



The evaluation hikoi: A Maori overview of programme evaluation

Helen Moewaka Barnes

Te Ropu Whariki

**This resource is designed to be used alongside other toolkits
to be available on the Whariki Research Group website.**

<http://www.whariki.ac.nz/>



Massey University

Last modified February 2009

Contents

Acknowledgements	2
Introduction	3
Our approach	3
Treaty of Waitangi	3
Models and frameworks	4
Programme evaluation	8
What is programme evaluation?	8
What is Maori evaluation?	9
Different approaches	10
He tangata: Maori evaluators	11
Competencies	11
Ethics	12
Power and relationships	12
The status of knowledge and evidence	13
The relationship between programme planning and evaluation	15
Programme design, planning and reporting	15
Intervention logic	16
Types of evaluation	18
Formative evaluation	18
Needs assessments	18
Process evaluation	19
Impact and outcome evaluation	19
A story	21
Doing evaluation	23
Evaluation design	23
Data collection: information gathering methods	25
Literature reviews	25
Observation and audits	26
Visual methods	26
Qualitative methods	26
Quantitative methods	27
Question design	27
Interview techniques	28
Data analysis and interpretation	29
Analysing interviews	30
Analysing numbers	31
Communicating results	32
Written reports	33
Formatting a report	34
Publications	35

Acknowledgements

He mihi nui ki a Belinda Borell, Wendy Henwood, Sandy Kerr, Jenny Rankine and others from Whariki who made valuable comments on this resource.

I would also like to acknowledge past Whariki and SHORE workers and other colleagues who have been involved in building evaluation knowledge including: Sally Casswell, Brendon Dacey, Paul Duignan, Fran Holibar, Kate McKegg, Sharon Milne, Bridgette Masters, Carla Spinola, Paul Stanley, Megan Tunks and Anaru Waa.

Introduction

Our approach

This book aims to:

- Provide the reader with an overview of the issues surrounding public health programme evaluation by and for Maori
- Give examples of the range of approaches that might be useful
- Highlight areas that evaluators may need to consider.

There are many different models and frameworks that can be used to guide indigenous researchers. Our approach has been to grapple with what it means, as Maori, to carry out formative, process and impact evaluation. The issues involved are described in this book. They include considerations of ownership, power, how to describe and identify measures and the challenges of maintaining credibility as Maori and as Maori evaluators. We acknowledge that much of this will be familiar to those experienced in programme provision or evaluation. It is our hope this book might provide new perspectives or insights.

We will introduce the reader to a range of possible ways of carrying out evaluation, recognising that these are but a few examples illustrating the diversity of Maori approaches. Maori evaluation is a site of ongoing creativity and development.

Treaty of Waitangi

Te Tiriti o Waitangi, the agreement between the tribes of New Zealand and the Crown outlining the rights and obligations of both parties, is relevant to Maori research and evaluation because it provides a framework for relationships, encompassing issues of ownership, control, equity, involvement and participation.

The Treaty, developed in part as a response to concerns over Maori health and wellbeing (Durie, 1994:83-84, Health Promotion Forum, 2002), obliges the Crown to reduce disparities between Maori and non-Maori. It is the overarching point of difference between research and evaluation in Aotearoa and research and evaluation in other contexts.

Generally, partnership, participation and protection have been identified as primary principles of the Treaty (Durie, 1994). However, definitions of these and of tino rangatiratanga are diverse. Encompassed by tino rangatiratanga in Article Two of the Treaty are the rights to exercise Maori world views, authority and control; meaning, in part, that we have a right to assert Maori worldviews as normal and legitimate. Smith (1996b) also outlines the way in which tino rangatiratanga relates to research questions such as what research is done, how it is done and what benefits and ownership accrue to what groups. Article Three supports equity of health status and the need to provide resources and evaluate outcomes for Maori.

Models and frameworks

There are a number of models and frameworks that can be used to guide Maori and other indigenous researchers. Although these models use different approaches, there are also understandings that are often common to these conceptualisations -

- Control and ownership
- Meeting indigenous/Maori needs and aspirations
- Carried out within an indigenous/Maori worldview, which is likely to question the dominant culture and norms
- Aiming to make a positive difference; transformative.

Health and health promotion models

Maori models of health are holistic and include *Te Whare Tapa Wha* (Durie, 1994), which conceptualises health as the four walls of a whare: Taha wairua, taha tinana, taha hinengaro and taha whanau. *Te Wheke* (Pere, 1988) uses each of the eight tentacles of the octopus to describe a dimension of health and uses the body to represent whanau unity. The intertwining of the tentacles reflects the interconnectedness of each dimension. *Nga Pou Mana* describes four supports as the foundation for social policies and well-being: Family; cultural heritage; physical environment; and turangawaewae (Royal Commission on Social Policy, 1989, cited in Durie, 1994).

Te Pae Mahutonga (the Southern Cross star constellation), was developed by Professor Mason Durie. The four central stars represent goals for a Maori health promotion model: Mauriora, access to te ao Maori; Waiora, environmental protection; Toiora, healthy lifestyles; Te Oranga, participation in society. The two pointers needed to undertake the tasks are Nga Manukura, leadership and; Te Mana Whakahaere, autonomy. Under each of these there is a five pointed star with a domain connected to each point. For example under Mauriora the domains are: usage; social resources; economic resources; language and knowledge, and culture and cultural institutions (Durie, 2000).

TUHA-NZ, a framework to assist health promotion providers to understand and apply the Treaty was produced by the Health Promotion Forum of New Zealand (2002). It uses the Treaty articles as goals under which objectives, strategies and performance indicators can be developed. The framework clarifies the meaning of each article in relation to health promotion and outlines issues to consider. *TUHA-NZ* gives examples of three specific goals related to the Treaty articles:

1. Achieve Maori participation in all aspects of health promotion
2. Achieve the advancement of Maori health aspirations
3. Undertake health promotion action which improves Maori health outcomes.

The framework then demonstrates how objectives, strategies and performance indicators might be developed under these goals. Although not necessarily applicable to Maori programme provision, this may be a useful document to read.

Community action is commonly to improve health and addresses a specific issue or issues. Communities work together to take action that may involve a range of

community groups and other agencies, from local to national levels. Community action is usually focused on changing environmental factors and other determinants of health using a primary prevention approach.

Research ethics and concepts

Kaupapa Maori research is a theory and an analysis of the cultural, political and social context of research that involves Maori and the approaches to research with Maori, by Maori and for Maori (Smith, 1996b). There are many excellent descriptions and discussions on kaupapa Maori and related issues (Cram, 2009, Pihama, 1993, Smith, 1995, Smith, 1996a, Smith, 1996c, Smith, 1999, Smith, 1997). Kaupapa Maori begins as a challenge to accepted norms and assumptions about knowledge and the way it is constructed and continues as a search for understanding within a Maori worldview (Bishop, 1996).

Although kaupapa maori research may be seen as taking a distinctive approach and having underlying principles based on Maori worldviews (Smith, 1996a), methods need to serve the issues and may be drawn from a range of methodologies. Kaupapa maori challenges norms and assumptions and should aim to make a positive difference (Smith, 1999). Therefore, the most important factors are the use, usefulness and ownership of the research (Moewaka Barnes, 2000).

Whakapapa has been described as a fundamental aspect of a Maori worldview (Rangihau, cited in Smith, 1996a) and a way of thinking, learning and storing and debating knowledge (Smith 1987, cited in Smith, 1996a). This includes where researchers are placed through whanau, location and research base (e.g. university) and what position and accountabilities evaluators work within (Moewaka Barnes and Stanley, 1999).

Whanau was used by Kathie Irwin as an embracing concept for her research study on first year Maori secondary teachers. This concept she described as “aroha, co-operation, collective responsibility”; she wanted to work within these relationships (Irwin, 1994). Smith (1996a) described whanau as providing a support structure that was significant “as a way of organising and supervising research.” (p26)

Research Ethic

This ethic (Cram et al., no date, Cram, 2009) outlines aspects of a kaupapa Maori methodology, including cultural values and researcher guidelines. It covers: A respect for people; he kanohi kitea (importance of meeting with people face to face); titiro, whakarongo...korero (looking and listening to develop understanding from which to speak); manaaki ki te tangata (collaboration and reciprocity); kia tupato (being politically astute and culturally safe); kua e takahia te mana o te tangata (don't trample the mana of the people) and kia ngakau mahaki (being humble in your approach).

Hikoi is the conceptual model under which Whariki carry out evaluation. The Whariki Research Group's name arose from a whakatauki that underlies the kaupapa of the group.

Ko tau hikoi i runga i oku whariki
Ko tau noho i toku whare
E huakina ai toku tatau toku matapihi.

Your steps on my whariki, your respect for my home, open my doors and windows.

One understanding of this whakatauki is that health involves the wairua, tinana and hinengaro; to pursue health, all elements must be respected. A further meaning is that, as researchers, we must tread gently and with respect for doors and windows to be opened. Information and knowledge cannot be asked for without respecting those who choose to share and without an understanding of the responsibilities and accountabilities that come with this relationship. Taking this kaupapa into our evaluation work, we have termed our evaluation process *hikoi*. This reflects our vision of evaluation as walking alongside others in a respectful relationship, each bringing different skills and perspectives, but undertaking the same journey in the same direction; this is not always the reality and when this journey is not a shared one, obstacles appear and relationships are strained.

