Return on Investment for Briefings, Orientations and In Country Support

By: Helgi Eyford
Peter Tamas
For: Canadian Bureau for International Education
Date: 26 September, 1997

Table of Contents

Return on investment for pre-mission briefings:

The literature on corporate human resource development suggests that three things are needed to calculate return on investment; the cost of the training, the dollar value of the improvement of performance, and a convincing causal story that links improvement to the training. In the private sector it is often possible to link return on investment to the balance sheet. For example, if cross-cultural training is proven to reduce the number of grievances on an assembly line, and if the cost of the training is less than the financial benefit of avoiding those grievances, then the training is worth it.

It is possible to extend this type of analysis into the public sector where the value of the 'product' is often unknown or unknowable. What is required is that we assume that the product is of sufficient value to justify the cost of its production. For example, if training can increase the efficiency of processing citizenship applications to an extent that is greater than the cost of training, then the investment is justified. The value of processing citizenship applications is assumed.

The issue that we face is that, unlike the first example, our product is of unknown and perhaps unknowable value, and unlike the second example, our training is not in support of a discrete process. In the first case where there are cars at the end of the assembly line and in the second where there is a stack of processed applications, we have strengthened democracy in another country and increased efficiency of skills transfer. It may be difficult to attach a dollar value to democracy in another country or conclusively identify the impact of our training on the success of skills transfer. Though these constraints may limit the power of the analysis an evaluation method developed in the private sector may be appropriate.

The basic model for assessing the impact of training used in the private sector is Kirkpatrick's four level approach. His model, which looks at smile sheets, learning, application and results, seems to be fairly broadly accepted. For the purposes of this investigation we will be relying on an extension of Kirkpatrick developed by Phillips (1995 various). Phillips proposes the following levels of evaluation:

1. Reaction and Planned Action	What are participants reaction to the program and what do they plan to do with the material?
2. Learning	What skills, knowledge, or attitudes have changed and by how much?
3. Job Applications	Did participants apply on-the-job what they learned?
4. Business Results	Did the on-the-job application produce measurable results?
5. Return on Investment	Did the monetary value of the results exceed the cost for the program?

If this is accepted, then the evaluation will be structured as follows:

1. Reaction and planned action, and
2. What skills, knowledge or attitudes have changed and by how much.

   At these levels all that is required is an extension of a standard "smile sheet." In addition to asking whether or not the participants enjoyed the various parts of the briefing, it should ask how the participants intend to apply their learning and whether and to what extent the briefing changed the targeted skills, knowledge and attitudes. At this point the only two possible sources for that information would be the participant and the instructor.

3. Did participants apply on-the-job what they learned?

Again, this inquiry would be centred around the learning points of the briefing and ask 'to what extent did the students apply what they had learned'. Accepting Phillips' criticism of Kirkpatrick's model, this stage must also identify if anything in their environment made it easier or more difficult to reflect their learning in action. If this evaluation is done with reference to a prior learning assessment, then it should be possible to talk about how much the briefing changed performance. Acknowledging Kealy's (1986) observation that there seems to be little correlation between advisor's and their host country national's perceptions of effectiveness, the advisors, their in country handlers and their host country nationals should be queried at this stage.

4. Did the on-the-job application produce measurable results?

Evaluation for results requires that we know what results we want and are able to describe them in an evaluable manner. Kealy (1990) states that:

A successful overseas assignment is one in which an advisor is able to provide information, training, and technology to his/her counterparts in the host country and, in doing so, enhance their capacity to manage and develop their country's resources. In this context, an advisor's effectiveness is measured by his/her ability to transfer skills, knowledge, and expertise to counterparts in the host country. (p. 5)

Granting this as an acceptable objective in this case and working loosely within Kirkpatrick's model, a possible hierarchy of goals would be as follows:

a. that 50 Canadians spend an average of one month in Ukraine
b. that host country nationals enjoyed the advisors' visits and intend to apply what they say they learned
c. that the Canadian advisors were effective in transferring their skills
d. that host country nationals are applying the skills transferred
e. that the application of those skills is having a positive impact, and, if we want to push the edge of evaluablility
f. that the positive impact of the implementation of transferred skills is of greater value than the cost of the project

In order to conduct a level four evaluation, we will have to decide at which point in this sequence (a-f) we wish to draw the line. The difficulty, as with all cases such as this, is that the more evaluable the question, the less informative the answer. For example, it is easy to ask if the host country nationals enjoyed the advisor's stay. If we accept Phillips criticism of Kirkpatrick, there is little reason to believe that there is any connection between having a good time and learning something. Further, the connection from that to application and outcome are even more tenuous. Thus, we would know if the host country nationals had a good time, but we would have no idea if our project had any impact beyond that.

There are three criteria that I will involve in drawing the line: cost, visibility and causation. Any approach that we develop has to affordable within a reasonable project budget. This limits the number of people we can talk to and amount of research that we can do in host countries. By visibility I mean the extent to which it is possible to meaningfully describe the phenomena we are interested in. For example, in order to answer a question such as (e) "to what extent has the application of transferred skills had a positive impact" in the context of fostering the development of democracy, we would have to be able to describe democracy in terms that we could measure in dollars and relate to our efforts. Finally, we have to be able to tell a good causal story.

In addition to making sense, that is the cause happening before, being logically connected and close to the effect, a good causal story has to eliminate (control for) alternative explanations. The classic example of a poor causal story is "football causes winter" as proved by the statement that "when football season starts, it is summer, and when it ends it is winter; therefore, football causes winter." The logic is irrefutable, as far as it goes. We have a similar but much more complex problem in our case.

Our training is only a small portion of the equipment advisors take to an environment that may influence their ability to reflect that learning in unpredictable ways. Granting that we can find out how much of their behaviour is attributable to our training, host country nationals do not live in a laboratory and our advisors are only a small part of their lives. This inability to control for outside influences limits how far down the causal chain we can meaningfully look[1].

Considering costs, visibility and the need for a good causal story I do not think that it is possible to meaningfully extend the evaluation beyond (d), that is, "are host country nationals applying the skills transferred by the advisors?" That is, under ideal conditions I would recommend that we ask host country nationals to offer examples of things that they learned, to talk about how that learning has influenced their behaviour and to comment on reasons why it may be difficult to implement what they have learned.   Where possible I would then query those immediately around the host-country nationals to determine whether they have modified their behaviour as they have reported.

With this, it should be possible to assess the effectiveness of the advisor with as much confidence as can be reasonably expected. If we tried to take the evaluation one step further and attempted to determine the effect of those changed behaviours on their institution, we would have to start trying to determine the relative contribution of an incredible range of potential intervening variables such as the activities of other aid agencies and changes in the political climate. The final step, attempting to determine return on investment, edges rapidly towards the ridiculous.

Drawing the line at this point eliminates the possibility of evaluation at the level of return on investment.[2] Restating, if we wish to conduct an evaluation at the level of return on investment, we

---

1 If we wish to relate our activities to impacts that lie beyond the end our ability to tell a good causal story, we must rely on sources other than our evaluation such as theories and hypotheses on the emergence of democracy. For example, it may be reasonable to suggest that a well functioning civil society is a necessary contributor to the growth of democracy. As such, our hypothetical project could be an institutional strengthening program with a focus on agencies of civil society. It may be possible to see if we have improved the institutional strength of a agent of civil society, but the connection between that and a strengthened democracy only as strong as the original theory. In short, if funders wish us to link our activities to results that are not possible to evaluate for or lie beyond our point of final intervention, they must take responsibility for the portion of the causal chain that is not covered or meaningfully evaluable.

2 In some of his other work Phillips suggests that it is possible to assess return on investment at any of the four levels. The caveat is that moving to dollar figures at earlier levels compromises the confidence level of the

have to be able to determine the value of the outcome in financial terms. By stopping the evaluation at the level of "do the advisors apply what they have learned?" we are not conducting the necessary subsequent steps of "is that implementation having an impact?" and "how much is that impact worth?"

Placing our inquiry in context again, we would have to ask the following sequence of questions.

1. (i) did the advisors enjoy the briefing and
   (ii) what do they intend to do with it

2. (i) what skills, knowledge, or attitudes of the advisor have changed and
   (ii) by how much

3. (i) are the advisors reflecting that learning in their behaviour overseas and
   (ii) what external factors control their ability to reflect that learning

4a. (i) did the host country nationals enjoy their contact with the advisors and
   (ii) how much of that can be attributed to the briefing

4b. (i) what skills, knowledge or attitudes of the host national have changed,
   (ii) by how much, and
   (iii) how much of that can be attributed to the briefing

4c. (i) did the host country nationals reflect that learning in their behaviour
   (ii) how much of that can be attributed to the briefing
   (iii) what external factors control their ability to reflect that learning

Methodology

Now that we have identified the overall objectives of the evaluation, we will now turn to more methodological issues. In broad form, under ideal conditions the evaluation would consist of a(an):

1. Prior Learning Assessment

   The prior learning assessment would serve to create a benchmark that would permit future comparisons. This would be conducted by telephone prior to the pre-mission briefing.

