

High Level Employees Perceptions of the Research and Evaluation Division and its Work: A Qualitative Study

Kai Schaefer
Master of Geography student

February 2000

BRAC
Research and Evaluation Division
BRAC Centre, 75 Mohakhali C/A, Dhaka - 1212

Contents

1. SUMMARY	2
2. INTRODUCTION.....	2
2.1 The Research and Evaluation Division at present	2
2.2 The Question	3
3. METHODOLOGY.....	4
4. FINDINGS.....	5
4.1 A few facts about the Interviews.....	5
4.2 Perceptions of RED and its work.....	5
4.2.1 The studies as a whole.....	7
4.2.2 The study reports	8
4.2.3 The seminars and workshops.....	9
4.2.4 Some main publications	11
4.3 Additional remarks	12
5. CONCLUSIONS AND PERSONAL REMARKS.....	14
6. REFERENCES.....	15
6.1 Examined in the first step.....	15
6.2 Asked in the main publications segment	15
7. APPENDIX 1: THE QUESTIONNAIRE.....	16

1. Summary

The purpose of this study is to examine the role of BRAC's Research and Evaluation Division and how it provides information and support to BRAC's high level employees in program development, planning and management. Data was collected from 15 employees through interviews and focused discussions with two people outside the target group during January 2000. After a short introduction and some remarks on the methodology used in this study, the main chapter, that deals with the participants critiques, complaints and suggestions follows.

The findings of this study clearly showed that the participants are quite satisfied with the improvement of RED in the last couple years. However, the results also reveal the need for further improvement. These include very specialized suggestions, such as the methodology used in the studies, to highly general complaints about a lack of interaction and communication.

The study paper closes with some conclusions and personal remarks.

2. Introduction

A special feature of BRAC, in fact one that initiated the researcher's interest in the organization, is that BRAC runs its own research institution. Scientific research is very important for successful and sustainable development. As Lovell indicates in the context of BRAC, "the Research and Evaluation Division plays an essential role in the design, implementation, and evaluation of BRAC programs." (Lovell, 1992, p. 144)

The Research and Evaluation Division (RED) was established in 1975 and at that time consisted of a single employee. Since then, RED has undertaken many different studies. These include baseline surveys, pilot studies, monitoring and evaluation studies, action research, diagnostic studies, demographic surveillance and impact studies (BRAC, 1999a, p. 68). By 1998 RED had completed a total of 93 studies (BRAC, 1999b).

2.1 The Research and Evaluation Division at present

It is difficult to provide exact figures for the numbers of staff actively working for the research program due to fluctuations in RED's employee base. However, at the beginning of 2000 the division had about 145 staff, of which about 45 were considered core researchers.

The precise number of RED studies completed in 1999 was not yet available. However estimates indicate that the final figure will be similar to that of 1998 (see above). It is important to note that RED undertakes additional studies in collaboration with other organizations. In the last year RED was involved in studies with 17 governmental as nongovernmental agencies.

RED's annual report contains a good, short overview about the divisions main events since its founding (BRAC, 1999b, p. VII). Therefore, the researcher will restrict his discussion to the program's recent history in order to note a single, important development in the program. Since early 1995, RED has compiled a research compendium in Bengali, *Nirjash*, to make its findings accessible for BRAC staff at all levels, particularly at the field level (Chowdhury, Cash, 1996, p.125). This multi-lingual initiative is an extremely important step for the improvement of availability of RED studies.

2.2 The Question

RED's aim is to improve BRAC programs by providing information and support for BRAC's high level employees in the fields of program development, planning and management. RED makes independent, scientific and high quality information from the field available to employees at head office. In turn, the corresponding BRAC employees of the head office are expected to use this information in order to improve the effectiveness of BRAC programs.

With this aim in mind, the questions raised in this study are: How do BRAC employees at head office receive the information offered by the Research and Evaluation Division, what is their opinion about the studies and what from their point of view might or should be improved?

3. Methodology

The methodology used in the course of this study was quite simple. This strategy was chosen so that the study might be easily repeated. The qualitative study occurred in three steps: In the first step existing literature was examined, the question of the study was developed and a qualitative questionnaire prepared and pre-tested with three employees just below the program coordinator level. This stage enabled the researcher to make any necessary changes in the questionnaire.

