Culturally Competent Evaluation for Aboriginal Communities: A Review of the Empirical Literature

Jill A. Chouinard and J. Bradley Cousins
University of Ottawa

Much of program evaluation is concerned with understanding and improving social programs so that they are ultimately more responsive and more reflective of program participant needs. At the same time, these programs exist and are embedded within specific social, cultural and historical contexts which impact program development, implementation, and eventual outcomes. Evaluations that attempt to address responsiveness to contextual and cultural specificity are often referred to as culturally competent, culturally responsive, inclusive, multicultural, or cross-cultural, among other terms. While there are no agreed upon terminologies, definitions, or even methodologies, what these approaches all share is the recognition that culture and context matter, and that there are no universally agreed upon rules or abstractions that can be applicable in all contexts (Guba & Lincoln, 2005). The recognition of culture and context thus becomes "an explicit criterion rather than an unspoken expectation" (SenGupta, Hopson, & Thompson-Robinson, 2004, p. 15) in evaluations of this type.

Although culturally competent evaluation has been historically and largely influenced by international cross-cultural evaluations (Hopson, 2003) conducted in developing countries, the growing disparities and increasingly multiracial and multicultural contexts in Canada and the United States is adding to the knowledge base as well. Despite the fact that researchers and evaluators have been working in diverse communities for many years, the specific focus on culture and cultural context in evaluation is nonetheless a more recent phenomenon. Evaluators contributing to the 1985 edition of *New Directions for Program Evaluation* (edited by Patton) for the first time asked how culture and cultural context might impact program evaluation (Hopson, 2003). Almost a decade later, Karen Kirkhart's presidential address at the 1994 American Evaluation Association conference asked that evaluators explore multicultural influences on their work. More recently, the American Evaluation Association formed a Task Force to review the *Program Evaluation Standards* of the Joint Committee from a culturally competent perspective. After significant input from numerous evaluation scholars and practitioners, recommendations were approved for future revisions to the *Program Evaluation Standards* (American Evaluation Association, Diversity Committee, 2004).[1] At the same time, program evaluation has greatly benefited from the active academic and practical interest in cultural competence in public and mental health and in social work (Lum, 2003; Sue & Sue, 1999).

---

[1] To our knowledge the revised version of the Program Evaluation Standards is currently being field tested.

Yet, while there is significant interest in cultural competence in evaluation, and the knowledge base is indeed growing, there is still much work to be done in terms of conducting empirical research that seriously attends to the challenges of culturally competent evaluation. As Hopson (2003) explains, "the challenge is for evaluators to understand how awareness and knowledge of cultural differences in evaluation work can contribute to different kinds of understandings about what evaluation is and what it can be" (p. 3). Empirical research on evaluation can help to meet this challenge. It is therefore our intention that this review of extant empirical literature adds to this vital area of program evaluation by providing critical insight into culturally competent evaluation in Aboriginal communities.[2]

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to review and synthesize the current empirical literature on cross-cultural evaluation in Aboriginal communities, and to begin to address the recognized lack of critically engaged discussion about research on culturally competent evaluation (Endo, Joh & Cao Yu, 2003; Hopson, 2003; SenGupta et al., 2004). It is our belief that the empirical research on cross-cultural evaluations has sufficiently evolved as to warrant stock taking in the interest of informing ongoing research in this growing area. To provide focus for this review we posed the following key questions:

1. What is culturally competent evaluation? What are the benefits to such practices? (Why bother?) Why does culture matter?
2. What does a culturally competent evaluation in Aboriginal communities look like? What are the relevant findings?

3. What methodological practices have been found to be culturally relevant in Aboriginal communities? What evaluation approaches have been found to be most effective?
4. What is missing in the literature? What gaps remain to be addressed?

Although we do not mean for this review to be exhaustive, we do intend to provide a comprehensive and critical review of the empirical literature on culturally competent evaluation in Aboriginal communities. One of the key assumptions guiding this review is the notion that culture is not a static and homogenous entity (Willging, Helitzer & Thompson, 2006), something that can be reified. Rather, culture is conceived of as a dynamic process in which beliefs and everyday practices are influenced by social transformation, social conflicts, and power relations (Guarnaccia & Rodriguez, 1996, as cited in Willging et al., 2006; Kirkhart, 1995; Kumanyika, 2003). As such, by focusing this review on the empirical research on evaluations in Aboriginal communities we attend to the specificities of culture, as well as to the historical and social domains that help define the dynamics of a cultural group. The primary focus on Aboriginal literature, however, does not imply that all Aboriginal groups are homogenous in any way (Weaver, 1999), but rather that there is a shared cultural, social and political history that is distinct and that must be understood on its own, as well as within the cultural framework of the dominant societal culture.

We now turn to a description of the methods we used to locate and define the sample of studies for review. This description is followed by a section that situates some essential conceptual distinctions necessary to understanding culturally competent evaluation and then a review and synthesis of the empirical studies we located. We end with a discussion about the state of knowledge in the empirical literature and a final section on implications

---

[2] The term 'Aboriginal' will be used throughout this document to refer to First Nations, Inuit and Métis people. Members of each of these groups have indigenous cultural heritage in Canada.

from the knowledge base for evaluation practice in community-based Aboriginal programs.

Method

There remain significant gaps in our knowledge about how to integrate notions of cultural context in evaluation theory and practice (Thompson-Robinson, Hopson & SenGupta, 2004), as well as gaps in our knowledge about how to conduct evaluations in Aboriginal communities (Rodriguez, 2002, as cited in White & Hermes, 2005). Our initial search was limited primarily to the literature published in the last ten years, and began with a review of evaluation journals such as the *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, *American Journal of Evaluation*, *New Directions for Evaluation*, *Evaluation and Program Planning*, and *Evaluation*. Bibliographies of key journal articles were perused for relevant citations. The search was further broadened to include key databases, the Educational Resources Information Clearinghouse (ERIC), PsycArticles, CSA Sociological Abstract, PsyINFO, and Medline.

To be included in this review, articles had to be empirical studies of evaluation of community-based programs specifically for Aboriginal people. In many cases, the published article took the form of a reflective narrative that used a specific evaluation as a basis for delving into cross-cutting evaluation issues. The majority of sources that were included came from peer-reviewed journals, academic books, Aboriginal and community-based foundation reports, academic conferences, or committee reports. To help further complement this review of empirical literature, articles discussing evaluations in Aboriginal communities but with a decidedly theoretical (as opposed to empirical) orientation were also included as a secondary source.

The literature search revealed a plethora of references to cultural competence, many of which are in the fields of public and mental health. Keeping the search focused only on articles that featured program evaluation, cultural context, and Aboriginal, Inuit, Native American or American Indian as key search terms, helped us to further refine the search. A total of 15 articles appearing in the period 1997 to 2006 resulted from this initial search. (All but three of the articles were published in the last five years). We read each empirical reference closely to assess the context, the purpose and focus of the study, the theoretical framework guiding or emerging from the study, characteristics of the evaluation approach and methodology used (if applicable), and the findings relevant to evaluations in Aboriginal communities. Table 1 provides a summary of our principal findings.

