

Secretariat for Analysis of
Swedish Development Assistance

Attitudes and opinions on an aid programme

*A review of a questionnaire to people engaged in development
cooperation with Eastern and Central Europe*

Kim Forss
Stockholm, November 1994

STOCKHOLMS
UNIVERSITETS
BIBLIOTEK

MAG
Rapp Övr.

9.737

SASDA

The Secretariat for Analysis of Swedish Development Assistance

The Swedish government has appointed a committee with the task of analysing the results and effectiveness of Swedish development aid. A special Secretariat, SASDA, was set up on 1 March 1993 to carry out the work.

The Secretariat will work until the end of 1994 and will have as its main task to propose to Government suitable mechanisms for evaluations and policy analyses of Swedish aid. In its work SASDA will give priority to carrying out a set of selected studies world-wide, at country, sector and subject level and to studies of individual organisations to provide a basis for decisions on development co-operation in the future and to gain experience on how policy evaluations should be carried out. A major study concerns Sweden's co-operation with Central and Eastern Europe.

SASDA's point of departure is the aim of a better understanding of the mechanisms of development in order to enhance the results and increase the effectiveness of aid in achieving the five goals set by the Swedish parliament: increased resources, economic and social equality, economic and political independence, the democratic development of society, and the long-term management of natural resources and care of the environment.

The studies and analyses will be managed partly by the Secretariat's own staff and will include studies commissioned from different specialists in the committee's areas of priority.

The staff are :

Ambassador Claes Sandgren	Head of the Secretariat
Dr Eva Julin	Senior Policy Analyst
Mr Enrique Ganuza	Senior Policy Analyst
Mr Per Johan Svenningsson	Senior Policy Analyst
Ms Kerstin Sandling	Assistant Secretary
Ms Gunilla Jernberg	Assistant Secretary

Postal address: SASDA
P.O. Box 16418
S-103 27 STOCKHOLM

Telephone: +46-8 791 21 80
Telefax: +46-8-791 21 88
Visiting address: Klarabergsgatan 23, Stockholm

Stockholms Universitet



30001 005303468

2003-05-12

Attitudes and opinions on an aid programme

A review of a questionnaire to people engaged in development cooperation with Eastern and Central Europe

Commissioned by the Secretariat for Analysis and Studies
of Development Assistance.

Kim Forss. Andante AB. 1 November 1994.

ISSN 1104-697X
Regeringskansliets Reprocentral

Table of contents.

Summary

Introduction	1
Method	1
The respondents	3
Objectives of development cooperation	6
Organization and coordination	7
Factors contributing to success	11
Problem areas	12
Achievements	15
Concluding remarks	18

Annex 1. The questionnaire (in Swedish)

Annex 2. Raw data from the questionnaire

Summary.

During the summer of 1994, SASDA sent out a questionnaire to 540 persons who had been engaged in development cooperation with Eastern and Central Europe. The group was selected to represent as many and varied professions and experiences as possible. The purpose of the questionnaire was to find out what people think of the cooperation programme; for example, concerning organization, effectiveness and problem areas.

The response rate to the questionnaire was 55%. Out of these 299 persons, it is interesting to note that around a third had been working in Eastern and Central Europe before 1989, and equally many had been working with aid programmes in Africa, Asia and Latin America. It was a group of people with much international experience.

Almost all of the respondents think that clear objectives are a precondition for success, but only a little more than half of them think the Swedish objectives in the cooperation program are sufficiently clear. Quite a few find that many projects have little relation to the objectives.

What do they think of the organizational structures implementing the aid programme on the Swedish side? The respondents are divided. Half of them think that the structure is effective, and that the authorities give clear and concrete instructions and work flexibly. The other half think they are not effective, unclear and rigid. A majority think they are competent in the subjects required, and a majority think their administration is too slow.

Aid coordination is a central topic. Most think that coordination should be improved. Their favoured mode is to let the organizations themselves take care of coordination by initiating the contacts they need. Most of the respondents are against coordination by some central power, and they do not want recipient countries to coordinate either.

The most significant factors contributing to success are: (1) long term commitment by the Swedish partner, (2) wide spread support in the recipient country, (3) flexible project design, and (4) high continuity among project personnel. More than half of the respondents said that their own projects possessed one or more of these qualities.

The most common problems were: (1) language difficulties, (2) financial strength of the partner in the recipient country, (3) communication difficulties, and (4) cultural differences preventing mutual understanding. Between 20% and 40% had experience of one or more of these problems. Very few found that corruption constitute a problem, or that there were mistakes in project design or that the Swedish partner lost interest after some time.

The questionnaire asked people to grade their results on a scale from "very high" to "very low". 25% thought their effectiveness was very high and another 52% thought it was high. 30% thought their efficiency was very high, and 41% thought it was high.

Effectiveness in this context means whether people "are doing the right things". Efficiency, on the hand, means whether people "do things right". Effectiveness is about end values, efficiency is about using resources at the least costs.

Whether true or not is another question, but it is interesting to know that most of the persons actually come from the programme with a fairly deep sense of satisfaction. Only 1% ranked their efficiency as very low, and none ranked effectiveness as very low.

It would be interesting to know if different groups tend to think alike or have similar experiences. There are few significant correlations between attitudes and experiences on the one hand and background data on the other hand. People with a lot of international experience are no more successful than others and they do not have other experiences concerning success factors or problems. There are no differences between those who have spent their careers working in Eastern and Central Europe and the others, and no differences between those who have been working in Africa, Asia and Latin America and the others.

Those who have been working on small projects are more likely to think that they have successfully reached their objectives, and that they have been efficient. But there are no differences between agencies. Those who had their funds from SIDA do not think they were more successful than others, for example. There is some correlation between the funding agency and attitudes towards organizations. Those who received their funds from the aid agencies are somewhat more critical, and those who received their funds through the other authorities are more appreciative.

Apart from those general patterns briefly indicated above, perhaps the most interesting observation from the questionnaire is how diverse the experiences and opinions are. Very often the group just splits in two. Many found that political changes have turned the table on them, others have no such experiences; many found that the recipient organizations lack technical and managerial experience but many others found this uncommon. Concerning training and technology transfer, many found that those trained disappear and that the wrong people were trained, but almost equally many had no such problems.