2. Impression Sheet

   The impression sheet would determine whether the participants enjoyed the briefing, what they intend to do with the material and, by reference to the prior learning assessment, what knowledge and attitudes have changed and by how much. The impression sheet would be a form given to advisors immediately after their briefing and would, when compared with the prior learning assessment, indicate what the advisor has learned.

3. Post Mission Advisor Performance Assessment

---

conclusion. For example, I can do an assessment at the learning level, if I by way of assumption and consultation guess at the final impact of the training, and then attach a dollar value to that conclusion. The danger with this approach is that we represent an uncertain reality with unjustifiably confidence inspiring figures.

This stage of the inquiry would determine the extent to which the behaviour of the advisors reflected the training they received and what external factors encouraged or discouraged them to do so. In addition to advisor post mission reports, this stage would, where possible, question the host country nationals. Advisors would be given a structured discussion interview as part of their post mission de-briefing. Host country nationals would be given a similar interview to comment on the behaviour of the advisor by telephone and, where possible, in person. By correlating the results of this analysis with that of the previous inquiry it should be able to determine the contribution of pre-mission briefing to changes advisor behaviour.

4. Post Mission Host Country National Performance Assessment

This stage of the inquiry would determine the extent to which the host country nationals' behaviour reflected the training objectives of the advisor and what external factors encouraged or discouraged them to do so.[3] Host country nationals would be given a structured discussion interview administered in person or by telephone. The people with whom they work would be given a similar interview to comment on the behaviour of the host country nationals. By correlating the results of this analysis with that of the previous inquiry it should be able to derive a rough sense of the contribution of pre-mission briefing to changes in host nationals' behaviour.

Technical Questions

1. Intercultural communications competence

In addition to a range of detailed information that is relatively easy to test for, one of the objectives of the pre-mission briefing is to increase the 'inter-cultural relations competence' of the advisors. Many authors have proposed new and elaborated on old theories of what Intercultural relations competence is, how it relates to effectiveness in foreign cultures, whether or not training has any impact on advisor performance, and how to test and train for those competencies.

There seems to be general consensus that Intercultural relations competence has cognitive, affective and behavioural components, but beyond that point the literature begins to diverge. Todd Imahori and Mary Lanigan offer a vision in their 1989 article *Relational Model of Intercultural Communications Competence* that seems to be well grounded in the work of previous authors, notes that the success of an encounter is not the sole responsibility of the advisor, and provides a reasonable framework for planning and evaluating training that is designed to improve the performance of advisors. Their model will be used in developing evaluation instruments that test for this competence.

2. Isolating the effects of training

[3] This whole exercise, of course, is being pursued within the context of prescriptive evaluation from the perspective of the funder. The appropriateness of this sort of evaluation and the accountability mechanisms that lie behind it are the subject of some controversy.

In looking at outcomes our greatest difficulty will be to ensure that the effects we see were caused by our intervention. Jack Phillips (1995, various) mentions ten different techniques to isolate the effects of training. Of his suggested approaches, the following may be relevant to our work:

1. participant estimation of training impact
2. supervisor estimation of training impact
3. management estimation of training impact
4. expert estimation of training impact
5. subordinate estimation of training impact
6. calculating/estimating the impact of other factors

Where appropriate, we can use these suggestions at two levels. First, we can check on the performance of the advisors. To do this we would ask the trainer, the advisor, his/her host national counterpart and his/her handler a series of questions designed to determine how much of their knowledge, attitudes and behaviour can be attributed to our training and what factors contributed to or inhibited their ability to reflect that learning. Secondly, we can ask a very similar set of questions of the host country nationals and those who surround them regarding the impact of the advisor on the host country nationals. If we can figure out how much and what of the advisor's performance is attributable to our training, we can determine how much impact the advisor had on the host country national(s), and we can isolate the impact of our training from other potential variables, we will have some idea of what the impact of our training of the advisor was on the behaviour of the host country national.

Summary

As far as I am able to determine this is the minimum required to yield a design that approximates a level four evaluation for the contribution of pre-mission briefings to mission success. That is, if this design is feasible, it should yield enough information to fit into a results based management framework. The prior learning assessment, post training survey and post mission follow-up should all be fairly easy and inexpensive to conduct. The level of inquiry that will be difficult is the discussions with host country nationals and those who surround them. The best that can be recommended for that final and, perhaps, most important stage is that an instrument be developed that can be used when the opportunity affords.

Instruments

The relational model identifies the categories of knowledge, attitudes and skills in the context of goals and prior experience and mentioned that it would not be reasonable for a single inquiry to attempt to address all of those areas. These instruments are designed to query the effects of pre mission briefings on the advisors' behaviour. For reasons mentioned above, they are not intended to capture for overall mission success...that is the transfer of skills to their counterparts.

With the exception of the post training assessments (smile sheets) all research will be conducted by informal guided discussion interviews. Though some components will remain constant, sections of each 'smile sheet' will have to be custom built to reflect the specifics of each training seminar. Structuring the remaining instruments as apparently informal discussions greatly increases the probability of introducing interviewer bias. The risk can be limited by using one well trained individual to conduct all interviews and is justified as many respondents may be reluctant to honestly state their opinion in a formal environment. These two approaches are reflected in the instruments below: where the 'smile sheets' are quite tightly defined, the remaining instruments are little more than talking points for the interviewer.

A second objective of this design is to reinforce the learning of the advisors by asking them questions that provide them with categories to structure their experience in a manner that increases the probability that they will find an opportunity to consciously apply some of the lessons taught in their briefing.

Prior Learning Assessment

This instrument is to be filled out by an interviewer during the course of a telephone conversation. The discussion should appear to be semi-structured.

Background Information

Name:	
Age:	
Gender:	
Sponsoring Organisation:	
Job Title:	
Date of Briefing:	
Host Organisation:	
Duration of Stay:	
Purpose of Mission:	

1. What would you like to learn in the briefing?

____

____

____

____

2. Relevant knowledge of destination country (detailed questions keyed to learning points of briefing e.g. health, money, logistics)

3. What are your goals for this trip (probe for cognitive, behavioural and affective)?

4. Are you looking forward to your trip? (not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (a great deal)
comments

5. What challenges do you expect to run into in Ukraine?

6. Have you worked overseas before? yes no

6a. if yes:
(For the following questions answer with a rating from 1 to 5 where one is a very strong 'no' or 'poorly' and five a very strong 'yes' or 'well'.

Question		Please circle a number below	
(Factor 1: Ability to deal with psychological stress)			
a. Did you spend time frustrated, stressed out or anxious?	(very little)	1 2 3 4 5	(a great deal)
b. How well did you deal with that?	(very poorly)	1 2 3 4 5	(very well)
c. Did you notice differences in their political or administrative systems?	(very little)	1 2 3 4 5	(a great deal)
d. How well did you deal with those differences?	(very poorly)	1 2 3 4 5	(very well)
e. Did you feel pressure to conform?	(very little)	1 2 3 4 5	(a great deal)
f. How well did you deal with that pressure?	(very poorly)	1 2 3 4 5	(very well)
g. Did you feel alienated?	(very little)	1 2 3 4 5	(a great deal)
h. How well did you deal with that?	(very poorly)	1 2 3 4 5	(very well)
i. Did you run into interpersonal conflict?	(very little)	1 2 3 4 5	(a great deal)
j. How well do you think you did handling those conflicts?	(very poorly)	1 2 3 4 5	(very well)

How good were you at:

(Factor 2: Ability to effectively communicate)			
k. starting meaningful dialogue with host nationals?	(very poor)	1 2 3 4 5	(very good)
l. understanding host nationals' points of view?	(very poor)	1 2 3 4 5	(very good)
m. dealing with misunderstandings?	(very poor)	1 2 3 4 5	(very good)
n. dealing with different communication styles?	(very poor)	1 2 3 4 5	(very good)

How good were you at

(Factor 3: Ability to establish interpersonal relationships)

o.	developing good personal relationships with host nationals?	(very poor)	1 2 3 4 5	(very good)
p.	maintaining good personal relationships with host nationals?	(very poor)	1 2 3 4 5	(very good)
q.	accurately understanding the feelings of host nationals?	(very poor)	1 2 3 4 5	(very good)
r.	working with host nationals?	(very poor)	1 2 3 4 5	(very good)
s.	empathising with host nationals?	(very poor)	1 2 3 4 5	(very good)
t.	dealing with different social customs?	(very poor)	1 2 3 4 5	(very good)

6b if ‘no’ or ‘yes’ BUT NOT in Ukraine add

How curious are you about Ukraine? (not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (very)

What are you curious about?

____

____

____

____

The Canada-Ukraine Partnership Program
Pre-Departure Briefing Evaluation

In order to properly assess the Pre-departure Briefing Seminar we would ask you to take a few minutes to fill out this evaluation. Your comments will help us determine the effectiveness of the session and guide the organisation of future briefing seminars.