The majority of studies that we selected were reported by evaluators working in cross-cultural settings, and who were attempting to pursue culturally and contextually relevant evaluations in Aboriginal communities. Many of the reported findings are presented as lessons learned or guiding principles, and were based on evaluator impressions of or reflections on evaluation experiences. Seven of the studies were conducted within the community health field and three were based on evaluations in Aboriginal communities in Canada. Before turning to a review and synthesis of this literature, we will first explore the concept of culturally competent evaluation, what it looks like, as well as how it is enacted in Aboriginal communities. Much of our commentary in this section comes from an integration of the non-empirical, conceptual sources we located.

Jill A. Chouinard and J. Bradley Cousins

Table 1

Summary Description of Research Studies on Aboriginal Community Programs and Interests

Study	Context	Purpose/Focus	Theoretical Orientation	Methodology/ Evaluation Approach	Relevant (Indigenous/Cultural) Findings
Caldwell et al. (2005)	American Indian Research and Program Evaluation Methodology National Symposium	Collective experiences to provide lessons learned and guiding principles	Empowerment; participatory; cross-cultural	Community-based, collaborative, participatory action research; "culturally anchored methodology"; re-traditionalisation (return cultural norms)	Understanding of postcolonial stress; relational research; authentic partnerships; community involvement in data interpretation; research codes of ethics; tribal, cultural and linguistic diversity; strengths and cultural protective factors; locally meaningful constructs; training and employment of community members as evaluation project staff; capacity building.
Fisher & Ball (2002; 2005)	Indian Family Wellness Project	Description of Tribal Participatory Research	Participatory; cross-cultural; empowerment	Tribal participatory research model based on tribal cultural and social values; evaluation was culturally specific and developed by a working group; used a multiple-baseline research design; data collected at multiple intervals	To develop tribal-specific models of well-being - consider historical context in evaluation; multiple baseline design; language changed to reflect local norms; domains measured include participation in cultural events, connectedness with extended family, tribe, and community, use of storytelling; assessment emphasizes prosocial domains such as respectful behaviour and social competence
Letiecq & Bailey (2004)	American Indian youth-based initiative	Conduct a culturally sensitive and appropriate cross-cultural evaluation and explore "outsider" perspective and provide lessons learned	Social class, culture, ethnicity and race-based perspective; cross-cultural	Tribal Participatory Research (TPR) Model (Fisher & Ball 2002): 1) tribal oversight; 2) cultural facilitator; 3) training and employing community members; 4) culturally specific intervention and assessment	Development and implementation followed TPR model but evaluation more challenging. Six issues raised: 1) outsider position (power differentials surfaced); 2) resistance to evaluation (buy-in, knowledge and resource limitations), 3) measurement considerations (who determines what is valid, reliable and accurate?), 4) cross-5) cultural dynamics of difference (ways of knowing differ), 6) confidentiality and logistical constraints.
McKenzie (1997)	Child and family services in eight First Nations Communities	Develop culturally appropriate child and family service standards in First Nations communities	Participatory; empowerment; evaluation as catalyst for change; cross-cultural	Community-Based Participatory Research model (CBPR); focus groups followed by feedback and consultations	Focus groups particularly effective in eliciting meaningful dialogue; culture recognized as essential; emphasis on traditional practices; time consuming process; limited resources; connection between theory and practice difficult to achieve.
Novins et al. (2004)	Measuring outcomes for mental health services (Circles of Care)	Create culturally appropriate outcome measurement plans	Participatory, cross-cultural	Participatory; grantees selected own assessment approaches (measurement, informants, timelines, specific measures)	Problem is emphasis on problems rather than strengths (deficit-based); need to select own outcomes; the more funders specify the use of specific outcome measures the less communities will pursue innovative approaches to measurement; importance of community-level outcomes; relationship between funders and community and balance of dual evaluation needs.
Peter (2003)	Preschool Immersion Program, Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma	Develop culturally responsive evaluation of a preschool language program	Critical theory, naturalistic inquiry, constructivist, participatory and emancipatory; cross-cultural	Culturally responsive evaluation; combination of Fourth Generation Evaluation (Lincoln & Guba, 1989) and Empowerment Evaluation	Enables legitimacy and helps surface diverse cultural values and perspectives; develops autonomy and ownership-makes the process uniquely Cherokee.

Study	Context	Purpose/Focus	Theoretical Orientation	Methodology/ Evaluation Approach	Relevant (Indigenous/Cultural) Findings
Potvin et al. (2003)	Evaluation of Kahnawake Schools Diabetes Prevention Project (KSDPP)	Provide principles of success	Dynamic, process-oriented, interactive and iterative implementation model; community programs seen as "negotiated spaces"; cross-cultural	Action learning principles; group discussion to determine lessons learned during implementation and evaluation, participatory	Four implementation principles: 1) integrate community members as equal partners (develop joint "Code of Research Ethics"); 2) integrate intervention and evaluation; 3) flexibility and adaptability; 4) project approached as learning opportunity
Robertson et al. (2004)	Evaluation of Comprehensive Indian Resources for Community and Law Enforcement (CIRCLE) Project	Design a culturally relevant evaluation	Cross-cultural; attempt to mirror Lakota approach to research and evaluation	Participatory action research(PAR) and empowerment evaluation; local researchers designed and implemented evaluation (activism-oriented approach as nation building); quantitative data to look at outcomes	Attempt to use evaluation research to produce direct community benefits by using Lakota methodologies to connect with Indigenous governance; benefits of PAR and empowerment evaluation: opportunity to pay sustained attention to data collection; disseminate findings through radio shows, written reports, group presentations at grassroots level, meetings
Rowe (1997)	Community substance abuse prevention program called Target Community Partnership Project	Study changes in community members participating in the Program	Quantitative; not cross-cultural	Process and outcome evaluation plan based on the Customized Framework for Evaluating Community Partnership Projects (Yin, Kaftarian & Jacobs, 1996); participant surveys and interviews; baseline and post-program assessment	Organizational and capacity building important to program success. Organizational factors include: maintaining strong cultural focus, building on community leadership, training community people, leadership and support from Tribal Council, involving Tribal professional staff, hiring community member to facilitate project, monthly community events.
Running Wolf et al. (2002)	Comprehensive Community Mental Health for Children and their Families Program	Challenges and successes of tribal community in research and evaluation	Not cross-cultural; historical and cultural influences	Four primary components: system level assessment, description of children served by program, assessment of service experience and longitudinal outcomes for children for up to three years, assessment of services provided	Need to understand extended family system; "wraparound process"; all communities different; to help build community empowerment in evaluation, used community-based advisory committees and established a collaborative skill-building relationship with evaluation team; challenge is protecting confidentiality in small communities.
Senese (2005)	Dine' Wellness Centre evaluation project at Little Singer Community School	Description of research and evaluation in Dine' Wellness Centre	Cross-cultural	Identified community stakeholders to understand how wellness concept framed connections with traditional Navajo spirituality; used interviews and focus groups	Cultural awareness necessary but not sufficient; relationship between cultural relevance and silence in evaluation concerning race in education and the culture of social class in post-industrial capitalism (see it as contradiction); confusion around notion of culture as applied to traditional ways of knowing and living and effects after a history of state-directed dispossession.
Thomas & Bellefeuille (2006)	Formative evaluation of cross-cultural mental health program for Aboriginal people who were in residential schools	Reporting on findings of formative evaluation conducted using Aboriginal methodology	Cross-cultural; Aboriginal; Lincoln & Guba's (1985) four criteria used to assess quality of research (as cross-cultural)	Aboriginal methodology; grounded theory; cross-cultural; qualitative: interviews and focus groups to assess Aboriginal healing circle and psychotherapy technique of 'focusing'	Communities to decide research priorities; mental health considered within wider context of health and well-being; healing and wellness must draw on the culture for inspiration; work must reflect a commitment to social justice, a critical pedagogy of decolonisation and a strength-based philosophy of personal, community and cultural capacity building.
Weaver (1999)	Community needs assessment conducted by Native Americans	Description of needs assessment	Assessment conducted by Natives for Natives	Development of project guided by community members; focus groups and interviews (methods that involve personal contact considered culturally appropriate)	Integrate culture in all things; involve Native communities in planning process, data gathering, and directly experience research outcomes; community support crucial; oral traditions are strong, so verbal explanations may be more useful;