Hikoi is both a process and a goal. It is about moving forward but at all times seeing the journey itself as important. This means that the process used in carrying out the work is as much a focus as the destination; the journey is not simply a means to an end. Hikoi only works where the kaupapa is shared, for example where the evaluators, the providers and communities all want the same thing; the success of a particular programme and have enough mutual trust to travel together on this path. It is also important that all those on the journey acknowledge and believe that the parties have the same destination in mind. Each ropu brings different skills and may have different ideas and perspectives, but all are prepared to travel together on the journey.

Guides and frameworks

The Community Project Indicators Framework (CPIF) was developed in Aotearoa to help funders and providers of community projects assess their progress. It covers activities and impacts and provides a number of indicator groups. Although not designed specifically for ‘Maori-for-Maori’ projects it may provide useful areas to consider (Ministry of Health, 2003) and can also assist with programme planning.

Guidelines for Researchers on Health Research Involving Maori was produced by the Health Research Council of New Zealand (1998). This document briefly outlines issues in conducting health research with Maori, emphasising consultation. It includes a consultation ‘checklist’ and is largely aimed at non-Maori researchers.

He Taura Tieke: Measuring Effective Health Services for Maori was developed by the Ministry of Health (1995). He Taura Tieke focuses on: technical or clinical competence, which covers cultural safety and appropriateness and is achieved through compliance with legislation, regulations, standards and best practice guidelines; structural and systematic responsiveness achieved through policy guidelines, contractual arrangements and monitoring procedures; and consumer satisfaction, which cover access, informed choices and the establishment of trust and respect, achieved through matching service or programme provision to Maori expectations (Ministry of Health, 1995).

The CHI audit model (Consolidate earlier experience, Holistic framework and Interactive) was developed by Professor Mason Durie in 1993 for the Public Health Commission. It provides a framework for cultural audits of provider contracts and outlines three key features: Maori development; health gains for Maori and Maori cultural beliefs and values, and includes cultural safety and intellectual property rights (Lawson-Te Aho, 1995).

Declarations and charters

The Mataatua Declaration on Cultural and Intellectual Property Rights of Indigenous Peoples (Ngati Awa, 1993) recognised the right of indigenous peoples to self-determination and to define and control cultural and intellectual property. It also outlined recommendations to a range of audiences (including states, national and international agencies, the United Nations and indigenous peoples) about access to, and protection of, indigenous intellectual and cultural property.

The Hongoeka Declaration for Maori Health Researchers was developed at Hui Whakapiripiri held at the Hongoeka Marae in 1996. It endorses the Mataatua Declaration and makes recommendations about the development and protection of research methodologies and practices by and for Maori (Te Ropu Rangahau Hauora a Eru Pomare, 1996).

The Ottawa Charter on Health Promotion was developed in 1986 at the 1st International Conference on Health Promotion. It provides a framework for developing public health approaches incorporating five action areas: Building healthy public policy; creating supportive environments; strengthening community action; developing personal skills and reorienting health services (World Health Organization, 1986). In New Zealand, the Health Promotion Forum ran a series of workshops on the Treaty and the Ottawa Charter and health promotion practice. What emerged was a prioritisation of the Treaty and an acknowledgement that the Ottawa Charter was one approach, albeit an influential one (Martin and Health Promotion Forum, 1999).

The Bangkok Charter for Health Promotion in a globalized world was developed at the 6th Global Conference on Health Promotion (WHO). It “complements and builds upon the values, principles and action strategies” of the Ottawa Charter and previous conferences to “address the strategies and commitments that are required to address the determinants of health in a globalized world” (World Health Organization, 2005). Strategies are to: advocate; invest; build capacity; regulate and legislate; and partner and build alliances. Indigenous people are mentioned once in the document, which has a strong focus on determinants of health and reducing inequities.

Programme evaluation

What is programme evaluation?

The term evaluation has a range of meanings in general use; here the focus is on programme evaluation.

Evaluation is about collecting and providing information on the 'value' of something. It involves information on how best to run a programme (formative), finding out how well a programme is running (process) and how well it is working or what the results have been (impact, outcome). Often evaluation needs to demonstrate that there is a planned, thoughtful and informed approach to the programme.

An evaluation can be any size, but there still tends to be a perception of evaluation as a large technical exercise. Evaluations may be carried out by the people running the programme or others in their organisation (internal evaluation), or may be done by people outside the organisation (external evaluation).

Cram (1995) argues that researchers are often viewed as the outside experts. In this sense, external evaluators are sometimes seen as being able to provide outside, more 'objective' knowledge than the people or groups being evaluated. Cram (1995:3) argues that a Maori view of knowledge "upholds the interests and mana of the group; it serves the community". It is probably fair to say that outside or external evaluations are usually viewed as having a greater legitimacy than self-evaluation or internal evaluation. Evaluators need to be mindful of this and to reflect on their power, responsibilities and accountabilities when carrying out external evaluations.

There are overlaps between evaluation and other areas such as quality improvement, monitoring and peer review audits. To improve and monitor performance, providers are often asked to measure, record and report on what they do. Continuous quality improvement (CQI) mechanisms are built into the programme to help this process. Evaluation may be part of CQI and may identify areas where further evaluation is needed. Deciding on evaluation often indicates an intention to improve the programme.

Monitoring is the ongoing recording of information to enable factors to be looked at over time. For example, a programme might be monitored to ensure that tasks are being carried out or information may be collected to monitor trends or changes that could occur as the result of a programme. Monitoring is often an important part of quality improvement.

Audits often refer to the examination of documents, accounts or other tangible things. To audit is to examine or inspect and verify (eg. financial or academic audits). An audit may be used as an evaluation tool; for example an environmental audit of smokefree areas might record specific factors and revisit these environments to record changes.

Evaluation may be carried out for a range of reasons, some more explicit than others. Durie (1985:3) wrote that evaluation was:

“...not only to justify funding, but also to determine effectiveness and compare standards of practice. Despite the inherent difficulties in evaluating community health projects, Maori people themselves are increasingly concerned that their programmes be taken seriously by health authorities, but if measurements are to be made, they are keen that the terms of reference be Maori ones.”

¹Programme evaluation can:

- Assist with programme objectives and identify effective strategies to increase the likelihood of success.
- Help to ensure that a programme actually does what is intended.
- Answer the question, “Is this the best way of doing this?”
- Identify the strengths and weaknesses of your programme.
- Help improve your programme and its delivery.
- Provide information to show key people and organisations how your programme is meeting its objectives and whether it is effective.
- Help you to know if your programme is reaching the people you want it to.
- Provide information about how resources are being used.
- Enable others to learn from your experiences.

What is Maori evaluation?

There are many different descriptions of Maori evaluation. Different words are also used to name a range of theories, approaches and methods. They include culturally responsible evaluation, culturally appropriate evaluation, culturally sensitive evaluation, Maori-relevant evaluation, Maori-focused evaluation, Maori models of evaluation, Kaupapa Maori, Maori evaluation tools, Maori frameworks, Maori paradigms, and indigenous protocols for evaluation.

Evaluation in general and Maori evaluation in particular is usually placed within the context of value and power. Below are some points likely to distinguish Maori from non-Maori evaluation:

- It is controlled and owned by Maori
- It meets Maori needs (although it may meet other needs as well)
- It is carried out within a Maori worldview, which is likely to question the dominant culture and norms
- It aims to make a positive difference.

Relationships and processes are a key part of evaluation in general and are often discussed in relation to Maori evaluation. Whakapapa, trust, long-term reciprocal relationships, participatory, power-sharing arrangements and the need for flexibility and reflection are common themes. This is often echoed by programme providers in the processes that they use in developing and implementing projects with Maori. It is a challenge for evaluators to reflect and legitimate these approaches. For these reasons, it is often suggested that evaluation needs to be explicit about how

¹ This table was drawn up by Wendy Henwood and has been used here with only slight adaptations.

knowledge is constructed - what values, ideas and views we draw on when we carry out evaluation - and that Maori evaluation needs to draw from Maori philosophies and knowledge, however these are described.

Different approaches

Sometimes an attempt to define or describe the approaches we use focuses on what is seen as specific to Maori or other indigenous peoples and what is different from non-indigenous groups.

PASE (Policy Analysis and System Evaluation Department at the Kamehameha Schools and Kohala Centre) suggests that Hawaiian-focused evaluation could be defined as “frameworks, measures, and procedures that most fairly represent the experiences of Hawaiian peoples and that yield information most useful to them.” The challenge would then become identifying what – concretely and specifically – is unique to the Hawaiian experience, history, and culture that would make good evaluation practice within the Hawaiian community distinct from good evaluation in any other community (PASE, 2003).

Te Korero Timatanga - Maori Focused Evaluation Hui (2002) saw the use of evaluation findings as a particularly important point and described Maori focused evaluation as:

... the tools, processes, existing models, resources, and in particular, evaluation findings, that can be better utilized by Iwi and Maori service providers.

