, for example, through the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) Industrial Co-operation Program whose budget was to increase by 17 per cent in the fiscal year 1986-1987.

6 *ibid.*, p.3.

7 "Competitiveness and Security." p.35.

MULTILATERAL ASSISTANCE: Canada's and other countries' governments and international financial institutions joined will support initiatives well beyond the scope of any single donor country.⁸ After Norway, Canada disburses the highest or 40 per cent of its ODA in contributions to multilateral agencies.⁹

BILATERAL AND GOVERNMENT TO GOVERNMENT TRANSFERS: This program assists selected developing countries in Asia, Africa, and the Americas with various types of development projects, including various forms of technical assistance.¹⁰ The assistance is financed through non-repayable loans or development grants which usually are extended 50 years without interest or repayment for the first 10 years. Food aid and emergency assistance as well remain part of Canadian bilateral assistance.

CRISIS ACTIVITY: Provisions are made under the ODA program for disbursements of a crisis nature such refugee or food aid in Africa and Asia.

8 "Canada Yearbook." 1984, p.685.

9 Speech by Joe Clark, February 1986, p.3.

10 "Canada Yearbook." 1984, p. 683.

1.3.2. ODA Program Policy Framework

The Secretary of State for External Affairs has outlined a policy framework which gives the ODA program geographic focus; specific third world target groups; economic sectors to emphasize; delivery channels; plus various terms and conditions.¹¹ The framework is summarized as follows:

GEOGRAPHIC FOCUS: 42 per cent of bilateral assistance to Asia; 42 per cent of bilateral assistance to Africa; 16 per cent of bilateral assistance to Latin America and the Commonwealth Caribbean.

THIRD WORLD TARGETS: Up to 80 per cent of bilateral assistance to Low Income Developing Countries (LIC's); .15 per cent of GNP to Least Developed Countries (LLDC's); 2 per cent of total ODA for emergency/ humanitarian assistance; concentration of ODA in approximately 30 developing countries; closer attention to the impact of development on women and their participation in development processes.

DELIVERY CHANNELS: The bilateral program 60 per cent share of ODA is to be maintained or increased; international financial institutions are to receive 18-20 per cent of official ODA; use of a variety of transfer mechanisms to provide assistance; and increased assistance to the voluntary sector.

¹¹ "Competitiveness and Security." Un-numbered page insert.

ECONOMIC SECTORS: Emphasis is placed on agriculture including food production, fisheries and forestry, energy, and human resource development.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS: 80 per cent of bilateral assistance is to be tied to Canadian suppliers of goods and services (excluding shipping); bilateral projects are to have 66 2/3 per cent Canadian content; and the ODA program must continue to be relevant and sensitive to Canada' national objectives.

1.4. International Development Agencies

The purpose of this section is to outline, in general, activities of federal agencies or departments participating in the ODA program and their involvement in evaluation. Five principal agencies or departments executing the federal government ODA program are examined.

a) Canadian International Development Agency

The main purpose of the Canadian International Development Agency or CIDA is simply to help the people of developing countries improve their lives and move toward self-reliance.¹²

¹² "CIDA Annual Report," 1984-1985, p.7.

The agency is responsible for operating and administering the majority of Canada's international development co-operation programs, managing approximately 75 per cent of the total ODA budget.¹³ With respect to the overall ODA policy framework, CIDA's involvement in bilateral or government-to-government programs accounts for 40 per cent of its approximate \$1.6 billion¹⁴ assistance disbursements. Its multilateral programs support the development efforts of approximately 85 different international organizations such as United Nations agencies and development banks. As well, CIDA sponsors special programs supporting Canadian institutions and voluntary groups involved in international development, plus, business co-operation programs supporting Canadian businesses seeking participation in development efforts.

b) International Development Research Centre

The International Development Research Centre (IDRC) is a corporation created by parliament in 1970 to stimulate and support scientific and technical research by developing countries for their own benefit.¹⁵ IDRC provides financial or professional support to research projects in areas including:

13 *ibid.*, p.4.

14 *ibid.*, p.47.

15 "The IDRC Reports," International Development Research Centre, Ottawa, October 1985, p.1.

farming; food storage, processing and distribution; forestry; fisheries; animal sciences; tropical disease and health services; water supplies; education; population studies; economics; communications; urban policies; science and technology policies; and information systems. The centre promotes the role of the scientist in international development by encouraging third world countries to make us the talent within their own scientific communities. The research projects supported by IDRC will be identified, designed, conducted, and managed by developing country researchers in their own country to meet their own priorities.

c) The Canada Commercial Corporation

The objective of the Canada Commercial Corporation (CCC) is to assist in the development of trade between Canada and other nations.¹⁶ The CCC fulfills this broad mandate by providing government-to-government export contracting services to the private and public sectors as well by providing contract management services to foreign governmental customers in acquiring Canadian goods and services. With the exception of a Canada-United States defense production sharing agreement, the use of CCC services are at the option of the private sector. CCC does not compete with existing or established export

¹⁶ "Canada Commercial Corporation Annual Report," Canada Commercial Corporation, Ottawa, 1985-86, p. 2.

marketing and distribution efforts. In 1985-86, the CCC reached \$986 million in sales or an increase of 24 per cent over the previous year.¹⁷ This growth has been attributed to major U.S. defense contracts and other successes in bidding on foreign government and international agency requirements.

d) The Export Development Corporation

The Export Development Corporation or EDC provides insurance to exporters, guarantees to banks, and financing to foreign buyers of Canadian capital goods and services to develop Canada's export trade.¹⁸ EDC will aid Canadian exporters competing in foreign markets on the criteria of price, quality, delivery, and service. EDC supports only exports with a minimum 60 per cent Canadian content. All goods and services are eligible for EDC export credits insurance which protects exporters for up to 90 per cent of their losses if their foreign customers are unable or unwilling to pay; only capital goods sold on credit terms of two years and more are eligible for EDC financing support. As well, EDC provides performance security insurance which protects exporters against the wrongful call of a performance security posted in connection with an export sale.

¹⁷ *ibid.*, p.4.

¹⁸ "Canada Yearbook," 1984, p. 681.

e) The Department of External Affairs

The Department of External Affairs protects and promotes Canadian interests abroad and conducts Canada's external relations.¹⁹ The department carries out these responsibilities by: conducting all diplomatic and consular relations on behalf of Canada; promoting the attainment of international peace and a safer world for Canadians to pursue their interests; assisting Canadian companies in expanding sales and exports thereby contributing to national job creation; fostering the development of international policies to the benefit of Canadians; assuming responsibility for Canadian international negotiations and official communications with other governments and international organizations; maintaining the Canadian foreign service; and evaluating and advising the government on economic, political, and other developments abroad likely to effect Canada.

Agencies responsible to the department of external affairs include the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security, the International Centre for Ocean Development, the International Joint Commission and major agencies participating in the ODA program including IDRC, CIDA, EDC, and the CCC.

¹⁹ "External Affairs Canada 1986-87 Estimates, Part III Expenditure Plan," Minister of Supply and Services, Ottawa, 1986, p.1-2.

1.5. Context For Evaluation and Planning in Government

The purpose of this section is to provide the reader with information on the general context for evaluation and planning in the federal government and as it would apply to agencies involved in the ODA. Relationships and links which exist between the two activities will also be made.

1.5.1. Federal Approach to Evaluation

The office of the comptroller general of Canada (OCG) is the central federal agency charged with overseeing and guiding the evaluation function in all departments and agencies of the government of Canada including those involved in the ODA. To this end the OCG makes available numerous publications, seminars, and other forms of assistance to guide departments in fulfilling evaluation policy responsibilities.²⁰ The OCG defines evaluation not so much as by what it actually is but by what it entails and by what its products ought to be in the federal government context. The OCG, in its publication Guide on the Program Evaluation Function states:

"Program evaluation in federal departments and agencies should involve the systematic gathering of verifiable information on a program and demonstrable evidence on its results and cost-effectiveness. Its purpose should be to

²⁰ Treasury Board Circular 1977-44 states generally that departments and agencies of the federal government will periodically review their programs to evaluate their effectiveness in meeting their objectives and the efficiency with which they are being administered.

periodically produce credible, timely, useful, and objective findings on programs appropriate for resource allocation, program improvement, and accountability." (p.3)

This description might lead one to conclude that evaluation is purely a "scientific" exercise. However, the OCG does admit formal evaluation is merely one means of providing relevant, timely, and objective findings and recommendations on the performance of government programs, thereby improving the information base on which decisions are taken:

"In this view, program evaluation, as part of the decision making and management process, should not be seen as an exercise in scientific research aimed at producing definitive "scientific" conclusions about programs and their results. Rather it should be seen as input to the complex, interactive process that is government decision making, with the aim of producing objective but not necessarily conclusive evidence on the results of programs.
(p.4)

The OCG views the process of carrying out evaluations as comprising various phases:²¹

- o Pre-evaluation planning (evaluation assessment) to decide on the appropriate questions to be asked in the evaluation study and the approaches to be used for answering them.
- o Conducting and reporting on the evaluation study; and
- o decision-making based on the evaluation findings and recommendations.

²¹ Treasury Board of Canada, "Principles for the Evaluation of Programs by Federal Departments and Agencies," Ottawa 1981, p.3.

1.5.2. Links Between Evaluation and Planning

Evaluation is linked to the management processes in government departments and agencies. The OCG establishes relationships between planning and evaluation. The departmental management process is presented by the OCG as three distinct but inter-related activities. These activities include:

- o Planning and budgeting or decision-making
- o Implementing or directing
- o Review and monitoring or evaluating

The planning and budgeting or decision making activity entails goal and objective setting and the determination of approaches and operational requirements for their attainment.

Implementing or directing entails invoking plans and the overseeing of concomitant operations. Review and monitoring or evaluation entails determinations on performance and results of operations vis-a-vis expectations, objectives, and plans. This latter activity, yielding information concerning observed and expected program outcomes, feeds back into the decision-making and directing activities.²²

Each agency described in section 1.4. maintains an evaluation capacity. Table 1.0 below is intended to provide a brief

²² Program review and monitoring in the federal government are not limited to program evaluation. Other activities including internal audit; financial reporting; management and quality reviews would all be included in this process. Each would feed-back to the decision-making and directing activities along with program evaluation.

overview of the evaluation divisions including staff complements, recent annual budget information, production-related information, and some indication of the nature of their evaluation approach. The data presented in table 1.0 was compiled based on preliminary telephone conversations with either evaluation directors or acting directors from the departments or agencies listed.

Table 1.0
SUMMARY OF EVALUATION ACTIVITIES IN MAJOR
FEDERAL AGENCIES PARTICIPATING IN ODA PROGRAM
FISCAL YEAR 1986

<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>IN-HOUSE STAFF*</u>	<u>APPROX. DEPARTMENT BUDGET (\$ M)</u>	<u>TOTAL PROGRAM EVALUATIONS</u>	<u>TOTAL PROJECT EVALUATIONS</u>	<u>TOTAL STUDIES</u>	<u>PER CENT IN-HOUSE ANALYSIS</u>	<u>PER CENT CONTRACTED ANALYSIS</u>
CIDA	11.0	4.5	NOT AVAILABLE	NOT AVAILABLE	75	5	95
IDRC	3.0**	.5	NOT AVAILABLE	NOT AVAILABLE	15	20	80
EXPORT DEV. CORP.	3.5**	.25	1	0	2	90-95	5-10
CANADA COMM. CORP.	0	0.0	Program evaluation function defers to Auditor General Special Examinations (comprehensive audits) every 5 years.			0	0
EXTERNAL AFFAIRS	9.0	.2	9	0	27	60-67	33-40

Source: Telephone Conversations with Directors or Acting Directors

* Includes Professional and Clerical

** Person Years

Total study figures will include assessment and other pre-evaluation documentation.

1.6. Planning, Evaluation, and Culture

While "culture, man, and nature" is no longer a popular theme, "culture, civilization, and nature" has come to be.²³ This latter theme has come to better imply growth and divergence of thought and milieux. Whether Western or Eastern, industrialized or non-industrialized, developed or under-developed, we have a variety of terms to re-enforce and describe our understanding of this divergence. Culture represents our individual and collective attempts to refine or improve milieux²⁴ and, hence, ourselves. Through the notions of improvement or refinement we may begin to establish theoretical links to planning. Planning is our forward thinking approach to demarcate the antecedence, requirements, and consequences of change within milieux. Substantive positive change would be the necessary and sufficient condition for betterment. Planning and culture share similar ends, yet, it may be the underlying intentionalities of planning which would ultimately distinguish the two.

Divergence implies difference and to a greater or lesser extent

23 Interestingly, in 1986, the Government of Canada re-named its Museum of Man to the Museum of Civilization. However, Marvin Harris, author of the anthropology text "Culture, Man and Nature" opted for the re-name "Culture, People, Nature" in 1975.

24 J. Coulson et. al. (eds.), "The Oxford Illustrated Dictionary," Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1985, p.206.

that which we have is a reflection of how we have planned. Resources are critical to the context of growth and development and we may also plan for our resources. The various concerns and foci of Canada's ODA, through inter-relation and exchange, become compensatory forums for differences or imbalances in resources between milieux. The manner in which we approach inter-relation and exchange between ourselves is highly variable. One's approach would be at least influenced and be at best determined by one's own milieu. We may accept that vast differences exist between the ideas, values and norms of cultures, yet our own personal ones profoundly affect our behaviour and ability to understand. True recognition of these differences between us implies that it may not always be possible to view the world through the eyes of another.