Given that the experiences are so different, it is interesting to speculate how the supporting organization could handle the different requirements from the groups implementing the programme and how one could accomodate their needs for clarity, coordination, freedom, speed and direction. Meeting the needs of some would offend about equally many others (or be irrelevant to them), at least judging by the results from this questionnaire.

Introduction.

As a part of its evaluation of development cooperation with Eastern and Central Europe, SASDA has distributed a questionnaire to many of the actors on the programme. The purpose of the questionnaire was to assess attitudes and opinions concerning development cooperation.

During four years of cooperation, the people involved have had many and diverse experiences. For example, some may think that the Swedish aid organizations handle their part of the job competently, and others find them ineffective. Some actors question the objectives of development aid, and others require more coordination. Another question is; do people think their projects were effective and useful, or have they come out of the tasks with negative and skeptical attitudes to the cooperation program?

Whereas these opinions may have an interest, they do not necessarily express the truth. Still, SASDA considered that it would be interesting to listen to the actors' wealth of opinions in a more organized form. If hundreds of people find the objectives of aid incomprehensible, ill conceived and confusing, then it would be worthwhile to explore why and how this could be rectified. Either the problems are with the objectives - or with the actors. It is also of interest if a majority have come out of the projects with a feeling of having done a job well - or if they are dissatisfied with their achievements.

Therefore, this report should be seen as a supplement to the other studies that contain more factual information; that is, facts about implementation and effects. This report may hold facts about opinions, but it does not say whether opinions as such are true or false. But if the factual findings in other reports are supported by attitudes and opinions, then the case is stronger. Similarly, if the thoughts and feelings expressed here run counter to the evidence gathered in other studies, then the issue might have to be further explored.

Method.

This report is based on a questionnaire developed and distributed by SASDA. The questionnaire was sent to 540 persons who have been involved in development cooperation with Eastern and Central Europe in one way or the other - as employees in the aid organizations, as consultants or evaluators, as project managers, teachers, volunteers or members of non-governmental organizations.

The 540 recipients were chosen at random, based on address registers from the major aid agencies and other authorities handling funds for the assistance programme. It was sent to people of many different professions; doctors, farmers, midwives and nurses, nuclear power inspectors, academic researchers, standardization engineers, missionaries, teachers at "folkhögskolor" and "studieförbund", small-scale entrepreneurs and people in the large multinational enterprises,

tax fiscals, judges, labour markets specialists, policemen and custom officers - and many others.

SASDA did try to make sure that no major group of people involved in the cooperation were left out, thus the sample was not random in the strict academic sense of the word. The total number of respondents was 299, representing a response rate of 55%. When the questionnaire was sent out, the respondents were assured total anonymity. SASDA did not keep any register of them, and did not tick off answers as they came in. Thus, it was not possible to send out reminders, nor to analyse if there was any group who is less frequent among the respondents than others.

The questionnaire is enclosed in annex 1. It consists of 56 questions, plus two opportunities for remarks and reflections. The questions are grouped in five batches; (a) the structure and objectives of the Swedish aid system, (b) factors contributing to success, (c) factors causing problems, (d) utility and effectiveness, (e) transfer of technology, and (f) background information about the respondents.

The whole process of designing, sending out and processing the results of the questionnaire was undertaken during considerable time pressure. That is why SASDA did not undertake a pilot distribution of the questionnaire, which might have revealed that respondents' had difficulties understanding some questions.

The question is how the response rates affect the interpretation of results. 299 responses is nevertheless a significant amount. It is possible to analyse and draw conclusions - if done appropriately and carefully. The major danger is that the response rate affects the reliability of the findings. It is standard practice to assume that those who choose not to respond have a more negative attitude to, or are less interested in, the subject of a questionnaire (Kaplan; The Conduct of Inquiry, 1964). Consequently, there might be a positive bias in the responses. The reader must be aware of this bias and keep it in mind while reading the report.

The validity of the report concerns if the different questions really get answers to those things they are meant to assess. Four of the respondents wrote that they found the questions difficult to interpret, but four out of 299 make slightly more than 1%. Still, the response rate might also be low because the questions were difficult - or irrelevant from the perspective of the respondent.

However, the questionnaire contains overlapping questions and thus it is possible to discern if there is any lack of correspondance between them which would signify low validity. (As an example, we would expect to find a strong negative correlation between question 16, that one success factor is that the idea to the cooperation originates with the partners in Eastern Europe, and question 30, that lacking commitment in planning and design from the partners was a major problem. The opportunities for cross references show that validity is high.)

Table 1. Background of people and organizations.

	Yes	No	No reply	Sum
Has your organization worked in Eastern and Central Europe before 1989?	29%	63%	8%	100%
Have you worked in Eastern and Central Europe before 1989?	28%	66%	6%	100%
Does your organization have a permanent presence in Eastern and Central Europe?	25%	70%	5%	100%
Has your organization worked with Swedish development cooperation in Africa, Asia or Latin America?	37%	56%	7%	100%
Have you worked with Swedish development cooperation in Africa, Asia or Latin America?	31%	64%	5%	100%

This report presents the findings of the questionnaire. The questionnaire used a 5 graded Lickert scale to assess opinions on questions concerning objectives and structure, utility and effectiveness, and technology transfer. Connections between variables have been assessed with contingency tables and chi-square analysis. When I write that there is a correlation between variables, that means that the contingency coefficient is high and that the results are statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

The entire work with the questionnaire has been managed by SASDA. My own role has been to provide advice and guidance on the questionnaire and to analyse the data and write this report. The data presented in the report should speak for itself. I hope that the analytical process is transparent and that the reader can identify where it might be wiser to interpret data in another way than I have done, or where the analysis should be extended and developed. The questionnaire is attached in annex 1 and the responses to each question are found in annex 2.

The respondents

Before we look at the answers to the questionnaire, I would like to present the respondents. Table 1 shows the background of the 299 persons who completed the questionnaire. The majority has no experience from working in Eastern and Central Europe before 1989, neither as individuals nor their organizations. Still, it is a considerable minority of more than 30% who have had business activities or some other work in Eastern and Central Europe previously. The region is familiar grounds for many.

It is also interesting to note that fully 37% of the organizations and 31% of the individuals have been working with development cooperation previously. They are not a majority, but in which other randomly chosen group of people or organizations would as much as a third have been working with aid programmes?