In the second step, 15 interviews were conducted using the questionnaire. In addition, the interviewer conducted two interviews with people outside the target group. Members of the target group were high level BRAC employees in program development, planning and management. The other interviews helped the researcher to understand how employees received RED studies since the questioned people had special knowledge of either BRAC or the Research and Evaluation Division.

Information collected during the interviews was recorded by taking notes instead of audio recordings, since audio recordings conducted in previous studies proved to be problematic.

Of the 15 interviews two are of poor quality and are therefore of minor significance to the findings. In one case this is due to lack of interest on the part of the interviewee, and a lack of English language fluency in the other.

In the third step the results and responses gathered during the 15 interviews were transferred into a table. This made it much easier to compare and analyze the results. This paper is the final outcome of the study.

4. Findings

This chapter lists the main findings of the study. These include:

- a) A description of the interviewees.
- b) The results related to RED as a whole including responses by interviewees regarding the division's studies, seminars, study reports and main publications.
- c) Additional remarks.

It should be kept in mind that Quotations attributed to study participants are not recorded word for word as the interviewer has not used audio recording in the course of the study (see above). However, where quotations are used both the tone and content of participants' statements has been reviewed for accuracy and they reflect as closely as possible the positions and views of the interviewees.

4.1 A few facts about the interviews

All 15 interviews were conducted with the same questionnaire. Of the 15 interviewees five were female and ten male. Eight program coordinators, five program managers, one general manager and one director were questioned.

In order to arrive at a comprehensive overview with statements from all BRAC divisions, four interviews were conducted with employees from each of the following programs: the Rural Development Program, the Non-Formal Primary Education Program and the Health and Population Program. In addition, the interviewer conducted sessions with two participants from the BRAC Urban Program and one participant from Human Resource Management.

On average the people worked with BRAC for 14.0 years with a minimum employment of one year and a maximum service of 27 years. An interesting result, though not subject of this study, was that the average entry time of the female employees in BRAC was 6.4 years ago in comparison to 17.9 years for the males.

4.2 Perceptions of RED and its work

It is important to note from the outset that all the employees interviewed in this study agreed upon the essential role of scientific research for the design, implementation and evaluation of development programs. The participants all saw tremendous advantages to BRAC having its own research department and they specifically cited RED as the appropriate institution for fulfilling this role.

Their most important statements regarding this advantage are best expressed in the following quotations: "If they didn't do their job either we ourselves or an outside research organization

would have to do it. When we need research we ask them. They are the people to talk to if problems appear." Further, "They've got a lot of experience generally, but more importantly for us, this experience especially relates to BRAC programs. An outside organization wouldn't have insights as deep as our own research division. It's the strength of BRAC. It's our 'library'!"

RED's most positive asset is seen as its experienced and professional staff. Related to this substantial resource is the staff's ongoing improvement due to training. In addition, the security of RED's "significantly independent status" or "RED as a third party" gives the department two clear advantages: the opportunity to "see problems we can't see, as we are too much involved" and to "say things as they are."

In this context the possibility for direct interaction and communication between the researchers and the program people is understood as a big benefit.

In regards to the question of what might be improved from their point of view, the following participant's suggestion appears most important: "As not everything is written down the researchers should share their findings more often with the program people personally." This point will be expanded upon later on in this chapter.

In addition, participants made some complaints about the organizational structure of the Research and Evaluation Division: "The young researchers start directly at RED, but first they should spend some time in a program to get some base level experience. I sometimes feel a gap between the researchers and me, they have so little time to get into the approaches. Occasionally they are somehow arrogant."

A related point was that some interviewees would like to see more program people participating in the research process to minimize the gaps - while a few of them saw the risk of bias in such research. In addition, one participant noted that "there should be two groups in RED for our program: one for fast action research and a second for long-term research."

The employees questioned were aware of time constraint problems so they suggested that "the RED should be expanded."

The last important point mentioned was the problem of staff turn-over, especially of young researchers: "As soon as the researchers get into it, they leave BRAC or work in an other department." One person suggested one explanation for this problem: "When I talked to young researchers they complained about a lack of internal information and communication, even about a lack of team spirit."

As regards this statement, an interviewee from outside the study pool noted that group feeling at RED has developed substantially in the last few years because staff turn-over has stabilized. S/he suggested that young people who felt alone in RED were perhaps isolating themselves as

there were enough options available to them. A weekly, informal tea-seminar on Thursdays might provide a suitable illustration of this point - actually internal communication is it's aim.