Successful practice in an inter-cultural setting would, consequently, rest on our recognition of difference between cultural milieux. Shared understandings also would be a conditions for success. By implication, if planning is to improve and refine in the context of inter-relation and exchange, then it must be sensitive and able to incorporate the manner in which milieux differ. The tools of planners, including evaluation techniques, must also reflect such sensitivities. For this reason, it will be useful to explore various theoretical attempts to explain how we might acquire this knowledge of cultures. Practical difficulties or

possibilities for planners and evaluators which arise out of this discussion must be considered.

Chapter Two

2.0. Literature Review: Introduction

This chapter presents a review of literature relevant to the domains of development planning and evaluation in the international context. The review is meant to provide general insight related to the central theme of the recognition of inter-cultural difference in development assistance evaluation study.

The meaning and importance of inter-cultural understanding is outlined. Theoretical attempts in the literature focussing on the acquisition of knowledge of cultures are explored in an effort to demonstrate the difficulty of problem. Practical approaches to planning and evaluation are considered in view of issues rising out of the theoretical discussion. Difficulties and possibilities, particularly those for evaluation, form the basis of a strategic model for an inter-cultural approach to international evaluation in the subsequent chapter.

2.1. Inter-Cultural Understanding

Contradictions arise in the attempt to explain what makes us each see the world the way we do; seeing the world the way others do presents an even greater paradox. As a response to this difficulty the Talmud, in an insightful and instructive

manner, states, "we do not see things as they are, we see them as we are." On first glance, this statement seems somewhat pessimistic to the extent that it appears to preclude the possibility of agreement between individuals by affirming the uniqueness of personal experience. However, on a more optimistic yet esoteric note, the affirmation of uniqueness of individual experience also implies a commonality. Stating that we do not see things as they are hints at the problem presented by the human condition; stating that we see things as we are hints at the solution. By understanding ourselves we can begin to understand others.

Stressing the inevitability of seeing things as 'we are' not as 'they are', the Talmud provides a governing principle for an approach to the world and its inhabitants. Plurality is affirmed and it is suggested that it can be accommodated. An image of a world with many different cultures may be inferred from the Talmudic statement. There is an acceptance in the Talmudic statement which affirms and accredits legitimacy and validity within and between cultures. At the same time, there is an implied recognition that differences will not always be surmountable.

One can not accept personal ideas, values and norms as the only true, or valid ones. Inter-cultural understanding entails both the acceptance of plurality and the recognition of our

limitations within it. For example, Captain Bligh and Fletcher Christian represent diametrically opposed characters; at equal odds with one another and under seemingly irreconcilable positions. Ultimately, one concludes each character is equally right and equally wrong in their actions.

A tolerance for ambiguity and the admission that certain differences may ultimately prove to be irreconcilable are essential. Yet while we may recognize and accept that vast differences exist between the ideas, values and norms of cultures, our own personal ones have profound effects on our behaviour and ability to understand. The question then becomes whether an outsider can actually acquire adequate knowledge of the ideas, values, and norms of another culture to enable meaningful and practical activity within that culture.

2.2. Knowledge of Cultures

Polyani, in "The Study of Man," states:

"We cannot comprehend a whole without seeing its parts, but we can see the parts without comprehending the whole. Thus, we may advance from a knowledge of the parts to the understanding of the whole."²⁵

Polyani distinguishes formulated (explicit) knowledge such as that set out in written words, maps or mathematical formulae from unformulated (tacit) knowledge such as we have of

²⁵ Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1958, p.29.

something which we are doing. We are able to critically reflect on that which is explicitly stated in a way in which we can not reflect on our tacit awareness of an experience. In this context, we may say that we know tacitly that we are holding our explicit knowledge to be true. Polyani argues that tacit knowledge is the dominant principle of all knowledge for it is tacit knowledge which would, for example, allow us to "know" our way about a neighbourhood. Tacit knowledge re-organizes our experiences (such as the study of landmarks or maps) so as to gain intellectual control over it. This manner of comprehending or making sense of experience is 'understanding'.

Understanding, according to Polyani, leads beyond what strict empiricism or descriptive generalization regards as the legitimate domain of knowledge. Empiricism strictly applied must discredit any knowledge whatsoever and it can be upheld only by allowing it to remain inconsistent.²⁶ Rival 'empirical' explanations are simply competing descriptive generalizations between which we ultimately select the most expedient. Discovery in this context is another version of how things are.

The possibility of inter-cultural understanding may be inferred from Polyani; in tacit knowing or moving from comprehension of

²⁶ *ibid.*, p.21.

the parts to a whole, our attention is shifted from a focal awareness of particulars to what he calls a subsidiary awareness of their joint meaning. An image of a world of many cultures surrounded by a reality which recognizes and accepts the validity and existence of distinct cultures emerges.

With respect to acquiring adequate knowledge of any single culture to enable for the outsider meaningful and productive practical experience, we may defer to Polyani's notion of subsidiary awareness. This awareness may be likened to the recognition of existential character of elements within a culture.

Polyani cites the examples of language, tools, machines, probes, and optical instruments, where our focal awareness will not be indicative of their real significance. As extensions of our bodies, only when viewed subsidiarily by focusing attention on their purpose do we know their significance. This awareness of purpose, according to Polyani, becomes the soil upon which our knowledge may live and grow.

One may easily concur with Polyani's approach to inter-cultural understanding. However, it would appear that he underestimates the difficulty of an outsider acquiring appropriate knowledge of a specific culture to enable meaningful and productive practical experience. We may have the ability to

focus attention on specific elements within a culture but there would be no guarantee of understanding its purpose or existential meaning. The influence of one's personal cultural values, ideas and norms which may be contradictory or incongruous, can prevent or inhibit the acquisition of this knowledge. Deeply rooted or fixed cultural responses may function as barriers to the acquisition of full or explicit knowledge of other cultural traditions. As well, the origins of any single tradition may be so foreign or deeply rooted in a particular culture's history, that a full appreciation of its purpose may be forever obscured to an outsider. That which Polyani considers understandable may end up simply being misunderstood.

More cautiously and less idealistically than Polyani, V.G. Childe in "Society and Knowledge"²⁷ also examines the problem of acquiring adequate knowledge of any single culture. Childe concedes that ultimately the acquisition of adequate knowledge of the ideas, values and norms of a culture may be impossible. Nevertheless, he notes that despite imprecision and limits, the ability to approach and interpret culture exists within us. Childe offers his approach by way of analogy.

He compares the reproduction of an ideal world of knowledge to the rebuilding of an ancient monument. Most of the material is

²⁷ Novello and Co., London, 1956, p.69.

on site but certain pieces remain unexcavated and will be found only once debris is removed. Temporary substitutes for certain pieces will be considered unless original pieces are found. Excavation and reconstruction continue, given the archaeologists' knowledge of similar monuments of the same era. However, precise details such as the number and placement of windows or roof construction techniques remain unknown. Using trial and error within the limits set by their general knowledge of the monument's plan surviving pieces are fitted. A scaffolding is used as a skeleton of the design provisionally outlined. Further gaps are uncovered and substitutes are used. However, this must be done with the utmost flexibility as the provisional design may have to be modified to accommodate surviving fragments which must be fitted in either to ensure structural soundness or in light of discoveries during the course of work. Childe argues in the same way that missing parts have been employed in this re-construction, "gaps in pooled experience must be filled with symbols, expressing ideas imagined on the model of ideas, already socially approved and objectified."²⁸ Childe asserts that knowers must rationally anticipate uncompleted patterns of reality in imagination, using partial patterns already known as a frame to support hypotheses. The frame must ultimately be flexible as hypotheses are modified in light of practice. If our

²⁸ *ibid.*, p.71.

scaffolding or frame is inflexible, data which fit or does not fit the design may go unperceived.

Childe admits that error and the notion of degrees of truth may inhibit the process he describes. Error will arise due to illusions, delusions or the incompleteness of accumulated knowledge about the external world being accepted as truth. The blend of rationality, intuition and experience he would advocate as central to the acquisition of knowledge would have its limits. However as knowledge is to be a practical guide for action, the only test of our conceptual reproductions is whether they in fact correspond to the external world. Childe's argument becomes one for trial and error within inter-cultural contexts.

While presenting an appealing argument, Childe's analogy seems to belie the complexity of that which he describes. While the reconstruction of an ancient monument is no mean feat, it may not be likened to the acquisition of knowledge say of cultures which construct such monuments. Clearly the opportunity for trials and tests would be equal between the reconstruction of the monument and the acquisition of knowledge of a culture. However, compared to the reconstruction of a monument, there would appear to be less room for error in seeking knowledge of a culture for practical reasons. Miscalculating the position of a monument icon only by a few centimeters or even a few feet

seems inconsequential in a practical sense and likely not harmful to the overall reconstruction. Failure to conduct field activity in concert with local styles of interaction, i.e. interviewing only tribal elders, might easily jeopardize an entire research project and perhaps even one's life in the most extreme case.

In Childe's monument reconstruction one has advance understandings of the architectural elements e.g. doors, windows, stairs, walls etc... under consideration. Cultures would not so easily be described and understood by such discrete elements. However, if we accept likening the elements of a culture to easily understood concepts such as windows and doors, the issue must be not their placement but the significance or motivation behind their placement. This latter task would be much more problematic and leaves open the possibility of even greater error. Attempts to define cultures categorically may prove to be difficult.

For example, in the philosophy of Cassirer, symbolic forms reflect our diverse modes of expression in the process of interpreting life-experience. By implication, individuals are necessary to the development, interpretation, and use of symbols from which ideas may be derived. Cassirer states:

"For man, all reality is ultimately cultural reality or symbolical reality which the human mind itself has created in the course of historical development, since that is the only kind of

reality which it is possible for the human mind to apprehend and evaluate."²⁹

Understanding any single cultural phenomenon requires that it be located within the sphere of (symbolic) expression to which it belongs and from where it derives its significance.³⁰ Here Childe might agree and argue, for example, that he would be more successful re-creating his monument alongside its ruins rather than inside his laboratory. Knowledge would come from experience within or alongside a culture and not outside it. This experience should extend into many forms of cultural expressions.

In the study of signs, focussing on symbols and words in particular convey information to their users. The term 'map' ignores the individual characteristics of any given map seen, touched, or otherwise perceived. However, it provides a convenient approach to refer to general characteristics shared with other objects to which the same name is applied. Meaning becomes the 'idea'; the idea of 'map' lacks all the individual peculiarities that distinguishes every empirical map. We have a 'fuzzy set', 'prototype' or 'template' against which other map objects may be compared.

However, reliance on the interpretation of cultural symbols to

²⁹ "The Philosophy of Ernst Cassirer," P.A. Schilpp, (ed.), Geo. Banta Publishing, Evanston, 1949, p.497.

³⁰ *ibid.*, p.561.

acquire knowledge is problematic. Seeking to ascertain the 'significance' of a symbol is not unlike the approach of Polyani who would have subsidiary focus on the purpose of a particular element. The difficulties which applied to Polyani apply equally to Cassirer. The existence of symbolic realities may also be questioned. For example, the old testament commandment forbidding images of G-d has left the Jewish religion unadorned, stark, and free of icons and symbols. Orthodox Jews accept this command so literally that no works of art, religious or otherwise, will be found in their homes for fear it be understood as pagan. Cassirer in attempting to gain knowledge of orthodox Jewish traditions would face considerable difficulty finding such symbols to interpret.

Rather than symbols, anthropology offers three functional sectors to consider in the analysis of cultural systems³¹: a) ecology or the tools, machines, techniques and practices relating human existence to the material conditions of specific habitats; b) social structure or the maintenance of orderly relationships among individuals and groups responsible for the production of food, fuel, and other life sustaining ecological transactions and for the breeding and care for children; c) ideology or to be brief, the entire realm of social patterned thought. These elements will be helpful in the description of activity within a distinct culture; they may facilitate

31 *ibid.*, p.156.

interesting cross-cultural comparisons. However as a more clinical approach to knowledge of cultural systems it necessitates 'rational' interpretations of perhaps 'irrational' events and phenomena. One would be remiss in overlooking or under-estimating observer biases.

The case for inter-cultural understanding is quite clear. It is based in part the affirmation and accreditation of the legitimacy and validity of many cultures each manifesting in their own way. However, less clear theoretically is whether, as outsiders, we are able to equip ourselves with sufficient and adequate knowledge of a particular culture towards meaningful and productive practice within that culture. Inter-cultural understanding must incorporate both of these considerations. The consideration of anything less would be an under-estimation of the complexities of the inter-cultural context.

Despite the difficulties noted in the approaches to knowledge discussed above, various themes emerge. All of the approaches lead to a responsiveness based on openness and a sincere desire to acquire such knowledge. Persisting in gaining familiarity, one must attempt to subsume personal ideas, values, and norms to those found in the local milieu. For example, Einstein, in proposing his theory of relativity, abandoned contemporary axiomatic scientific wisdom in lieu of more subjective

revolutionary premises. One must become imbued in a milieu; notions of the need for observation coupled with flexible participation equally emerge. At a minimum and if all else fails, in our human nature we at least possess the ability to learn to adapt.

2.3. Implications For Planning and Evaluation Practice

For planning and evaluation practice in an inter-cultural setting, it is essential to recognize and accept from the outset that cultural milieux differ. In entering this practical sphere, it is insufficient to merely accept that such differences occur. Without the recognition that our knowledge may be limited, practical strategies may not accommodate, anticipate and operate in concert with the ideas, values, and norms of local milieux.

Given the difficulties established in the discussion of acquiring knowledge of cultures, the extent to and manner in which outside or foreigner practitioners can ultimately carry out such work are legitimate concerns. Whether there exist approaches or strategies for practitioners to accommodate, anticipate and function in concert within a given cultural setting must be considered. Are there measures to minimize risks for the use and quality of information? Planning and evaluation of development assistance cannot be divorced from

the cultural realities or context in which the assistance is delivered. Consequently, it would be incumbent upon planners and evaluators alike to ensure control of evaluations rests with those from local milieux.