Taken together, 64% of the sample either come from organizations or themselves have worked in Eastern and Central Europe, or with aid programmes in other regions. The majority thus has some familiarity with either the region or the subject of development cooperation, but for a sizeable minority it is all new. The distribution of roles reflects the total. A small percentage work with the aid agencies (5%), the vast majority work with project implementation (80%), and 2% of the respondents have taken part in monitoring, evaluation and control. 9% worked with something falling outside these three categories, and 4% did not answer the question.

Table 2. Responses to the question: Which organization funded your activities in Eastern and Central Europe?

	Count	Percentage
The Board for International Technical Cooperation (BITS)	94	49%
The Swedish International Development Authority (SIDA)	26	14%
The Secretariat for Cooperation with Eastern and Central Europe (ÖSEK)	22	12%
The Swedish Institute	20	11%
SwedeCorp	12	6%
The Swedish Nuclear Power Inspectorate (SKI)	7	4%
The Swedish Institute for Radiation Protection (SSI)	3	2%
Swedfund	2	1%
The Environmental Protection Board (SNV)	1	-
Other agencies	1	-
Sum	188	100%

Table 2 shows which agency they worked for, or which agency handled their funds. Almost half of the respondents have had BITS as the agency financing their projects, and then the other aid agencies follow suit. A small minority have received funds outside these structures; that is from technical agencies like the Nuclear Power Inspectorate or the Board for Environmental Protection.

A larger sample would probably have had many more reporting their funds from BITS or the other aid agencies, but I think the trend is correctly reported. Table 3 analyses the size of funds. The majority of organizations have disposed of funds between 100.000 SEK and 1 million SEK, and almost quite as many have disposed of between 1 and 10 million SEK. The majority of organization have thus had relatively little money. These sums do not allow for any but minor investments, and in general they only purchase limited amounts of consulting services or training.

Even though 20% of the organizations say that they dispose of more than 10 million, this does not mean that the projects are large. Remember that people in the aid agencies also answer, and they account for 5% of the respondents. However, the size of funds that the actors have been able to use to finance their activities should not be surprising. The whole programme is often said to be characterized by many and small activities rather than a few large ones, and table 3 supports that picture.

Table 3. Responses to the question: "How large were the governmental funds that your organization disposed for development cooperation with Eastern and Central Europe?"

Less than 100.000 SEK	9%
Between 100.000 and 1 million SEK	35%
Between 1 million and 10 million SEK	30%
More than 10 million SEK	20%
No reply	6%
Sum	100%

In sum, most of respondents have received their funds from the aid agencies. Most have been involved in rather small projects of between 100.000 and 10 million SEK. Many have been working in Eastern and Central Europe before 1989, and many with development cooperation in the Third World. Note that between 10 and 30% did not answer one or more of the questions in the background section.

The most likely reason is that they felt their anonymity would be threatened. When the background variables are correlated with other variables, the lack of responses on these questions undermines the interpretation of data. Also note that some organizations have very few responses, it is thus impossible to draw any conclusions regarding the differences between agencies.

Objectives of development cooperation

Since its start in 1989, development cooperation with Eastern and Central Europe has had three objectives; (1) to contribute to the development of market economies, (2) to support the transformation to democracy and legal governance, and (3) to improve environmental conditions. Since then, a fourth objective has been added; to support the sovereignty of the three Baltic republics. The question is if these objectives are understood and used practically in the cooperation programme.

Table 4. Attitudes towards objectives.

"Please indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement with the following statements:"		
	Agree	Disagree
Clear objectives are a precondition for successful cooperation	82%	2%
Development objectives are mainly of concern to the Swedish authorities, the recipients countries do not care about them.	29%	59%
The objectives of Swedish development cooperation are sufficiently clear and concrete.	57%	20%
There are many examples of cooperation that has no connection to the objectives.	38%	25%
Sweden should give priority to one objective.	29%	51%

The questionnaire explores the issue of objectives by presenting a number of statements concerning relevance, applicability and usefulness of the objectives. The statements and an indication of agreement or disagreement are presented in table 4. (Note that the rows do not sum up to 100, the difference is explained by the category of no responses and those neither agreeing or disagreeing.)

The respondents are almost unanimous in that clear objectives are a precondition for success. There is a weak correlation between agreement to this statement and the respondents' previous experience of working in Easterns Europe and in developing countries. Those who rank their projects as successfull (question 40) are also more likely to agree with the statement.

Now, given that more than 80% think that clear objectives are important, how many think that the existing objectives are sufficiently clear? Well, it is still a majority, but only 57%. Thus a substantial amount of those who think that clear objectives are important find the existing objectives lacking in this respect.

There is a correlation between this statement and the indicator of success. Those who think they succeeded also think the present objectives are sufficiently clear and concrete. There is also a connection between this statement and the organization people received funds from; those in contact with BITS, SwedeCorp, the Secretariat for Eastern and Central Europe, and the Swedish Institute held a larger group of people who thought the objectives were not sufficiently clear and concrete.

Still, more than half of the respondents are against the opinion that one objective should be given priority. However, it should be noted that quite a large minority (29%) do agree with the statement to this effect. Those who want to give priority to one objective were often active on large projects, above 10 million SEK and had their money from the "specialized" agencies (not from the aid agencies). They were also more likely to indicate that they were successful - although the correlation was weak).

To what extent are the projects related to the overriding objectives of Swedish development cooperation? It is interesting to note that there is no clear opinion on that question. Although 25% reject the suggestion that few have a relation to the objectives, there are somewhat more, 38%, who agree. It is not possible to draw any conclusions, but many have seen projects unrelated to objectives although there are also quite a few who have other and perhaps more fortunate experiences.

Finally, it is encouraging to note that most of the respondents think that the objectives are of relevance and importance to the recipients as well. But even though a majority disagree with this rather provocative statement, it is alarming that fully 29% agree. There should not be cause for anyone to agree with such a ludicrous idea!

Organization and coordination.

This is not the place to explain the organization of Swedish development cooperation with Eastern Europe. Suffice it to say that many organizations were involved and that the subject has been treated by several parliamentary inquiries. But what do the people involved

think; what is their gut reaction when confronted with value-laden statements about the organizations?