Jill A. Chouinard and J. Bradley Cousins

Study	Context	Purpose/Focus	Theoretical Orientation	Methodology/ Evaluation Approach	Relevant (Indigenous/Cultural) Findings
					allow time to develop collaborative relationships; community and groups focus rather than individual.
White & Hermes (2005)	Culturally responsive evaluation of the Hopi Teachers for Hopi Schools Project	Jazz as metaphor to understand spaces between traditional Western ways and Hopi ways of knowing	Cross-cultural; critical and interpretive paradigm; explore own positionality	Collaborative Participatory Action Research, critical race theory, qualitative approach; methodological bricolage, e.g. focus groups, reflexive autoethnography, story telling, testimonies, collective student reflective conversations	Self-reflective throughout evaluation asking questions about cultural appropriateness; methodological and epistemological humility required.
Willging et al. (2006)	Diabetes prevention program for urban American Indian women	Assess cultural appropriateness of intervention and provide lessons learned	Participatory; critical self-examination of own biases and position	Participatory; focus groups for pilot testing	Must account for broader social context; operationalization of concept of culture requires considerable flexibility to accommodate differing values, beliefs and practices; intra-cultural variation is the norm; constituent-involving strategies do not necessarily mean that it will be culturally appropriate.

Culture and Context in Evaluative Inquiry

There are many different ways of defining an evaluative inquiry. For the purposes of this review, evaluation will be defined as a "systematic inquiry leading to judgements about program merit, worth and significance, and support for program decision making and knowledge production" (Cousins, 2003; Weaver & Cousins, 2004). This definition, though broad, does provide a sense of purpose and does distinguish evaluation from other forms of social sciences research and inquiry (see Levin-Rozalis, 2003, for a further discussion of these differences). At the same time, it clearly underscores the fact that evaluation is about making "judgements" and about creating knowledge, two points to which we will return shortly. Of interest is that there is nothing in this definition about the program itself, about its context, nor about the people involved in, nor who will benefit from the program. Thus behind this rather stark definition of evaluation are essential methodological questions about the nature of knowledge and reality, values, methods and techniques, and the role of the evaluator. These questions cannot be answered in the abstract, but can only be "negotiated…in

the discretionary space formed by the intersection of an evaluator's theory and the particular characteristics of the presenting contexts" (Greene, Lipsey, Schwandt, Smith, & Tharp, 2007, p. 111). It is precisely within the space between the program context and the evaluator's perspective that culture, and ultimately culturally competent evaluation arises. According to Hughes, Seidman and Williams (1993), culture and research intersect in a number of places, influencing us (and what we observe) as researchers, as well as in the meanings and interpretations participants connect to the context and to the research instruments. Culturally competent evaluation is thus "a matter of surfacing the culture-based assumptions of both those being evaluated and those doing the evaluation" (Nelson-Barber, LaFrance, Turnbull, & Abruto, 2005, p. 62). This requires that we critically examine our own individual values, assumptions and biases (Nelson-Barber et al., 2005; SenGupta et al., 2004), our "cultural ethnocentrism" (Reagan, 1996, p. 4), in order to more fully appreciate the dynamic cultural context in which evaluation takes place.

Enhanced cultural understanding and a commitment to cultural sensitivity, however, is not enough (Senese, 2005), as we need to

develop a far more profound appreciation of the impact of culture and context in evaluation than a mere appreciation of diversity can render. If we accept that knowledge and knowledge construction are "inherently culture bound" (Lather, 1991), it thus becomes imperative that evaluation practices move beyond a mere awareness of plurality and cultural differences to a more enhanced understanding of "related systemic processes of asymmetric power relations and privileges" (Symonette, 2004, p. 108). Culture, within this broader understanding, thus becomes thought of less as a local manifestation and more as a concept within a larger system of domination (Hall, 1999).

Reflecting upon power differences is significant, particularly when working in communities where there is history of power imbalance and dislocations. As Nelson-Barber et al. (2005) remind us, "simply inviting everyone to the table does not ensure that the power differential recedes" (p. 71). The notion of power becomes even more salient when working in Aboriginal communities, as the historical factors that created the power imbalances and inequities between Aboriginal communities and the dominant culture persist to this day. Contextual factors and cultural considerations must thus move beyond mere demographic descriptions of communities and program, to the less vocalized issues of power, racism, and economic and class disparities that continue to define our society (Senese, 2005; SenGupta et al., 2004). As Willging et al. (2006) challenge us, "the broader social context in which such programs take form requires our analytic attention" (p. 139).

Equally important is the recognition that evaluation is ultimately about creating knowledge, an output that is itself culturally and contextually-based (Hopson, 2001; LaFrance, 2004; Scheurich & Young, 2002). Knowledge production, according to Gordon et al. (1990), has been historically dominated by "communicentric bias," which they define as

"the tendency to make one's own community the centre of the universe and the conceptual frame that constrains all thought' (p. 15). To move cultural competence in evaluation beyond the more legitimate and accepted vocabulary, beyond mere words, we must appreciate that there are no resonant universal social science methodologies and no neutral knowledge generation. Knowledge, as Foucault (1980) suggests, is not only infused with power, it is an effect of power.