1. General

	Please circle a number below
a. Did you enjoy the briefing?	(not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (very much)
b. Did the briefing meet your objectives?	(not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (absolutely)
c. Was the trainer well prepared?	(not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (very well)
d. Did the trainers present the material well?	(not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (very)
e. Were you comfortable?	(not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (very)
f. Was the presentation of material well paced?	(not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (very)
g. Was the presentation well structured?	(not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (very)
h. Were there opportunities to ask questions?	(none) 1 2 3 4 5 (many)
i. Was the pre-departure package helpful?	(not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (very)
j. Were the organisational staff helpful?	(not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (very)

2. Sessions

Please rate the following sessions	Please circle a number below
a. Institutional context (Helgi Eyford)	(poor) 1 2 3 4 5 (excellent)
b. Historical & political context (Orst Subtelny)	(poor) 1 2 3 4 5 (excellent)
c. Cultural context (Helgi Eyford)	(poor) 1 2 3 4 5 (excellent)
d. Emotional context (Betty-Anne Smith)	(poor) 1 2 3 4 5 (excellent)

e. Environmental context (Konia Trouton)	(poor) 1 2 3 4 5 (excellent)
f. Linguistic context (Stephan Patten)	(poor) 1 2 3 4 5 (excellent)
g. Practical context (Helgi & Stephan)	(poor) 1 2 3 4 5 (excellent)

2. Do you think that this briefing will change how you behave in Ukraine? (not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (a great deal)

   If yes, please offer examples.

   ____
   ____
   ____
   ____

3. Are you looking forward to your trip? (not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (a great deal)

   comments:

   ____
   ____
   ____
   ____

4. How curious are you about Ukraine? (not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (a great deal)

   What are you curious about?

   ____
   ____
   ____
   ____

5. Has the briefing changed your expectations? (not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (a great deal)

   If so, how have they changed?

   ___

   ___

   ___

   ___

6. Was there anything in the briefing that you found challenging or unsettling? (nothing) 1 2 3 4 5 (a great deal)

   Please specify:

   ___

   ___

   ___

   ___

7. Have your goals changed as a result of this briefing? (not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (a great deal)

   If yes, which goals and how were they changed?

   ___

   ___

   ___

   ___

   ___

questionnaire number

Post Mission Advisor Performance Assessment - Advisor questionnaire

This instrument is to be filled out by an interviewer during the course of a telephone conversation. The discussion should appear to be semi-structured.

Name:	
Date:	
Interviewer:	
Counterparts (with contact info.)	

1. The objective of the following group of questions is to determine the extent to which the briefing contributed to an improvement in the following categories of behaviour. Acknowledging Kealy's observation that there is little or no correlation between advisor and counterpart perceptions of effectiveness, there is no attempt to determine the advisor's perception of accomplishment.

Question		Please circle a number below	
(Factor 1: Ability to deal with psychological stress)			
a. Did you spend time frustrated, stressed out or anxious?	(very little)	1 2 3 4 5	(a great deal)
b. How much did the briefing help you deal with this ?	(very little)	1 2 3 4 5	(a great deal)
c. Did you notice differences in the Ukrainian political or administrative systems?	(very little)	1 2 3 4 5	(a great deal)
d. How much did the briefing help you deal with those differences?	(very little)	1 2 3 4 5	(a great deal)
e. Did you feel pressure to conform?	(very little)	1 2 3 4 5	(a great deal)
f. How much did the briefing help you deal with that pressure?	(very little)	1 2 3 4 5	(a great deal)
g. Did you feel alienated?	(very little)	1 2 3 4 5	(a great deal)
h. How much did the briefing help you deal with that?	(very little)	1 2 3 4 5	(a great deal)
i. Did you run into interpersonal conflict?	(very little)	1 2 3 4 5	(a great deal)
j. How much did the briefing help you handle those conflicts?	(very little)	1 2 3 4 5	(a great deal)

How much did the briefing help you:

(Factor 2: Ability to effectively communicate)

k. start meaningful dialogue with Ukrainians?	(very little)	1	2	3	4	5	(a great deal)
l. understand Ukrainians' points of view?	(very little)	1	2	3	4	5	(a great deal)
m. deal with misunderstandings?	(very little)	1	2	3	4	5	(a great deal)
n. deal with different communication styles?	(very little)	1	2	3	4	5	(a great deal)

How much did the briefing help you:

(Factor 3: Ability to establish interpersonal relationships)

o. develop good personal relationships with Ukrainians?	(very little)	1	2	3	4	5	(a great deal)
p. maintain good personal relationships with Ukrainians?	(very little)	1	2	3	4	5	(a great deal)
q. accurately understanding the feelings of Ukrainians?	(very little)	1	2	3	4	5	(a great deal)
r. work with Ukrainians?	(very little)	1	2	3	4	5	(a great deal)
s. empathise with Ukrainians?	(very little)	1	2	3	4	5	(a great deal)
t. deal with Ukrainian social customs?	(very little)	1	2	3	4	5	(a great deal)

2. Was the briefing accurate? (not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (very)

if no, please specify.

____

____

____

____

3. Did you use anything that was mentioned in the briefing or in the texts? (nothing) 1 2 3 4 5 (everything)

if yes, please specify three examples:

____

____

____

____

4. Were there conditions in Ukraine that made it difficult to act on suggestions made in the briefing or texts? (nothing at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (just about everything)

if yes, please specify:

____

____

____

____

5. Was the briefing helpful in any other ways? (not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 (a great deal)

if yes, please specify how:

____

____

____

____

6. What changes would you make in the briefing?

____

____

____

Post Mission Advisor Performance Assessment - Counterpart questionnaire:

This instrument is to be filled out by an interviewer during the course of a telephone conversation. The discussion should appear to be semi-structured.

Name:	
Organisation:	
Job Title:	
Name of Advisor	
Relation to Advisor	
Purpose of Mission:	

Question		Please circle a number below	
(Factor 1: Ability to deal with psychological stress)			
a. Did the Canadian appear to spend time frustrated, stressed out or anxious?	(very little)	1 2 3 4 5	(a great deal)
b. How well did he/she appear to deal with that?	(very poorly)	1 2 3 4 5	(very well)
c. Did the Canadian appear to notice differences in your political or administrative systems?	(very little)	1 2 3 4 5	(a great deal)
d. How well did he/she appear to deal with those differences?	(very poorly)	1 2 3 4 5	(very well)
e. Did the Canadian appear to feel pressure to conform?	(very little)	1 2 3 4 5	(a great deal)
f. How well did he/she appear to deal with that pressure?	(very poorly)	1 2 3 4 5	(very well)
g. Did the Canadian appear to feel alienated?	(very little)	1 2 3 4 5	(a great deal)
h. How well did he/she appear to deal with that?	(very poorly)	1 2 3 4 5	(very well)
i. Did the Canadian appear to run into interpersonal conflict?	(very little)	1 2 3 4 5	(a great deal)
j. How well do you think he/she did handling those conflicts?	(very poorly)	1 2 3 4 5	(very well)

How good was the Canadian at:

(Factor 2: Ability to effectively communicate)

k. starting meaningful dialogue with Ukrainians?	(very poor)	1	2	3	4	5	(very good)
l. understanding Ukrainians' points of view?	(very poor)	1	2	3	4	5	(very good)
m. dealing with misunderstandings?	(very poor)	1	2	3	4	5	(very good)
n. dealing with different communication styles?	(very poor)	1	2	3	4	5	(very good)

How good was the Canadian at:

(Factor 3: Ability to establish interpersonal relationships)

o. developing good personal relationships with Ukrainians?	(very poor)	1	2	3	4	5	(very good)
p. maintaining good personal relationships with Ukrainians?	(very poor)	1	2	3	4	5	(very good)
q. accurately understanding the feelings of Ukrainians?	(very poor)	1	2	3	4	5	(very good)
r. working with Ukrainians?	(very poor)	1	2	3	4	5	(very good)
s. empathising with Ukrainians?	(very poor)	1	2	3	4	5	(very good)
t. dealing with Ukrainian social customs?	(very poor)	1	2	3	4	5	(very good)

2. What three things do you think Canadians should be told before they come to Ukraine?

____

____

____

____

Orientations

The task of a post arrival orientation for foreign students arriving in Canada is somewhat different than the role of a pre-mission advisor briefing. Where the objective of the second is to maximise the ability of a Canadian advisor to transfer skills to host country nationals, the objective of the first is to increase the ability of the foreign nationals to learn and, then, hopefully apply the skills they learned in their home countries. Despite this difference, a very similar analysis applies. First, there are the levels of evaluation provided by Phillips. Restating, those are:

1.	Reaction and Planned Action	What are participants reaction to the orientation and what do they plan to do with the material?
2.	Learning	What skills, knowledge, or attitudes have changed and by how much?
3.	Job Applications	Did participants apply on-the-job what they learned?
4.	Business Results	Did the on-the-job application produce measurable results?
5.	Return on Investment	Did the monetary value of the results exceed the cost for the program?

Stating the sequence in terms of our activities we have the following:

1. Reaction and planned action, and
2. What skills, knowledge or attitudes have changed and by how much.

   As with the evaluation of briefing, at these levels all that is required is an extension of a standard "smile sheet." In addition to asking whether or not the participants enjoyed the various parts of the orientation, it should ask how the participants intend to apply their learning and whether and to what extent the briefing changed the targeted skills, knowledge and attitudes. At this point the only two possible sources for that information would be the participant and the instructor.