To demonstrate, from an institutional perspective, that the control of evaluations may rest with those from local milieux and the benefits of this approach, the ensuing analysis considers planning and evaluation approaches of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC). While a number of other agencies involved in Canada's official development assistance program have been identified, the IDRC approach has been selected as it explicitly emphasizes the importance of local input in the processes and presents possible resolutions toward improving the use and quality of evaluation information.

2.3.1. Planning and Evaluation Cycles

Development assistance agencies must plan and provide in view of local beneficiaries and; in the absence of knowledge of local milieux, certitudes with respect to the appropriateness and outcomes of the aid direction would be few in number. Plans divorced from the cultural realities of milieux are hardly worth implementing. Development aid plans cannot be devised, implemented and then wait for culturally sensitive

evaluations to ascertain efficacy. The IDRC maintains a cyclical and integrated approach to planning and evaluation. Allocation decisions are guided by policies and goals which are derived from information on developing countries research needs and priorities, on the activities of other donors, and on past and current program and project experience. Table 2.0 outlines the IDRC planning and evaluation cycle:

Table 2.0

IDRC PLANNING AND EVALUATION CYCLE

*****		*****	
*	<u>ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT</u>	*	*
*	. economic, social, political conditions	*	*
*	. other donor agencies	*	*
*****	. research institutions, systems, resources	*****	*
*	. research needs and priorities	*	*
*	. evaluation information	*	*
*	*****	*	*
*		*	*
*****		*****	
*	<u>POLICY ESTABLISHMENT</u>	*	<u>PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS</u>
*	. goal setting	*	. identification
*	. type, level and duration of	*	. development
*	support	*	. implementation
*	. geographic and institutional	*	. monitoring
*	distribution of response	*	. evaluation
*****		*	. follow-up
*		*****	
*	*****	*	*
*	<u>ALLOCATION DECISIONS</u>	*	*
*	. staff: field of expertise	*	*
*****	and location	*****	*
*	. budget	*	*
*	. service and support	*	*
*	*****	*	*

SOURCE: IDRC, May 1984, p.4.

IDRC environmental assessment information is obtained by travel and interaction of IDRC program officers with Third World researchers and policy makers; from trip reports, staff

meetings, workshops, project completion reports and final studies including evaluations. These assessments represent and form a basis for planned programs and projects; and allocation and policy decision with respect to these. With respect to the level of resources allocated to evaluations, the IDRC board maintains a position of modesty by endorsing the principle of purposive evaluations. Routine and comprehensive evaluation is seen as expensive and unproductive as it amounts to fishing for information which carries the prospect of catching something useful but also of returning empty-handed.

The planning and evaluation cycle of the IDRC reflects the notion that plans cannot be divorced from local milieux and then wait for direction from subsequent culturally sensitive evaluation. For example, where plans are divorced from knowledge of the needs of a milieu, materials selected in a project may be inappropriate, selected technologies may be too complex and un-adaptable, recipients may not have the skills to employ and benefit from instrumentation. Only waiting for evaluations to ascertain misguided implemented plans would be costly and inefficient.

2.3.2 The Use of Evaluations

In the context of aid organizations, various functions have

been attributed to the tasks of planning and evaluation.³² Planning will direct resources towards aid objectives. Evaluation will provide ex ante, on-going, or ex post information on the use of resources facilitating decisions on the appropriateness of one development solution (or resolution) over another. A third function of evaluation as input to the decision process relates to the use of evaluation by local aid beneficiaries.

The manner in which evaluation information is gathered, organized, and presented reflects its role as a source of management and planning information. In the context of government planning, evaluation can have both formative and summative use.³³ Provided an organization has a system to use evaluation information to enhance, enrich or improve organizational or program performance, then evaluations have formative or operational uses. Provided planners and policymakers allocate resources on the basis of the evidence of a program's worth or value, then evaluations have summative or strategic use. In very general terms, evaluation is useful to decision-makers inasmuch as they may be able to improve program

32 K. Forss, "Planning and Evaluation In Aid Organizations," Institute of International Business, Stockholm, 1985. p.4.

33 J. Wholey, "Evaluation and Utilization in the United States," in J. Hudson (ed.), The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation, Office of the Auditor General of Canada, Ottawa, Volume 1, April 1986, p. 13.

performance and possibly acquire new resources. Evaluation may be useful to planners and policymakers in distinguishing relative program merit.

In catering to program planners and policymakers³⁴ and the decisions they must make regarding resource shifts, the Office of the Comptroller General states evaluations must answer or address themselves to basic classes of issues:

- o RATIONALE: To what extent are the objectives and mandate of the program still relevant? Are the activities and outputs of the program consistent with its mandate and plausibly linked to the attainment of the objectives and intended program impacts and effects?
- o IMPACTS AND EFFECTS: What impacts and effects, both intended and unintended, resulted from carrying out the program? In what manner and to what extent does the program complement, duplicate, overlap or work at cross-purpose with other programs?
- o OBJECTIVES ACHIEVEMENT: In what manner and to what extent were appropriate program objectives achieved as a result of the program? Has the program achieved what was expected?
- o ALTERNATIVES: Are there more cost-effective alternative programs which might achieve the objectives and intended impacts and effects? Are there more cost-effective ways of delivering the existing program?

This OCG evaluation approach with its generalized categories of issues is to be applied by all government agencies whether they operate in a domestic or international context. However, the two contexts differ substantively. Extreme cultural differences

³⁴ In this context, program planners would likely be a departmental deputy head.

can arise when operating internationally; there may be different and even contradictory perspectives in the definition of evaluation issues. As well, the criteria to address or respond to OCG evaluation issues may vary widely depending on the cultural viewpoint. What may be good and useful to the OCG may be valueless to aid recipients. Views on matters of program worth and value might also differ between milieux.

The conduct and outcomes of development assistance evaluations must be provided for in terms which have meaning to local beneficiaries. In view of the difficulties indicated for outsiders seeking knowledge of cultures, the input of local beneficiaries in the conduct of evaluations would be critical. Local beneficiaries offer knowledge of milieux without which one may fail in certain important realizations. For example, definitions of indicators, benefits or costs may differ between an aid donor and recipient. Scientific or quantitative research methods may prove to be inconsistent or irreconcilable within a particular cultural setting. Qualitative methods alone may be inadequate. Evaluation recommendations may be at odds with accepted cultural traditions or patterns. Possibly plagued by such difficulties, the overall usefulness of such studies becomes questionable. When the results of evaluation studies are of no use to local inhabitants, they are likely of no use to anyone.

The evaluation approach of the IDRC confirms the validity of this logic. The IDRC notes that an unfortunate scarcity of indigenous evaluation expertise coupled with logistical and methodological difficulties associated with conducting evaluations in developing countries has lead many donor agencies to carry out evaluations using external expertise and aimed at their own information needs.³⁵ This approach, while offering certain expediencies, presents drawbacks to meeting both project and evaluation objectives of both donors and hosts. According to the IDRC, these drawbacks include:

- o the findings may be relevant only to the external agency and not be pertinent to the needs of local institutions;
- o results may not reflect an adequate understanding of the local situation and problems; and
- o the provision of collaborative and logistical support to external evaluators puts considerable strain on the already over-taxed resources of developing country institutions.³⁶

Consequently, the IDRC evaluation approach is presented as locally focussed and consultative. Evidence in IDRC guideline and procedural materials, support the contention that local input enhances evaluation information quality and usefulness. For example, evaluation consultant selection preferences of the IDRC are stated in the order as follows:

- 1) nationals of third world countries.
- 2) nationals of Canada.

35 *ibid.*, p.3.

36 *ibid.*, p.3.

3) nationals of other developed countries.³⁷

There exists a preference at the IDRC for the use of technical specialists as evaluators rather than evaluation specialists. In-house IDRC evaluators take on more of a project facilitator role. Employing local evaluators or those with local responsibility related to planning or research co-ordination ensures relevance for the IDRC and recipients.

By implication, the application of the OCG evaluation approach where beneficiary involvement is missing is questionable. Without beneficiary involvement, the product of the OCG evaluation approach would be too one-sided or imposing. Neither formatively or summatively, could such evaluations be useful; their information base would either be inaccurate or incomplete. Planners and local beneficiaries would be disabled in their actions towards further refinements or improvements by relying on information out of touch with the full set of circumstances.

Where aid effectiveness is of concern, planners must ensure evaluations reflect and incorporate the perspectives of recipient milieux along with legitimate donor concerns. Evaluations must ultimately benefit aid recipients. Only if recipients can use an evaluation can they benefit from it. Given the difficulties in obtaining knowledge of cultures and

³⁷ IDRC, March 1985, p.3.

the importance of local use of evaluation results, logic dictates local recipients ultimately have to conduct the evaluations to ensure their meaningful use.

2.3.3. The Quality of Evaluation

Evaluation quality assurance in an inter-cultural setting goes beyond the demonstration of methodological rigour and the use of sophisticated analytical techniques in research.

Environments which may be less amenable to such demonstrations and techniques may be found in an inter-cultural setting. A variety of influences which will promote and detract from evaluation quality will be found in the setting.

For example, the IDRC identifies a number of challenges which may impinge upon evaluation quality. While not always strictly defined by the IDRC as culturally related, these challenges reflect the premise that differences between milieux and evaluator-host apperceptions can pose barriers:

"Infrastructural problems may inhibit travel or communication; existing databases may be difficult to access or inadequate as sources of background or baseline information; evaluation skills are often scarce and the few skilled people may be hard to identify and locate. There may also be cultural, linguistic or organizational barriers to carrying out what is often seen as a foreign process using an imported methodology."³⁸

With respect to evaluation methodology, IDRC evaluation

³⁸ IDRC, April 1986, p.2.

guideline and procedural documentation eschews the notion of strict adherence to quantitative evaluation approaches in international study. In addition to possibly obfuscating key information required by decision makers and local beneficiaries, advanced techniques including stagy modelling are thought not to give better results particularly in view of the lack of available model testing data in the third world. Indicating "sophisticated" analytical techniques very often do not meet expectations of the concerned parties, the IDRC indicates:

"it does mean that we do not stress the importance of developing a logical and rigorous evaluation design. In fact we believe that qualitative evaluative information should be used at all times, if possible, complemented with quantitative data. In our operational experiences we have often opted for a triangulation of 'hard' and 'soft' methodologies to evaluate programs."³⁹

Primary IDRC supported techniques for the collection and analysis of evaluation data include questionnaire surveys, file analysis, in-depth interviews, citation searches and benefit-cost analysis.⁴⁰

As the use of evaluation is linked to local beneficiaries, the control of local beneficiaries and evaluation quality assurance become inseparable issues in the inter-cultural setting. Evaluation information quality must be assured in terms which

³⁹ IDRC, October 1985, pp.15-16.

⁴⁰ IDRC, April 1986, p.4.

render the studies amenable, meaningful, and understandable in the terms of local beneficiaries. Where no measures towards evaluation quality assurance in such terms have been taken, the use of the study by local beneficiaries may be jeopardized.

IDRC institutional experiences reflecting exposure to host milieux at all public and private levels, is highly sensitive to donor-recipient differences. This experience, manifested in IDRC evaluation procedures and guidelines, stresses approaches which recognize and work within the constraints posed by seeking improved information quality and usefulness. Actions taken to obtain this nature of information, and which are based primarily on perceived cultural and methodological considerations, include a preference for the incorporation of indigenous evaluation professionals, multiple information gathering strategies, evaluation teams, and multiple information sources.

2.4. Practical Evaluation Examples

To provide a better context for the discussion on the problems and potential for evaluation information quality and usefulness, practical examples of evaluations in an inter-cultural setting will be considered. The study of these examples is intended to illustrate how the introduction of local control to evaluations can minimize problems of outsiders

acquiring knowledge of cultures and can translate into approaches which operate in concert with milieux. Two recently undertaken IDRC evaluation studies will be examined.

In one case, the IDRC undertook jointly with the Ethiopian Science and Technology Commission (ESTC) an evaluation of all IDRC-supported research in Ethiopian national institutions. The ESTC is an Ethiopian government agency responsible for building and coordinating the country's research and development capabilities. The second study presents the findings of an evaluation undertaken in Tanzania jointly by the IDRC and the Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA) of all IDRC-supported research projects. This report contains, as well, a listing of issues and recommendations flowing from an evaluation workshop designed to elicit a 'stakeholder' consensus on evaluation follow-up activities.

The Tanzanian evaluation was to help plan research programs, set policies for efficient and effective operation and to increase the contribution of SUA research output to national agricultural development. In the Ethiopian evaluation study, the ESTC was seeking to improve its own management of research programs and to build up national planning and evaluation capacities in the research systems. The IDRC describes its part in the two studies as follows:

"IDRC wanted to improve the delivery and effectiveness of its support to research in both countries. It wanted to explore ways of supporting research other than single, sectorally-

focussed projects: in Ethiopia, by determining the need and feasibility of a country-wide programming strategy; and in Tanzania, by looking at the possibility of providing institutional support through a broad range of coordinated support activities."⁴¹

Each of the two studies entailed technical component which evaluated the research activities themselves and a management component which examined separate research support services. In both evaluation studies, the method employed by the IDRC relied heavily on the use of host nationals in all levels of the evaluation process. Implicit in the IDRC method is a recognition of the possible shortcomings or compromises to final outcomes of evaluation research in having only foreign or non-host national evaluators. While the evaluation studies were jointly undertaken, in both cases stakeholder national institutions conducted the bulk of evaluation tasks including the undertaking of study design and data collection responsibilities; data analysis and issue identification; preparation of evaluation recommendations.