The impact of culture and context on evaluation, as well as the dynamic of power, "race" and the production of knowledge discussed above, helps underscore the complexities and interconnectedness of culture and context in the evaluative endeavour, particularly in more culturally distinct communities. For the purposes of this review, the following definition of culturally competent evaluation, as elaborated upon by SenGupta et al. (2004) in a recent edition of *New Directions for Evaluation*, provides a provocative and useful depiction:

> Cultural competence in evaluation can be broadly defined as a systematic, responsive inquiry that is actively cognizant, understanding, and appreciative of the cultural context in which the evaluation takes place; that frames and articulates the epistemology of the evaluative endeavour; that employs culturally and contextually appropriate methodology; and that uses stakeholder-generated, interpretive means to arrive at the results and further use of the findings (p. 13).

This definition of cultural competence in evaluation is useful insofar as it encompasses both a practical and a theoretical orientation, emphasizing responsiveness to the cultural context, methodological and epistemological considerations, and enhanced evaluator and stakeholder roles.

Review and Synthesis of the Empirical Literature

In this section we provide an overview and an integration of the literature we located for this review.

Description

As previously stated, only articles that make direct use of empirical research and pertain directly to program evaluation in Aboriginal communities have been selected for this analysis. The more theoretically oriented literature will be included as a secondary source to supplement the empirical literature. The 15 empirical articles selected for this review were published between 1997 and 2006, with the majority appearing between 2002 and 2006. Of these, 12 of the evaluations (on which the reflective accounts are based) were conducted from a cross-cultural perspective (Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people working together); of the remaining three studies, one was conducted by an Aboriginal evaluator and two were conducted by evaluators in the field of public health.

All of the articles were based on participatory research methodology; of these, two were based on Participatory Action Research (e.g., Caldwell et al.,2005), two on Tribal Participatory Research (e.g., Fisher & Ball, 2002), one on Community Based Participatory Research (McKenzie, 1997), one on Culturally Responsive Evaluation (Peter, 2003), two on Empowerment Evaluation (blended) (e.g., Robertson, Jorgenson & Garrow 2004), and one on Collaborative Participatory Action Research (White & Hermes, 2005). The remaining eight studies were merely designated as participatory or collaborative evaluations, with no further methodological refinement provided. The purpose of the articles included providing lessons learned and guiding principles, describing culturally responsive programs and their evaluations, and developing culturally responsive and relevant evaluations.

Synthesis

As mentioned, all of the research studies included in this review are based on participatory principles, an orientation to research that has been found to be more responsive and germane to cultural context at the community level than have traditional or mainstream approaches to evaluation (Israel et al., 2003; LaFrance, 2004; Nelson-Barber et al., 2005). As Robertson et al. (2004) pointed out, in the participatory approach "people cease being relatively passive objects of research and assume active control over the research process. They generated the questions, interpret the data, and importantly, use the results of research to develop action plans aimed at transforming their communities" (p. 520). The participatory process thus enables people at the community level to become active participants in the research process and to cease being "considered as passive agents of someone else's vision" (Potvin, Cargo, McComber, Delormier, & Macaulay, 2003, p. 1301).

Participatory Variations

Before turning to some of the more salient issues in the literature, it is worthwhile to take a brief look at some of the distinctions in participatory approaches noted in these studies. Of interest is that many of the challenges and concerns raised, as well as lessons learned, have little to do with the methods evaluators used (the mechanics of the specific participatory approaches), though some of these were elaborated. Rather, challenges had mostly to do with the processes of developing participatory evaluation approaches in Aboriginal communities. While this does potentially further confuse one participatory approach with another by failing to distinguish among methodological differences, it provides rich data

on the cross-cultural experiences of evaluators in Aboriginal communities.

Tribal Participatory Research (TPR), as elaborated by Fisher and Ball (2002, 2005), is intended to be a refinement of community-based participatory research (CBPR), and is designed specifically for American Indian communities. The emphasis of TPR is on developing a collaborative process between researchers and community members and on establishing an infrastructure within the community to enable future research (Fisher & Ball, 2002, 2005). Letiecq and Bailey (2004) applied Fisher and Ball's (2002) TPR process to a cross-cultural evaluation of an American Indian youth-based initiative to explore the "outsider" perspective and provide lessons learned. Specifically, they applied the four principles of TPR, which are establishing tribal oversight of the project, using a cultural facilitator, training and employing community members as project staff, and using a culturally specific intervention and assessment (Fisher & Ball, 2002; Letiecq & Bailey, 2004). The four principles of TPR are based strongly on a "community-up" approach, and are designed "to ensure that the project would be culturally tailored and specific and would meet the needs of the community as determined by the community" (Letiecq & Bailey, 2004, p. 346).

Similarly, using a participatory action research (PAR) process, Caldwell et al. (2005) sought to develop a "culturally anchored methodology" in order to enable the "re-traditionalization" of community norms. At the beginning of the evaluation, they developed a "research code of ethics", a process designed to enable evaluators and community members to jointly develop a partnership to help guide the evaluation. Moreover, in an effort to culturally anchor the evaluation process, Potvin et al. (2003) developed a similar formalized partnership, which they explained "helped identify those aspects of the project likely to become obstacles to collaboration" (p. 1,299). Whether the evaluation process included such

formalized partnerships or not, all of the evaluations included negotiation and collaboration between outside researchers and Aboriginal communities concerning roles and responsibilities. Thus, despite the different names given to the evaluation approaches, most of the cross-cultural evaluations reviewed did develop processes to enable relationships between the community and the evaluator and to further facilitate the participatory process.

Cultural Context

Although the participatory approach as described in the literature did help with bridging the cultural gap between researchers and community members, an equally important consideration was the need to firmly ground the evaluation within the cultural context of the community. The literature clearly indicates that Aboriginal communities must be given the opportunity to decide the research priorities for their communities, set research agendas, and determine critical areas (Thomas & Bellefeuille, 2006). As "culturally bounded communities" (LaFrance, 2004), they need to be able to build culturally specific and locally meaningful constructs (Caldwell et al., 2005) and to integrate culture in all things. A number of the studies also underscored the fact that consideration must also be given to tribal, cultural and linguistic differences between communities (Letiecq & Bailey, 2004; Caldwell et al., 2005; Willging et al., 2006). Reflecting upon an evaluation conducted in eight different Aboriginal communities, Running Wolf et al. (2002) noted that not only do community needs differ from one to the other, but communities also interpret and enact culture differently as well, all of which Weaver (1999) pointed out makes it extremely difficult to generalize findings from one community to the other.