3. Did participants apply on-the-job what they learned?

   At this point the design diverges from the previous example somewhat. Where in the previous section the emphasis was on the transfer of known skills, the point of these missions is learning new skills. The objective of the training we offer is to support the learning and application of these skills. Thus, at this level, our question would be to ask if the participants are applying what they learned in the orientation while in Canada.

4. Did the on-the-job application produce measurable results?

   In study tours there are a sequence of desired results: first that the foreign nationals learn well in Canada, second that the foreign nationals apply that learning on return to their country of origin and third, that the application of that learning produces results. Our task is to determine the contribution of our orientation to this series of desired outcomes. Returning to the example of Kirkpatricks' sequence as modified by Phillips we have the following:

   1. (i) did the foreign nationals enjoy the orientation and
      (ii) what do they intend to do with it

2. (i) what skills, knowledge, or attitudes of the foreign nationals have changed as a result of the orientation and
   (ii) by how much

3. (i) are the foreign nationals reflecting that learning in their behaviour in Canada, and
   (ii) what external factors control their ability to reflect that learning

4a. (i) what skills, knowledge or attitudes of the foreign national have changed as a result of their time in Canada,
   (ii) by how much, and
   (iii) how much of that can be attributed to the orientation

4b. (i) did the foreign nationals reflect their learning in their behaviour on return to their country of origin
   (ii) of that, how much can be attributed to their orientation, and
   (iii) what external factors control their ability to reflect that learning

4c. (i) what impact is that changed behaviour having, and
   (ii) how much of that can be attributed to the orientation

5. Did the monetary value of the results exceed the cost for the program?

Granting 4a, b and c, the next task is to attach a dollar value to those benefits. Rather than detail how this would be done at this point I will explore whether evaluation at level 4 is feasible.

The next step, as with briefings, is to determine how far it is possible to evaluate. As with the previous section, the difficulty we face is in telling a convincing causal story. To be specific, it may be possible to pick out the effect of our training on the students' stay in Canada, but it will be very difficult to control for intervening variables if we wish to extend that analysis to consider the impact of that training on their performance and the results of that performance after their return to their countries of origin. As such, evaluation should stop at level 3, that is, are the foreign nationals reflecting the material offered in the orientation in their behaviour in Canada and what external factors control their ability to reflect that learning. Extension of the evaluation to their behaviour after their return would have to be made conditional on greater involvement of the orientation program in the design of the study tour.

Methodology

Our evaluation will query at three points, on arrival in Canada, immediately after the orientation and just prior to the student's return to their country of origin. The first instrument will be a prior learning assessment keyed to the learning points of the orientation augmented by questions designed to predict the students' success in a Intercultural context. The second will be a very similar instrument that is designed to capture for changes in the categories queried in the prior learning assessment, and the third will be configured to inquire to what extent (s)he applied that material and what external factors controlled for his/her ability to reflect that learning.

The primary data source will be the foreign student. Unlike the previous example, the assessment of the effectiveness of training given to advisors, there is no single equivalent to the advisor's counterpart in the case of foreign students. The best that we can do in this case is to determine, on a case by case basis, what faculty or support staff had substantial contact with the student and query them. These people would only be asked to respond to questions immediately after the departure of the foreign student.

In Country Support

In addition to pre-mission briefings, our project also supplies advisors with in-country handlers backed by an office that looks after quite a range of logistical and substantive issues. The role that we serve, from this perspective, is facilitation and risk reduction. The only complication from an evaluation standpoint is that advisors are often not aware of the amount of support they receive. This reduces the use of the advisor's report in assessing our effectiveness.

In order to assess the effectiveness of our support to a mission we must do the following:

Facilitation

1. identify all the services given to an advisor
2. identify how that advisor could have achieved the same end on their own
3. specify the difference between the two (time, feasibility, money)
4. consult with each advisor to attach a value to that difference
5. aggregate the stated benefits over a period of time

Risk reduction

1. identify the risks that the support reduces
2. identify the inconvenience imposed when each risk is encountered
3. identify the level of risk for unsupported advisors and degree of confidence in that statement
4. identify the level of risk for supported advisors and degree of confidence in that statement
5. determine degree of variation in risk and overall level of confidence
6. consult with advisors to assign a dollar value to that variation
7. aggregate that dollar value over a period of time

Finally, combine the two aggregated benefits and subtract from the total the cost of operations. If done properly, this should yield a fairly accurate assessment of the return on investment of an in country support unit.

Conclusion

As I have stated in this paper, pre-mission briefing and in country support are only a small part of the equipment that an advisor takes into the field. Other variables, such as the technical capacity of the advisor, the actual needs of the host national's organisation, the degree of commitment of the host national and his or her organisation, the political climate in the host country and the appropriateness of the style of intervention all lie beyond the scope of a pre-mission briefing and in country support program. Of the variables outside the scope of this project one of the more important is the selection of the candidates. It would not be reasonable to expect that a one day to one week training session would result in significant gains in empathy, self-confidence, alter-centredness, little need for upward mobility or high ambiguity tolerance...all of which Kealy (1990) identified as central to advisor effectiveness.

Though I have extended the possible scope of evaluation through to possible changes in host nationals behaviour, and that question appears to be evaluable, I do not think that it is just to hold a briefing and support program accountable for results at that level. As such, and although it does not offer any indication of the outcomes that interest CIDA, I would recommend that the evaluation of a briefing and support program stop at the point where it determines whether the briefing had an impact on the advisor's behaviour and whether the in country support smoothed the road enough to justify the investment. Extension of the evaluation to the level of changes in host national behaviour would be conditional on a more participatory project conception and design.

Appendix A - Client centred approach to return on investment

Moving from an absolute to a client based perspective offers a second way to calculate return on investment. We can, as a service provider, do two things: we can point out some of the risks (both quantifiable and non-quantifiable) that their expatriate staff will face as an argument for the value of a briefing and, secondly, we can demonstrate that it is less expensive for a client to purchase our briefing than it would be for them to develop one themselves.

Risks

Health
- debilitating disease
- discomfiting disease
- debilitating injury
- discomfiting injury

Business
- lost contracts due to misunderstood negotiation practice
- misunderstood contractual terms
- ignorance of contract enforcement mechanisms
- lost opportunities due to unknown holidays
- inability to identify decision makers
- inability to identify or keep appropriate staff
- inability to identify or keep appropriate or partners

Politics
- inability to identify decision makers
- inability to navigate the bureaucracy

Customs
- lost opportunities and/or credibility due to unintentional offense
- lost opportunities due to misunderstood cues

Logistics
- lost time
  - transportation
  - missed appointments
- increased costs
- increased risk of violent crime
- inability to find appropriate lodging
- inability to find needed supplies
- inability to communicate with home office

Language
- inability to understand very basic communication
- inability to understand greetings
- inability to understand warnings of danger

Cost of development

These figures represent the cost of developing a briefing that will provide the traveler with the minimum basic information required for their mission. This does not include names and roles of potential contacts in the host country that are often critical to mission success and it incorrectly assumes that somebody with little or no background can prepare a relevant briefing. Time costs are figured at $60 000 per year for the staff person and $100 000 per year for the traveler. These salaries reflect the institutional cost, not paid salary.

Development time		
5 days assembling country specific information	@ $250	1250
4 days finding and interviewing recent returns	@ $250	1000
2 days finding and interviewing a recognized country expert	@ $250	500
1 day briefing		250
Trip preparation		
.5 day interview with country expert (traveller's time)	@ 416	208
(expert's time)	@ 1000	500
5 days reading cross cultural materials	@ 416	2080
1 day briefing	@ 416	416
Material costs		
460 in printed materials for country specific information		460
200 in printed materials for general cross-cultural skills		200
Total		**6764**

Annotated Bibliography

The purpose of this section is to provide summaries of the relevant portions of the articles that were drawn on in developing the above paper. Notes take the form of summaries mixed, where appropriate, with direct quotations from the author(s).

Evaluation Methodology

Imahori, Todd T. and Lanigan, Mary L. *Relational Model of Intercultural Communications Competence.* in International Journal of Intercultural Relations, Vol. 13, pp. 269-286, 1989.

Imahori et al. provide a model of Intercultural relations competence that is well based on previous work and extends into new areas. Of the models studied this seems to be the best basis for the development and evaluation of the component of advisor briefings concerned with Intercultural relations competence. The model they provide is quite complex and their suggestion is that a study only focus on a few of the items that they have discussed.