The IDRC in the SUA evaluation, for example, stressed the importance of local control as a factor in evaluation usefulness when it states:

"IDRC supported the idea that the evaluation should as far as possible be carried out using local resources in order to increase its usefulness as a management and decision-making tool. Therefore the technical evaluation was carried out by a team of SUA researchers with

⁴¹ IDRC, April 1986, p.5.

assistance from consultants from the region, while the management evaluation was carried out by staff from the University of Dar-es-Salaam Faculty of Commerce. IDRC provided SUA with the consultancy services of Mazingira Institute, a Kenya-based non-profit research organization, and an officer of the Ethiopian Science and Technology Commission, both with some experience in evaluation."⁴²

The Ethiopian evaluation reflects this same method to the extent that the ESTC undertook with a consultancy of the Mazingira Institute, Nairobi an overview of the scope of IDRC Ethiopian activities; the evaluation of IDRC-funded Ethiopian projects; and an assessment of the IDRC contribution to building Ethiopian research capabilities. Another local stakeholder, the Ethiopian National Productivity Centre (NPC), was responsible for a review of organizational finance and other administrative aspects of IDRC-funded projects.

The IDRC in collaborating with the active evaluation participants uses this approach to ensure that objectives, resources, data and user are brought together to generate the information which is required. The IDRC states:

"Developing consensus and obtaining approval for the evaluation design and objectives can be difficult; it is helped considerably when the design bears the approving agency fingerprints, and when the evaluating agency will be one of primary users of the evaluation results."⁴³

In the IDRC approach there is recognition of value to separating the evaluating agencies from the approval agency.

⁴² IDRC, November 1985, p.3.

⁴³ IDRC, April 1986, p.7.

The IDRC approach appears to circumvent potential difficulties which may arise out of foreign misunderstanding or misinterpretation of the local context. Reliance on host evaluating agencies as opposed to proven outside consultants or head office staff to conduct evaluation studies has ensured quality and acceptance of output for all parties associated with the evaluation. Not necessarily defining the difficulties as purely cultural related, the IDRC preference for local control, gives explicit recognition to problems associated with foreign evaluators understanding foreign milieux and the potential consequences for the quality and usefulness of evaluation information.

The IDRC evaluation approach places great emphasis on local or situational concerns. Specific attention is placed on developing country research needs and priorities. IDRC stresses that its staff rely upon travel and contact with Third world researchers, trip reports, workshops and so on in understanding these needs and priorities. The emphasis is so much so that local evaluators are given preference over non-local evaluators in the conduct of studies. It should not be inferred that the IDRC emphasis on local evaluation professionals indicates that non-local evaluators have no place in conduct of the research. Rather, the IDRC approach is motivated by an organizational goal to improve the levels and skills of Third World researchers in general.

2.5. Emerging Responsiveness

What then is the necessary balance for culturally sensitive evaluation? The discussion has indicated that while intercultural understanding is a foundation upon which development assistance evaluation must occur, difficulties arise for outsiders in obtaining adequate knowledge of cultures towards practical ends. Inflexibility and orthodoxy may also inhibit culturally sensitive and situationally responsive practice.

Situational responsiveness entails:

"a genuine openness to understanding the important idiosyncrasies of each evaluation, so that the design, measures, processes, and findings are situationally appropriate, relevant, and useful... (it) includes sensitivity to culture in all its manifestations: political culture, program culture, local community culture, inter-personal norms, societal traditions, and local cultural values."⁴⁴

Evaluation must be useful and meaningful in a qualitative sense to local beneficiaries. While outside evaluators must do what they can to imbue and familiarize themselves in the problems and needs of milieux, maximization of local input and participation represents an important consideration in view of possible shortcomings to outsider knowledge. The IDRC evaluation approach recognizes the value of outside or foreign evaluator input as facilitating the conduct of studies by local aid beneficiaries. The control of local beneficiaries over evaluation processes emerges as a central consideration in the

⁴⁴ *ibid.*, p.94.

discussion of evaluation information quality and usefulness.

If development is seen as an integrated holistic approach encompassing various disciplines, so should evaluation be.

Evaluation ought not to be narrow in its focus.

Chapter Three

3.0. Model Towards Improved Evaluation Information Quality and Usefulness In an Inter-Cultural Setting.

Following the discussion of practical difficulties and possibilities for planning and evaluation, this chapter proposes a model towards the improvement of evaluation information quality and usefulness in an inter-cultural setting. The model is premised on the notion that in view of the need for improved evaluation information quality and usefulness, foreign or outside evaluators alone cannot define and execute studies. Without the control of local aid beneficiaries over studies difficulties will arise. The model draws heavily on the approach established by the IDRC where the approval agency is separate from the evaluating agency; it becomes the basis for the analysis of the survey questionnaire of international evaluation professionals in the subsequent chapter.

3.1. Model Components and Elements

Two components or sides are presented in the model towards improved evaluation information quality and usefulness. The first component entails elements which pertain to the activities of the foreign or outside evaluator alone. The second component entails elements which pertain to both foreign

evaluators and local aid beneficiaries involved. Each element of the model presents a set of evaluation related considerations or actions to be taken by the concerned party aimed at improved information quality and usefulness. A diagrammatical representation of the model is presented below in Table 3.0..

Table 3.0.

**MODEL TOWARD IMPROVED EVALUATION INFORMATION QUALITY
AND USEFULNESS IN AN INTER-CULTURAL SETTING**

	<u>FOREIGN EVALUATION PROFESSIONALS</u>		<u>FOREIGN EVALUATION PROFESSIONALS FACILITATING LOCAL AID BENEFICIARIES</u>	
	*****	*****	*****	*****
	* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *
	* INTER-CULTURAL * * AWARENESS	* OBTAIN KNOWLEDGE * * OF SPECIFIC * * CULTURES	* DEFINITION OF NEEDS AND * * PROBLEMS OF SPECIFIC * * MILIEU	* DEFINITION/EXECUTION OF * * EVALUATION STRATEGIES * * * *
	*****	*****	*****	*****
	* * *	* * *	* * *	* * *
	*****	*****	*****	*****
ACTIONS OR CONSIDERATIONS	* RECOGNITION * * AND ACCEPTANCE * * OF CULTURAL * * DIFFERENCES *	* - PARTICIPATION * * - ADAPTATION * * - DISTANCING FROM * * ONE'S OWN * * CULTURE *	* DETERMINE CONSIDERATIONS: * * - CULTURAL * * - METHODOLOGICAL * * - ETHICAL *	* - MULTIPLE INFORMATION * * GATHERING * * - MULTIPLE INFORMATION * * SOURCES * * - HOST NATIONAL * * INVOLVEMENT * * - EVALUATION TEAMS *
	*****	*****	*****	*****

3.2. Foreign Evaluation Professionals

In the context of the model, foreign evaluators must become attuned to the complexities and challenges of evaluation in the inter-cultural setting. The attuned foreign evaluator must

possess an inter-cultural awareness or sensitivity and seek to acquire as much detail or information as is possible on the specific milieu in which the study is being conducted.

Fulfilling these criteria, an outside evaluator becomes better equipped to facilitate locally controlled evaluation studies.

3.2.1 Inter-Cultural Awareness

Inter-cultural awareness or the acceptance of differing cultural ideas, values, and norms coupled with the recognition of our limits within this plurality are pre-requisites for evaluator involvement in an inter-cultural setting. An awareness that one's personal cultural ideas, values and norms are not the only true and valid one's leaves one open to actions towards obtaining knowledge of specific cultures in which one may practice. At the same time, recognition that full knowledge may be unattainable is essential.

3.2.2 Obtaining Knowledge of Specific Cultures

If one might never be able to fully duplicate, replicate, or comprehend another's understanding or knowledge of a milieu, one may at least approach it. The approach, following from the notion of flexible alongside participation inferred from Childe, may entail:

- o Adaptation to the host culture.
- o Distancing from one's own culture.

Adaptation to the host culture means living close enough to the limits, conditions and tempo of the culture.⁴⁵ Immersion in the host culture is done for the purpose of maximizing exposure to the culture. Eating local foods, speaking the language, mixing with crowds and frequenting locales where no other foreigners go will introduce one to host cultural contexts, tastes, variations, and even potentialities.

Immersion in the host culture or the adaptive process calls for a distancing from one's own culture. Fears or aversions to local conditions must be overcome, and discomforts may be endured. Distancing from one's own culture is for the purpose of providing an appreciation and acceptance of the disparity between the host and one's own culture.⁴⁶

Evaluation inquiry, given local knowledge, necessitates a naturalistic or emergent study approach. Tolerance for ambiguity, patience, adaptiveness, capacity for tacit learning, and courtesy become essential personal ingredients to towards the construction of an evaluation approach sensitive to host country needs.⁴⁷ In the interpretation of experience in the host culture, many possibilities can arise; the elimination of

⁴⁵ F.Seefeldt, Cultural Considerations for Evaluation Consulting in the Egyptian Context, in M. Patton (ed.), "Culture and Evaluation," San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1985, p.73.

⁴⁶ *ibid.*, p.75.

⁴⁷ *ibid.*, p.76.

those possibilities which have the least explicative potentiality leaves one with that which perhaps best approaches local knowledge. As one's knowledge may ultimately be imperfect the further input of local aid beneficiaries becomes essential.

3.3. Foreign Evaluation Professional and Local Aid Beneficiaries

Foreign or outside evaluators must facilitate rather than dominant or control evaluation studies. Recognizing their own limitations for practical activity in a foreign cultural milieu, outside evaluation experts must aid local beneficiaries who in turn must conduct evaluation studies. By imparting skills and expertise to be adapted and used by local evaluators foreign evaluators facilitate evaluation through a human resource development approach. Outside evaluators can facilitate in the definition of needs and problems of the specific evaluation milieu and in the definition and execution of possible evaluation strategies.

3.3.1. Definition of Needs and Problems Within Milieux

Given legitimate management information concerns of donor agencies and legitimate aid recipient concerns, foreign evaluation professional and local beneficiaries must work in concert in the definition of the needs and problems of the

specific evaluation milieu. However, foreign evaluators must facilitate rather than dominate with their influence. Overall, as facilitators, foreign or outside evaluators can act as trainers in evaluation skills development for host country nationals who may then in turn train other host nationals. A human resource development approach can reduce host country dependencies by increasing skills and autonomy.

In evaluation outside one's familiar or personal milieu must expect and accommodate categorical or situational differences⁴⁸. As a foreign or outside professional may not always be able to expect and accommodate such differences, the control of local aid beneficiaries is essential. Local aid beneficiaries can indicate, define or refine potential issues, strategies, or approaches to ensure the evaluation is conducted in concert with the circumstances of the milieu. Incorporating knowledge of local beneficiaries will yield insight to aspects or factors within a milieu which might arise and affect the conduct of evaluation study. These aspects or factors which only local beneficiaries could identify, accommodate, and incorporate within an evaluation strategy include those which may be:

- o Uniquely cultural
- o Methodological
- o Ethical

Differences which are uniquely cultural and which necessitate

48 M.Merryfield, 1985, p.5.

control of local beneficiaries towards their resolution in evaluations can include:

A) Beliefs and Values:

Host culture beliefs and values may not coincide with basic project assumptions. Host educational expectations, work or attitudes towards graft and corruption would exemplify possible differences.

B) Sense of Time:

Host culture perceptions of or approach to the past, present and future may effect study logistics, the conceptualization of the project and its evaluation. The advances made by a project in two years may be noteworthy in one cultural yet deplorable in another.

C) Roles of Institutions

Host culture perceptions of the roles of institutions may differ. For example, more self-serving attitudes towards institutional influence or position may found. Approaches focussing on potential personal gains through performing one's service or job may be encountered.

D) Language or Communication Norms:

Unfamiliarity with the host language may lead to misunderstanding or misconceptions. The translation of concepts, uniquely cultural interpretations and connotations may not always be accurate. English speaking host interpreters may be atypical senior officials who do not communicate well with local populations. Obtaining equivalent information across different host language groups may lead to reliance on only certain individuals in the host culture.

With respect to communication norms host cultures, for example, may fear or distrust foreigners. The sex, age and credentials of the investigator may all play a role in his or her acceptance.

E) Infrastructure and Services:

Using one's own country standards to judge host country infrastructure i.e. postal service, roads, or bureaucracy may prove to be insufficient. Problems may arise as national records or other systems are perceived as unreliable.

F) Work Ethics

The "nine to five" work ethic is not universal. Approaches which stresses the quality of time spent working rather than productivity or total output could be encountered. Frequent

closing of establishments due to religious or other reasons may be unexpected or frustrating; study scheduling may be difficult or disrupted. Outsiders may be unfamiliar with local work habits or patterns which may be influenced by climatic factors such as hot or cooler periods during the day.

Differences which may impinge on methodological aspects of evaluation and which would necessitate the guidance and direction of local beneficiaries towards final resolution include:

A) Pre-ordinate Study Designs and Standardized Measures:

As the determination of variables is often difficult, evaluation issues and questions may be best decided on site. Pre-ordinate measure may overlook or neglect important data or information which may entirely contextual.

B) Methods:

Methods of investigation selected will impinge upon the quality of information gathered. Qualitative methods may be needed to develop quantitative questions. Ultimately, there may be no agreement on the approach to determining methods yet it is certain that scientific methods will not always be congruent with the host culture world view.

C) Data Collection:

The host culture may not share an understanding of evaluation, questionnaires, or anonymity. Communication norms vary by culture and these may dictate who may respond to questions and with which kinds of answers.

Differences related ethics are many and they present possibilities for rather harsh consequences. Confidentiality of respondents cannot always be protected; vested interests may react against project opposers. Evaluations may become politicized and be used only to justify project termination. Outside evaluators may carry and impose the baggage of Western imperialism or superiority. Lastly, satisfying the clients of the evaluation (or those who pay for it) may be completely different from satisfying the beneficiaries of the project.