Maori evaluators also debate whether specific methods are more suited to Maori. For example, qualitative methods may be considered more relevant and appropriate than quantitative methods. Kanohi ki te kanohi (face to face) is sometimes described as appropriate in contrast to telephone or postal data collection methods, which may be seen as inappropriate for Maori generally.

We take a broad approach and use the term Maori evaluation to describe evaluation that is carried out by Maori; either the evaluators are all Maori or the evaluation is, at a minimum, controlled by and owned by Maori. We also take the position that methods and approaches firstly need to suit the purpose for which they are being used. For this reason we are not suggesting that there is a standard or defined set of methods or tools that make up Maori evaluation.

However, there are some approaches that Maori and others would deem unethical; for example, taking information from Maori without consideration of Maori ownership or the use of the research, with Maori being merely participants without control.

If appropriate, evaluators may go beyond the methods and approaches available and described in the literature and adapt or create new ways of doing evaluation. These may include evaluation drawing on knowledge from their local iwi or methods from any other source that they are able to apply to serve their evaluation.

Any individual or group involved in evaluation will be able to add to this ongoing discussion with points that relate evaluation to their own tikanga and practice. For us, the key component of tikanga is the way in which we carry out evaluation. Our processes, and the ways in which we do our work, are as important as the outcomes.

He tangata: Maori evaluators

Just as there are many different approaches and descriptions of Maori evaluation, so too are there many descriptions of what a Maori evaluator is or should be. Some talk about the difference between a Maori evaluator and an evaluator who happens to be Maori; generally referring to the worldviews and accountabilities that are acknowledged and consciously and critically applied. There is general agreement that Maori evaluators are needed to call an evaluation 'Maori'. However, partly because the workforce is small and overstretched, some consider that evaluation can be Maori led and controlled, but may include some non-Maori workers and still be called Maori evaluation.

Cram et al. (no date:5) describe how some argue that Pakeha researchers have “no place within Maori research.”

Apart from problems created by research questions structured in terms foreign to the community it is the point at which the researcher is representing the community in their results that is problematic. Such representation is created within the researcher's culture and this (alternative construction) is likely to be given priority over the community's construction. (Cram et al., no date:10)

Competencies

Cultural competence is a phrase sometimes used to describe desirable attributes in relation to Maori and other indigenous and 'minority' groups; commonly language and knowledge of the culture are included in these descriptions of competence. However, there is some resistance to this term, largely because an evaluator could possess technical skills and knowledge of a culture without being appropriate or acceptable to the community or to the programme being evaluated. An evaluator may 'know things' but still operate within a different worldview.

Jakob-Hoff and Coggan (2003) have described core competencies for evaluators, which arose from and build on initiatives of the Australasian Evaluation Training and Professional Development sub-committee. Although useful as a description of the skill areas involved in carrying out evaluation, this does not include issues for Maori.

The Health Promotion Forum of New Zealand (2000) has outlined health promotion competencies, defined as “a combination of attributes that enable an individual to perform a set of tasks to an appropriate standard.” They group these under seven 'knowledge clusters' and nine 'skill clusters'; both clusters include the Treaty

It is not just technical skills that are important in carrying out evaluation. As well as personal attributes such as integrity, excellent communication and relationship skills,

evaluation is a craft you learn by doing and it takes time. Support from others, such as mentoring, and formal and informal learning can all contribute to this process.

Ethics

Ethics is not only about practical issues such as confidentiality, data storage and access, but also covers ownership of information, power relationships and the processes and outcomes of the evaluation.

Ethics forms, from local or national ethics committees, can provide guidelines for considering some practical issues such as how you deal with anonymity or confidentiality and how and where to store and handle data. It can also provide some starting points for considering power and other issues; most ethics forms will ask about ethnicity, consultation and other related areas.

However, ethics and power are complex and cannot be fully dealt with solely in terms of relatively straightforward questions and answers. Ethical considerations therefore need to be explored on a project by project basis and are inextricably linked to relationships (Moewaka Barnes et al., 2009).

Power and relationships

Power operates at many levels; it covers the role of the evaluation and the evaluators, their relationships with providers, funders and participants and the power and status of the evaluation and its implications.

Evaluators need to consider who they are accountable to and in what ways. Usually these accountabilities are multiple: for example funders, providers and communities. As Maori we need to consider what this means in terms of our loyalties to our iwi, our accountabilities and the expectations that are likely to be placed on us. We are not usually in the position of being able to come into a community, carry out an evaluation and leave, perhaps never to be seen again. One of our performance indicators is whether we are asked back, by funders, providers and by others we have worked with or whether groups who have heard of us through word of mouth approach us.

Sometimes evaluation is about walking a fine line, keeping the integrity of the evaluation in tact, but being able to provide an external critique that enables all parties to learn from and make use of the evaluation. The reality is, sometimes you cannot keep your integrity and please all parties. If this is the case, processes need to be in place to ensure that, even if there are differing views, each voice has an opportunity to be heard and considered.

It is preferable, if not essential, that evaluators, funder, providers and other relevant parties clearly convey their needs (including the information that they want), agendas and ongoing communication processes before the evaluation starts. Then, if issues do arise, there are hopefully some agreed upon starting points and channels to address them. Be aware that some providers and their communities can feel threatened and protective when it comes to evaluation; others may welcome it as an opportunity for their voices to be heard in a way that may give them greater credibility.

Also, consider the role of participants. What do you tell them about the evaluation and the evaluators; not simply what can they tell you? Do they understand the part that their contributions may play in supporting the programme or bringing about changes that may have impacts for them and their communities? How will you communicate with participants before, during and after data collection?

The status of knowledge and evidence

A common catch cry is that programmes should be evidence based. Certainly if we are tackling an issue and we know what has been tried effectively in the past, it is important to see if the same or similar strategies will work for us. It is equally important that we do not repeatedly implement strategies that evidence tells us does not work. However, if we are interested in innovation and evidence creation we need to question the assumption that all programmes should be narrowly evidence based.

Evaluation is an important component in this; it enables us to test out strategies in a planned way and to evaluate our attempts in order to suggest new approaches that might work. Evaluation can, over time work alongside projects to build new knowledge about what does and doesn't work and under what conditions.

The issue of what constitutes evidence is complex: different groups and individuals operate within different world views and with differing needs and agendas. We need to be explicit about the values, assumptions, agendas and knowledge bases that come together when determining evidence. In the research and evaluation field what is considered to be evidence is strongly based on published literature. This tends to put Maori and other indigenous groups at a disadvantage in terms of contributing to and building evidence in these arenas.

Rather than trying to describe programmes in terms that are accepted and largely legitimated in non-Maori research, it might be useful to consider how to frame evaluations within a Maori worldview; for example, showing how a nutrition programme may have led to strengthening marae and iwi structures and why this is a successful impact (Moewaka Barnes et al., 1998). Usually, it is necessary to demonstrate effectiveness across a range of criteria or to show how Maori worldviews might link to other more accepted forms of evidence. In the above example this can be done by linking marae and iwi structures to notions of capacity building and community development. The difficulty here is about what gets lost in translation; evidence in non-Maori terms does not encompass the full depth and understanding of Maori evidence when it is taken out of a Maori world view and context in an attempt to legitimate and explain why this is evidence of effectiveness.

By contributing to a body of knowledge that asserts a Maori world view as legitimate, we hopefully move toward a greater acceptance of what Maori see as 'successful' and 'robust', and reframe what is meant by these terms or use different terms altogether. If communities are not recognised for their expertise, which includes knowing what processes and approaches work for their people, then the history of suspicion towards research and evaluation is perpetuated. Community frustration and the need to constantly explain and persuade hinders rather than supports change. Unfortunately,

as in the kaupapa maori debate, we are too often in the position of explaining why this 'other' way of seeing, doing and expressing things is legitimate.

Durie (1985) suggested that:

the evaluation of Maori health projects using Maori criteria will present problems to most health bodies and researchers who lack adequate understanding of whenua, whanaungatanga and mauri. It will fall to Maori authorities to determine whether a given project has relevance to Maori people. How does it relate to the land? Does it strengthen whanaungatanga? Will it nurture the mauri? There are many factors that can be used to gauge the effectiveness and value of a community health project. If the project purports to be relevant to Maori people, then Maori criteria must be used.

However, there are difficulties around defining what Maori criteria are, who defines them and how they relate practically to the programme that is the centre of the evaluation.

It may be that the funder is not interested or not seen as interested, in less tangible aspects of a project or in 'evidence' that is outside of their accepted knowledge system. However, if no attempt is made to present these aspects then the richness of what has happened will be invisible. The funders and others will not have the opportunity to consider these factors or to see them as valid approaches and Maori will not have the opportunity to build evidence.

The relationship between programme planning and evaluation

Programme design, planning and reporting

When planning and reporting on your programme, it is usual to describe and document:

- Goal/s: state the overall purpose of the programme. Aims are usually at a somewhat lower level than goals; for example a goal may be to have a smokefree Aotearoa and an aim may be to reduce smoking uptake in Te Tai Tokerau.
- Objectives: identify what the programme seeks to achieve; where possible objectives should be measurable.
- Strategies: identify how the objectives will be met.
- Activities: what you will do.
- Performance indicators: identify specific targets such as who, where, how much and when.