> Up to this point most assessments of Intercultural relations competence have only focused on one or two of the dimensions of affective, behavioural or cognitive capacity. This model represents the first approach that attempts to integrate all three of these sectors of capacity and frame it within the context of an individuals goals and prior experience. The authors mention Ruben (1976) and a series of his successors and Hammer et al.'s (1978) model and subsequent validations as approaches to assessing the behavioural competence of advisors. The third culture approach of Gudykunst, Wiseman and Hammer (1977) is mentioned as an attitudinal approach and Collier's rules vision (1986, 1988) is mentioned as a cognitive way to view the same subject area. By referencing Spitzberg (1984) the authors substantiate their claim that these three areas are interdependent in determining ICC competence. That is, high ICC competence requires knowledge, motivation and skills.
>
> The authors contend that ICC competence is a relational phenomenon that is not well measured by examining only the competence of the sojourner. It is the interaction that must be measured, not the individuals' competence. According to this model, effectiveness is measured by looking to the 'effective relational outcome' between an advisor and a host rather than a unilateral adaptation of the sojourner.
>
> Given that the definition of competence is both process and outcome driven, the measure must likewise look both to the competence of the interactants and the effectiveness of their interaction.
>
> The authors define Intercultural communications competence as "...the appropriate level of motivation, knowledge, and skills of both the sojourner and the host-national in regards to their relationship, leading to an effective relational outcome" and state that "The model has two major components: an advisor and a host-national. Each dyadic member conceptually possess three major elements contributing to relational outcome, that is, competence, experience and goal."

The authors break competence down into the categories of knowledge, motivation and skills as follows:

Knowledge:

- appropriate knowledge of interaction rules (Collier, 1988)
- cultural specific and cultural general knowledge (Wiseman et al., 1987)
- linguistic knowledge (Nishida, 1985)

Motivation:

- specific attitudes toward the other's culture such as perceived social distance and positive regard toward members of the other culture (Wiseman et al., 1987)
- General attitude about foreign cultures such as ethnocentrism and open mindedness (Gudykunst et al., 1977, Wiseman et al., 1987)
- attitudinal orientations to the specific partner (anxiety, unconditional regard, assertiveness, attentiveness, attraction and attitudinal similarity)

Skills

- Ruben's 1976, 1977 seven dimensions are plausible (i.e. display of respect, interaction posture, orientation to knowledge, empathy, self-oriented role behaviour, interaction management, and tolerance for ambiguity)
- Linguistic skills are also important (both the sojourners linguistic ability and the host nationals' accommodation ability must be measured).
- Affinity seeking behaviours (being friendly and showing concern and interest are importance competence factors).

Goals

- Goals and competencies are inter-related. A seasoned sojourner may set very high goals (intimate relations with a host national) where an inexperienced sojourner may only want to establish working relationships. The goal is an anticipated outcome, so, the nature of goals influences relational outcomes.

Past Experiences

- Prior experience predicts future performance...that is, if a person has performed well in the past, they will anticipate and likely perform well in the future. Similarly, competence impacts experience...somebody with poor skills is more likely to have a poor experience that will, in turn, impair future performance.

Relational Outcome

- Ruben and Kealy's (1979) Intercultural effectiveness is a feasible variable since they measured interactional effectiveness in both task and social relationships. Similarly, Koester and Olebe's (1987) communication effectiveness and Collier's (1988) relational validation are feasible.
- Spitzberg and Cupach, (1984) offer a model for relational satisfaction that includes:
  - level of relational commitment
  - interpersonal solidarity
  - conflict satisfaction
  - intimacy
  - relationship stability

Koester and Olebe (1987) provide an approach to examining uncertainty reduction

The authors observe that it is pragmatically impossible to examine all of the variables that they have identified in one study. They suggest that any one study should identify a subset of those variables and limit their examination accordingly.

Data on the relational success of a trainee should be confirmed by asking all parties to the interaction for their views and comparing the results.

Ruben, Brent D, Assessing Communication Competency for Intercultural Adaptation, *Group and Organisation Studies*, September 1976, 1(3), 334-354.

This is the first study in which Ruben articulated his behavioural model for assessing Intercultural relations competence. His assessment instrument takes the form of seven questions that an observer of an interaction can use to identify degrees of Intercultural relations competence. This model was incorporated into the later analysis conducted by Mitchell Hammer et al. in their *Dimensions of Intercultural Effectiveness: an exploratory study* (below).

This is Ruben's (and later Ruben and Kealy's) seven part assessment program for cross cultural communications competence. He proposes the following indicators:

1. Display of respect (the ability to express respect and posit regard for another)
2. Interaction Posture (ability to respond to others in a descriptive, non-evaluative manner)
3. Orientation to knowledge (relativistic vs. absolutist world view)
4. Empathy (the ability to put oneself in the other's shoes)
5. Self-oriented role behaviour (task and process contribution to group function)
6. Interaction management
7. Ambiguity tolerance

The paper concludes with the actual questionnaires used in his study.

As stated in *The Relational Model* this is one feasible alternative for behavioural indicators of cross cultural competence. Though well developed and subsequently confirmed, the model developed by Hammer, Goodykunst and Wiseman seems to be more appropriate for the design and evaluation of a cross cultural training program.

Koester, Jolene, The Behavioural Assessment Scale for Intercultural Communication Effectiveness, *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, Vol. 12, pp. 233-246, 1988.

This article describes a modification and validation of Ruben's 1976 behavioural approach to the identification of Intercultural relations competence. The instrument is called BASIC (Behavioural Assessment Scale for Intercultural Communication).

Hammer, Mitchell R., Gudykunst, William B. and Wiseman, Richard L., Dimensions of Intercultural Effectiveness: an exploratory study, *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, Vol. 2, pp. 382-393, 1978.

These authors provide an alternative to Ruben's seven behavioural indicators of cross cultural communications effectiveness. Of the models for assessing the behavioural Intercultural communications competence of advisors, this seems to be the best developed. It should be possible to use this design to query both the host country nationals and, with a slight modification, advisors. For example, the host country national would be asked "to what extent was the advisor able to deal with frustration" while the advisor would be asked "to what extent where you able to deal with frustration" and "to what extent did your briefing help you to deal with frustration".

The authors drew on quite a number of former studies, including Ruben, 1976 and composed the following 24 questions querying the ability of an advisor. The questions would be posed as follows: "On a scale of one to four please rate the ability of the sojourner:"

1. to deal with frustration,
2. to deal with interpersonal conflict,
3. to deal with unfamiliar situations,
4. to deal with changes in lifestyle,
5. to deal with stress,
6. to deal with pressures to conform,
7. to deal with financial difficulties,
8. to deal with social alienation,
9. to deal with different political systems,
10. to communicate in the language of the host culture,
11. to deal with different social customs,
12. to deal with unforeseen problems,
13. to initiate interaction with a stranger,
14. to enter into meaningful dialogue with other people,
15. to deal with communication misunderstandings between myself and others,
16. to develop satisfying interpersonal relationships with other people,
17. to deal with anxiety,
18. to understand another person's point of view,
19. to deal with different communication styles,
20. to deal with a different educational system,
21. to maintain satisfying interpersonal relationships with other people,
22. to accurately understand the feelings of another person
23. to empathise with another person, and
24. to work with other people.

When the results of the questionnaire were analysed data grouped into three areas. Those groupings were analysed and the following titles developed.

Factor 1: Ability to deal with psychological stress. (questions 1, 2, 5 17, 9, 6, 7 and 8)

- 1. to deal with frustration,
- 5. to deal with stress,
- 17. to deal with anxiety,
- 9. to deal with different political systems,
- 6. to deal with pressures to conform,
- 8. to deal with social alienation,
- 7. to deal with financial difficulties,
- 2. to deal with interpersonal conflict,

Factor 2: Ability to effectively communicate. (questions 14, 13, 15 and 19)

- 14. to enter into meaningful dialogue with other people,
- 18. to understand another person's point of view,
- 15. to deal with communication misunderstandings between myself and others,
- 19. to deal with different communication styles,

Factor 3: Ability to establish interpersonal relationships.(questions 16, 21, 22, 24, 23 and 11)

16. to develop satisfying interpersonal relationships with other people,
21. to maintain satisfying interpersonal relationships with other people,
22. to accurately understand the feelings of another person
24. to work with other people.
23. to empathise with another person, and
11. to deal with different social customs,

The remaining questions did not correlate decidedly with any factor

13. to initiate interaction with a stranger,
3. to deal with unfamiliar situations,
4. to deal with changes in lifestyle,
10. to communicate in the language of the host culture,
12. to deal with unforeseen problems,
20. to deal with a different educational system,

Hammer, Mitchell R, *Behavioural Dimensions of Intercultural Effectiveness: A Replication and Extension*, International Journal of Intercultural Relations, Vol. 11, pp. 65-88, 1987.

Following the 1978 publication of Hammer et al. *Dimensions of Intercultural Effectiveness: an exploratory study* there was a follow up in 1983 (Abe, H., & Wiseman, R. (1983), A cross-cultural confirmation of the dimensions of Intercultural effectiveness. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 7, 53-67.) that claimed that the data grouped better around five descriptors. The analysis conducted in this paper confirms that the original description offered in the 1978 paper is a better fit to the data. In addition to this confirmatory analysis Hammer places his instrument as the successor to Ruben's.

Advisor Effectiveness

Ruben, Brent D, & Kealy, Daniel J, Behavioural Assessment of Communication Competency and the Prediction of Cross-Cultural Adaptation, *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, Vol. 3, pp. 15-47, 1979.