Knowledge of the full range cultural, methodological, and ethical subtlety of milieux which can influence the conduct, quality and use of evaluations may not be obtainable by foreign or outside evaluators. The complexities and challenges involved in their accommodation are best left in the hand of local aid beneficiaries or those closest to the subtlety presented. The guidance and insight of local residents will ultimately determine feasible and situationally sensitive approaches to the execution of evaluations.

3.3.2. Definition and Execution of Evaluation Strategies

With the control of local beneficiaries, final evaluation resolutions sensitive to milieu ought to be defined and executed. Where evaluations are by and for local beneficiaries, final decisions on evaluation issues, questions, indicators, data sources, and collection procedures must be in their hands. Locally determined resolutions which focus on improving the quality of information gathered and the usefulness of evaluation include:⁴⁹

- o The use of a variety of information gathering strategies and information sources.
- o The involvement of host country people in the evaluation.
- o The use of evaluation teams.

Information gathering strategies and information sources refer to the use of multiple data collection approaches and multiple data sources. Data collection strategies would entail, for example, interviews, citation searches, observation and documentary analysis. Data sources would include persons affected by the project, national data bases, project records, ethnographic data, and the seeking out of project skeptics. Unintended outcomes or discrepancies of the findings may be uncovered by gathering information in many different ways and through different sources.

As well their maximal involvement in the conduct of studies,

⁴⁹ *ibid.*, p.13.

local beneficiaries become a source of evaluation data. This involvement will enhance study credibility, increase evaluation utilization and provide an outlet for better coping with differences. Specific host national involvements can include program staff and other client representatives.

Evaluation teams including technical, behavioral, and cultural specialists will provide a diversity of perspectives on the project, or aspect thereof. Team familiarity with the host culture and its language would be essential. Host nationals ought to decide on team composition and be incorporated into the evaluation team.

Improved information quality and usefulness, as an object of evaluation in an inter-cultural setting is critical from a development planning perspective. Planning decisions which employ evaluation can be only as reliable as the evaluation information itself. Beneficiary involvement fulfills a role of quality assurer. A sense of ownership of results following from local beneficiary enhances utilization. Local involvement might never account or compensate for such things as human mathematical error. However, it can guide in the selection of strategically more appropriate evaluation approaches given the particular foreign or international context. Planners calling upon evaluation information in making development assistance decisions ought to scrutinize closely chosen evaluation

strategies. Only when convinced of the inter-cultural suitability of evaluation information, ought planners to rely and call upon them in decision making.

3.4. Model Application

The above model for improved information quality and usefulness in international evaluation is used as a basis for the questionnaire survey of international evaluation professionals. The questionnaire survey examines various considerations or actions raised by the model. The survey solicited from international evaluation professionals, both within and outside government, views on the application of their knowledge of milieux in international evaluations; the involvement of local beneficiaries in carrying out studies; specific areas where problems of inter-cultural differences can re-orient thinking in the course of evaluation studies; and strategies towards improved evaluation information quality and usefulness.

Chapter 4

4.0 Research Findings

This chapter reports on the main research findings related to the problems of and approaches to inter-cultural differences as they arise in federal development assistance evaluation study. The findings are based on results of the mail-out questionnaire survey of international evaluation professionals across Canada.⁵⁰ The analysis of the information is conducted within the context of the model for improved evaluation information quality and usefulness established in Chapter 3 of this thesis. Within the model context, the objective of the survey was to ascertain from Canadian international evaluation professionals information including:

- o Whether and the extent to which their own personal knowledge of local milieux is considered important in the conduct of evaluation studies.
- o Whether and the extent to which local aid beneficiaries should be involved in the conduct of evaluation studies.
- o An assessment of inter-cultural factors which impinge on the quality and usefulness of international evaluations.
- o An assessment of various strategies to overcome difficulties posed in international evaluation.

Individuals directly involved in either the management or conduct of Canadian international program or project evaluation

⁵⁰ Refer to Appendices A. and B. respectively for a statement of the questionnaire methodology and an example questionnaire including summary statistics.

studies were selected as the study population. This population includes members of both private and public sectors. As well, technical specialists, say in agriculture or in other fields, who also participate in such evaluation studies are represented in the population. This entire group is referred to as Canadian international evaluation professionals.

4.1. Foreign Evaluators and Local Beneficiaries

The results of the questionnaire survey indicate that international evaluation professionals place great emphasis on the acquisition and use of their own personal knowledge of milieux. At the same time, these evaluators were less inclined to agree that indigenous evaluators (local aid beneficiaries) should take the lead role in managing and conducting studies. However, the evaluation professionals surveyed attached importance to the incorporation of indigenous evaluators into study teams for strategic purposes.

Approximately 84 per cent of respondents indicated their personal knowledge of milieux as 'always important' in their work. No respondent indicated that this knowledge was never important in the course of their activities.

The overall high degree of importance attached to this knowledge by international evaluation professionals is echoed

by their unanimous agreement (100 per cent) that such knowledge can contribute to improved evaluation information quality and usefulness.

Respondents were asked to indicate specific areas where they felt their knowledge of milieu will contribute to improved evaluation information quality and usefulness. The results of this question are listed in Table 4.0 below.

The results in Table 4.0 indicate that the majority of evaluators surveyed feel the knowledge is usefully applied in all the listed categories. It would take on particular importance in the selection of evaluation study indicators; the determination of data sources; the development of data gathering strategies; interpreting data; and in providing credibility to a study upon completion. In total, these responses affirm the overall importance of obtaining knowledge of cultures in the adaptation of methodologies and approaches to evaluation in the inter-cultural setting.

Table 4.0.

Uses of Local Knowledge:
Areas Where Evaluation Information Quality and
Usefulness Can Be Improved
(per cent affirmative)

<u>76%</u>	PREPARING EVALUATION STUDY OPTIONS	
<u>88%</u>	SELECTION OF EVALUATION INDICATORS	
<u>76%</u>	DESIGNING SURVEYS	
<u>80%</u>	DETERMINATION OF DATA SOURCES	
<u>84%</u>	DEVELOPMENT OF DATA GATHERING STRATEGIES	
<u>72%</u>	ASSESSING PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE REQUIRED FOR THE STUDY	
<u>80%</u>	INTERPRETING DATA	
<u>80%</u>	STUDY CREDIBILITY UPON COMPLETION	
<u>68%</u>	OVERALL RELIABILITY OF DATA	
<u>8%</u>	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	N=25

Source: Survey of International Evaluation Professionals, 1987.

Certain respondents noted that the benefits of this knowledge go beyond the improvement of evaluation information quality and usefulness. Respondent comments which indicate its usefulness in other aspects of development assistance included "it would also improve project identification and management" and that it contributes to "better definition of issues". Other comments which focussed on the limits to local knowledge included "in straight engineering jobs (local knowledge is) not too important"; "Local knowledge should be part of the team but does not need to be held by all members of the team"; "Evaluation may deal with domestic benefits of international aid and in such circumstances local knowledge is not needed because there is not much interest in impacts of the recipients. Typically it is important." Interestingly, the category "assessing professional expertise required for the study" was one of least selected areas where international evaluators felt having knowledge of local milieux makes a contribution.

A survey question asked whether in developing countries indigenous evaluators should take the lead role in managing and conducting studies. Here, 44 per cent of the sample took a neutral stance. The responses when re-calculated without the neutral cases indicated that only approximately 33 per cent of the sample agreed to strongly agreed that indigenous evaluators should take lead roles. The remaining 66 per cent of the

sample disagreed to strongly disagreed with the notion of lead roles for indigenous evaluators. Of this latter group approximately 50 per cent had 7 or more years of evaluation experience.

Despite their knowledge of milieux and what it may dictate, the evaluation professionals surveyed appear reluctant to hand over complete study responsibility to local or indigenous evaluators. In this regard respondent comments included, "indigenous evaluators can work effectively as co-managers, leaders, or researchers.", "depends on context and (indigenous evaluator) training."

A survey question asked the extent to which the sample agreed or disagreed that multi-disciplinary team approaches coupled with more local input can enhance evaluation effectiveness and utilization. Approximately 87 per cent of the sample was in agreement with the use of multi-disciplinary teams coupled with more local input. Of this group, approximately 52 per cent had 7 or more years of international evaluation experience.

Incorporating specialists and local beneficiaries in addition to evaluation specialists appears acceptable and necessary. By implication, the evaluation professionals surveyed realize technical specialists and local evaluators will possess knowledge of the practicality and details of local operations which perhaps could be beyond the research skills of an outside

evaluator. Interestingly, with respect to the use of scientific method by indigenous evaluators one respondent commented, "In fact, local professionals, researchers, and evaluators often maintain the most rigorous standards of "western" social science. At the same time there exists reluctance to allow local beneficiaries control over the management and conduct of studies. Indigenous personnel are to be incorporated into the research project from a strategic perspective point of view

While the sample is in agreement that local input to evaluation studies is beneficial, there appears to be a limit to this involvement from the perspective of outside evaluation professionals. Knowledge of the practicality and details of milieux of local personnel are seen as a necessary condition for their incorporation on evaluation teams but it is not accepted by the outside evaluation professionals surveyed as a sufficient condition for local control over the conduct and management of studies.

A number of reasons may explain the position taken by the professionals surveyed. In view of the need to ensure adequate handling of donor agency (the paying client) issues and concerns, the evaluators may insist on their participation. Nevertheless, these issues and concerns could receive adequate treatment by outside evaluators under studies which are managed

and directed by local or indigenous personnel. This situation begs the question of whether there exist sufficient numbers of trained indigenous personnel to conduct the studies. It has been previously indicated in the literature review that the IDRC notes a continued scarcity of well-trained local personnel. Certain respondent comments have echoed this concern.

4.2. Areas Where Problems of Inter-Cultural Difference Arise

Problems associated with inter-cultural differences, for the purposes of the questionnaire survey, were categorized under six general headings including beliefs and values; sense of time; roles of institutions; language or communication norms; infrastructure and services; and work ethics. Survey respondents were asked the extent to which they agree or disagree that problems arise out of differences under these general headings. By implication, the question considers the extent to which inter-cultural differences in these areas may affect, challenge, or re-orient thinking in evaluations. The results of this question appear below in Table 4.1.

The survey results indicate the majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that differences in approaches, attitudes or expectations in the categorized areas arise in the course of evaluation studies. In some areas, the data indicates that

approximately two-thirds or more of respondents agree to strongly agree that differences can pose difficulty in the course of evaluation studies. Following mean sample responses given for each of the areas, certain areas appear to pose greater difficulties in the course of studies. These areas ranked in order of magnitude include differences in language or communication norms, differences in beliefs and values; differences in views on the roles of institutions; and differences in sense of time.

Table 4.1

Potential Areas of Inter-Cultural Differences
In the Conduct of International Evaluations
(N=21)

<u>AREA</u>	<u>AGREE TO STRONGLY AGREE</u>	<u>NEUTRAL</u>	<u>DISAGREE TO STRONGLY DISAGREE</u>	<u>RANK AS A DIFFICULTY ENCOUNTERED*</u>
BELIEFS AND VALUES	67%	23%	0%	2
SENSE OF TIME	57%	33%	10%	4
ROLES OF INSTITUTIONS	67%	23%	10%	3
LANGUAGE OR COMMUNICATION NORMS	81%	14%	5%	1
INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES	50%	40%	5%	6
WORK ETHICS	62%	28%	10%	5

* This ranking in order of magnitude is based on the mean sample response for each of the listed areas. Refer to Appendix B. for complete scores.

Source: Survey of International Evaluation Professionals, 1987.

By implication, it may be said that each of these areas could

have an influence on evaluation approaches in an inter-cultural setting. There is confirmation that evaluator perspectives may not necessarily coincide with those dominant in the local evaluation setting.

Whether the number of years of evaluation experience had an effect on the degree to which problems area are perceived was also examined. A cross-tabulation of the number of years of evaluator experience by each of the areas listed was carried out. Table 4.2 below presents the results of this cross-tabulation for responses falling into the agree to strongly agree range of the specified problem areas.

Table 4.2.

Cross-Tabulation of Problem Areas Perceived
By Years of Evaluation Experience
(agree to strongly agree as per cent of all responses)

<u>YEARS OF EXPERIENCE</u>	<u>BELIEFS AND VALUES</u>	<u>SENSE OF TIME</u>	<u>ROLES OF INSTITUTIONS</u>	<u>LANGUAGE OR COMMUNICATION</u>	<u>INFRA-STRUCTURE AND SERVICES</u>	<u>WORK ETHICS</u>
1-3 YEARS	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
4-6 YEARS	67.2%	57.2%	79.7%	85.7%	66.7%	28.6%
7-9 YEARS	100.0%	100.0%	66.7%	100.0%	66.6%	100.0%
10 YEARS OR MORE	100.0%	87.8%	66.7%	88.9%	55.6%	77.7%

Source: Survey of International Evaluation Professionals, 1987.

Of the total agree to strongly agree responses for categories of differences including beliefs and values, sense of time, language and communication norms and work ethics, increased

response percentages are associated with more experienced evaluators. However, for other categories such as differences in roles of institutions and infrastructure and services response percentages are more uniform. Where greater proportions of more experienced evaluators are indicated, this data could serve to indicate the more problematic areas according to those most experienced in the evaluation field. It is interesting to note declines in certain percentages for the listed categories as years of evaluation experience increase. Some veteran evaluators, over time, may become perhaps more accustomed or philosophical throughout their transactive processes. Overall, the results illustrate that, regardless of the years of experience, the respondents remain cognizant of the possibility of problems arising out of differences in approaches to the listed categories.