Indicators are also used in relation to indicators of effectiveness/success, or performance. Short, intermediate/medium or long term indicators of effectiveness/success are usually less output defined than performance indicators. For example a performance indicator may be that three hui have been held, while an effectiveness/success indicator may be that some of the organisations that attend the hui work together to develop programmes around local tobacco supply to under 18 year olds. Performance indicators tend to be more about accountability and tasks being completed, and indicators of effectiveness/success are more useful for looking at whether a programme is on track in achieving its objectives. They are therefore critical for external evaluators, but are also important for the programme providers to be able to examine, not only that they are carrying out the activities they are contracted to do but that there are indications that these activities are having a positive effect. Wherever possible try to think about and identify what these effectiveness indicators might be and how you might be able to determine whether they are being met.

Some providers will be more interested in outputs. Others will acknowledge the importance of effectiveness/success indicators, support their development and use with related resource needs as part of your programme design, implementation, monitoring and reporting.

Programme reports for management and funders often describe what and how many (outputs), while evaluators are more focussed on knowing how, why and for what purpose. The closer management, funder and evaluation needs are aligned the less that providers have to reframe or even rewrite their work for different audiences. It is desirable that the reporting needs of funders and the needs of evaluators are closely aligned so that programme reports can meet several needs. It is also useful to involve management in evaluation to get their understanding and commitment and enable consistent reporting requirements.

Intervention logic

Having a well planned and articulated logic behind what you do is essential, for both the project and the evaluation. Although there are various schools of thought and related definitions, intervention or programme logic is basically the way that the programme components – e.g. goals, aims, objectives, resources, people and organisations, strategies, activities – link together and how the programme is supposed to work. The logic needs to be clear, make sense and be based on evidence in its broadest sense. This doesn't mean that only tried and true strategies should be implemented. Sometimes there is little evidence and learning from other areas can be transferred or innovative strategies can be trialled. We need to look at what we know about what works and what doesn't as well as what, based on knowledge and experience, we believe might logically follow from our strategies. Clear intervention logic ensures that, when you undertake activities, you know not only what you are doing and who you need to work with, but why and how this relates to the objectives and goal of your project.

Intervention logic is often presented in diagrammatic form; for example boxes with aims, objectives and activities with arrows (one way or two directional) drawn between them to show the relationships. This enables an examination of the programme design and the expected relationships between programme elements. You need to be able to define each aspect of your programme and the relationship between each of these, as clearly as you can. Although the interconnections and overlaps between the different elements present a challenge, these relationships are just as important, if not more, than what you place in each box.

There are many different ways of developing intervention logic and just as many ways of presenting it. They range from basic diagrams to more complex formats. In our experience, indigenous peoples, in particular, are looking at non-linear forms of representing their programmes, including spirals, circles and triangular shapes.

There are also different levels at which you might develop your model and sometimes programmes develop more than one: an overview of the intervention, the processes involved, impacts over different timeframes and where the intervention might sit in relation to the wider environment, for example. What sort of model you develop will depend on your programme and on what you are developing the model for – presenting to others, using as a brainstorming tool with programme workers etc.

Commonly, you will need to do a lot of thinking and a lot of arranging and rearranging. It is often useful to brainstorm and bounce ideas off others and test your logic to see if it makes sense to others. Developing intervention logic means that you need to systematically think about each aspect of your programme from the aims and goals through to the strategies and people and groups involved. Put each into a short, clear phrase or heading and arrange and rearrange them in boxes (circles etc) to see what you think is the best fit in terms of the relationship between each.

Some questions to ask:

- What is the wider context in which the programme developed?
- What are the goals and/or aims of the programme; how is it supposed to work and what is it supposed to do??
- What are the objectives that relate to these goals/aims; who is the programme supposed to impact on, in what ways?
- What strategies will work/might work towards or achieve these objectives?
- How will we implement these strategies; who is the programme supposed to be working with, where, in what ways, what resources and skills do we need?
- How will we know that we are being effective?
- What indicators of effectiveness can we develop that will tell us in the short, intermediate and long term that we are on track with our strategies and that they are working towards the objectives and that the objectives are working towards our aims and overall goals?
- What might impact on the programme's effectiveness?
- Does each component lead on to the next and follow from the one/s before it/ how do the different components relate to each other?
- Does it make sense? Is it logical?

For Maori there is often little 'evidence' in terms of published literature (see *The status of knowledge and evidence* section). We are therefore often in the position of evidence building and we need to be clear about what knowledge bases we are drawing on and what assumptions we are basing our logic on. In this way we can depict what we do, learn from it and test and build evidence. This may include examining programme logic and the role that evaluation might play in bringing wider perspectives and legitimacy to the programme and the way that it operates for Maori.

Intervention logic provides a framework for programme planning and for programme evaluation. Clear intervention logic ensures that, when you undertake evaluation, you know how all the different parts link together and what is needed for a programme to work towards its goals; why the project did what it did and what this was expected to achieve or work towards. Programme logic can also provide a framework for insights into why a project didn't work in the way it was intended; were there some ingredients that didn't come together or some assumptions that were made that didn't work out in practice?

In the following section (Types of evaluation) you will see how these types of questions relate to different aspects and stages of evaluation.

Types of evaluation

The following section describes three main types of evaluation: Formative evaluation, process evaluation and impact or outcome evaluation (also called summative evaluation).

Although these types of evaluation often overlap, they each have a purpose that is best suited to a particular stage of a programme.

Formative evaluation

Formative evaluation is about developing, refining and improving a programme in a planned way. This should happen as you begin and develop your programme so that the programme is built on a strong foundation. An important part of formative evaluation is supporting the development of programme goals, objectives and strategies, gathering information and identifying key people that may be involved in the programme. Formative evaluation can be carried out by the programme providers as part of the development of their project or with the assistance and support of an external formative evaluator (sometimes called ‘critical friend’).

Formative evaluators ask:

- What resources are available and how can they be best used (people, skills, time, budget, infrastructure)?
- What needs to be put in place and developed before the project design/planning is complete e.g. what needs to be done (people employed, information gathered etc) before the programme goals, objectives, strategies and planned activities can be established?
- What are the indicators of effectiveness/success?
- Has the design been thought through at each step and is it logical i.e. has the programme established a link between all the parts of the programme design: goals, aims, objectives, strategies and activities (including the right mix of skills and resources needed to implement the programme) and has it identified relevant indicators of effectiveness? What information, experience and strategies might help you meet those goals and objectives?
- Are the strategies relevant and responsive to the group you are trying to reach?
- What is already known about the issue or programme (previous experience, existing information, how does it fit with other initiatives, perceived barriers)?
- Who needs to be involved (relationships, networks, collaboration, who is not being heard)?

Needs assessments

Needs assessments are sometimes carried out in the early formative stages; either before programme planning begins or alongside planning. Communities may be charged with describing a problem or problems in their communities in order to access funding to address needs. Needs assessments can get information from observation, examining available documents, interviews and/or surveys. But, needs assessments do not only have to describe deficits. You can also look at the strengths of your community and what you could potentially build on.

Before you start, think about the purpose of the needs assessment and whether it is the best use of resources. For example, you may have funding to address alcohol use in your local community. Finding out how many people drink and whether people think drinking is a problem will not necessarily help you to design a programme. Look at what you already know and what you need to know to address the issues. It may be that developing collaborations and involving the community in the programme is a better use of resource than describing how bad the problem is.

Process evaluation

Process evaluation documents what a programme does in practice and usually takes place around mid-delivery; when a programme has been running long enough for evaluators to be able to describe the programme activities in some depth. Information from process evaluation helps you to understand why a programme produces the results that it does. Process information can also be used for formative evaluation purposes, by feeding it in to further refine and improve a programme. It can be used to help others carrying out similar programmes and to enable stakeholders to see the story behind the programme.

Process evaluators ask:

- What happened in the programme, what did it consist of (including background to the project, planning processes and organisational issues)?
- Did the programme carry out the activities it planned to do; if not the reasons why?
- What were the issues around the programme; barriers, enhancers, changes in plans etc?
- What does this mean e.g. can the programme be improved, is it on track towards meeting its objectives?

Impact and outcome evaluation

Impact and outcome evaluation examines what has happened or changed as a result of a programme (causality). The importance of establishing causality varies with each evaluation. However, it is usually important to at least be able to describe whether and in what ways a programme may have contributed to changes. The terms impact and outcome evaluation are often used interchangeably and there are varying

definitions. Be clear at the beginning about what each stakeholder means by impact or outcome and what the evaluation is expected to demonstrate.

Impact evaluation looks at more immediate effects (short term or intermediate) and what progress has been made towards meeting the programme's objectives. Impact may include changes in awareness, knowledge, attitudes and behaviour and in social and physical environments (sometimes called proxy measures) that may be short or intermediate steps towards the programme aims or goals.

Outcome evaluation looks at longer-term programme effects, particularly in terms of achieving the programme's goals; for example a change in health status.