As table 5 shows, there are about equally many who think the organizational structures are effective as who think they are ineffective. However, there were quite a few, 27%, who did not respond or who did not express any opinion. There is no correlation between this opinion and any other variable. It is interesting to see that those who think the organizational structure is ineffective are as many as those who hold the opposite opinion. Given that the organizational structure is rather "unorthodox", I would have expected a clearer vote of "for or against".

Table 5. Attitudes towards organizations.

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>
The organizational structure for development cooperation with Eastern and central Europe is effective.	37%	36%
The authorities are competent in subjects required.	47%	32%
The authorities give clear and concrete instructions.	40%	35%
The authorities have the expected flexibility.	39%	36%
The authorities are too slow in their administration.	55%	27%

It is rare that those who actually do the work in development cooperation are allowed an opinion on the organizations. It is usually the latter who evaluate the former. But what do the various firms, consultants, experts etc think of the administrative role of the aid agencies - and other agencies with a role in distributing funds?

The questionnaire identifies four distinguishing characteristics; whether the agencies are competent, clear, flexible and fast. If everything was ideal, there would be 100% agreement to statements that the agencies were competent etc. If the situation was really bad, there would be 100% disagreement. As it is, there are about equally many who express content with the agencies as there are who would complain. There are two exceptions to the rule. Almost twice as many agree with the statement that the agencies are too slow, as who disagree. A majority think the agencies are competent.

Is there any difference depending on who the respondents are? Very seldom. Those who are engaged in large projects tend to be more positive, at least on the issues of speed and flexibility. Apparently the agencies make sure that they are treated faster and better than those engaged in small projects - or there might be some other variable

explaining the difference. But experience of aid work, or previous experience in Eastern Europe does not influence the answer here.

Most of the statements can be correlated with the agency the respondents were in contact with. Those who thought the agencies were slow in handling the projects had usually been in contact with the aid agencies. 92% of those who had been funded via SwedeCorp and 72% of those in contact with BITS thought that the agencies were too slow. It was also more common that those respondents who had been in contact with the specialized agencies; that is, SKI, SSI, and NUTEK, thought the agencies were flexible, competent and gave clear directives.

The Secretariat for Cooperation with Eastern Europe also ranked high. As for the aid agencies, opinions were divided, as is shown in the table - although somewhat more negative generally. However, we should remember that the number of respondents is low.

Table 6 presents the opinions on the subject of coordination. A majority think that the coordination needs to be strengthened, but perhaps the majority of 60% is not quite as large as I would have believed when reading evaluation reports and white papers from the government. 60% is not a very large majority, and in addition there is a sizeable minority of 17% who do not see a need for more coordination.

If a system needs further coordination, there are still many ways of achieving this. Without making the list too long, the questionnaire assessed attitudes towards three distinct modes of coordination - through central leadership, through mutual contacts between the Swedish actors, or coordination by the recipient country.

Table 6. Attitudes towards coordination.

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>
There is a need for better coordination of development cooperation.	61%	17%
Cooperation is best coordinated by a central power who decides on who is doing what.	28%	50%
Cooperation is best coordinated if the Swedish organization themselves take the contacts needed.	56%	25%
Cooperation is best coordinated by the recipient countries.	22%	55%

Table 7: General remarks on organization

The Swedish authorities have poor knowledge of the subjects and/or do not understand conditions in the recipient country.	16
It is not possible to have long-term projects.	15
Coordination between the Swedish authorities is poor.	14
The Swedish authorities are not sufficiently flexible.	10
The Swedish authorities take too long to reach decisions.	6
The distribution of roles between the authorities is unclear.	4
Poor coordination between donor countries.	4
The implementing organizations should be supported through training, pamphlets etc.	3
Our project got too little funds.	3
In many cases are the authorities helpful and polite	3

It is quite clear that the respondents think that coordination is best achieved if they are left to themselves. They think the best coordination occurs if the Swedish organizations themselves are free to take the contacts they need for this purpose. The favoured mode is one of mutual adjustment, through decentralized initiatives among the Swedish organizations.

The least favoured mode of coordination is by the recipient countries. The questionnaire does not tell us why, and there might be many reasons why the actors do not trust coordination by the recipients. On the other hand, I can easily think of a large number of reasons why the authorities in the recipient countries need to be involved in aid coordination - not least because they themselves strongly and consistently insist on that role.

It is interesting to note that there is a correlation between the position in the programme and the opinions on coordination. Those who work with the authorities handling funds are more concerned that the recipient countries should be involved in coordination, but those who are engaged in implementation mean that coordination is best handled by themselves. Those who had large projects, above 10 million SEK, also thought they handled coordination best themselves.

Similarly those who worked for the authorities handling funds more strongly gave voice to a need for more coordination. So did those who received their funds from BITS, SwedeCorp and SIDA. Those who were engaged via the specialized agencies (SKI, SSI etc) were not so likely to

see coordination as a problem. The latter were also strongly opposed to the statement that "coordination is best achieved by a central power".

Finally, this section of the questionnaire ended with an open question where the respondents were asked to add any comments they felt necessary or called for in respect of organization and objectives. Table 7 summarizes these statements and gives the number of respondents who made each remark (or a very similar one).

Factors contributing to success.

Let us now turn to the section of the questionnaire asking about factors contributing to success. In the previously reviewed analysis of evaluation results, there were a number of things that seemed to characterize many projects, both as common problems or as things that seemed to distinguish projects that were successful. These were tested in the questionnaire, by asking the respondents to describe whether they recognized these issues from their own projects and whether they recognized them from other projects.

Table 8 below shows the frequencies of responses. Let us first look at the experiences people have found on their own project - or projects. The table shows the number of respondents who found that people recognized each success factor from their own project. The success factors are presented in rank order; that is, how many of the respondents that identified them as characteristic of their own projects. The respondents had two choices; either they recognized the factor as something present on their own project, or their projects did not have the qualities described.

Consequently, when 55% have checked the factor "high continuity among project personnel" that should mean that this phenomenon was typical of 55% of the respondents' projects, and the remaining 45% did not have a high continuity of personnel. In my experience, a high turnover of personnel usually threatens technology transfer, and it would be helpful for most project if people stay in their positions. Here, the responses lead to the conclusion that most of the time they do, but in 45% of the cases one cannot say that it was a typical characteristic.