The questionnaire survey also inquired whether ethical dilemmas such as in disclosure versus confidentiality, the politicization of studies or the imposition of western values often arise. Here, approximately 56 per cent of the sample agreed to strongly agreed; 36 per cent remained neutral; and 8 per cent disagreed to strongly disagreed such dilemmas arise often. Standard solutions to these situations are not easily recommended. However, certain respondent comments reflect the possibility of accommodating or minimizing such problems. These comments included "such disparities show poor evaluative technique/theoretical base."; "(ethical dilemmas) tend to

disappear with good representation." Whether proper evaluation techniques, theoretical bases or good representation (presumably on the evaluation team) would be able to reconcile ethical dilemmas remains unclear. Ultimately, the judgement of individual evaluators or evaluation teams will determine how well such dilemmas are resolved and the manner in which information quality and usefulness would be affected by them.

With knowledge of local circumstances with respect to such areas, evaluation methodologies and approaches may be better adapted to the inter-cultural setting and aimed at improved evaluation information quality and usefulness. The occurrence of these problems, demonstrating that outside evaluator knowledge may be insufficient, strengthens the case for increased indigenous involvement in evaluations. With better indigenous evaluator representation on the team or indigenous evaluator control, the effects of these problems would certainly be minimized.

4.3. Definition and Execution of Evaluation Strategies

The issue of local beneficiary involvement as a fundamental in international evaluation has been examined in section 4.1.. The professionals surveyed agreed on the benefit and importance of beneficiary involvement in evaluation teams but not on their complete control or conduct over studies.

The model for improved evaluation information quality and usefulness also explored views of international evaluation professionals in areas information gathering and data sources. Given their acceptance of the benefit and importance of local beneficiary involvement in evaluation teams, this involvement presumably extends the influence and participation of beneficiaries in decisions related to the strategies discussed below.

4.3.1. Information Gathering

Approximately 64 per cent of the sample felt that the need to employ a variety of information gathering strategies is more acute in international evaluation than say in domestic or non-international evaluations. Of this group, approximately 40 per cent had 7 or more years of experience in international evaluation. These strategies might include the interviews, documentary analysis, observation, national data bases and project records referred to in chapter 3. Respondent comments focussed on this topic included, for example, "exhaust Canadian data sources before field trip (the more you know before you arrive, the more you can learn from the field trip)", "need fairly long period in the field to ensure all key respondents can be contacted". Clearly, multiple lines of evidence would be recommended and essential in any evaluation.

Differences in language and communication norms has been ranked as a significant potential difficulty in international evaluation. The survey questionnaire asked whether local language interpreters usually provide consistent and reliable information. Approximately 45 per cent of the sample remained neutral or were unable to respond due to no experience. A recalculation of responses without the neutral cases indicated that approximately 64 per cent of the remaining sample disagreed to strongly disagreed that local language interpreters usually provide reliable and consistent information. These results might imply the importance of exercising caution in the selection and utilization of interpreters. There may no substitute for an outside evaluator alone to be functional in the local language.

4.3.2. Information Sources

When asked the extent to which they would agree or disagree that quantitative methods are more dependable than qualitative methods in international evaluation, approximately 62 per cent of the sample disagreed to strongly disagreed. Of this group, approximately 43 per cent had 7 or more years of international evaluation experience. Approximately 29 per cent in the sample agreed to strongly agreed that quantitative methods are more dependable. Of this latter group 20 per cent had 1 to six years experience and 10 per cent had 7 or more years of experience.

The remaining members surveyed remained neutral on the question.

Overall, the sample indicates quantitative methods would not always be reliable. However, that nearly one third of the sample felt quantitative methods are more dependable, a strong case for a blending of the two approaches in international study could be made.

Approximately 88 per cent of the sample agreed to strongly agreed that instances arise when the selection of study designs and measures are best decided on-site. Of this group, approximately, 54 per cent had 7 or more years of international evaluation experience. Pre-ordinate study designs and measures could be inflexible and could bear no relationship to the cultural context in which the study is to take place. Flexibility is always necessary. Sometimes designs and measures have to be adjusted. Relevant respondent comments in this regard included "criteria for evaluation has to be tailored for each country and project...sometimes more important to read between the lines.", "make the best use of what there is rather than focussing on excellent data."

4.4. Relationships With the Proposed Model

The results of the questionnaire survey leave one with a sense

of the difficulties and complexities of practical evaluation activity in an inter-cultural setting. Outside evaluators do accept that vast differences between the milieux occur; they strive obtain knowledge of milieux to affect what they consider to be measures towards improved information quality and usefulness. These measures have been shown to include the incorporation of indigenous personnel on evaluation teams. At the same time, this group does not agree that complete control of evaluation should be in the hands of local beneficiaries. The degree of local involvement becomes an extremely important aspect or consideration in international evaluation. The evaluators surveyed are aware of the difficulties, challenges, and the manner in differences can re-orient thinking in the course of studies. For this reason they would agree on the value of local participation. With local participation specific actions or resolutions may be pursued with an aim to improving information quality and usefulness. In the context of the questionnaire survey, significant actions or resolutions which at a minimum would necessitate local participation on a team would be in the selection of evaluation indicators, the determination of data sources, the development of data gathering strategies, and interpreting data and results. The methodological and practical importance of including at a minimum local beneficiary participation may be confirmed.

Given differences between milieux, factors which may be

uniquely cultural, methodological, or ethical impinge on efforts to improve evaluation information quality and usefulness emerge from the survey. With respect to uniquely cultural considerations, the survey results indicate a number of areas of difference the extent to which they may pose difficulty during or influence the conduct of international evaluations. Ethical dilemmas arise for outside evaluators; There was some suggestion in the sample that with proper evaluative techniques, a good theoretical basis, and good representation including local beneficiaries on evaluation teams, the occurrence of such problems may be minimized or their resolution would be made more easy.

Over and above local participation, methodological considerations in overcoming challenges of differing milieux have been shown to be many. Potential differences between milieux necessitate strategies and approaches which may have to be tailored in each individual case. Multiple information gathering strategies and data sources, a blending of qualitative and quantitative methods, having evaluators functional in the local language or the cautious use of local language interpreters are supported by the survey findings. Evaluator agreement with the importance of the on-site selection of study designs and measures, and the use of evaluation teams including technical specialists and local evaluators illustrate the influence of milieux on studies and the manner in which knowledge of milieux is necessary in developing strategies to circumvent potential problems as they may arise in international study.

Chapter 5

5.0. Conclusions and Prescriptions

The purpose of this thesis has been to raise awareness levels of planners and evaluators alike of the difficulties and complexities of work in an inter-cultural setting. It sought to stress that for the practitioner, the problem of gaining adequate knowledge of other cultures is paradoxical and not to be under-estimated. Differences between cultures and their influences on individuals are vast; bridges to help us resolve these differences are not easily found. In many cases, resolutions will not be found.

5.1. Recognition of Inter-Cultural Difference in Evaluation

Inter-cultural understanding, in the context of this thesis, has been defined to include an acceptance of vast differences as they will occur within and between cultures coupled with the admission of one's limitations in gaining knowledge of other cultures. This latter criteria or admission has been taken as the basis for what is meant by the phrase "recognition of inter-cultural difference."

As a group, the evaluation professionals surveyed clearly demonstrate an acceptance that milieux differ and that individually each milieu presents a unique challenge in a

practical sense. For this reason these professionals are to receive credit. However, at the same time there is reluctance on their part to admit there is no easy way out of the problems they face. It is not sufficient to argue that in an inter-cultural setting we may cope in a state of semi-readiness with our personal knowledge of milieu in order to resolve difficulties as they arise. In this context, it may be stated that the evaluation professional accept that differences exist but that they do not recognize them for their full import.

This thesis has stressed that viewing the world and resolving problems through the eyes of other individuals is not always possible. Recognizing this problem suggests that those closest to a particular milieu are the best ones to attack the problems within a milieu. Outsiders will be apart from the history and culture of a milieu while local inhabitants know the skills, and traditions as they emerge out of the environment. For this reason aid recipients are the best evaluators. The refusal of evaluation professionals to fully accept this role for aid beneficiaries appears as an under-estimation of inter-cultural reality and an over estimation of outsider abilities within the setting. While the professionals surveyed clearly accept the reality of inter-cultural differences, they fail to recognize their significance.

As a compromise, the evaluation community sees allocating roles

to local beneficiaries within study teams as beneficial. While this strategy may be a compromise it is likely one only for the local beneficiaries who without control over the conduct of these studies have no guarantee that final outcomes will be in terms which conform to the cultural or other realities of their context.

An alternative compromise is presented by this thesis. This compromise is in having outside or foreign evaluators only facilitate local beneficiaries in the conduct of evaluations. As facilitators foreign or outside evaluators can impart evaluation skills to local beneficiaries who will apply them in view of their knowledge of their milieu. While legitimate management information concerns of donor or approval do exist and these can receive proper treatment in locally controlled studies. A human resource development approach to evaluation will reduce recipient country dependencies by increasing skills and autonomy. This realization is taken as the recognition of inter-cultural difference in evaluation.

5.2. Prescriptive Measures

Stressing the complexities, paradoxes, and challenges of practical activity in an inter-cultural setting to planners and evaluators alike represents an important step forward in the full recognition of inter-cultural difference. Practitioners

must be made aware of the limits to their knowledge and understandings. A re-orientation of foreign evaluators roles from that of researcher to teacher or trainer to cultivate indigenous evaluator skills must follow. Foreign or outside evaluators must be able to provide the facility to local aid beneficiaries who will then conduct evaluations in their own terms which have meaning in their own context. Prescriptive measures towards the recognition of inter-cultural difference in development assistance evaluation fall in the domain of human resource development for professional evaluators and local aid beneficiaries.

5.2.1 Evaluation Policy Implications

The OCG as the government central agency responsible for evaluation and related organizations such as the Canadian Evaluation Society (CES) must assume greater responsibilities in the context of evaluation human resource development. They must direct activities which seek to further reduce local aid beneficiary dependency by increasing their skills and autonomy.

To attack the problem of shortages of skilled indigenous evaluators the OCG and CES must train evaluators to be trainers. This training must emphasize outside or foreign evaluators in the field have roles as advisors whose advice may be accepted or rejected.

Through workshops, exchanges, publications and other forms of skills development Canadian evaluators must become aware of the need and importance of local beneficiary control over evaluation activity.

Evaluation skills training and exchanges programs for countries participating in Canada's ODA program must commence immediately. This training may take place in either Canada or on-site in the countries in question. Evaluators from these countries must be given the opportunity to interpret and apply evaluation processes on their own terms. Trained indigenous evaluators must also become versed in the management information concerns of donor or approval agencies to ensure their studies treat issue of all concerned parties.

The OCG offers standard publications an evaluation approach to be applied by all government department or agencies regardless of the milieu in which they operate. Evaluation in an inter-cultural setting has been shown to be quite different from domestic or non-international evaluation studies. Specialized OCG publications and literature which stress the complexities of inter-cultural evaluations and the concomitant roles and responsibilities of foreign evaluators must be prepared and disseminated.

5.2.2. Development Assistance Policy

The importance of the quality and use of evaluation increases correspondingly with our committed increases to our levels of development assistance to Third World countries. At present Canada commits 0.5 per cent of the gross national product to official development assistance (ODA); it is committed to 0.6 per cent of GNP by 1995 and 0.7 per cent of GNP five years later. As increased levels of bilateral and multilateral aid are allocated, it is incumbent upon agencies to ensure that proper evaluative mechanisms are in place. Conditions which recognize the importance of and guarantee local control over evaluations must be attached to delivered aid.

Development assistance funding agencies would also have a role in stressing to central evaluation agencies that as delivered aid is for programs and projects by developing countries, evaluation too must be for and by developing countries.

Development assistance agencies must become more active the funding of evaluation human resource initiatives which stress the facilitator role of foreign evaluators in indigenously controlled evaluations.

5.3. Professional Planning Implications

Planning may entail evaluation but it is in no way limited to

or by it. They are similar to the extent that they are both transitive and represent actions that pass on to an object. However, evaluation, loosely defined, seeks only to ascertain amount or value. Planners, in not being limited to evaluation, extend themselves to the prescriptive processes and requirements for change. Planners, in not being limited by evaluation, have recognized shortcomings in rational numeric thought.⁵¹ At best, evaluation is a planning tool which if it is to be accepted in the context of inter-relation and exchange must also be sensitive to difference between milieux.

Sensitivity to milieux in the context of this thesis is found in the local control over the conduct and management of evaluations in an inter-cultural setting. Planners in calling upon the use of evaluations in the course of their activity must ensure this requirement is met. When evaluations are presented in a form with anything less, planners may question the studies for their inter-cultural appropriateness.

Furthermore, planners have a responsibility in emphasizing the role for foreign or outside evaluators as facilitators. Coming to terms as a professional with the practical complexities and challenges of work in an inter-cultural setting is essential for planners. Recognizing and not under-estimating the

⁵¹ H. Rittel and M. Weber, "Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning," in Policy Science, University of California, Berkeley, 1972, Volume 4 II, p. 14.

problems presented in inter-cultural settings must become a message for planners to carry. This message must be carried into every activity, whether in planning or using evaluations, directed towards increasing autonomy and reducing dependencies of developing nations.