Consider very carefully what sort of changes you might expect to see in what timeframes and plan the evaluation accordingly. Three years is often considered to be a minimal timeframe for short term impacts to be seen. Be realistic about what changes might be demonstrated by relatively small programmes in a short time especially, for example, in the context of colonisation and poverty.

Impact evaluators ask:

- How will we measure and examine the programme's impacts?
- What were the intended (and unintended) impacts of the programme - short, intermediate and/or long term – that tell us whether and in what ways the programme worked towards the objectives and the aims and the overall goals?
- What does this mean e.g. in terms of programme developments, sustainability, longer term impacts, implications for other projects and initiatives?

A story

There was once a village where the people were unwell. It was identified that the people were lacking in Omega 3 fatty acids and that fish were an excellent source. Some people said that it was their own fault that they did not eat fish. A group of researchers said that they should carry out a survey to find out how much fish people ate and who ate the most. Others said that they needed education and that they should put up some posters and talk to the people about eating more fish. The leaders didn't know who to listen to and so they decided to carry out a needs assessment.

"We know that people don't eat enough fish," they said. "What we want to know is why and what we can do about it." The needs assessment found out that people liked fish and wanted to eat them. However, there were very few fish available in the village as the people only managed to catch a few from the rocks nearby. They also noted that they had a beautiful harbour with fish in it.

So they sent out a waka, but the crew came home empty handed. They sent out two waka, and the crews came back with a few fish. They sent out more and more until they had sent out all the waka they had, but there still wasn't enough to feed everyone. The people were tired, hungry and frustrated and in worse shape than before.

They carried out a formative evaluation and found that some of the people on the waka didn't know that they were supposed to be catching fish. Some thought the aim was to catch fish, but didn't know they needed to feed the village, so some of the fish were edible and some were not. Some knew it was about being healthy and so they concentrated on building up their physical fitness and learning more about the tikanga of the waka. Others tried to catch fish, but just didn't know how.

The formative evaluators and the village leaders made it clear that the *goal* was to improve the health of the village, the *aim* was to provide fish for the people and the *strategies* were to send out people in waka to catch and bring back edible fish for the village. They talked to the most skilled people in their tribe and the people learnt how to fish, the best places to fish, the best times to fish, which fish were edible and how to bring the fish back so that they were fresh.

After this they only needed to send out five waka to feed the whole village and the people were well fed. The people who went fishing every day wanted to share the job but most people thought that they were the only ones who could catch fish. Others wanted to help with the fishing but didn't know what to do.

So they carried out a process evaluation, which told the people what they had been doing, where they had been catching fish and how they stored them. Then a neighbouring iwi said that women were no good at fishing and they should send out only the men. The women said they wanted to continue fishing. The men said that they were happy for women to share the work, but if women were no good at it they had better stop. So they carried out an impact evaluation and the men stopped.

After the formative evaluation, the iwi had a clear plan of how the programme would work; what the programme activities and assumptions were. They had a clear goal, aim and strategies. The assumption that feeding the people fish would improve their health was based on sound knowledge, and this aim was being met. It was too early for an outcome evaluation to find out if the goal of improving the people's physical health was being achieved. An unintended effect was that the people said they were fitter and worked better as a team as a result of being on the waka. The evaluators said this had built the capacity of the village and increased their knowledge in several areas. The impact evaluation in this example showed that the *intervention logic* was effective.

Doing evaluation

The following section outlines four broad phases in evaluation: Planning and design; carrying out the evaluation; analysis and interpretation; and communicating results. Although we include practical information we also suggest you read Section 3: Information Gathering Methods from Programme evaluation: An introductory guide for health promotion (Waa et al., 1998), which provides some more detailed guidelines and examples.

Evaluation design

An evaluation design is a description of the aims of the evaluation and how you plan to achieve them; the purposes, approaches and methods (Duignan, 2003). The evaluation needs to be related to the project aims and objectives, meet the agreed needs of the different stakeholders and be achievable. A research methodology is a theory and analysis of how research does or should proceed and a method is a way of gathering information, including evidence. Designs can range from small to large and from straightforward to complex. Your evaluation needs to fit the resources available and be appropriate for the size and timeframes of the programme being evaluated.

It is important to clearly define what the evaluation aims to do, how you will communicate your findings and who the different audiences are i.e. who you and/or the programme providers and funders may want to disseminate findings to. Audiences include groups such as other evaluators, government departments, programme participants, community groups and the media.

There may be groups who will have direct expectations of the evaluation such as the provider and the funder. Although you may not be able to meet all their expectations, it is important that you are clear about who you are accountable to, in what ways and what you can and can't achieve. Evaluation of programmes often needs to meet multiple stakeholder expectations.

Funders may want information that is different from what the communities and providers want. An external evaluation of a programme may, for example, have a written contract outlining the funder's expectations. The programme being evaluated may not see these as meeting their needs. For example, providers may want to focus on what is needed to run the best possible programme, while funders may want to know if they received 'value for money' and if they are purchasing the best strategies. If the evaluators cannot negotiate these expectations at the outset, the evaluation runs the risk of not meeting the funder's requirements or the findings being rejected by the programme providers. It is therefore important to find out what the information needs are and try to find ways of carrying out the research that respects the different parties, but is still realistic from an evaluation perspective.

Determining what will be measured and how it will be measured can be a complex task. Evaluators need to consider what value judgements, assumptions, evidence and knowledge bases they are using (see *The status of knowledge and evidence* section), as well as what is relevant to any particular programme and the stakeholders in the

evaluation. Criteria for determining effectiveness need to reflect what the project is trying to achieve.

Previously we discussed formative, process and impact evaluation. Other design terms you may hear or know are:

- **Quasi-experimental** design is where comparison groups are used that are not randomly selected. For example two communities are selected, one because a programme designed to bring about change (intervention) is going to take place and the other is selected as a comparison community because it has similar characteristics to the intervention community. The evaluation collects similar data from both groups before the intervention and some way into the intervention to see what changes may have happened in the intervention community (as a result of the intervention) that did not happen in the comparison community.
- **Case studies** are where ‘cases’ are selected from a number of evaluation possibilities. For example, there may be several programmes run under the same kaupapa, but you decide not to evaluate all of them or to only carry out evaluation of a particular aspect of the projects. The evaluation focuses in-depth on one or more programmes or aspects (‘cases’) in order to look in more detail at what happens.
- **Naturalistic enquiry or studies** are also called low-constraint, because they fit the evaluation in to the programme as much as possible. These may be careful, unobtrusive evaluations in ‘natural’ settings where the evaluator does not try to manipulate or change things to see what happens e.g. observing and recording what food is served and eaten on a marae. The idea is that the evaluator intrudes and influences participants as little as possible; however, if you know someone is watching you, will you still have that third cream bun?
- **Meta analysis:** looks across information from a number of evaluations to see what can be learnt from them in addition to the individual findings of each project.

Generally, whatever the design, an evaluation plan describes:

1. The **aim/s** of the evaluation: these need to be clear and achievable.
2. **What the evaluation will involve:** a brief description of how you intend to meet the aims and the general design features of the evaluation.
3. The **methods:** describe how and from what sources the information/data will be collected.
4. **Analysis:** describe how the data will be analysed and what the evaluation will be looking for in the analysis.
5. **Dissemination:** feedback, hui, conferences, reports; describe what will be produced for the evaluation e.g. brief project reports, process reports, impact reports.
6. **Timeline:** provide milestones and dates when these will be achieved.
7. **Budget:** how much the evaluation costs; the extent to which you break down different budget items varies.
8. **Other** information such as who the stakeholders are, what relationships will need to be established, evaluation management, how the evaluators will

communicate with key groups, such as the providers and the funders and ethical requirements etc.

9. Look around at a range of programmes and evaluations to find out what others have done.

Data collection: information gathering methods

Good evaluation needs reliable data-collection methods in order to collect useful information. There are many ways you can collect data and it is important to choose the method/s that will meet your information needs, are realistic in terms of time and resources (yours, the programme providers and others) and can be agreed upon by the appropriate groups. For example it is no use deciding on collecting information through observing part of the programme if the providers will not agree to this or in expecting people to give you a lot of information that they do not have the time to provide.

It is usually a good idea to think about what you want to know in general terms before trying to write detailed lists of questions. For example, you may decide that you want to know if the project was effective, and then break this down into what areas of information will tell you this: did it bring about changes in the kai served on marae; did people change what they ate at home; were there changes in schools and so on. From this you can then decide what your sources (*sample*) of information will be and then work out what sort of questions you will need to ask to get the information you want. Deciding how many people you will collect information from (your *sample size*) depends on what methods you are using, what you need to demonstrate (find out) and what resources you have. Having expert knowledge is particularly important for large evaluations and quantitative methods, where things such as power calculations may be needed to determine your sample size.

Thinking about what you would realistically hope the project would achieve will give you an idea of the methods you will use and whether you will be considering quantitative or qualitative methods or a combination of both. Basically, quantitative methods involve numbers and measure quantities. Qualitative methods are more about understanding the nature or 'quality' of what you are asking about.

If you're uncertain about what you're doing or if you want statistics and you're not a statistician, seek advice before you start.