In theory, the table should thus tell us which the most significant factors contributing to success are, and it should also tell us where there is a need to pay particular attention in future cooperation. So, how should we interpret the table? At first it is question of setting standards. Let me take an example: it would be desirable if most projects were characterized by a well-conceived balance between technical support, training and equipment, and that the initiative came from the recipient and that the project had wide-spread support in the recipient country. In fact, a priori all the eleven factors should have a high percentage of respondents checking them in the questionnaire. It would have been best if we could only read 100% in the table above, but that is of course an impossibility.

Table 8. Success factors.

	Percentage indicating "this is how it was on my projects"
The Swedish partner has a long-term commitment.	70%
The project has wide spread support in the recipient country.	58%
The project has a flexible design.	56%
High continuity among project personnel.	55%
Strong and powerful local project leader.	53%
Competent management in our partners' organization.	48%
The project rapidly provides concrete results to the recipient.	48%
The initiative comes from the recipient.	43%
The project had sufficient resources from the start.	42%
The project had a well-conceived balance between technical support, training and equipment.	39%
The recipient had a strong bargaining position visavi the Swedish partner.	28%

It should be a cause for some concern if we read the table for what it does not explicitly say; that 52% of the respondents cannot identify that there is a competent management in their partners' organization, for example, or that 44% cannot confirm that their projects have a flexible design. Now, there is nothing saying that one factor is more important than the others, and there is no requirement that all be present. Perhaps a project can succeed even if only characterized by one or two of the factors - if these are the right ones. However, the table shows which are most typical - and roughly speaking how common they are. Note that few of any success factor appears on more than around 50% of the projects. But to give the table a positive formulation, it is also comforting that more than 50% of the respondents think their own activities are characterized by so many of the "success factors".

Problem areas.

The common problems were treated similarly, and they are presented in table 9. When reading the table, it is important to remember that the presence of one or two problem factors does not mean that a project is not successful. Problems are there to be solved, but the questionnaire did not ask when and how the problems were solved. Note that far fewer recognize problems compared to success factors.

It is possible to cross validate the responses. For example, somewhat less than 20% indicate that personnel turnover among the recipient organizations cause problems, and 55% indicate that there was high continuity among project personnel. As for the difference, one may assume that on some projects this is not a factor of any particular significance. But the figures tally.

Several of the responses can be compared in this way. Note that the most important factor contributing to success was a long standing commitment from the Swedish partner, and the least frequent problem was that the Swedish partner loses interest.

Table 9. Problems.

	Percentage indicating "this is how it was on my projects"
Language difficulties, eg in training and technical documentation.	44%
The cooperating partner did not have the financial strength required.	40%
Difficulties communicating with the recipient country.	36%
Cultural differences prevent mutual understanding.	22%
Overestimated the technical competence of partners.	18%
High personnel turnover among our partners.	17%
The partners were not sufficiently committed to the project.	10%
Corruption.	7%
Unrealistic or ill-conceived objectives.	7%
Mistakes in project design.	6%
Swedish partners lose interest in the project.	5%

Apart from the fairly low frequency of most problems, it is also remarkable how "simple" the most common problems are. Not until we come to the problem of cultural differences do we get into something which is not solved with a little more time and money. Whereas the most prominent success factors are abstract and "more easily said than done", the problems are concrete and easy to find solutions to.

Table 10. Rank order of "the most important contributions of my project"

	Number of persons giving <u>this answer:</u>
The opportunity to transfer knowledge	32
Contributing to democratic development	16
The cooperation lead to personal contacts	14
Contributing to the development of market economies and a more effective industrial structure	13
Mutual learning and competence development	12
Better understanding between countries and people	11
Improved environmental conditions	8
Contributing to development	8
Increased export opportunities for my firm	7
Increasing trade which is good for Sweden	5
Improved safety of nuclear reactors	4
Institutional development	3

It may be of particular interest to note that corruption is not said to be present in the experience of more than 7% of the respondents. Of course it would have been more encouraging if none had any such experience, but if the figure portrays the truth, corruption might be far less prevalent than "folklore" would lead us to believe.

Each of these reviews in the questionnaire were followed by open questions where the respondents were asked to identify other problems or success factors. A handful noted that good personal relations were important for success and one had to agree on the objectives. It was important that people at different levels were engaged and committed, and one should not count on quick results. It takes time to achieve results.

The most common remarks on problems concern language difficulties and cultural differences. 4 respondents complained about lacking competence in the recipient countries, and a few wrote of the technical bias in Eastern Europe - people have a superstitious belief in technical solutions to problems, which leads them to bypass social and organizational issues.

Achievements.

In an open question, the respondents were asked to note what they thought was the most important contribution of their projects in Eastern and Central Europe. Table 10 presents the results. Few chose to write. In fact, only a bit more than a third wrote anything. The table shows that the three development objectives figure among the achievements, but the most prevalent and common is knowledge transfer. There is a debate on the value and extent of institutional development. This debate cannot be carried out here, but suffice it to say that 1% of the respondents indicate that they make a contribution in this respect.

In more concrete terms, the questionnaire also asked the respondents to rank the success of their own projects. Table 11 presents the results of how they ranked effectiveness and efficiency. It is quite clear that around 70 to 75% are highly content with their achievements; they think they reached the objectives and did so at optimal costs. This result would also be expected, if we compare with the percentages indicated under success factors and problems.

I have investigated if the rankings of success can be correlated with any other variable. There is no difference between the aid agencies and other Swedish authorities. Those funded by BITS do not think they achieved better results than those funded by SIDA, NUTEK, SKI or SwedeCorp, for example. Those with previous experience in Eastern and Central Europe do not consider themselves more successful than others, nor do those who have been working with aid projects in the Third World.

Table 11. Rankings of effectiveness and efficiency.

	Very High	High	In between	Low	Very Low
Looking at the project objectives, how would you rank effectiveness	25	52	13	4	0
Looking at the process of cooperation, how would you rank efficiency	30	41	17	5	1
Note, the table shows percentages. There were 6% who did not repond, and the sum in each row is thus 100.					

There is a weak correlation between size of projects and effectiveness. Those who took part in the small projects are more likely to think they reached the objectives than those taking part in projects over 10

million SEK. This may well be a question of the level of ambition though, and it may be so much more difficult to feel really content about a sizeable project with complex objectives (if that is what they have).