For planners, substantive positive change implies betterment. In seeking betterment, a deontology is imposed which requires us to act and work in the best, right or correct manner. However, difficulties do arise as variability would be found in the belief in or selection of the best, right, or correct manner. We may inter-relate and exchange to precipitate betterment yet we may not escape the duty imposed. For this reason it has been argued that certain planning problems may not be solved but only re-solved - - over and over again.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bourguignon, E. and Greenbaum, L. "Diversity and Homogeneity in World Sciences." New Haven: Human Relations Area Files Inc., 1973.
- Cassen, R. "Does Aid Work?" Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Cassirer, E. "An Essay on Man." New Haven: Yale University Press, 1944.
- Childe, V.G., "Society and Knowledge." London: Novello and Co. Ltd., 1956.
- Cohen, L.J. "The Diversity of Meaning." London: Methuen & Co., 1962.
- Didsbury, H.F. (Ed.) "Creating a Global Agenda." Bethesda: World Future Society, 1984.
- Faludi, A. "Planning Theory." Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1973.
- Forss, K. "Planning and Evaluation In Aid Organizations." Stockholm: Institute of International Business, 1985.
- Friedmann, J. "Urbanization, Planning, and National Development." Beverley Hills: Sage Publications, 1973.
- Graves, F.L. Towards Practical Rigour: Methodological and Strategic Considerations for Program Evaluation, "Optimum.", Volume 15-4, 1984.
- Hardy, W.G. "Language, Thought, and Experience." Baltimore: University Park Press, 1978.
- Harris, M. "Culture, People, Nature." New York: Thomas Crowell, 1975.
- House, E.R. (Ed.) "Philosophy of Evaluation." San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.
- Howard, N. "Paradoxes of Rationality: Theory of Metagames and Political Behaviour." Cambridge: MIT Press, 1971.
- Hudson, J. (Ed.) "The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation." Volume 1 Number 1, Ottawa: Office of the Auditor General of Canada, 1986.
- IDRC "IDRC Evaluation Procedures Working Draft #1." Ottawa: IDRC, March 1985.

IDRC "The Evaluation of Externally Funded Research and Development Projects In Developing Countries." Ottawa: IDRC, April 1986.

IDRC "Evaluations In Third World National Research Systems: Some trends and Operational Experiences." Ottawa: IDRC, October 1985.

IDRC "The Role of Evaluation In Planning." Ottawa: IDRC, May 1984.

IDRC, "Evaluating National Research Systems and Programs In the Third World." Ottawa: IDRC, April 1985.

IDRC "Nazreth Workshop on IDRC Supported Research Projects In Ethiopia." Ottawa: IDRC, April 1984.

IDRC "Evaluation of IDRC Supported Projects at Sokoine University of Agriculture, Tanzania." Ottawa: IDRC, November 1985.

Kapferer, B. "Transaction and Meaning." Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues, 1976.

Kindleberger, C. and Herrick, B. "Economic Development." New York: McGraw-Hill Inc., 1977.

Lasch, C. "The Minimal Self." New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1984.

Lewis, W.A. "Theory of Economic Growth." London: Allen and Unwin, 1978.

Migueluez, R. "La comparaison interculturelle." Montral: Les Presses de l'Universit de Montral, 1977.

Mumford, L. "The Urban Prospect." New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World, 1968.

Office of the Comptroller General, Treasury Board. "Guide on the Program Evaluation Function." Ottawa: Government of Canada, 1981.

Office of the Comptroller General, Treasury Board. "Principles for the Evaluation of Programs." Ottawa: Government of Canada, 1981.

Padilla, A. (ed.) "Acculturation." Boulder: Westview Press, 1980.

Osgood, C.E. et. al. "The Measurement of Meaning." Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1967.

Paris, C, (ed.) "Critical Readings in Planning Theory." Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1982.

Patton, M.Q. (Ed.) "Culture and Evaluation." San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Perloff, R. and E. (eds.) "Values, Ethics, and Standards in Evaluation." San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Polyani, M. "The Study of Man." London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1959.

Rittel, H. and Weber, M. Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning in "Policy Science" Volume 4 II, 1973. Berkeley: University of California.

Russell, B. "An Inquiry Into Meaning and Truth." London: Unwin and Allen, 1966.

Szalay, L.B. "Subjective Meaning and Culture." Hillsdale: Erlbaum Associates, 1978.

Schlipp, P.A. (ed.) "The Philosophy of Ernst Cassirer." Menasha: Geo. Banta Publishing Co., 1949.

Sjoberg, G. "The Preindustrial City." New York: Macmillan Publishing, 1960.

Taylor J. and Williams, D. (Eds.) "Urban Planning Practice In Developing Countries." New York: Pergamon Press, 1982.

Appendix A.

Questionnaire Survey Method

Sample Design and Selection

Establishing public sector evaluation professionals entailed consultation with a variety of sources and directories. Initially, and in efforts to complete a study sample, it was hoped that the public sector evaluation staff would be able to provide names of private sector consultants who do work on their behalf. This method proved futile due to official concern over the propriety of distributing such information. A second avenue entailed the establishment of contacts with known consultants or contractors operating in the field. These contacts were asked if they could provide the names of other private sector individuals involved in international evaluation studies. This method proved successful. A final sample including approximately 50 individuals involved in international program evaluation activities was attained.

Biases

The sample is heavily weighted towards "private sector" evaluation professionals or those who conduct evaluation work on behalf of government agencies. Approximately only 20 per cent of those to whom questionnaires were sent are "public sector" evaluation professional. However, as it is presumable

that private sector evaluators carry out their activities under contract and to the satisfaction of their public sector clients, this bias would be only marginal.

As much as possible a Canada-wide sample base was sought. A bias was seen in the possible concentration on national capital region professionals. However, the concentration of evaluation professionals in and around the national capital region may simply be a fact and likely does not represent a bias. Rather, not having such a concentration found in the sample might indicate bias. The concentration of professional in and around the national capital region is reflected in the approximate provincial sample distribution which is as follows:

Quebec	21 per cent
Ontario and NCC	66 per cent
Manitoba	2 per cent
Saskatchewan	2 per cent
British Columbia	9 per cent

Questionnaire Design

An initial mail-out questionnaire was subjected to a pilot test. Prior to the pilot test, comments on the initial design had been solicited from numerous sources including faculty at the University of Manitoba; the Carleton University Norman Paterson School of International Affairs, and evaluation staff at CIDA.

For the pilot test, questionnaires were sent to evaluation staff at the IDRC and one copy was sent to the director of Program Evaluation at the Department of External Affairs in Ottawa. The pilot results were most helpful in suggesting survey areas in need of clarification or modification.

Revisions based on the pilot suggestions are incorporated in a final questionnaire. This final questionnaire which appears in Appendix B. was mailed-out on April 12, 1987.

Interviewees

As indicated, individuals involved in the direct conduct or management of evaluation studies in either the public or private sectors plus a variety of technical specialists were included in the survey population. A listing of the firms or agencies included in the survey population is presented on the following pages:

Survey Sample:
Questionnaire on Inter-Cultural Difference In Federal
Development Assistance Evaluation

DPA Group
220 Laurier Avenue West
Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5Z9

ABT Associates
90 Sparks Street
Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5T8

Price Waterhouse
Box 151
Toronto Dominion Centre
Toronto, Ontario M5K 1G1

Universalia Management Systems
2086 Tupper Street
Montreal, Quebec H3H 1N8

Nawitka Resource Consultants
840 Cormorant Street
Victoria, British Columbia V8W 1R1

N. Thomas, Agronomist
Box R.R. #1
Mallorytown, Ontario K0E 1R0

School of Agricultural Economics
University of Saskatoon
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

CUSO
135 Rideau Street
Ottawa, Ontario K1N 9K7

EDPRA Consultants
200 Elgin Suite 803
Ottawa, Ontario K2P 1L5

IDRC-Evaluation Division
Box 8500
Ottawa, Ontario K1G 3H9

Woods Gordon Management
55 Metcalfe Street
Ottawa, Ontario K1P 1L5

Mr. David Rain
4695 St. Jacques Suite 203
Montreal, P.Q. H4A 2E6

Transportation Institute
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba R3T 2N2

Econosult Incorporated
1100 Dorchester Blvd. W.
Montreal, Quebec H3B 4N4

Hickling Management
350 Sparks Street
Ottawa, Ontario K1R 7S8

Goss Gilroy and Associates
601-124 O'Conner Street
Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5M9

DPA Group
131-601 West Cordova
Vancouver. B.C. V6B 1G1

DPA Group
347 Bay Street # 903
Toronto, Ontario M5H 2R7

Strategic Management Assoc.
275 Slater Street #801
Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5H9

Jaidco Consultants Ltd.
2415 Southvale
Ottawa, Ontario K1B 4T9

Hamilton International
P.O. Box 499
Arnrior, Ontario K7S 3L9

Universalia Management
2086 Tupper Street
Montreal, Quebec H3H 1N8

Price Waterhouse Ltd.
180 Elgin Street
Ottawa, Ontario K2P 2K3

Consultation Nadeau
275 St. Jacques West #50
Montreal, Quebec H2Y 1M9

Ms. Carol Eggan
2570 Southvale Crescent #9
Ottawa, Ontario K1B 5B7

Henry Fletcher
304 Taylor Road
Westhill, Ontario M1C 2R6

MMB Rural Development Corp.
1292 Chattaway
Ottawa, Ontario K1H 7S4

Mr. Yves-Andre Provost
6229 Chemin Deacon
Montreal, Quebec H3S 2P6

Lopata Inc.
15 Rue Des Caps
St. Romual, Quebec G6W 3S4

Director Program Evaluation
CIDA
200 Promenade du Portage
Hull, Quebec K1A 0G4

Treasury Board
CIDA Evaluation Liason
L'Esplanade Laurier
Ottawa, Ontario

Coop D'Animation
800 rue Cherrier
Montreal, Quebec H2L 2P5

P. Egli Inc.
65 Chemin St. Andrews
Baie D'Urfe, Quebec H9X 2T9

Serexpert Ltee.
845 rue Cardinal
St. Laurent, Quebec H41 3E3

Inmanex Inc.
14 Okanagan Drive
Ottawa, Ontario K2H 7E8

Director, Evaluation
Dept. of External Affairs
L.B. Pearson Building,
Ottawa, Ontario

Treasury Board
External Affairs Evaluation
Liason
L'Esplanade Laurier
Ottawa, Ontario

Note: In some cases more than one individual in the firm or agency received a questionnaire form.

Appendix B.

QUESTIONNAIRE ON INTER-CULTURAL DIFFERENCE IN FEDERAL
DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE EVALUATION

- A) NAME: _____
- B) TITLE: _____
- C) FIRM OR GOVERNMENT 20% - PUBLIC
AGENCY: 80% - PRIVATE N=25
- D) TELEPHONE: () _____
- E) PLEASE INDICATE THE NUMBER OF YEARS YOU PERSONALLY HAVE WORKED IN THE AREA OF INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION:
i. 0% LESS THAN 1 YEAR
ii. 8% 1-3 YEARS
iii. 36% 4-6 YEARS
iv. 12% 7-9 YEARS
v. 44% 10 YEARS OR MORE N=25

- F) ON THE SEVEN POINT SCALE TO THE RIGHT, PLEASE INDICATE THE DEGREE OF IMPORTANCE YOU ATTACH TO KNOWLEDGE OF LOCAL MILIEUX (e.g. THROUGH PERSONAL EXPOSURE TO CUSTOMS, LIFESTYLES, TASTES, etc...) IN INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION WORK. (strike anywhere on line.)
- | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|---|---------------------|---|---|-----------------|---|
| | : | : | : | : | : | : | : |
| | : | : | : | : | : | : | : |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | ALWAYS IMPORTANT | | SOMETIMES IMPORTANT | | | NEVER IMPORTANT | |

- G) CAN HAVING THIS LOCAL KNOWLEDGE CONTRIBUTE TO IMPROVED EVALUATION INFORMATION AND USEFULNESS?
100% YES 0% NO N=25
 $\bar{X}=1.9$ STD.D.= 1.0 N=25

- H) IF YES, INDICATE IN WHICH AREAS? (MORE THAN ONE AREA CAN BE SELECTED)

- i. 76% PREPARING EVALUATION STUDY OPTIONS
- ii. 88% SELECTION OF EVALUATION INDICATORS
- iii. 76% DESIGNING SURVEYS
- iv. 80% DETERMINATION OF DATA SOURCES
- v. 84% DEVELOPMENT OF DATA GATHERING STRATEGIES
- vi. 72% ASSESSING PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE REQUIRED FOR THE STUDY
- vii. 80% INTERPRETING DATA
- viii. 80% STUDY CREDIBILITY UPON COMPLETION
- ix. 68% OVERALL RELIABILITY OF DATA
- x. 8% OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY) _____ N=25

- I) TO WHAT EXTENT WOULD YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE THAT INTER-CULTURAL DIFFERENCES, SUCH AS IN APPROACHES, EXPECTATIONS, OR ATTITUDES TOWARD THE AREAS BELOW, POSE DIFFICULTIES IN THE COURSE OF INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION STUDIES.

- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|---|---------|---|---|-------------------|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|----------------|--|---------|--|--|-------------------|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|----------------|--|---------|--|--|-------------------|--|
| <p>i. BELIEFS AND VALUES:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td></td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="2">STRONGLY AGREE</td> <td colspan="3">NEUTRAL</td> <td colspan="2">STRONGLY DISAGREE</td> </tr> </table> <p>$\bar{X}=2.7$ STD.D.=1.1 N=21</p> | | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | STRONGLY AGREE | | NEUTRAL | | | STRONGLY DISAGREE | | <p>ii. SENSE OF TIME:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td></td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="2">STRONGLY AGREE</td> <td colspan="3">NEUTRAL</td> <td colspan="2">STRONGLY DISAGREE</td> </tr> </table> <p>$\bar{X}=3.1$ STD.D.=1.5 N=21</p> | | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | STRONGLY AGREE | | NEUTRAL | | | STRONGLY DISAGREE | |
| | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | STRONGLY AGREE | | NEUTRAL | | | STRONGLY DISAGREE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | STRONGLY AGREE | | NEUTRAL | | | STRONGLY DISAGREE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>iii. ROLES OF INSTITUTIONS</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td></td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="2">STRONGLY AGREE</td> <td colspan="3">NEUTRAL</td> <td colspan="2">STRONGLY DISAGREE</td> </tr> </table> <p>$\bar{X}=2.9$ STD.D.=1.1 N=21</p> | | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | STRONGLY AGREE | | NEUTRAL | | | STRONGLY DISAGREE | | <p>iv. LANGUAGE OR COMMUNICATION NORMS:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td></td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="2">STRONGLY AGREE</td> <td colspan="3">NEUTRAL</td> <td colspan="2">STRONGLY DISAGREE</td> </tr> </table> <p>$\bar{X}=2.4$ STD.D.=1.2 N=21</p> | | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | STRONGLY AGREE | | NEUTRAL | | | STRONGLY DISAGREE | |
| | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | STRONGLY AGREE | | NEUTRAL | | | STRONGLY DISAGREE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | STRONGLY AGREE | | NEUTRAL | | | STRONGLY DISAGREE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>v. INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td></td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="2">STRONGLY AGREE</td> <td colspan="3">NEUTRAL</td> <td colspan="2">STRONGLY DISAGREE</td> </tr> </table> <p>$\bar{X}=3.4$ STD.D.=1.1 N=21</p> | | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | STRONGLY AGREE | | NEUTRAL | | | STRONGLY DISAGREE | | <p>vi. WORK ETHICS:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td></td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> <td>:</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="2">STRONGLY AGREE</td> <td colspan="3">NEUTRAL</td> <td colspan="2">STRONGLY DISAGREE</td> </tr> </table> <p>$\bar{X}=3.2$ STD.D.=1.4 N=21</p> | | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | STRONGLY AGREE | | NEUTRAL | | | STRONGLY DISAGREE | |
| | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | STRONGLY AGREE | | NEUTRAL | | | STRONGLY DISAGREE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | : | : | : | : | : | : | : | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | STRONGLY AGREE | | NEUTRAL | | | STRONGLY DISAGREE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Appendix C.

SPSSX Log File:
 Survey on Inter-Cultural Difference In
 Development Assistance Evaluation

14 MAY 87 SPSS-X Release 2.1 for Honeywell CP-6
 11:11:45 Carleton University (Academic) Honeywell CP-6

SPSS-X for CP-6 Carleton University (Academic) License Number 232

1.000 1 0 TITLE SURVEY ON INTER-CULTURAL DIFFERENCE IN EVALUATION
 2.000 2 0 DATA LIST RECORD=1 /1 NAME 1-10(a) AGENCY 11 YEARS 12 KNOWNMIL 13-15
 3.000 3 0 HAVKNOW 16 AREAS1 17 AREAS2 18 AREAS3 19 AREAS4 20 AREAS5 21
 4.000 4 0 AREAS6 22 AREAS7 23 AREAS8 24 AREAS9 25 AREAS10 26
 5.000 5 0 BELVAL 27-29 SENTIME 30-32 INSTIT 33-35
 6.000 6 0 LANGCOM 36-38 INFRA 39-41 WORKETH 42-44 QUALQUAN 45-47 INTERP 48-50
 7.000 7 0 TEAMAPP 51-53 ONSITE 54-56 ACUTE 57-59 DILEMMA 60-62 LEADROLE 63-65
 8.000 8 0 PROGSTUD 66 PROJSTUD 67 OBJECT 68

THE ABOVE DATA LIST STATEMENT WILL READ 1 RECORDS FROM FILE SURCOM1.PH180004
 VARIABLE REC START END FORMAT WIDTH DEC

VARIABLE	REC	START	END	FORMAT	WIDTH	DEC
NAME	1	1	10	A	10	
AGENCY	1	11	11	F	1	0
YEARS	1	12	12	F	1	0
KNOWNMIL	1	13	15	F	3	0
HAVKNOW	1	16	16	F	1	0
AREAS1	1	17	17	F	1	0
AREAS2	1	18	18	F	1	0
AREAS3	1	19	19	F	1	0
AREAS4	1	20	20	F	1	0
AREAS5	1	21	21	F	1	0
AREAS6	1	22	22	F	1	0
AREAS7	1	23	23	F	1	0
AREAS8	1	24	24	F	1	0
AREAS9	1	25	25	F	1	0
AREAS10	1	26	26	F	1	0
BELVAL	1	27	29	F	3	0
SENTIME	1	30	32	F	3	0
INSTIT	1	33	35	F	3	0
LANGCOM	1	36	38	F	3	0
INFRA	1	39	41	F	3	0
WORKETH	1	42	44	F	3	0
QUALQUAN	1	45	47	F	3	0
INTERP	1	48	50	F	3	0
TEAMAPP	1	51	53	F	3	0
ONSITE	1	54	56	F	3	0
ACUTE	1	57	59	F	3	0
DILEMMA	1	60	62	F	3	0
LEADROLE	1	63	65	F	3	0
PROGSTUD	1	66	66	F	1	0
PROJSTUD	1	67	67	F	1	0
OBJECT	1	68	68	F	1	0

END OF DATALIST TABLE.

9.000	9	0	VARIABLE LABELS
10.000	10	0	YEARS 'YEARS IN EVALUATION'
11.000	11	0	KNOWMIL 'KNOWLEGDE OF MILIEUX'
12.000	12	0	HAVKNOW 'KNOWLEDGE CONTRIBUTES'
13.000	13	0	AREAS1 'STUDY OPTIONS'
14.000	14	0	AREAS2 'INDICATOR SELECT'
15.000	15	0	AREAS3 'DESIGNING SURVEY'
16.000	16	0	AREAS4 'DATA SOURCES'
17.000	17	0	AREAS5 'DATA GATHERING'
18.000	18	0	AREAS6 'ASSESSING EXPERTS'
19.000	19	0	AREAS7 'INTERPRETING DATA'
20.000	20	0	AREAS8 'STUDY CREDIBILITY'
21.000	21	0	AREAS9 'DATA RELIABILITY'
22.000	22	0	AREAS10 'OTHER'
23.000	23	0	BELVAL 'BELIEFS/VALUES'
24.000	24	0	SENTIME 'SENSE OF TIME'
25.000	25	0	INSTIT 'INSTITUTIONAL ROLES'
26.000	26	0	LANGCOM 'LANGUAGE/COMMUNICATION'
27.000	27	0	INFRA 'INFRASTRUCTURE'
28.000	28	0	WORKETH 'WORKETHIC'
29.000	29	0	QUALQUAN 'MORE DEPENDABLE'
30.000	30	0	INTERP 'INTERPRETOR INFO'
31.000	31	0	TEAMAPP 'MULTI-DISCIP/LOCAL INPUT'
32.000	32	0	ONSITE 'ON-SITE SELECTION'
33.000	33	0	ACUTE 'ACUTNESS OF INFO NEEDS'
34.000	34	0	DILEMMA 'DILEMMAS ARISE'
35.000	35	0	LEADROLE 'INDIGENOUS EVALUATORS'
36.000	36	0	PROGSTUD 'PROGRAM STUDIES'
37.000	37	0	PROJSTUD 'PROJECT STUDIES'
38.000	38	0	OBJECT 'OBJECTION TO NAME USE'
39.000	39	0	VALUE LABELS AGENCY 1 'PUBLIC' 2 'PRIVATE'/YEARS 1 'LESS THAN 1 YEAR'
40.000	40	0	2 '1-3 YEARS' 3 '4-6 YEARS' 4 '7-9 YEARS' 5 '10 YEARS OR MORE'/
41.000	41	0	KNOWMIL 1 'ALWAYS IMPORTANT' 4 'SOMETIMES IMPORTANT' 7 'NEVER IMPORTANT'
42.000	42	0	/HAVKNOW 1 'YES' 2 'NO'/AREAS1 AREAS2 AREAS3 AREAS4 AREAS5
43.000	43	0	AREAS6 AREAS7 AREAS8 AREAS9 AREAS10 1 'YES' 0 'NO'/BELVAL
44.000	44	0	1 'STRONGLY AGREE' 4 'NEUTRAL' 7 'STRONGLY DISAGREE'/SENTIME 1
45.000	45	0	'STRONGLY AGREE' 4 'NEUTRAL' 7 'STRONGLY DISAGREE'/INSTIT 1
46.000	46	0	'STRONGLY AGREE' 4 'NEUTRAL' 7 'STRONGLY DISAGREE'/LANGCOM 1
47.000	47	0	'STRONGLY AGREE' 4 'NEUTRAL' 7 'STRONGLY DISAGREE'/INFRA 1
48.000	48	0	'STRONGLY AGREE' 4 'NEUTRAL' 7 'STRONGLY DISAGREE'/WORKETH 1
49.000	49	0	'STRONGLY AGREE' 4 'NEUTRAL' 7 'STRONGLY DISAGREE'/QUALQUAN 1
50.000	50	0	'STRONGLY AGREE' 4 'NEUTRAL' 7 'STRONGLY DISAGREE'/INTERP 1
51.000	51	0	'STRONGLY AGREE' 4 'NEUTRAL' 7 'STRONGLY DISAGREE'/TEAMAPP 1
52.000	52	0	'STRONGLY AGREE' 4 'NEUTRAL' 7 'STRONGLY DISAGREE'/ONSITE 1
53.000	53	0	'STRONGLY AGREE' 4 'NEUTRAL' 7 'STRONGLY DISAGREE'/ACUTE 1
54.000	54	0	'STRONGLY AGREE' 4 'NEUTRAL' 7 'STRONGLY DISAGREE'/DILEMMA 1
55.000	55	0	'STRONGLY AGREE' 4 'NEUTRAL' 7 'STRONGLY DISAGREE'/LEADROLE 1
56.000	56	0	'STRONGLY AGREE' 4 'NEUTRAL' 7 'STRONGLY DISAGREE'/PROGSTUD 1
57.000	57	0	'1-5 STUDIES' 2 '6-10 STUDIES' 3 '11-20 STUDIES' 4 '21-30 STUDIES'
58.000	58	0	5 '31-40 STUDIES' 6 '41-50 STUDIES' 7 '51 OR MORE'/PROJSTUD 1
59.000	59	0	'1-5 STUDIES' 2 '6-10 STUDIES' 3 '11-20 STUDIES' 4 '21-30 STUDIES'

60.000 60 0 5 '31-40 STUDIES' 6 '41-50 STUDIES' 7 '51 OR MORE'/OBJECT 1 'YES' 2
 61.000 61 0 'NO'
 62.000 62 0 MISSING VALUES BELVAL KNOWMIL SENTIME INSTIT LANGCOM INFRA WORKETH
 63.000 63 0 QUALQUAN INTERP TEAMAPP ONSITE ACUTE DILEMMA LEADROLE (9.9)
 64.000 64 0 LIST VARIABLES=ALL/CASES=25

THERE ARE 19384 WORDS OF MEMORY AVAILABLE.
 THE LARGEST CONTIGUOUS AREA HAS 19362 WORDS
 371 WORDS OF MEMORY REQUIRED FOR LIST PROCEDURE.
 92 WORDS HAVE ALREADY BEEN ACQUIRED.
 279 WORDS REMAIN TO BE ACQUIRED.

NAME	Y	S	L	W	U	Q	T	L	A	S	A	K	H	A	B	E	I	N	N	I	R	L	N	A	N	A	C	E	R	S	T	M	H	L	D	P	R	O	P	R	O
25	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	2	1	3	2	3	4	4	2	4	3	4	3	4	1	1	2											
22	4	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	1	0	2										
23	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	3	6	3	3	4	6	6	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	1	2	2												
25	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	2	2	4	1	3	3	4	4	1	2	6	2	4	3	0	2													
25	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	3	4	3	2	4	2	5	4	2	2	2	2	2	5	1	1	1												
25	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	2	2	1	3	3	2	5	4	1	1	4	3	1	1	1	1	2												
25	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	3	5	3	5	4	6	4	3	2	3	4	10	1	1	2													
25	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	3	4	6	3	7	4	1	1	1	1	4	6	0	6	2												
24	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	4	2	4	3	2	5	4	3	3	2	2	4	6	1	1	2												
24	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	3	2	4	3	4	2	7	5	2	4	3	3	5	4	2	2	2												
23	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	4	4	2	1	2	4	5	4	2	3	1	4	4	2	2	2													
23	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	4	4	2	1	2	4	5	4	2	3	1	4	4	2	2	2													
24	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	4	2	2	2	3	4	1	3	2													
23	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	4	3	5	5	4	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	2	1	1	2													
25	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	3	3	3	2	3	3	10	5	10	3	4	4	4	9	9	1													
12	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	5	3	2	3	2	6	1	7	2													
23	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	4	4	2	3	3	4	4	2	6	2	3	4	2	4	0	1	2													
13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	4	3	3	10	3	7	3	3	10	3	6	5	1	7	2													
25	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	7	4	1	4	7	6	6	1	2	4	2	4	1	1	2													
13	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	9	1	1	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	3	10	2	10	2	0	2													
13	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	1	10	6	10	2	2	2													
15	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	1	10	4	10	2	0	2													
25	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	4	3	4	1	4	1	6	6	2	2	2	2	5	1	2	2													
23	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	1	2	2	1	4	1	0	2													
25	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	10	10	10	10	10	10	2	3	2	1	3	2	4	1	1	1	2													

NUMBER OF CASES READ = 25 NUMBER OF CASES LISTED = 2
 PRECEDING TASK REQUIRED 1.70 SECONDS CPU TIME; 153.37 SECONDS ELAPSED.
 92.000 66 0 FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=ALL
 93.000 67 0 /STATISTICS=DEFAULT
 THERE ARE 19930 WORDS OF MEMORY AVAILABLE.
 THE LARGEST CONTIGUOUS AREA HAS 19930 WORDS.
 ***** MEMORY ALLOWS A TOTAL OF 2847 VALUES, ACCUMULATED ACROSS ALL VARIABLES.