Literature reviews

Evaluation usually includes a literature review. This can be big or small, but is designed to let you know what has been done in your particular field and to place the evaluation and its findings in the context of what has been carried out and what is known about the field. It provides a background to the project and the evaluation, it enables you to learn from what others have done and assists in the interpretation of the findings by providing evidence that your evaluation may support or challenge. Sources of information include libraries, local authorities, the internet and other providers and researchers. Because not all useful information is available from these sources (particularly for Maori), you may want to approach people who have worked in the area to see if they know of any information that might be helpful.

Observation and audits

Observation is about describing people and/or environments e.g. who, how many and where are people smoking on a marae setting and, environmentally, what signs and provisions there are in relation to smoking. You may observe and record at one point in time or over days, weeks, months or years to see if changes occur. Observing and recording a number of environmental features to see if they support or hinder certain practices is usually called an *environmental audit*.

Visual methods

Photographs and video can be used to visually show aspects of a programme. For example, process evaluation can use photographs or copies of resources, such as posters or pamphlets in reports. This is visually interesting and is much more effective than trying to describe them.

Photography and video can also be used as evaluation tools. For example young people could be given cameras prior to the start of youth programmes in their community and asked to record images that they feel reflect their lives. As part of impact evaluation, after the programme is well established and has been running for some time, they could be asked again to reflect their lives on camera. Differences could be examined in light of the programme activities and involvement.

Qualitative methods

Qualitative methods usually involve collecting relatively in-depth information from a smaller number of people than quantitative. You might ask people not only what happened or what they thought about a programme, but also the reasons behind their thoughts and experiences.

Think about what sort of information you need and who is likely to be able to contribute; think about the *range* of perspectives you want so that you don't just get the information from a group of people who have similar experiences and ideas. Consider the type of information and how many people you might need to interview so that you get the range you want. *Saturation* is a term used when the interviews are not bringing out any new information and you can feel confident (as long as you have the right range of people) that you have carried out as many interviews as you need.

Qualitative interviews are usually face to face, although telephone interviews are sometimes used; particularly for follow-up interviews, when the participant and the interviewer have already established a relationship.

Technological advances, for example access grid rooms (a more sophisticated form of video-conferences), may also provide useful ways of carrying out interviews. Qualitative methods include:

Individual interviews: stakeholder interviews, key informant interviews, participant interviews. These can be relatively intimate one to one interviews that cover sensitive or personal topics or gather information from individuals who have useful insights or who are in key positions to comment, such as programme staff and programme participants.

Group interviews: focus group and affinity group interviews. You need to think carefully about who is going to be in the group, which is usually made of no more than 8-10 people. Generally focus or affinity group interviews are with people who will be able to talk relatively comfortably about issues and have some shared ground, rather than strongly opposing views and experiences. If you decide interviews with people who may hold opposing views are useful to the evaluation you will need to think this through and ensure that participants are aware of the dynamics and that the process is safe. *Hui* are an example where opposing views can be aired within a tikanga that should respect and manaaki the participants and their contributions. Group interviews and hui have a particular purpose and should not be viewed simply as a cheaper way of gathering data from more people than individual interviews.

Story methods. These include *lifestory* techniques where participants are asked to talk more broadly about their lives and experiences, rather than focusing on a particular area, such as a specific intervention and *most significant change stories*. A method for documenting and monitoring change that collects 'significant stories' from the field and involves a range of stakeholders in the review and selection of the stories to be presented.

Quantitative methods

A common quantitative method used in evaluation is the survey.

In its simplest form a survey may be a handout at the end of session, where participants are asked to fill in boxes or categories. These are called self completed surveys because the participants are asked to fill them in themselves and hand them back. Self completed surveys can be postal, web based or handed out to people who are asked to complete them and put in a box, return them or wait for them to be picked up (the national census is an example of a self completed survey of this type). Computer surveys have also been carried out using self complete techniques. The New Zealand Adolescent Youth Health Survey selected young people at schools and asked them to carry out the survey, which was loaded onto a computer programme with graphics and other features designed to capture their interest.

There are assisted surveys or interviewer completed, such as telephone or face to face using paper forms or entering into a lap top. The interviewer, in this case, asks the questions (sometimes with cue cards or pictures if face to face) and records the answer on paper or on the computer.

Surveys are appealing because they can offer a relatively cost effective (time and money) way of collecting information and collecting information from large and/or spread out groups. Numbers also hold a certain level of power because people see them as more objective and reflecting the 'truth' in a way that people's stories, perceptions and experiences may not be viewed. However, if a survey is not designed carefully and/or is not the right method to use for the information that you want, any time or money that you spend on it will be wasted.

Question design

Interview questions need to be kept clear, non-ambiguous and as simple as possible. Although questions form an important part of qualitative interviewing, they are

largely a guide to the information you are trying to gather. The interviewer's knowledge of what the interview schedule (the total set of questions for each interview) is designed to find out and the use of probes, appropriate language and follow-ups in the conversation are very important parts of the process.

Quantitative question design is more critical and the way the questions are put to participants is less flexible because you are trying to draw consistent conclusions across larger numbers of people. If you change the questions, even slightly, or ask them in different ways or order, it is less certain that you are actually measuring the same thing each time.

Qualitative interviews aim to gather rich experiences and perceptions, rather than a selection of responses that are consistent across the whole sample. For these reasons, qualitative questions are often described as open-ended and participants can answer in any way they want. In quantitative questioning a participant may be asked to choose a response from a list, select a category or select a point on a scale. Scales can be descriptive (not useful, useful, very useful...), numerical (rate on a scale from 1 to seven) or use symbols ☺.

Don't ask more than one question at a time. In qualitative interviews it is harder for the participant to decipher and then respond to two questions at once. When you come to analyse quantitative data it is difficult to know whether people were responding to all parts of the question or only some of it.

Example of more than one question at a time:

Do you think that restitution and more support should be provided for victims of crime and that violent offenders should be subject to longer prison sentences and hard labour?

If respondents said yes to this, were they agreeing with all parts of the question or only with some? How easy was it for people to decide how to answer this question? What did the question designers really want to know?

Pre- test your questions: this will enable you to see how they work with people who are not familiar with them and with people who are similar to the sample you will be working with (this may mean pre-testing with a diverse group depending on who you will be collecting information from in the field). Pre-testing will give you an idea of what works and what doesn't work, if some questions are confusing or unclear and if your questions are giving you the sort of information you are looking for. It may also provide an opportunity for interviewers to become familiar with the questions.

Interview techniques

Generally, the more at ease and comfortable the interviewer is, the more comfortable the participants will feel. Interviewers need to be careful to show respect for participants and to acknowledge the value of all information, whether they agree or disagree with the different perspectives. Watch your tone, body language and facial expressions (don't yawn, no matter how late a night you had!). If you go into an

interview believing in the value of each person's korero and respecting that they have taken the time to talk to you, this will be apparent to the participant.

Quantitative interviewing generally requires the same wording and ordering of questions for each participant.

When carrying out qualitative interviews be encouraging without making judgements (for example saying, "That's really useful" and "It's important to get a range of views" is preferable to "Yes, I agree with you" or "Are you sure, really?"). Each person's style is different and different approaches will work with different people. For example the way you speak to a kuia or koroua will be different from how you speak to taitamariki. Different things will help each person feel more at ease. However there are common sense approaches that will work for most situations.

- Try to draw the person out as much as possible.
- Be careful not to interrupt.
- Listen to what they say and try to repeat their korero back to them when appropriate to show that you are listening. For example in response to an earlier question they may have told you about a hui they went to that was part of a whanau development project. Your next question might be "Can you tell me about any hui that you have been to as part of the whanau development project?" Instead you could say "You said earlier that you went to one of the whanau development hui. Are there any other hui that you have been to as part of the whanau development project?"
- Be respectful.
- Leave yourself plenty of time and don't appear rushed or in a hurry.
- Have food!
- Have fun!

Data analysis and interpretation

Analysis can be time consuming and needs to be planned for so that the process is not rushed. How you are going to carry out your analysis needs to be decided as part of your evaluation design. It will be driven by what information you are seeking and what methods you have used to get the information. Have a clear idea of your audience and the purpose of what you are writing before you carry out analysis. Although you may see some of the data as interesting, if it is not serving the purpose of your evaluation, spending time on analysing it may mean that you don't provide the information that is going to be useful and used.

The extent to which you involve others will depend on how you work and what resources you have available; one evaluator carrying out analysis; a team carrying out some analyses individually and coming together to discuss findings at key points; two or more evaluators independently analysing data then presenting findings as separate readings of the information. Think about the steps you will use in analysis and seek advice if needed.

Analysing interviews

Interview data can be analysed from notes, listening to interviews on tape and/or reading through transcripts (interviews that have been recorded, then typed out from listening to the tapes). Generally, the more involved your interviews are the longer it will take to analyse. Transcripts will need to be checked against the tapes for accuracy. Sometimes copies are sent back to participants for them to check and change if they want. It can help to listen to all or parts of the interviews on tape as well as reading transcripts, particularly if the analyst and interviewer are different people.