Strength-Based Focus

The need to maintain a strong cultural focus is also apparent in the emphasis put on developing community-based measurement protocols and defining culturally appropriate standards of excellence (Caldwell et al., 2005). An important finding reported in a number of the studies is that outcomes must not be based on a deficit model but rather based on the strengths, as well as the culturally protective factors found in the community (Caldwell et al., 2005; Novins, King & Son Stone, 2004). As Thomas and Bellefeuille (2006) explained:

> For many First Nations and Aboriginal peoples, healing means dealing with approaches to wellness that draw on the culture for inspiration and means of expressions. Hence, acknowledging the existing frameworks of healing and knowledge within Aboriginal communities…is needed (p. 11).

Enabling Aboriginal communities to develop a strength-based approach to evaluation rather than falling back on the negative stereotypes of the past, thus provides a more culturally and historically positive grounding for future evaluations. As Jolly (2002) concludes, "we must understand and be responsive to the nuances of culture without lowering our expectations by creating measures that reinforce stereotypes" (p. 20). At the same time, evaluation and outcome indicators must contribute to community empowerment and not be introduced merely as measures to ensure external accountability (McKenzie, 1997).

Culturally Relevant Outcome Measurement

Developing culturally relevant outcome measures and indicators in Aboriginal communities has also received considerable attention in the literature, as it challenges Western-based notions about what is accurate, reliable, and valid evaluation research (Letiecq & Bailey, 2004). As Smylie et al. (2003) pointed

out, "Western science has been described as reductionist, linear, objective, hierarchical, empirical, static, temporal, singular, specialized, and written" (p. 141), all very different from the more holistically based Aboriginal epistemology. Aboriginal people "generally do not fragment experience into mutually exclusive dichotomies, but tend rather to stress modes of interrelatedness across categories of meaning, never losing sight of the ultimate whole" (Brown, 1982, cited in Christensen, 2002, p. 31). As a result, in Aboriginal communities, outcome indicators cannot be so neatly demarcated and contained, as outcomes are often integrated into the culture of the broader community (Thomas & Bellefeuille, 2006; Weaver, 1999; Willging et al., 2006), as well as historically and contextually interrelated (Fisher & Ball, 2005), making it expressly difficult to determine evidence-based progress (as is often required by funding agencies).

Differences in Western and Aboriginal epistemological constructs, in "ways of knowing", thus require more elaborated strategies for developing culturally and contextually appropriate approaches to outcome measurement. A number of studies (Novins et al., 2004; Weaver, 1999), for example, found that all data collected must benefit the whole community, thus underscoring the need to measure community level outcomes rather than more discrete individual outcomes. Fisher and Ball (2002, 2005) also noted the emphasis on the family's role in determining children's outcomes, thus indicating the need to look at the relationships between children and their immediate and extended families, a point that is further corroborated by Running Wolf et al. (2002). Robertson et al. (2004) observed that despite the outcomes selected, there is nonetheless difficulty reducing objectives and activities to specific timelines, making it "necessary to constantly assess the usefulness of evaluation indicators, including better or different indicators as they present themselves, adjust if the system changes make the data

irrelevant, and guard the integrity of the data despite a politically changed environment" (pp. 516-517). Fisher and Ball (2005) further suggested that changes in outcome indicators "might not be easily achieved until key contextual factors have been addressed" (p. 50). As the literature details, there are a number of challenges to conducting evaluations in Aboriginal communities, particularly in determining culturally relevant and meaningful indicators that truly reflect the programs and the communities they serve.

Inquiry Methodologies

To integrate Aboriginal ways of knowing into the evaluation, a number of the studies reviewed (McKenzie, 1997; Thomas & Bellefeuille, 2006; Weaver, 1999; White & Hermes, 2005) reported the use of qualitative methods, in the form of focus groups and interviews, as a means of engaging participants in a reflective dialogue about the issues that matter to them and to their communities. Thomas and Bellefeuille (2006) also pointed out that qualitative methods "provide a sensitive mode of inquiry more in line with the cultural oral traditions and non positivist epistemological worldview of Aboriginal people" (p. 4). Recent developments in the use of technology also show much promise for use in this context (Johnston, 2005; 2007). Budak and Taylor (2007), for example, illustrated the use and benefits of an approach called 'photovoice' in an evaluation of Aboriginal justice programs. Photovoice is a technique that engages community members in taking photographs of meaningful or salient phenomena, relative to intended outcomes or other evaluative issues. As a participatory process, the use of a qualitative approach in cross-cultural evaluations further provides the opportunity for non-Aboriginal people to learn about the Aboriginal cultural context.

Interconnectivity with Broader Community

Culturally competent evaluations in Aboriginal communities thus require not only an understanding of the community itself, and of Aboriginal epistemological "ways of knowing", but also an appreciation of the interconnectivity and relationship with the broader community, one that is situated within a historical context. A number of the studies do note that for authentic collaborative and participative evaluations to take place, there must be an active recognition that there is a history of exploitation and colonialization between Aboriginal communities and the dominant culture (of which external evaluators would generally be members) that cannot be ignored. As Letiecq and Bailey (2004) explain:

> Perhaps one of the more salient lessons learned has been the importance of relationship building and the need to reaffirm such relationships often. The historical injustices experienced by tribal communities and the misuse of tribal knowledge requires constant dialogue and frequent meetings to ensure cross-cultural understanding and appropriateness (p. 354).

Thus while many of the studies did acknowledge the historical legacy of Aboriginal communities and the need to consider the historical context in the process of evaluation, as well as the need to explore our own cultural biases, only Letiecq and Bailey (2004) and Senese (2005) actively noted the existence of unequal power differentials as an issue in developing authentic cross-cultural relationships.

This draws to a close our synthesis of the studies we located. We now turn to a discussion of these findings and their implications for ongoing research on cross-cultural evaluation in Aboriginal communities.

Discussion

Beyond a review and synthesis of the empirical literature on cross-cultural evaluation in Aboriginal communities, the purpose of this paper is to further our understanding of what it means to include culture and cultural context in an evaluation, in a setting where questions of program merit and worth help surface questions of values, epistemology, and politics. This review, though not exhaustive, does provide a current picture of the empirical research on evaluation in Aboriginal communities both in Canada and in the United States. All of the 15 studies discussed provide thorough accounts of participatory and collaborative evaluations in Aboriginal communities, with a strong emphasis on methods. The studies also provide examples of sincere attempts to fully engage community members in designing and implementing evaluations, and in learning and building new knowledge to ameliorate their lives. There is much that we can learn from these accounts of evaluation studies, particularly in terms of building collaborative relationships with Aboriginal people, the use of Aboriginal knowledge to evaluate programs, the relationship between culture and context in evaluation, and methods best suited to Aboriginal "ways of knowing."