Those who have a presence in Eastern Europe; that is, who have a permanent office there, are also more likely to indicate that their projects were effective and efficient. Whether true or not is another matter, but it is a reasonable hypothesis.

However, even though generally successful in their own eyes, the achievements may be mitigated by factors beyond the control of project management. The questionnaire asked people to rank the occurrence of four different factors. These responses can also be used to validate the success factors and the problems discussed above. Table 12 presents these four factors.

It is interesting to note that only some 20% have found that rapid political changes affect the outcome of their projects. As the conditions have been very turbulent during the last four years, one could have expected this figure to be higher.

The most common factor here is the lack of funds. It is interesting to note that this is much more widely recognized as a problem here than among the problem factors above. Perhaps the respondents in table 12 take a wider view of the sustainability of project results, and thus are more likely to see the results threatened by financial constraints. The formulation of the questions do make it possible to interpret them slightly differently.

Table 12. Rankings of intervening factors affecting outcome.

	Very Common	Common	Neither	Uncommon	Very Uncommon
The objectives were irrelevant to the recipients	0%	12%	18%	39%	21%
Political changes have swept any long-term results	3%	17%	22%	27%	19%
Lack of funds make the recipient unable to sustain the project	13%	42%	19%	10%	5%
Lacking technical and managerial competence	7%	39%	21%	17%	4%
Note that each row should sum to 100. The percentages of no response were 9, 11, 10 and 11% respectively					

Most projects have knowledge transfer as an important activity, and we saw above that many ranked this as the most important achievement. But even this is also threatened by problems and intervening factors, but these are of a different nature. Whether institutions fall apart or political changes make the project activities redundant at times matter less. If some people have been taught skills, then the skills persist.

But there may be other things affecting the transfer of skills. The questionnaire mentioned some and asked for comments on their frequency. The results are presented in table 13. As the table shows, the problems are significant; in three of the four cases there are some 20 to 40% who find the problem quite common, and 55% find that the extent of training is a common problem.

The table speaks for itself, together with table 12 above. Together they lend credibility to the responses concerning success factors and problems, and to some extent the indicator of achievements. No one would have expected the cooperation programme to be problem free, and the frequency and type of problem listed here does seem to reflect common trends and experiences. Note that none of the problems are faced by all, but many are faced by substantial minorities. They are significant enough to merit general attention.

In evaluation studies a problem may be swept away or hidden when it is not proved with certainty or of minor significance. Perhaps it does not carry enough weight and perhaps it is not important enough to let our attention be diverged from the positive results. But the issue itself does not disappear, and if it is forgotten there are no chances to find general solutions. The lists identified by the people here should be taken ad

Table 13. Rankings of intervening factors affecting knowledge transfer.

	Very Common	Common	Neither	Uncommon	Very Uncommon
Those being trained move	9%	32%	24%	20%	2%
Wrong persons are trained	4%	23%	20%	33%	8%
Training was unrealistic	3%	14%	18%	36%	13%
Too few are trained for them to have an impact and change their organization	10%	45%	19%	12%	0%
Note that each row should sum to 100. The percentages of no response were 12, 11, 14 and 13% respectively					

notam. When 30 to 50% of 299 respondents agree on a problem area, that means 100 to 150 people have a similar experience, and there are reasons to believe that they represent a much wider audience. Even if relatively insignificant, the factors identified make the projects less effective than they could otherwise be.

Concluding remarks.

I do not intend to summarize the findings of the questionnaire, the review above is indeed little but a summary. Many of the most interesting aspects of the data show up in contingency tables, but as there are so few responses in some categories, few of the expected correlations pass tests for statistical significance. When I wrote the report I have tried to make almost every possible combination of variables, but I found few reasons to present any of them in the text. They were simply not reliable.

Still, I think the review has something to say. It does not present hard data nor any unbiased views of effectiveness, organization or any other subjects. But the sheer fact that hundreds of persons hold similar opinions or believe in similar (or opposite) facts has some significance. This might serve planning, support and guidance from those dispensing funds for cooperation. Here follows some opinions that highlight typical patterns of response:

Almost all of the respondents think that clear objectives are a precondition for success, but only a little more than half of them think the Swedish objectives in the cooperation program are sufficiently clear. Quite a few find that many projects have little relation to the objectives.

What do they think of the organizational structures implementing the aid programme on the Swedish side? The respondents are divided. Half of them think that the structure is effective, and that the authorities give clear and concrete instructions and work flexibly. The other half think they are not effective, unclear and rigid. A majority think they are competent in the subjects required, and a majority think their administration is too slow.

Aid coordination is a central topic. Most think that coordination should be improved. Their favoured mode is to let the organizations themselves take care of coordination by initiating the contacts they need. Most of the respondents are against coordination by some central power, and they do not want recipient countries to coordinate either.

The most significant factors contributing to success are: (1) long term commitment by the Swedish partner, (2) wide spread support in the recipient country, (3) flexible project design, and (4) high continuity among project personnel. More than half of the respondents said that their own projects possessed one or more of these qualities.

The most common problems were: (1) language difficulties, (2) financial strength of the partner in the recipient country, (3) communication difficulties, and (4) cultural differences preventing mutual understanding. Between 20% and 40% had experience of one or more of these problems. Very few found that corruption constitute a problem, or that there were mistakes in project design or that the Swedish partner lost interest after some time.

The questionnaire asked people to grade their results on a scale from "very high" to "very low". 25% thought their effectiveness was very high and another 52% thought it was high. 30% thought their efficiency was very high, and 41% thought it was high. Whether true or not is another question, but it is interesting to know that most of the persons actually come from the programme with a fairly deep sense of satisfaction. Only 1% ranked their efficiency as very low, and none ranked effectiveness as very low.

There are few significant correlations between attitudes and experiences on the one hand and background data on the other hand. People with a lot of international experience are no more successful than others and they do not have other experiences concerning success factors or problems. There are no differences between those who have spent their careers working in Eastern and Central Europe and the others, and no differences between those who have been working in Africa, Asia and Latin America and the others.