The authors describe research conducted with Canadian cooperants and their spouses in Kenya (n=19) that explored culture shock, psychological adjustment and interactional effectiveness. For each of these areas the authors developed indices and instruments that are alluded to but not published in the paper. Of the three the only one that may particularly interesting is the interactional effectiveness. Unfortunately this instrument is based on the coding of discussion format interviews. While very powerful the analysis of the results is very time consuming. The authors' basic conclusion seems to be that those who are most culturally insensitive seem to suffer the least culture shock, are the most efficient but the least effective.

Kealy, Daniel J., *Cross-Cultural Effectiveness: A Study of Canadian Technical Advisors Overseas*, Canadian International Development Agency, 1990.

This is a summary of Kealy's doctoral work that looked at 1400 Canadian advisors and their spouses over the period from 1986-1989. The objective of this work was to identify characteristics of and predictors for effective advisors. Kealy concluded that attention needs to be paid to self-selection, selection, preparation, the role of women in development, interpersonal and cross cultural communication, the human skills of team leaders, and the compatibility of executing agency and CIDA interests. In his work Kealy created or identified three instruments that will be of use in the assessment of the effectiveness of advisors and, by extension, the impact of training on advisor effectiveness.

The author concluded that the following are key in determining sojourner effectiveness.

Self Selection

1. There needs to be an instrument that enables prospective sojourners and their spouses to make better informed decisions.
2. Spouses need to give careful attention to their expectations and motives

Selection

1. Prospective sojourners need to be assessed on non-technical grounds. Selection should be based on predictors of effectiveness, not adaptability
2. Spouses must be interviewed along with sojourners.

Preparation

1. More time should be spent on training advisors for effectiveness, stressing the realities and difficulties of working overseas and the need for establishing effective working relationships with national counterparts.
2. Those who are responsible for recruitment and preparation must change their attitude towards culture shock. A large percentage of those who will be most effective overseas will experience severe culture shock. A support system should be established in countries of assignment to help Canadians adapt and assist them in becoming more involved in and knowledgeable about the local culture.

3. Greater emphasis should be placed on language training for advisors for all countries. Learning the local language greatly facilitates overseas effectiveness.
4. In country support services should recognise the special problems faced by accompanying spouses and children and address their particular requirements.

Women in Development

Results of the study clearly support the potential for the effectiveness of women on overseas development projects. In fact, women were found to score significantly better on a number of skills and attitudes associated with development effectiveness.

Interpersonal and Intercultural Communication

Poor communication and a lack of understanding between Canadian advisors and national counterparts have resulted in ‘problem projects’ in most countries which receive development assistance. These two concerns were identified by many national counterparts during the study. Intercultural and interpersonal barriers must be broken down if there is to be an effective transfer of skills and knowledge.

Team Leaders

More attention must be paid to the selection of Canadian team leaders. Interviews with Canadian advisors emphasised the crucial role played by the team leader in a project’s success. The effective team leader was described as having the following skills:

- team building
- Intercultural negotiation and diplomacy
- willingness and ability to coach first time advisors and spouses
- flexibility
- ability to clarify the roles and responsibilities of all members of the project team
- ability to command respect from both Canadians and nationals
- communications and bridging

Executing Agencies

Greater attention should be given to ensuring that executing agencies involved in technical assistance projects overseas adhere to CIDA’s primary objective: the transfer of skills and knowledge to national counterparts. Success for these agencies must be more than merely not having to repatriate an employee. As such, executing agencies should attempt to recruit inter culturally skilled personnel and devote more attention to developing better strategies for transferring skills and knowledge.

"A successful overseas assignment is one in which an advisor is able to provide information, training, and technology to his/her counterparts in the host country and, in doing so, enhance their capacity to manage and develop their country's resources. In this context, an advisor's effectiveness is measured by his/her ability to transfer skills, knowledge, and expertise to counterparts in the host country." (p. 5)

The author provides the following as a description of an ideal advisor:

1. professional commitment to the job and a desire to help
2. the necessary technical background and skills
3. caring behaviour as indicated by:

- relationship building: the capacity to build and maintain friendly, co-operative, trusting relationships with others
- respect: the capacity to show interest in, attentiveness to, and respect for others
- sensitivity to local realities - social, political and cultural
- empathy: the ability to read suffering or discomfort on another person's face and competence in perceiving the needs and feelings of others

4. Action orientation, as indicated by
   - initiative: one of the first to act or propose a plan of action
   - self-confidence: expresses and demonstrates self-confidence with regard to personal goals and judgement
   - frankness: frank and open in dealing with others
5. Other centredness, as indicated by
   - self control: calm and controlled when confronted by interpersonal conflict or stress
   - flexible and open to new ideas, other beliefs and points of view
   - perseverance: a determination to work for the goals, even when tasks get overly frustrating
   - team work: prefers to work with others than alone
6. Low need for upward mobility
   - low need for high earnings
   - low need to live in a desirable area
   - low need for advancement
   - low need for prestige and status
7. Low security needs (high tolerance for ambiguity), as indicated by
   - low concern for degree of tension or job stress
   - low concern for good physical working conditions
   - low concern for security of employment
   - low concern about working relationship with his/her boss
   - low concern for a well-defined job situation
8. High self monitoring, as indicated by
   - skill at reading social situations
   - skill at regulating his/her behaviour to meet the needs of the situation
9. Social adroitness, as indicated by
   - skill at persuading others to achieve certain goals
   - diplomacy
   - social insight
10. Positive pre-departure expectations and a desire for contact with local culture

On assignment, the effective overseas advisor

1. may experience difficulty or stress in adjusting to the new environment
2. express a high level of personal and professional satisfaction
3. learns the local language and makes contact with local people
4. derives satisfaction overseas from participating in the local culture.

"There is a need to assess people on the non-technical criteria for individual effectiveness overseas. Selection should be based on an advisor's potential for overseas effectiveness, rather than his/her adaptability to a foreign culture." (p. 65)

Three instruments developed for the study have proved useful for selecting candidates for overseas development assignments. They are:

- the Living and Working Overseas Inventory, measuring interpersonal and other related skills associated with overseas effectiveness; completed by the candidate.
- the Interpersonal Behaviour Checklist, an instrument for obtaining colleagues' and supervisors' assessment of the degree to which the candidate possesses the critical skills for effectiveness. Personal references submitted by the candidate would be asked to complete the checklist in lieu of writing a letter of reference.
- the Development Communication Index, a field instrument used to assess the quality of communication and the accuracy of perception between Canadian advisors and their national counterparts working on a development project. This index presents 30 scenarios related to such issues as project progress and adaptation skills. The advisor and counterpart are asked individually to respond to each situation and to predict how his/her counterpart would likely respond. The instrument is designed as a problem-solving tool, i.e., the responses can immediately be fed back to advisors and counterparts and can serve as the basis for workshops on team building and cross-cultural communication. The development communication index is particularly promising. In completing the index, both Canadian and nationals enjoyed the task and expressed great interest in the results.

Hannigan, Terence P., Traits, Attitudes, and Skills that are Related to Intercultural Effectiveness and their Implications for Cross-Cultural Training: A Review of the Literature, *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*,, Vol. 14, pp. 89-111, 1990.

Based on secondary research the author offers a glossary of terms related to Intercultural communications competence and groups them under the headings of traits, skills and attitudes. Based on that grouping the author makes some suggestions about the form of Intercultural communications training.

The taxonomy suggested by the author is as follows:

Skills

- listening skills
- ability to enter into meaningful dialogue
- initiate interaction
- deal with misunderstandings
- deal with different communication styles
- linguistic ability
- interaction management
- organisational ability
- technical competence
- ability to effectively communicate ones knowledge to others
- ability to deal with psychological stress

Attitudes

- cultural empathy
- relativistic orientation to knowledge
- acceptance of others as people
- non-judgmental attitude
- respect for host culture
- interest in nationals
- sense of politics

Traits (positive)

- patience
- tolerance
- courtesy
- persistence with flexibility
- energy
- self-confident maturity
- self-esteem

Traits (negative)

- perfectionism
- rigidity
- dogmatism
- ethnocentrism
- dependent anxiety
- task-oriented behaviour
- narrow-mindedness
- self-centred role behaviours

Among other things the author notes that "cross-cultural training programs should challenge trainees to become aware of their own dogmatism." "Another area that should be examined is the individual's need for control"

The Effectiveness of Training

Deshphande, Satish P. and Viswesvaran, Chockalingam, Is Cross-Cultural Training of Expatriate Managers Effective: A Meta Analysis.

This study set out to determine the overall effectiveness of cross cultural training as represented in all of the evaluative literature that the authors could find. They concluded that cross cultural training has a demonstrable impact on the performance of expatriate managers. They claim that their study should remove any doubts surrounding the value of cross cultural training. Among other things they note that the cost of failed expatriate adjustment can be up to $150 000 and the total cost to US firms of this sort of failure is upwards of two billion dollars annually. In terms of actual significance, the authors state that the true mean correlations ranged from 0.39 to 0.56 which suggests that cross-cultural training has a major impact on the effectiveness of expatriate managers.

> Interestingly, the authors did not control for the type or duration of cross cultural training. As such, the study permits the conclusion that training is useful, but it offers no indication as to what that training should look like.