The idea in qualitative analysis is not to arrive at what most people said or agreed on, but to represent the data in its depth and diversity; common themes and shared or different perspectives and experiences all need to be articulated. Subtle changes of wording can change meaning. For these reasons you need to think about how you frame your analyses; for example avoiding “ten people said this and only two people said that.” However, it is difficult to avoid quantifiable terms altogether and phrases like “most said” and “a few said” are commonly used. Other ways of describing data are “a common theme running through the korero was...” or “participants were generally positive about ... Some suggestions for improvements were...”

Findings should not be presented as a long, reiteration of interviews, but should look across all the data to pull out themes that make sense of the information at a higher level. Sometimes qualitative data is analysed and findings presented person by person or question by question. However, this is not always useful. For example, take the case an intervention that worked held student open days with resources and displays. Imagine that an evaluation wanted to look at what happened at the open days and what participants thought of the open days. If findings were presented question by question, units of analysis (themes or groupings) just for the open days might contain (1) what students did at an open day, (2) what students thought about the open day, (3) what teachers did at an open day, (4) what teachers thought about an open day, (5) what resources students could recall, (6) what students thought about resources and (7) what resources teachers could recall (8) what resources teachers had used, (9) what teachers thought about resources etc. It can become long and drawn out without ordering the findings in a useful way. It may be better to include a description of the activities in an introductory section (see *Written reports*) and use themes such *open day participation* and *use of resources*. Include teacher and student data, clarifying the sources of different perceptions” a student commented that...” or grouping sources e.g. “both students and teachers thought the displays were colourful and eye catching”.

There are some computer packages that can assist with analysing qualitative datasets (collections of transcripts or other information you are using); these are particularly useful when you have a lot of information or want to analyse the same data in a lot of different ways. Most of these programmes enable you to code (select themes, give them ‘codes’) your transcripts and store the sections of the interview you want under each code. You can use as many codes as you like and put sections (a single word through to the entire transcript) of the interview under multiple codes. Then, for example you could ask the computer to pull out what all the female participants said about food and children and, separately, what all the males said about food and

children; or more complicated combinations, depending on your coding and questioning.

Whether or not you are using a computer programme for analyses, labelling each interview with something (invented name, numbers etc) that does identify the participant is a useful technique (a unique identifier). When you use information from that participant (in the narrative or a quote) in your draft report put the identifier and transcript page number or tape counter beside the information. When you read through the report you can then easily check if you have a range of quotes from all the participants or if you are giving the impression that a particular viewpoint was common when checking tells you all the quotes around that issue came from one person. You can easily go back to the interview to check the meaning of a quote if there are queries about it or if you want to refer back to it to draw out a particular theme. Delete the identifiers from the final report but retain a copy for your own reference if needed. You may still have some labels in your report to name or describe where the quotes came from e.g. “male, 16yrs”, “Tahi” or “Hira”. Just be careful that, if confidentiality is a requirement, labels do not enable people to put the quotes together to form a picture that identifies the participant.

Analysing numbers

Analysing your data question by question, then looking to see where you might do more complicated analysis is a common way of proceeding and presenting data in quantitative research.

There are some simple ways of presenting numbers that do not need expert input. This will depend on your design (sample size, what is being measured) and what the design requires in terms of analysis. Sometimes you need only basic maths (and a calculator) to analyse numbers.

Although percentages may seem more complicated and therefore more impressive, it is generally not useful to use percentages with small samples (around 30 or less). For example, the following are findings from twenty survey forms collected from workshop participants:

Ten participants said they would recommend the workshop to others, five said they might, two said they wouldn't and three said they didn't know.

OR:

Fifty percent of participants said they would recommend the workshop to others, 25% said they might, 10% said they wouldn't and 15% said they didn't know.

Which looks more impressive? Which is the easiest to understand and which makes you feel you got the clearest picture of what participants said?

Consider when tables, graphs or other diagrams might be useful ways of presenting the data and when it is better to describe it in the text.

Be careful about when you claim differences between things. In quantitative research a difference implies that you have some statistical basis to your claims. For example, in a sample of boys and girls from a local intermediate school, there were ten 12 year

old boys and ten 12 year old girls; twenty in total. Of these, five boys and four girls said they had got alcohol from their parents. You might say:

More twelve year old boys than 12 year old girls got alcohol from their parents.

OR

Five twelve year old boys and four 12 year old girls said they had got alcohol from their parents.

The first sentence implies that you have carried out power calculations and found that this difference was significant (called a statistical difference). Somewhere in your report the analysis should be described.

In larger samples, say 200 boys and girls you might say:

Twelve year old boys (50%) were more likely than 12 year old girls (40%) to get alcohol from their parents.

OR

Fifty percent of twelve year old boys and 40% of 12 year old girls said they had got alcohol from their parents.

Again, the first sentence implies that you have carried out power calculations and found that this difference was significant. The second sentence does not tell you whether power calculations have been carried out. In larger samples you would expect this to be done and for it to be described in the text. If a statistical difference was found you could then use a sentence like the first one or say:

More twelve year old boys (50%) than 12 year old girls (40%) said they had got alcohol from their parents.

OR (if no difference)

Fifty percent of twelve year old boys and 40% of 12 year old girls said they had got alcohol from their parents; however, these differences were not significant.

Communicating results

How you will let others know about your evaluation findings should be built into your design and planning at the beginning (see *Evaluation design* and *Data collection*), although as the evaluation proceeds there may be changes.

The way we work (in common with most Maori evaluators) is that communication processes and forms of communication (written, oral, visual etc) are a planned part of the evaluation and integral to the relationships involved. One phrase that we use is “no surprises”. This means that we don’t go into a community, carry out our interviews, return to the office, analyse and write a report and then send it off. We feed information back to providers and funders as we proceed. We have a practice of sending reports to providers so that they can read what we have written and get an opportunity to respond before the report is finalised.

It is important to outline your different audiences; decide what information will be communicated to each and how you will present it: written forms, video, photography, audio etc.

Some of the ways of communicating findings are:

- Written feedback to participants (as well as sending transcripts to participants you may send brief, overall summaries).
- Presentations to providers and funders.
- Written reports to providers and funders; disseminate more widely depending on agreement.
- Community hui, workshops.
- Video, drama, music.
- Presentations to others: policy makers, evaluators, key agencies etc.
- Joint presentations at conferences etc.
- Media, local newsletters.
- Websites.
- Posters, pamphlets.

How and in what ways you communicate is likely to involve the input of the providers and funders. Providers may want to organise or be involved in community and other feedback; this can provide a support system for the evaluators.

You need to carefully consider confidentiality, trust and accountability and what information will be included and how you will present it. We prefer to be able to disseminate widely, but there can be ethical or sensitivity issues around this. Sometimes you may have findings that some stakeholders are concerned about and you may need to negotiate how this information will be presented and what its purpose is. There are often ways you can address these concerns without compromising the integrity or values of the findings. However, this is not always possible.

Think about how you present negative comments; saying programme participants didn't like the training sessions is unlikely to be useful unless there is something constructive to say or a point of learning. It may be as honest, but more useful to say that the participants felt that they needed more recognition for their skills and opportunities to participate in group discussions in the training sessions. Obviously the data that you work from is very important at this stage – if a participant said that they didn't feel that they got much out of the training this alone is not helpful unless the interviewer asked something like “Can you tell me what it was you weren't happy about?” and “Do you have any suggestions?” Some findings may be more appropriate to present verbally, while others will be communicated in various written forms.

Written reports

How you write is important; reports don't have to use complicated language to express complex ideas. Clear, concise writing is best. People shouldn't have to decipher what you write in order to understand it; this limits your audience and annoys at least as much as it impresses!

Deciding how to structure your report and what to include takes time. The sooner you can draw up an outline the better; this can be useful to do in the early stages of the evaluation. The report outline may change, but you will be aware of what areas you need to cover and the main information reporting needs. Read other evaluation reports in order to decide how you want to present your evaluation. Are there things that you found particularly interesting or useful? Do you know if the reports were well received?

If you write something it should be readable. Always read what you have written; sometimes it can help to read it aloud. Get others to check over and read your reports; it's easy to miss things when you are too familiar with the material. People who have little expertise in the field can provide useful input on grammar, typos and readability. Peer reviewers can look at the reports from the perspective of someone with knowledge of your area.

It is easier to make sense of reports when sections are logically broken down and there aren't long, under structured passages. Think about headings and sub-headings so that the reader can refer to sections that particularly interest them. They also make it easier for the reader to refer back to sections of the findings when reading the discussions and conclusions.

Think about the visual appeal of your reports; possibly include illustrations, photographs and copies of resources.

Formatting a report

There are of course many different ways of structuring reports. One suggested format is:

- Title/authors etc
- Acknowledgements
- Table of Contents
- Summary
- Introduction
- The project
- The evaluation: methods etc
- Results/Findings
- Discussion
- Conclusion
- References
- Appendices

If you include recommendations, they should be practical and clearly related to the findings.

Commonly a summary is placed at the beginning of a report. A summary is a 'retelling' of the report and is 1-3 pages long. It contains a concise (sometimes using numbers or bullet points) overview of the key points of the report; brief points about

the evaluation and the project, methods, findings and conclusions. Some people may only read the summary so you need to include the key findings and enough information to enable the reader to understand the context and purpose of the evaluation. Write the summary last.