Apart from those general patterns briefly indicated above, perhaps the most interesting observation from the questionnaire is how diverse the experiences and opinions are. Very often the group just splits in two. Given that the experiences are so different, it is interesting to speculate how the supporting organization could handle the different requirements from the groups implementing the programme and how one could accommodate their needs for clarity, coordination, freedom, speed and direction. Meeting the needs of some would offend about equally many others (or be irrelevant to them), at least judging by the results from this questionnaire.

De första frågorna behandlar samarbetets mål och organisation. Med mål avser vi de av regeringen formulerade målen för samarbetet med Östeuropa, dvs att främja marknads-ekonomi, att bidra till demokratisk utveckling och uppbyggnad av rättsstatens institutioner,

att värna om miljön samt att bistå det baltiska staterna att befästa sin självständighet. Med organisation avser vi den svenska myndighetsstrukturen som handlägger samarbetet. Var vänlig ange om Du instämmer i eller tar avstånd från följande påståenden:

	Instämmer helt i	Instämmer delvis i	Varken/eller	Tar delvis avstånd från	Tar helt avstånd från
1. Det behövs klara mål för att samarbete skall bli bra	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. De övergripande målen är mest en svensk angelägenhet, de mottagande länderna bryr sig inte om dem	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Det svenska stödets mål är tillräckligt konkreta och tydliga	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Det finns många exempel på samarbete som inte har någon anknytning till målen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Sverige borde ge prioritet åt något enstaka mål	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Den svenska myndighetsstrukturen för samarbetet med Östeuropa är ändamålsenlig	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Myndigheterna har god ämneskompetens	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Myndigheterna ger klara och tydliga besked	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Myndigheterna är tillräckligt flexibla	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Instämmer helt i	Instämmer delvis i	Varken/eller	Tar delvis avstånd från	Tar helt avstånd från
10. De anslagsbeviljande organens handläggning är alltför långsam	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Det krävs en bättre koordination av samarbetet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Samarbetet blir bäst koordinerat om en central ledning bestämmer vad som skall göras och av vem	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Samarbetet blir bäst koordinerat om de olika svenska organisationerna själva tar de kontakter som behövs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Samarbetet koordineras bäst av de mottagande länderna själva	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

15. Har Du några andra synpunkter, t.ex. avseende de svenska stödmyndigheternas arbetssätt, som Du anser vara särskilt viktiga? Notera gärna dessa här:

Sekretariatet har beställt en genomgång och analys av de utvärderingar som gjorts av biståndet till Central- och Östeuropa. Den visar att det verkar finnas några gemensamma drag kring de insatser som blivit framgångsrika, respektive några förhållanden som brukar känneteckna sådana insatser som inte lyckas så bra. I det följande ber vi Dig att för det första, med ett kryss ange

Framgångsfaktor

	Finns på de insatser jag arbetar med	Känns igen från de flesta andra insatser
--	--------------------------------------	--

16. Idén till samarbetet har utvecklats av mottagaren	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. Mottagarens organisation har en kompetent ledning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. Insatsen har utbrett stöd i det mottagande landet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. Hög kontinuitet bland de personer som deltar i samarbetet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. Det finns en god balans i insatsen mellan tillgång på utbildning, rådgivning och utrustning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21. Den svenska partnern har ett långsiktigt intresse för samarbetet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22. Mottagaren kan formulera tydliga krav på sin svenske motpart	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
23. Insatsen kan snabbt anpassas efter skiftande omständigheter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
24. Den lokale projektledaren har en stark ställning inom sin organisation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
25. Samarbetet leder snabbt till konkreta vinster för mottagaren	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
26. Insatsen är från början planerad med tillräckliga medel	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Problem/anledningar till låg målpuppfyllelse:

	Finns på de insatser jag arbetar med	Känns igen från de flesta andra insatser
27. Svårighet med kommunikationer till mottagarlandet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
28. Språksvårigheter, t.ex. vid utbildning, teknisk dokumentation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
29. Överskattning av samarbetspartens tekniska kompetens	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
30. Insatsen var dåligt förankrad på mottagarsidan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
31. Bristfällig ekonomisk bärkraft hos samarbetspartnern	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
32. Stor rörlighet bland personalen hos samarbetspartnern	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
33. De svenska deltagarna i insatsen förlorar intresset/engagemanget	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
34. Korruption	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
35. Kulturellt betingade svårigheter att förstå varandra	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
36. Brister i projektplanering, delarna i insatsen hänger inte samman eller är dåligt koordinerade	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
37. Målen är orealistiska eller otydligt formulerade	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
38. Ange om Du har noterat några andra betydelsefulla framgångsfaktorer eller problem utöver de som listats ovan.		

39. Vad anser Du vara den främsta nyttan eller det främsta värdet av Ert samarbete med Central- eller Osteuropa idag?

	Mycket hög	hög	mittemellan	låg	mycket låg
40. Om Du utgår från de konkreta projektmål som Ert samarbete har haft, hur skulle du rangordna målpuppfyllelsen?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
41. Om Du ser tillbaka på samarbetet, hur skulle Du värdera kostnadseffektiviteten i det som Ni har gjort?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Projekten når oftast sina mål i rimlig utsträckning, men av olika anledningar nyttiggörs resultaten ibland ändå inte. Det kan finnas olika förklaringar till detta. Var vänlig ange i vilken utsträckning Du anser att

följande förklaringar är riktiga (utifrån Din erfarenhet i största allmänhet, både avseende Er egen verksamhet och sådant som Du stött på i andra sammanhang)

	mycket vanligt	vanligt	varken det ena eller andra	ovanlig	mycket ovanligt
42. Projektets mål var irrelevanta för mottagaren	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
43. Politiska förändringar har sopat undan förutsättningarna för bestående resultat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
44. Brist på investeringsmedel gör att mottagaren inte kan fortsätta verksamheten	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
45. De nödvändiga kunskaperna i ledning, ekonomisk och teknisk saknas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Utbildning av olika slag, kurser, seminarier, on-the-job training, studiebesök etc är vanligt förekommande i samarbetet. I den mån de som deltar faktiskt lär kan det ändå vara svårt att tillämpa kunskaperna. Det kan finnas olika anledningar till varför det blir så. Nedan har

vi listat några tänkbara orsaker. Var vänlig ange i vilken utsträckning Du anser att följande förklaringar är riktiga (utifrån Din erfarenhet i största allmänhet, inte nödvändigtvis avseende Er egen verksamhet):

- | | mycket vanligt | vanligt | varken det ena eller andra | ovanligt | mycket ovanligt |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 46. De som utbildats flyttar till nya arbetsuppgifter | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 47. Det är fel personer som tagit del av utbildningen | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 48. Det är alltför få som utbildats för att sedan driva förändringsarbetet i sin organisation | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 49. Utbildningen har inte varit anpassad till verklighetens krav | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

I den mån Du har några egna synpunkter eller kommentarer till frågorna 40 - 49, lämna dem gärna nedan.