Kealy, Daniel J. and Protheroe, David R., The Effectiveness of Cross-Cultural Training for Expatriates: An Assessment of the Literature on the Issue, *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, Vol. 20 No. 2 pp. 141-165, 1996

In this article the authors have reviewed the literature that assesses the effectiveness of cross cultural training for sojourners. They conclude that, though positive, the evidence is not conclusive. They then propose several criteria that need to be considered as part of any reliable study and finally propose the design of an empirical study that would attempt to measure the impact of Intercultural training on overseas performance. The design that they propose fits much more into the category of a large scale academic undertaking and is not relevant to the ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness that we must undertake.

> The authors criticise Deshapande and Viswesvaren (1992) as follows:
> "This research employed a computer-based technique called meta-analysis, which attempts to render commensurable the results of studies using different measures and thereby enable the research to aggregate research findings over many different studies. Meta-analysis is only as valid as the underlying studies it employs, and unfortunately the authors did not limit their review to the methodologically-sound studies only. Moreover, this literature review treated "cross-cultural training" as an undifferentiated, generic entity, which unfortunately makes it impossible to identify more precisely the different impacts that various types of cross-cultural training might have. In this light the author's conclusion that their review "should remove any doubts that corporate leaders have about the effects of [such] training" (Deshpande & Viswesvaren, 1992) seems excessively optimistic."
>
> "Despite their encouraging findings, the conclusions of the well-designed studies that have been done in some domestic areas cannot simply be assumed to hold in the case of expatriates. It is evident that ROI studies in business, while suggestive on the issue of the

effectiveness of training in general, are difficult to extrapolate to situations like the roles of expatriates, even business expatriates, where goal-definition is usually murkier."

"The upshot is that no study of expatriates has yet been done which measures the longer-term results of training for expatriates and which is designed so as to eliminate alternative explanations for performance levels overseas (such as experience prior to training, the overseas work environment etc.). For this reason, we recommend to the community that a major study be launched which replicates at the international level, and indeed goes beyond, the methodologically advanced studies of Intercultural situations already done in some domestic areas."

The criticism that they make of by Deshapande and Viswesvaren (1992) is harsh and certainly sets the stage for their proposed large scale research project. In the absence of that project, the material offered by Deshapande and Viswesvaren (1992) was the best meta analysis found during the literature review.

Return on Investment

There is not a great deal of variety in the literature on return on investment. The basic principles seem to stay the same and variation occurs, if at all, at the level of detail in implementation. Of the authors reviewed on the topic of return on investment the work done by Phillips seems to be the most clearly reasoned and accessible.

Phillips, Jack, Return on Investment-Beyond the Four Levels!, *Academy of Human Resource Development (AHRD) Conference Proceedings (St. Louis, MO, March 2-5, 1995), Eric Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED398370*.

The author presents Kirkpatrick's four level model of evaluation (below) and demonstrates that his model is widely used and largely validated.

1.	Reaction	How well do the trainees like the program?
2.	Learning	What principles, facts and techniques did the conferees understand and absorb?
3.	Behaviour	Did the trainees change their on the job behaviour?
4.	Results	What results were obtained?

Kirkpatrick's model has apparently been subject to the following criticisms:

Linkages:

Links between levels are assumed, that is, if somebody enjoys the program, they learned something, and if they learned something, then that knowledge is applied, and when that knowledge was applied, performance improves. Unfortunately these links do not exist, or if they do, they are not very strong. Importantly, there is strong evidence to suggest that there is no necessary correlation between enjoying the program and learning and while they may have learned, there might be a whole range of reasons why that knowledge is not applied.

Definitions

Kirkpatrick's definitions were very tight at levels 1-3. E.g. level one looks at a very narrow definition of whether or not participants 'enjoyed' the training. Level 2 is limited to the learning of principles, facts and techniques, not knowledge skills and attributes. At level 3 behavioural change is limited to a narrow definition of observable behaviour. There are many reasons why training may not appear in behaviour and there are times when training will result in non-observable yet important changes.

Accountability

Kirkpatrick's model does not yield dollar figures in the final analysis nor does it properly account for training costs.

Isolating the effects of training

Early work by Kirkpatrick did not identify conclusive means to isolate the effect of the training. Recent work (Phillips 1995) identifies 10 ways to isolate training effect. This issue must be identified at level 3 and level 4 evaluations.

The author has taken these criticisms into account and formulated the following modification of Kirkpatrick's model:

1.	Reaction and Planned Action	What are participants reaction to the program and what do they plan to do with the material?
2.	Learning	What skills, knowledge, or attitudes have changed and by how much?
3.	Job Applications	Did participants apply on-the-job what they learned?
4.	Business Results	Did the on-the-job application produce measurable results?
5.	Return on Investment	Did the monetary value of the results exceed the cost for the program?

The author recommends the following techniques for converting soft data to monetary values:

1. participant estimation
2. supervisor estimation
3. management estimation
4. HRD staff estimation
5. historical costs
6. expert opinion
7. external studies

"Estimating values can be a reliable and accurate method for placing values on training data (Marelli, 1993b). Even soft, interpersonal skills training can be evaluated in dollar-and-cents terms (Fritz-enz, 1994)."

"In workshops where this model has been presented reaction with practitioners has been overwhelming. In a sample of 285 practitioners in the U.S.A. and Canada, 98 percent preferred this modified model to the four level model of Kirkpatrick. The other two percent had no opinion." (pp. 7)

The author suggest the following to isolate the effects of training:

1. control groups
2. trend line analysis
3. forecasting methods
4. participant estimation of training impact
5. supervisor estimates of training impact
6. management estimates of training impact
7. customer input
8. expert estimation of training impact
9. subordinate estimation of training impact
10. calculating/estimating the impact of other factors

"This model also recognises the fact that there should be intangible benefits that will be presented along with the ROI calculation." (pp. 9)

Phillips, Jack, Was it the Training?, *Training and Development*, v. 50 no. 3 pp. 28-32 March 1996.

This article expands on each of the methods identified above for isolating training effectiveness mentioned above...i.e

1. control groups
2. trend line analysis
3. forecasting methods
4. participant estimation of training impact
5. supervisor estimates of training impact
6. management estimates of training impact
7. customer input
8. expert estimation of training impact
9. subordinate estimation of training impact
10. calculating/estimating the impact of other factors

Phillips, Jack, How Much Is the Training Worth?, *Training and Development*, v. 50 no. 4 pp. 20-24 April 1996.

The author suggests this basic formula for calculating return on investment:

1. collect level 4 evaluation data
2. isolate the effects of training from intervening variables
3. convert results to monetary terms
4. total the costs of training
5. compare costs with benefits

Further, he provides detailed suggestions on how to convert to monetary value:

1. focus on a single unit of improvement
2. determine a value for that unit
3. calculate change in performance
4. obtain the annual amount
5. determine annual value

"For some soft data, it may be appropriate to use research to estimate the value. It's fortunate that many databases contain studies on the costs of various items related to training, including employee turnover, absenteeism , and grievances, as well as safety and customer satisfaction. Ideally the data should come from a similar setting in the same industry." (23-4)

Of the authors reviewed on the topic of ROI, Phillips seems to present the best reasoned and reasonable discussion. His clarity makes it easy to identify areas in which we will have quite serious difficulties demonstrating return on investment.

Decker, Carol A, Campbell, Clifton P, Determining the Cost Effectiveness of Training (A Self-Contained Instructional Module), *Eric Document Reproduction Service no ED394045*, May 1996

This is a detailed fifty page module that describes how to calculate ROI in the private sector. It is written in a manner that provides ample argument to suggest why it is not possible to uncritically import ROI analysis into our sector of activity.

Brauchle, Paul E., Interpreting a Compact Cost/Benefit Analysis that Assess the Performance Value of Training, *Eric Documentation Reproduction Service No. ED398370*, March 1995

Again, this author provides a step by step guide that demonstrates why we can not really do return on investment. The formula is as follows:

1. Determine the effect of the training
2. Determine the dollar value of the effect
3. Find out how many people have been trained
4. Determine the training cost per person
5. Put the information together.

Burkhart, Jennifer, Evaluating Workplace Education Program Effectiveness, *Eric Document Reproduction Service ED399435*

The author provides a good introduction to the evaluation of HRD programs in the workplace. She is not as specific as Jack Philips but assumes a lower level of reader familiarity with the topic area. This article proposes that evaluation needs to be incorporated at all phases of the design, implementation and impact assessment of a program cycle.

Communication Accommodation

Gallois, Cynthia; Franklyn-Stokes, Arlene; Giles, Howard & Coupland, Nikolas. Communication Accommodation in Intercultural Encounters. in Kim, Young Yun & Gudykunst, William B. eds. *Theories in Intercultural Communication, Eric Document Reproduction Service ED 351738.*

> One of the issues identified by Imahori et al. in *The Relational Model* is that the success of a cross cultural communication incident is at least in part determined by the ability of the host country national to accommodate to the idiosyncrasies of the sojourner. This article addresses the issue of accommodation. Communication accommodation theory works with the concepts of convergence, divergence and maintenance strategies in communication. Convergence involves changing ones linguistic (language, dialect, vocabulary, speech style etc.) or paralinguistic behaviour (tone of voice, speech rate etc.) to more closely match that of the other party in the conversation in order to seek approval, improve comprehension or show solidarity. Divergence is the opposite to this and maintenance refers to a lack of change in behaviour in response to the other party(s). Generally speaking, and so long as it is not obviously overdone, converging behaviours are good and diverging or maintenance behaviours are not. The majority of the article focuses on communication between groups with a historical power imbalance and, as such, is not entirely appropriate for the work that we are undertaking.