The introduction should include what people need to know in order to understand what is being evaluated and how the evaluation was done; it usually includes a brief background to the issue (possibly with a literature review) and descriptions of the project and the evaluation, including evaluation methods.

The results or findings section presents a structured view of the data, perhaps separated into themes, or under programme objective headings (see *Analysing interviews* and *Analysing numbers*). Think about the most useful and readable way of structuring this section so that it serves the information needs of the evaluation. You need to give the reader enough information to understand what you have based your discussions and conclusions on.

Typically discussion and conclusion sections are placed at the end of the report. The discussion pulls the findings together, briefly drawing out the key points and explaining their significance; how they tie in with the literature and their implications in terms of the aims of the evaluation e.g. whether the indications are that the programme is meeting its objectives etc. In the discussion section you are not simply retelling what is contained in your report, but you interpret and present new understandings (a critical analysis) based on the findings and supported, where appropriate by other sources, such as literature. The discussion section should lead logically to your concluding remarks. One mistake sometimes made is to draw conclusions without providing enough information for the reader to know what they are based on. The reader needs to be able to refer back to the findings and, even if they disagree with your conclusions, they can see how and in what ways you have constructed the arguments that lead to your conclusions.

Publications

The term publication generally means papers written for peer reviewed journals. After initial culling by an editor or editorial board some papers will be sent to people considered to have expertise in your field (peer reviewers). They provide a critique and recommendations for rejection or acceptance; acceptance may require anything from major to minor rewrites.

Although they have a high standing in the scientific and academic arena, publications are often last on the list. We tend to prioritise other forms of dissemination; e.g. reporting to funders, providers, participants, the wider community, others involved with the programme or organisations such as policy makers who are able to make direct use of the evaluation findings. Papers may serve dissemination purposes other than being a means of increasing academic status and advancement. When we look for papers to draw on in literature reviews or to inform our evaluation and to support our knowledge and evidence bases, papers do carry weight and are reasonably readily accessible (see *Intervention logic* and *Literature reviews*). They are also accessible internationally and can enable interesting interchanges between indigenous peoples who share some common concerns and struggles.

You might want to include the possibility of papers in your evaluation plan and contract documents. We generally include a sentence that says that we will negotiate this possibility and provide an opportunity for funders and providers to read and comment on papers before sending them to a journal.

References

- Bishop, R. (1996) *Whakawhanaugatanga: Collaborative Research Stories*. Dunmore Press, Palmerston North.
- Cram, F. (1995) *Ethics and Cross-Cultural Research*. Department of Psychology, University of Auckland, Auckland
- Cram, F. (2009) Maintaining indigenous voices. In Mertens, D. & Ginsberg, P. (Eds.) *The Handbook of Social Research Ethics*. Sage, Los Angeles, pp.308-322.
- Cram, F., McCreanor, T., Smith, L., Nairn, R. & Johnstone, W. (no date) *Maori-Pakeha Teamwork in Maori Health Research*. University of Auckland, Auckland
- Duignan, P. (2003) Approaches and terminology in programme and policy evaluation. In Lunt, N., Davidson, C. & McKegg, K. (Eds.) *Evaluating Policy and Practice: A New Zealand Reader*. Pearson, Auckland,
- Durie, M. (1985) The evaluation of Maori health initiatives. *ANZSERCH Conference - Health Politics and Change, Auckland*.
- Durie, M. (1994) *Whaiora: Maori Health Development*. Oxford University Press, Auckland.
- Durie, M. (2000) Te Pae Mahutonga: a model for Maori health promotion. *Public Health Association Millennium Conference, Palmerston North*.
- Health Promotion Forum (2000) *Nga Kaiakatanga Hauora mo Aotearoa Health Promotion Competencies for Aotearoa-New Zealand*. Auckland
<http://www.hpforum.org.nz/page.php?p=28&fp=8>.
- Health Promotion Forum (2002) *TUHA-NZ: A Treaty Understanding of Hauora in Aotearoa - New Zealand*. Auckland. <http://www.hpforum.org.nz/Tuha-nz.pdf>.
- Health Research Council (1998) *Guidelines for Researchers on Health Research Involving Maori 1998*. Health Research Council of New Zealand, Auckland.
- Irwin, K. (1994) Maori research methods and processes: an exploration. *Sites* 28, 25-43.
- Jakob-Hoff, M. & Coggan, C. (2003) Core competencies for evaluators. In Lunt, N., Davidson, C. & Mckegg, K. (Eds.) *Evaluating Policy and Practice: A New Zealand Reader*. Pearson, Auckland,
- Lawson-Te Aho, K. (1995) *A Maori policy analysis framework for the Ministry of Health: discussion document*. Te Aho Associates,
- Martin, H. & Health Promotion Forum (1999) *E Rua. A Report of the Workshops Health Promotion in Aotearoa-New Zealand: Working with the Treaty of Waitangi and the Ottawa Charter*. Health Promotion Forum of New Zealand, Auckland
- Ministry of Health (1995) *He taura tieke: measuring effective health services for Maori*. Wellington
- Ministry of Health (2003) *Community Project Indicators Framework (CPIF): It's Use in Community Projects (Working draft)*. Ministry of Health, Wellington
- Moewaka Barnes, H. (2000) Kaupapa Maori: explaining the ordinary. *Pacific Health Dialog* 7, 13-16.
- Moewaka Barnes, H., Borell, B., Edwards, S. & McCreanor, T. (2009) Epistemological domination: social science research ethics in Aotearoa In Mertens, D. & Ginsberg, P. (Eds.) *Handbook of Social Research Ethics*. Sage, Los Angeles, pp.442-457.

- Moewaka Barnes, H. & Stanley, P. (1999) *Kia Mau te Mana. Community Action to Prevent Alcohol Problems*. WHO Regional Office for Europe, Copenhagen,
- Moewaka Barnes, H., Tunks, M., Dacey, B. & Hallmond, H. (1998) *Te Pataka o Te Tai Tokerau Outcome Evaluation Report*. Whariki Research Group, Alcohol & Public Health Research Unit, University of Auckland, Auckland
- Ngati Awa (1993) *The Mataatua Declaration on Cultural and Intellectual Property Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. Retrieved 9 February, 2009, from <http://www.ngatiawa.iwi.nz/documents/mataatua.shtml>
- PASE (2003) *Evaluation Hui: Toward Guidelines for Culturally Responsible Evaluation and Research*, InfoBrief. Policy Analysis & System Evaluation, Honolulu, Hawai'i. <http://www.ksbe.edu/pase/pdf/EvaluationHui/InfoBrief.pdf>.
- Pere, R. (1988) *Te Wheke: Whaia Te Maramatanga Me Te Aroha*. In Middleton, S. (Ed.) *Women And Education In Aotearoa*. Allen & Unwin, Wellington,
- Pihama, L. (1993) *Tungia te Ururua, Kia Tupu Whakaritorito te Tepu o te Harakeke*. Masters thesis. University of Auckland.
- Smith, G. (1997) *The Development of Kaupapa Maori: Theory and Praxis*. PhD Thesis. Education. University of Auckland.
- Smith, L. (1995) Re-centring Kaupapa Maori research. *Te Matawhanui Conference: Maori University Teachers Conference, Palmerston North, February*.
- Smith, L. (1996a) Kaupapa Maori Health Research. *Hui Whakapiripiri: A Hui to Discuss Strategic Directions for Maori Health Research*. Te Ropu Rangahau a Eru Pomare, University of Otago, Wellington School of Medicine, Wellington, pp.14-30.
- Smith, L. (1996b) *Kaupapa Maori Research*. Department of Education, University of Auckland, Auckland
- Smith, L. (1996c) Notes on Methodological Issues for Maori Health Research. *Hui Whakapiripiri: A Hui to Discuss Strategic Directions for Maori Health Research*. Te Ropu Rangahau a Eru Pomare, University of Otago, Wellington School of Medicine, Wellington,
- Smith, L. (1999) *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Zed, London.
- Te Korero Timatanga - Maori Focused Evaluation Hui (2002) *Hui Report*. Mihoroa Marae, Paki Paki, Hawkes Bay, 22-24 October.
- Te Ropu Rangahau Hauora a Eru Pomare (1996) Hongoeaka Declaration for Maori Health Researchers. *Hui Whakapiripiri: A hui to discuss strategic directions for Maori health research*. Te Ropu Rangahau Hauora a Eru Pomare, Wellington School of Medicine, Wellington,
- Waa, A., Holibar, F. & Spinola, C. (1998) *Programme Evaluation: An Introductory Guide for Health Promotion*. The University of Auckland, Auckland.
- World Health Organization (1986) Ottawa Charter for Health Promotion, adopted at the: *First International Conference on Health Promotion: The Move Towards a New Public Health, 17-21 November, Ottawa, Canada (sponsored by Canadian Public Health Association, Health and Welfare Canada, and the World Health Organization)*. Division of Health Promotion Education and Communication, WHO,
- World Health Organization (2005) *The Bangkok Charter for Health Promotion in a Globalized World*, 6th Global Conference on Health Promotion, Thailand, 7-11 August. http://www.who.int/healthpromotion/conferences/6gchp/bangkok_charter/en/print.html.