At the same time, this review raised many questions from an evaluative perspective about validity, utilization, participatory inquiry, power dynamics and its effects on relationships, and the perspectives of the people themselves whose communities and whose programs are the focus of evaluation. All of the articles were written from emancipatory and constructivist perspectives, with the emphasis on understanding people's construction of meaning, their lived experiences. This emphasis, while necessary in a cross-cultural context, must strike a balance between evaluation as a transformational and emancipatory project and evaluation as a form of systematic inquiry related to questions of judgment, and program

merit and worth. In evaluation, particularly in cross-cultural evaluation, questions of validity and reliability of results, as well as questions concerning process use and the utilization of results, remain important to advancing knowledge *about* evaluation, and more specifically *about* culturally competent evaluation. Moreover, the use of a participatory or collaborative approach, while necessary in cross-cultural settings, should not obscure a more thorough analysis of power and politics within an evaluation context, as power differentials often persist despite the use of more inclusive approaches. What follows is a brief discussion about validity, power and politics, utilization, and collaborative approaches to evaluative inquiry within cross-cultural settings.

Validity Considerations

One of the persistent questions is how culturally competent evaluation that is grounded in the community context, in indigenous ways of knowing, and in a participatory approach, is more likely to generate accurate and valid findings? Cousins and Whitmore (1998) identified pragmatic, political and philosophical justifications for participatory and collaborative approaches to inquiry. The third justification, specifically enhanced meaning and understanding, relates the notion of validity in terms of evaluation knowledge, findings and data and practitioner perspectives. As has been noted, the lack of understanding about the interaction between cultural competence and program implementation and impact can "jeopardize the validity of the evaluation" (Nelson Barber, 2005, p. 61) and can "lead to misrepresentations of social reality" (Madison, 1992, p. 36). Considerations of validity in evaluation, particularly in culturally competent evaluations, has the potential to shed light on the relationship between culture, context and program outcomes, all of which would help further our understanding about culturally

competent evaluation. Kirkhart (1995) develops the notion of "multicultural validity", a construct designed to assess the accuracy, soundness and appropriateness of our understanding across-cultural contexts. Similarly, Stanfield (1999) considers "relevance validity" as a means of assessing whether the data represents the realities of the community. Both validity constructs are particularly salient given the power inequities and the potential for misunderstanding between evaluators and Aboriginal communities. As Kirkhart (2005) reminds us, "as with all knowledge, evaluative understanding and judgements are culturally contextualized" (p. 21), and thus employing validity as a construct enables evaluators to more adequately attend to issues of power and privilege. For Lather (1993), who has written extensively on validity in social research, "it is not a matter of looking harder or more closely, but of seeing what frames our seeing-spaces of constructed visibility and incitements to see what constitute power/knowledge" (p. 675). Considerations of validity thus have the potential to provide an enhanced understanding of the cultural context and may help to surface tensions inherent in cross-cultural evaluations.

Power and Politics

We need to articulate power differentials epistemologically and methodologically, recognizing that despite the collaborative methodologies and the methods we enact in good faith, we are not merely different but unequal, with power continuing to favour the dominant, and more privileged social class. As such, we need to engage in a more substantive discussion about power and politics in cross-cultural evaluation using participatory methods, particularly in communities with a continuing history of exploitation. This point has further merit if we consider the very different ways of knowing between Aboriginal communities and the West, and if we consider the prominence of Western scientific knowledge claims through

the centuries. As Hopson (2003) points out, "competence in a multicultural context will involve recognizing the "epistemological ethnocentrism" that privileges the dominant worldview and values of the white middle class" (p. 2). While participatory approaches to evaluation may help bring all stakeholders to the table and may even help ameliorate *some* power differentials, challenges of creating meaningful dialogue between the powerful and less powerful persist (Mathie & Greene, 1997). Gregory (2000), argues that despite dealing with power differentials at a methodological level, through stakeholder agreements and terms of reference, for example, it is only through a more overt consideration and acknowledgement of power that issues surrounding participation and inherent imbalances can be addressed. As SenGupta et al. (2004) conclude, "addressing issues of power in evaluation constitutes a significant task" (p. 13).

Use of Findings and Process

While a culturally and contextually grounded evaluation may be motivated by social justice, the justification for a culturally and contextually grounded evaluation may also have to do with more practical benefits such as problem solving and program improvement. It might be beneficial to engage in a discussion about evaluation use as a pragmatic (or practical) rationale for a focus on culture and context in evaluation (Shulha & Cousins, 1997), as well as for the selection of a participatory approach, particularly given the link to capacity building sited in the literature (Cousins, Goh, & Clark, 2005). Linking culturally competent evaluation to the extant literature on evaluation use, participatory evaluation, and capacity building studies, for example, can help further our understanding about the relationships between culture, context, and community, and about what is relevant to the community, what processes work well to build capacity among community members, and what happens to the

results of the evaluation (did the community members learn? What did they learn? What did they do with what they learned?).

Specification of Collaboration

All of the empirical studies considered in this paper utilized a participatory or collaborative approach to evaluation, an approach that is more responsive to culture and context at the community level. That said, there are discernable differences at the methodological and philosophical levels among evaluations based on collaborative and participatory approaches. Although one might expect some overlap in ideological and methodological characteristics among all types of collaborative and participatory approaches to evaluative inquiry (Cousins & Whitmore, 1998) (and perhaps all the more so given the common goal of cultural and contextual competency) it might be argued that discernable and notable differences in purpose and form would emerge given the many types of participatory and collaborative inquiry which exist. The blending and juxtaposition of one participatory or collaborative method with another may fail to provide the clarity required to "extend knowledge about the circumstances and conditions under which particular approaches are likely to be effective" (Cousins, 2005, p. 183). At this early juncture in advancing and practicing culturally competent evaluation there needs to be more discussion about methodological and process issues as we begin to build a knowledge base and learn from other experiences in the field. The conceptual tools developed by Cousins and Whitmore (1998) and refined by Weaver and Cousins (2004) could help evaluators in cross-cultural contexts to render in a more explicit way than is presently the case considerations about interests (political, pragmatic, philosophic) and form (control, diversity, manageability, power dynamics, depth of participation) in collaborative inquiry.

The foregoing considerations are of particular interest to evaluation practice. To conclude the article we now turn our attention to research on evaluation. Specifically, we suggest some directions for research as we begin to make sense of where we are and of where we would like to go in the future.

Agenda for Future Research

The current discussion provides a good summary of cross-cultural evaluation in Aboriginal communities and enables us to take stock of the research on evaluations of this type. At the same time, it helps refine our understanding of what it means to conduct culturally sensitive or responsive evaluations in Aboriginal communities and helps us map future research directions. Based on the current review and synthesis of the literature, there are substantive and methodological issues warranting further study. More substantively, all of the studies reviewed used participatory approaches to evaluations in Aboriginal communities, developing collaborative methodologies based on Participatory Action Research (PAR) principles in order to more fully involve Aboriginal people in the evaluation process and thus underscoring the need to ground the evaluation in the cultural context of the community. While these approaches would appear to have significant merit, the tension between the evaluation needs of diverse stakeholders, that is, between Aboriginal community members and government funders, between outside evaluators and community members, and between evaluation as capacity building and evaluation as a means of judging program merit, worth and significance, was underreported in the literature. We need to further study what role culture plays in mediating these relationships, both in the field and at the evaluation table. We also need to engage in discussions about power differentials amongst evaluators and community members, particularly given the participative and

collaborative approaches used in cross-cultural evaluations. We also need to better understand the relationship between power, knowledge, evaluation use and questions of validity.