Blake, Brian F., Heslin, Richard, & Curtis, Shannon C., Measuring Impacts of Cross-Cultural Training, in Landis, & Baghat S. Dan, *Handbook of Intercultural Training 2nd. edition* , Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1996.

The authors provide an extremely detailed introduction to the field of cross cultural training and its evaluation. Rather than come at the question of return on investment, that is evaluation as a management issue, the authors approach the evaluation of cross cultural training from a more scientific perspective. Though their analysis is very powerful, the types of investigation they propose is much more rigorous than can be reasonably expected from an ongoing program. Despite this, they do provide some frameworks that are very useful.

> Cross Cultural Training Taxonomies
> The authors identified two different ways to classify cross cultural training:

1. Gudykunst, Hammer and Wiseman (1977) classifies training into the following categories
    - intellectual
    - area stimulation
    - self-awareness
    - cultural awareness
    - behavioural
    - interactional

2. Mendenhall and colleagues
    - skills that deal with self (self-confidence, avoiding depression and anxiety)

- skills that deal with other (skills that foster relationships with host nationals)
- skills that deal with perception (appropriate vies and attitudes toward the other culture)

Rather than work with one of those visions, the authors focused instead on instructional techniques, that is:

1. intellectual or area study (books, films lectures...the assumption being that knowledge is predictive of adaptive success)
2. laboratory (trainees practice exercises to strengthen intellectual learning (cultural assimilator model))
3. case-study (presents a trainee with a complex and realistic situation that is more involving than the intellectual or laboratory techniques)
4. group discussion (participants play a more active, involving role as they discuss the ideas and problems being considered)
5. simulation (places the student in a highly arousing situation and usually requires that they solve some sort of problem)
6. role playing (brings a trainee into a situation that can have high similarity to what they will experience in the host culture)
7. personal growth emphasis (focuses on the trainees' self understanding in the hope that understanding motivation, fears and defences, they can respond to situations in appropriate ways (T-group, encounter group))

The authors contend that training should draw on a variety of approaches.

Immediate outcomes of training:

> While the immediate effects of training can be thought of in terms of knowledge, skills and attitudes the specifics must be determined by the nature of the learning needs of the sojourner and his or her upcoming assignment. "The immediate measurement of training impact is often seen as unimportant and is contrasted in a negative light to the real situation in the other country. But, in the final analysis, whatever measures the evaluator can get will be used in evaluating a program. Most often, the measures the evaluator can get are of immediate outcomes - tests and demonstrations at the training site."(170)

The authors identified Hammer, Goodykunst and Wiseman's Dimension of overseas success (c.f. Hammer et al. above), they are:

- personal adjustment
- interpersonal effectiveness
- professional effectiveness

An organisation must make the following decisions re. evaluation:

1. whether or not to conduct an evaluation
2. the focus of the evaluation
3. the level of rigor desired
4. the evaluation design ("A balanced evaluation should consider both home and host culture data sources by using both home and host nationals as evaluators" p171)
5. potential data sources (self-reports, judgements of significant others, archival/objective measures, evaluator observations, measures of the sojourner's overt behaviour)

"Although they are difficult to obtain, the increased use of behavioural measures would improve CCT evaluations." (p 172)

Operational Criteria

"Operational criteria are the observable indicators used, the actual yardsticks on which the CCT program is measured." "it is essential that operational criteria directly reflect the dimensions of success assumed in the CCT objectives" "Criteria must be *selected* to ensure their *content validity,* which means that in combination they must include all of the various components of success assumed in the CCT objectives. Further, they must be *measured* to ensure their *construct validity* so that observed variation between trainees on an operational criterion can safely be assumed to represent variability on the particular theoretical dimension underlying that criterion. Given the previously mentioned problem in theoretically defining successful Intercultural adjustment, given the frequent vagueness of CCT objectives, and given the need for content and construct validation to flow from clearly specified theoretical constructs, validation of criteria can be very difficult." (p. 172)

Evaluation can have one of the three following objectives:

1. To generalise findings from a specific group to a larger range of contexts
2. To test theories that should be applicable to a wide variety of people and cultures by way of specific application to a given group.
3. To demonstrate that a program based on a theoretical premise is effective in a range of contexts.

Validity

There are four types of validity that we must be concerned for:

1. *Statistical conclusion validity:* Is participation in the CCT related to ones scores on the criteria of evaluation?
   - Low Statistical Power: insufficient sample size, insensitive statistical test, overly restrictive alpha level
   - Fishing and multiple comparisons: Repeatedly dredging the same data increases the probability of finding a spurious relationship
   - Measure Reliability: The measures may actually be capturing for a high degree of random error. Low measure validity may reduce the ability to detect a successful program.
   - Training implementation reliability: The way the training is done may vary from trainer to trainer and from one trainee group to the next
   - Random Irrelevancies in the Research Setting: Environmental variations may introduce error

2. "Internal validity is the degree to which the design legitimately permits one to conclude that a specific CCT program did or did not cause an effect on the criterion"
   - History: Events between the time of the training and the evaluation that have nothing to do with the training but may change the performance of the trainees

- Maturation: An observed effect could be caused by a person growing wiser, more experienced or in some other way changing between the time of the training and that of the evaluation
- Testing: The change may have been caused by the pre-mission test (Hawthorn effect)
- Instrumentation: The change may be attributable to slight changes in the instrument between the pre and post tests
- Selection: If comparison is made to a non-equivalent control group then conclusions could be meaningless.
- Mortality: Drop out of a program is almost never random, and as such, is a threat.
- Ambiguity about the direction of causality: Designs that require that all information be gathered at the same time are especially prone to this threat.
- Diffusion: Communication between treatment and control groups.

3. *Construct validity* pertains to the fit between operational and theoretical definitions, to the ability to infer from the concrete measures used in the study the relevant theoretical definitions
   - Inadequate explication of constructs: Confusion about which are the important facets of the CCT program or about the reason for the observed impacts of CCT may reflect the fact that the theoretical framework underlying the CCT program was specified in a vague or superficial manner"
   - Mono-operation bias: Single measures of one dimension of impact or single presentation of the training risks under-representing a complex phenomenon. Multiple measures of the same dimension and measures over multiple trainings is preferred.
   - Subject effects and researcher effects: Individuals' responses may be changed out of fear of being evaluated or when they are influenced by the researchers characteristics or cues.

4. *External validity:* pertains to the generalisation of a study's conclusions beyond the sample of people, time and settings included in the evaluation study. External Validity flows from the degree of correspondence among the sample of people/time settings in a study, the populations they actually represent, and the populations to which generalisation is desired.
   - Interaction of multiple treatments: When people participate in more than one training program, it is hard to pinpoint the cause of an observed change
   - Interaction of testing: Pre testing can sensitise learners to the program and produce greater change than would be seen in those that are later not pre-tested
   - Interaction of setting and CCT: A change in instructional setting may change the impact of the training
   - Interaction of history and CCT: The observed impact of the studied program may have been caused in part by an event unrelated to the training

Theoretical/Background

Cui, Geng and Van Den Berg, Sjef, Testing the Construct Validity of Intercultural Effectiveness, *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, Vol. 15, pp. 227-241, 1991.

The authors provide a model of Intercultural communications competence that is somewhat similar to that offered in the 1978 work by Hammer, Goodykunst and Wiseman.

The authors concluded that:
"The cognitive dimension of Intercultural effectiveness includes the knowledge of language, non-verbal behaviour, and communication rules of the host country. The affective dimension of Intercultural effectiveness requires a set of perceptions toward the host culture that enable cultural strangers to "position themselves in a psychological orientation" that is "favourable" or "complimentary" with that of the host culture (Kim, 1988). The affective quality is the ability to acknowledge cultural differences, to empathise with the host country's cultural norms and working styles, etc. The third component is the behavioural dimension, which requires an advisor to demonstrate his or her cognitive and affective qualities in social interaction with the host people"

In table format, the authors propose that the following competencies compose Intercultural communications competence:

Communication Competence
- Language ability
- Ability to initiate conversation
- Ability to establish a meaningful relationship
- Ability to maintain such a relationship

Cultural Empathy
- tolerance for uncertainty and ambiguity
- empathy for cultural norms
- empathy for different working styles
- awareness of cultural differences

Communication Behaviour
- Appropriateness of social behaviour
- Display of respect

The authors undertook a confirmatory factor analysis and concluded that its three factors, communication competence, cultural empathy, and communication behaviour, are basically good indicators of Intercultural effectiveness.

Fray, Robert B. A Brief Guide to Questionnaire Development. for Office of Measurement and Research Service, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University *Web Document, http://educsrvb.educ.cua.edu/ft/tamu/vpiques3.ht.*

This is a very good and succinct introduction to questionnaire development.