Allra sist skulle vi vilja ha några uppgifter om den organisation Du arbetar i.

50. Vad sysslar Din organisation huvudsakligen med inom samarbetet med Central- och Östeuropa?
- ☐ anslagsberedande myndighet
☐ genomför insatser
- från vilken myndighet kommer huvuddelen av Era anslag?
.....
☐ utvärdering, kontroll och uppföljning
☐ något annat, nämligen
51. Hur mycket statliga medel har organisationen sammanlagt disponerat för samarbete med Central- och Östeuropa?
- ☐ mindre än 100.000 kronor
☐ mellan 100.000 och 1 miljon
☐ mellan 1 och 10 miljoner
☐ mer än 10 miljoner
52. Har organisationen någon stadigvarande närvaro i samarbetsländerna?
- ☐ Ja
☐ Nej
53. Har organisationen verkat i Central- och Östeuropa före 1989?
- ☐ Ja
☐ Nej

54. Har Du personligen arbetat med Central- och Östeuropa före 1989?

☐ Ja
☐ Nej

55. Arbetar Din organisation med svenskt bistånd till Afrika, Asien eller Latinamerika?

☐ Ja
☐ Nej

56. Har Du personligen arbetat med svenskt bistånd till Afrika, Asien eller Latinamerika?

☐ Ja
☐ Nej

Har Du några övriga synpunkter, lämna dem gärna här nedan. Glöm inte att svara före den 8 september 1994.

Tack för Din medverkan !

ANNEX 2 -- RAW DATA FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Questions on objectives and organisation

	Completely agree	Partly agree	Neither	Partly disagree	Completely disagree	No reply
Clear objectives are necessary to achieve good cooperation	239	47	1	6	1	5
The over-all objectives are mainly of interest to Sweden	8	78	26	86	90	11
The objectives of the Swedish assistance are sufficiently clear and specific	53	119	56	48	11	12
Many activities are not related to the objectives	36	77	85	39	35	27
Sweden should give priority to one objective	28	61	46	76	77	11
The structure of the Swedish funding system is effective	17	94	65	77	30	16
The Swedish agencies have a good competence in subject-matters	42	98	49	73	23	14
The agencies give clear and precise instructions and information	25	95	63	81	23	12
The agencies are sufficiently flexible	28	91	60	81	28	11
The agencies are too slow in handling applications	62	102	50	40	32	13
A better coordination of the cooperation is needed	80	101	47	39	11	21
The cooperation is best coordinated by a central unit	21	62	47	88	63	18
The coordination is best handled by the Swedish executing organisations	59	109	37	44	29	21
The coordination is best handled by the recipient countries	11	54	48	91	76	19

Questions on success factors

	In my own projects	In other projects	In both	Not usual/ no reply
The idea for the cooperation was developed by the recipient	128	11	19	141
The recipient has a competent management	142	7	12	138
The activity is widely supported in the recipient country	173	9	22	95
High continuity of staff in the cooperation	164	4	11	120
Good balance between training, advice and equipment	115	6	3	174
The Swedish partner has a long term interest in the cooperation	208	6	32	53
The recipient can formulate clear demands on the Swedish partner	84	11	10	194
The activity can quickly be adjusted to changing conditions	170	6	12	111
The recipient project leader has a strong position in her organisation	158	7	18	116
The cooperation quickly provides concrete results to the recipient	143	4	10	142
The project had enough resources from the start	127	12	10	150

Questions on problem factors

Difficulties with communications to the recipient country
Language difficulties
Overestimation of the recipient's technical competence
Recipient partners not sufficiently committed to the cooperation
The recipient partner lacks financial strength
Lot of staff changes at the recipient organisation
The Swedish participants loose interest
Corruption
Cultural difficulties in understanding each other
Bad project planning or coordination
The objectives are unrealistic or unclear

	In my own projects	In other projects	In both	Not usual/ no reply
	107	28	23	141
	130	28	25	116
	54	24	4	217
	29	22	7	241
	120	15	21	143
	53	10	13	223
	16	20	3	260
	20	19	4	256
	68	26	11	194
	18	25	8	248
	21	24	6	248

Questions on achievement

How would you rank your fulfillment of your specific objectives?
How cost-efficient has your cooperation been?

	Very high	High	Average	Low	Very low	No reply
	75	156	39	11	1	17
	89	121	51	16	3	19

Questions on why project results may not be used

The project objectives were irrelevant to the recipient
Political changes have swept away the preconditions for results
Lack of investment funds prevents the recipient to continue
Lack of knowledge in management, economy and technology

	Very common	Common	Neither	Uncommon	Very uncommon	No reply
	1	37	54	116	63	28
	8	53	66	81	58	33
	40	126	57	29	16	31
	21	117	63	52	13	33

Questions on why training may not be used

Trained staff have been moved to other tasks
Wrong persons attended training
Too few have been trained to make an impact
The training was not up to the demands of the real world

	Very common	Common	Neither	Uncommon	Very uncommon	No reply
	26	96	73	60	7	37
	12	70	61	100	23	33
	31	134	58	36	2	38
	10	44	56	107	39	43

General questions

What is the main task of your organisation?

Funding agency	Executing organisation	Evaluation/control	Other	No reply
16	238	6	26	13

How much government CEE funds does your organisation dispose of?
(in million Swedish Crowns)

<0.1	0.1 - 1.0	1.0 - 10	> 10	No reply
26	104	89	60	20

Does your organisation have a permanent presence in CEE?

Has your organisation worked in CEE before 1989?

Have you personally worked in CEE before 1989?

Does your organisation work with third world assistance?

Have you personally worked with third world assistance?

Yes	No	No reply
74	210	15
86	190	23
85	197	17
109	170	20
93	191	15

Note: CEE = Central and Eastern Europe