From a methodological perspective, all of the literature reviewed was in the form of case studies and narratives, written primarily from constructivist and social justice orientations. While all of the studies provided many valuable and informative lessons for future evaluation in Aboriginal communities, there was a lack of substantive discussion about epistemological issues, which potentially have both extrinsic and intrinsic manifestations in evaluations involving alternative ways of knowing and potential challenges to Western epistemological worldviews. In cross-cultural research and evaluation, further epistemological discussion, including possible relationships to notions of culture, for example, would help advance research in Aboriginal communities. Questions about why and how culture matters remain outstanding. At the same time, we need greater methodological and philosophical clarity surrounding the use of participatory and collaborative approaches to cross-cultural evaluation. We need to understand which participative methods help advance notions of culture in evaluation, how they are effective, and how we can continue to advance such participatory approaches for further research and evaluation.

Acknowledgement

References

American Evaluation Association, Diversity Committee. (2004). *Final Report: A cultural reading of the program evaluation standards (2nd edition).*

Budak, M., & Taylor, D. (2007, June). *Photovoice: An innovative method for community involvement in evaluation.* Paper presented at the Canadian Evaluation Society, Winnipeg.

Caldwell, J. Y., Davis, J. D., Du Bois, B., Echo-Hawk, H., Erickson, J. S., Goins, R. T., Hill, C., Hillabrant, W., Johnson, S. R., Kendall, E., Keemer, K., Manson, S. P., Marshall, C. A., Running Wolf, P., Santiago, R. L., Schacht, R., & Stone, J. B. (2005). Culturally competent research with American Indians and Alaska Natives: Findings and recommendations of the first symposium of the work group on American Indian research and program evaluation methodology. *The Journal of the National Centre, 12* (1), 1-21.

Christensen, R. A. (2003). Cultural context and evaluation: A balance of form and function, National Science Foundation, Arlington, VA.

Cousins, J. B., & Whitmore, E. (1998). Framing participatory evaluation. In E. Whitmore (ed.), *Understanding and practicing participatory evaluation. New Directions for Evaluation*, no.80. (pp. 3-23) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cousins, J. B. (2003). Utilization effects of participatory evaluation. In T. Kellaghan, D. L. Stufflebeam & L. A. Wingate (Eds.), *International handbook of educational evaluation* (pp. 245-265). Boston: Kluwer.

Cousins, J. B. (2005). Will the real empowerment evaluation please stand up? A critical friend perspective (Chapter 8), In D.M. Fetterman, A. Wandersman (Eds.), *Empowerment evaluation: Principles in practice* (pp. 183-208). NY: The Guilford Press.

Cousins, J. B., Goh, S., & Clark, S.. (2005). Data use leads to data valuing: Evaluative inquiry for school decision making. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 4*, 155-176.

Endo, T., Joh, T., & Cao Yu, H. (2003). *Voices from the field: Health and evaluation leaders on*

multicultural evaluation. Social Policy Research Associates, The California Endowment.

Fisher, P. A., & Ball, T. J. (2002). The Indian family wellness project: An application of the tribal participatory research model. *Prevention Science*, *3*(3), 235-240.

Fisher, P. A., & Ball, T. J. (2005). Balancing empiricism and local cultural knowledge in the design of prevention research. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the new York Academy of Medicine*, *82*(2), Supplement 3, iii44-iii55.

Foucault, M. (1980). *The history of sexuality* (Volume 1). NY: Vintage.

Gordon, E. W., Miller, F., Rollock, D. (1990). Coping with communicentric bias in knowledge production in the social sciences, *Educational Researcher*, *19*(2), 14-19.

Greene, J. C., Lisey, M. W., Schwandt, T. A., Smith, N. L., Tharp, R. G. (2007). Method choices: Five discussant commentaries. In G. Julnes, D.J. Rog (eds.), *Informing federal policies on evaluation methodologies: Building the evidence base for method choice in government sponsored evaluation. New Directions for Evaluation*, no. 113. (pp. 111-127) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gregory, A. (2000). Problematizing participation: A critical review of approaches to participation in evaluation theory. *Evaluation*, *6*(2), 179-199.

Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences (Chapter 8). In N.K. Denzin, and Y.S.Lincoln (eds.), *SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hall, S. (1999). Cultural studies and its theoretical legacies. In S.During (ed.). *The cultural studies reader (pp 97-109)*. Second edition. NY: Routledge.

Hopson, R. (2001). Global and local conversations on culture, diversity, and social justice in evaluation: Issues to consider in a 9/11 era. *American Journal of Evaluation*, *22*(3), 375-380.

Hopson, R. (2003). *Overview of multicultural and culturally competent program evaluation: Issues, challenges and opportunities*, Social Policy Research Associates, The California Endowment, Oakland, CA.

Hughes, D., Seidman, E., & Williams, N. (1993). Cultural phenomena and the research enterprise: Toward a culturally anchored methodology. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *21*(6), 687-703.

Israel, B. A., Schilz, A. J., Parker, E. A., Becker, A. B., Allen, A. J., & Guzman, R. (2003). Critical issues in developing and following community based participatory research principles (Chapter 3), In M. Minkler, N. Wallerstein (Eds.), *Community-Based Participatory Research for Health* (53-76). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Johnston, A. (2005, Oct). *Using methods that work with Aboriginal communities.* Paper presented at the Joint meeting of the Canadian Evaluation Society and the American Evaluation Association, Toronto.

Johnston, A. (2007, June). *Using technology to enhance Aboriginal evaluations II.* Paper presented at the Canadian Evaluation Society, Winnipeg.

Jolly, E. J. (2003). One the quest for cultural context in evaluation: All things are not equal-They never were. *Proceedings on the Cultural Context of Educational Evaluation* (03-032), National Science Foundation, Arlington, VA.

Kirkhart, K. E. (1995). Seeking multicultural validity: A postcard from the road. *Evaluation Practice*, *16*(1), 1-12.

Kirkhart, K. E. (2005). Through a cultural lens: Reflections on validity and theory in evaluation (Chapter 3), In S. Hood, R. Hopson, H. Frierson (Eds.), *The role of culture and cultural context: A mandate for inclusion, the discovery of truth, and understanding in evaluative theory and practice* (pp. 21-39). Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.

Kumanyika, S. K. (2003). Commentary: Cultural appropriateness: Working our way toward a

practicable future. *Health Education & Behavior*, *30*(2), 147-150.

LaFrance, J. (2004). Culturally competent evaluation in Indian country. In M. Thompson-Robinson, R.Hopson, S. SenGupta (eds.), In search of cultural competency in evaluation. *New Directions for Evaluation*, no.102. (pp. 39-50) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern*, NY: Routledge, Chapman and Hall, Inc.

Lather, P. (1993). Fertile Obsession: Validity after poststructuralism. *The Sociological Quarterly*, *34*(4), 673-693.

Letiecq, B. L., & Bailey, S. J. (2004). Evaluating from the outside: Conducting cross-cultural evaluation research on an American Indian reservation. *Evaluation Review*, *28*(4), 342-357.

Levin-Rozalis, M. (2003). Evaluation and research: Differences and similarities. *The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, *18*(2), 1-31.

Lum, D. (2003*). Culturally competent practice: A framework for understanding diverse groups and justice issues*, in D. Lum, Ed., Pacific Grover, CA: Thomas Learning.

Madison, A-M. (1992). Primary inclusion of culturally diverse minority program participants in the evaluation process. In A.M. Mdison (ed.), *Minority issues in program evaluation. New Directions for Evaluation*, no. 53. (pp. 35-43) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mathie, A., & Greene, J. C. (1997). Stakeholder participation in evaluation: How important is diversity? *Evaluation and Program Planning*, *20*, 279-285.

McKenzie, B. (1997). Developing First Nations child welfare standards: Using evaluation research within a participatory framework. *The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, *12*(1), 133-148.

Nelson-Barber, S., LaFrance, J., Trumbull, E., & Aburto, S. (2005) Promoting culturally reliable and valid evaluation practice (Chapter 5), In S. Hood, R. Hopson, H. Frierson (Eds.), *The role of culture and cultural context: A mandate for inclusion, the discovery of truth, and understanding in evaluative theory and practice* (pp. 61-85.). Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.

Novins, D. K., King, M., & Son Stone, L. (2004). Developing a plan for measuring outcomes in model systems of care for American Indian and Alaska Native children and youth, *American Indian and Alaska Native Mental Health Research, The Journal of the National Centre, 11*(2), 88-98.

Peter, L., Christie, E., Cochran, M., Dunn, D., Elk, L., Fields, E., Fields, J., Hirata-Edds, T., Huckaby, A., Raymond, M., Shade, D. C. H., Sly, G., Wickliffe, G., & Yamamoto, A. (2003). Assessing the impact of total immersion on Cherokee language revitalization: A culturally responsive, participatory approach. In J. Reyhner, O. Trujillo, R.L. Carrasco, L. Lockard (eds) *Nurturing Native languages*. Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.

Potvin, L., Cargo, M., McComber, A. M., Delormier, T., & Macaulay, A.C. (2003). Implementing participatory intervention and research in communities: Lessons from the Kahnawake schools diabetes prevention project in Canada, *Social Science & Medicine*, *56*, 1295-1305.

Reagan, T. (1996). *Non-western educational traditions: Alternative approaches to educational thought and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Robertson, P., Jorgensen, M., & Garrow, C. (2004). Indigenizing evaluation research. *American Indian Quarterly*, *28*(3/4), 499-526.

Rowe, W. E. (1997). Changing ATOD norms and behaviors: A native American community commitment to wellness. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, *20*(3), 323-333.

Running Wolf, P., Soler, R., Manteuffel, B., Sondheimer, D., Santiago, R. L., & Erickson, J. S. (2002). Cultural competence

approaches to evaluation in tribal communities. *Symposium on Research and Evaluation Method: Lifespan Issues related to American Indians/Alaska Natives with Disabilities*, AIRPEM Working Group on American Indian Research and Program Evaluation Methodology. Washington, DC.

Scheurich, J. J., Young, M. D. (2002). Coloring epistemology: Are our research epistemologies racially biased? in J.J. Scheurich (ed.). *Anti-racist scholarship: An advocacy*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Senese, G. (2005). The PENAL project: program evaluation and Native American liability (Chapter 8), In S. Hood, R. Hopson, H. Frierson (Eds.), *The role of culture and cultural context: A mandate for inclusion, the discovery of truth, and understanding in evaluative theory and practice* (pp. 129-147). Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.

SenGupta, S., Hopson, R., & Thompson-Robinson, M. (2004). Cultural competence in evaluation: An overview. In M. Thompson-Robinson,R. Hopson, S. SenGupta (eds.). *In search of cultural competence in evaluation: Towards principles and practices. New Directions for Evaluation*, , no. 102, (pp. 5-19) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass).

Shulha, L. M., & Cousins, J. B. (1997). Evaluation use: Theory, research, and practice since 1986, *Evaluation Practice*, *18*(3), 195-209.

Smylie, J., Martin, C. M., Kaplan-Myrth, N., Steele, L., Tait, C., & Hogg, W. (2003). Knowledge translation and indigenous knowledge. *Circumpolar Health*, *63* Supplement (2), 139-143.

Stanfield, J. H. (1999). Slipping through the front door: Relevant social scientific evaluation in the people of color century. *American Journal of Evaluation*, *20*(3), 415-431.

Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (1999). *Counselling the culturally different: Theory and practice* (3rd Edition). NY, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Symonette, H. (2004). Walking pathways toward becoming a culturally competent evaluator: Boundaries, borderlands, and border crossings. In M. Thompson-Robinson, R. Hopson, S. SenGupta (eds.), *In search of cultural competence in evaluation: Towards principles and practices. New Directions for Evaluation*, no. 102, (pp. 95-109) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Thomas, W., & Bellefeuille, G. (2006). An evidence-based formative evaluation of a cross-cultural Aboriginal mental health program in Canada, *Australian e-Journal for the Advancement of Mental Health*, *5*(3), 1-14.

Thompson-Robinson, M., Hopson, R., & SeGupta, S. (2004). Editors notes. In M. Thompson-Robinson, R. Hopson, S. SenGupta (eds.), *In search of cultural competence in evaluation: Towards principles and practices. New Directions for Evaluation*, no. 102. (pp. 1-4) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass).

Weaver, H. N. (1999). Assessing the needs of Native American communities: A Northeastern example. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, *22*, 155-161.

Weaver, L., & Cousins, J. B. (2004). Unpacking the participatory process. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Evaluation, 1*, 19-40.

White, C. J., & Hermes, M. (2005). Learning to play scholarly jazz: A culturally responsive evaluation of the Hopi teachers for Hopi schools project (Chapter 7), In S. Hood, R. Hopson, H. Frierson (Eds.), *The role of culture and cultural context: A mandate for inclusion, the discovery of truth, and understanding in evaluative theory and practice* (pp. 105-128). Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.

Willging, C. E., Helitzer, D., & Thompson, J. (2006). 'Sharing wisdom': Lessons learned during the development of a diabetes prevention program for urban American Indian women. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, *29*, 130-140.