However a comparatively rapid turn-over of new members on the research team continues. One explanation for this problem might be that the research division's good reputation makes it very attractive for recently examined young researchers to get their first practical experience in the organization. One participant suggested that since science careers are competitive in Bangladesh it is good for the researcher's career to have a RED reference.

4.2.1 The studies as a whole

Overall the studies are seen as essential and as the basis of all of BRAC's programs. They are very helpful at both the planning and design stages of new and existing projects and are greatly useful for decision-making and implementation. The studies give security to BRAC managers through confirmation of either their own theories or as a scientific reference strategic changes.

Typical answers to questions regarding difficulties encountered in evaluating the success of programs tended to acknowledge the lack of a necessary stage in successful program management. "I am generally busy with planning so I don't have the time to look after the impact," said one participant. Another interviewee observed that "we sometimes keep our eyes closed and don't see the problems related to the implementation of the program."

It is here that the studies appear to be most necessary and useful: "The studies help us to understand the program in detail, show what impact they have and if not, why not. They give us deep insights and important directions to develop the programs."

One participant noted that "the research division opens my eyes to things I haven't noticed before." Fortunately, this appears to be a check on this kind of management obstacle in evaluating the success of a program.

In conclusion, it seems clear that for many employees "first hand information from the field" or a third party helps identify "recommendations for quality improvement that we don't think about." A concluding observation: "With the studies we might learn from the past and alternative options might be developed. They show gaps and missing links between staff and community perceptions that explain ineffectiveness."

The majority of the interviewees agreed that there has been a lot of improvement. However, "there's always space for further improvement!"

Two main problems with the studies were identified. The first issue is that of timeliness. Studies are sometimes not finished within a given time frame. If a special study is delayed too much it might "become almost useless," and would be just a "waste of money." "What is needed are rapid results and rapid publication." The second, and maybe even more important problem

for publication in international journals, what has in fact occurred several times and improves the international reputation of BRAC.

Since the author raised the specific question if the interviewed employees would prefer studies written in Bengali there is more to say about the language issue. Regarding their answers the interviewees might be divided into two contrary groups.

On one side there are statements like "they should be written in English since they are for the high-level," or "the English will be improved by reading," "in English you need only a few words to say a lot - sometimes Bengali might be more difficult and complicated," and lastly "English is international; in English the researchers might compare themselves with the rest of the scientific world." Some of them do admit that "a translation in special cases would be good, as it's easier for the mid-level outside the head office, and BRAC wants to create new managers from it."

On the other side there were responses like "Bengali is our mother language, English takes time, but in English and Bengali would be best." Almost all of them added that English is necessary, because of "international acceptance," yet overall, recognize the advantage of studies written in their mother language, that "for a lot of people, especially the field staff, Bengali would be easier, so more people might read the papers." The statements given in reference to *Nirjash* will be handled in the section of the main publications.

Whether the studies are written in Bengali or English, identical advice was given to use "an easier language." Indeed "the easiest language possible. This might be very difficult, but it happens quite often that a work is not understood or even misunderstood, due to a complicated writing style."

4.2.3 The seminars and workshops

Like reports, meetings in seminars or workshops have their own positives. Definitely the biggest one is the possibility for direct interaction and communication between the researchers and the program staff. "They are a platform for discussion in which a shifting from topic to topic is possible." Some more examples should be given: "In the workshops the field staff and the management might share their ideas," "there is scope to exchange views and you might get information which is not written down in the papers," "with very different people attending them, you get very different views - it's a kind of reflection of the study," and "it's a kind of network building."

"In the proposal workshops we've got the possibility to influence the research, we might add our views." This opportunity to affect the direction of the study is considered to be a very important step by all the questioned persons. The kind of interaction that might help both groups is the main chance for improvement. "They seek research topic from us, we give problems to

identified by the interviewees is that of quality and amount of interaction and communication between the researchers and the program staff. "There's a gap in perspective between the researchers and the program people." One of the primary advantages of having an in-house research department is the potential for high levels of interaction and collaboration between researchers and program staff. As this problem was mainly mentioned in connection with the seminars and workshops, it is discussed in detail further down.

In addition to these two, some other issues were brought up. Some of the interviewees have identified problems with the methodology of the studies. One mentioned that sometimes the samples are too small, while another complained about the lack of a consistent methodology and a third person brought up the question of too much theory for some very field based subjects. "They either do quantitative or qualitative studies, sometimes both types of methodology should be used in a study, especially for critical ones. Maybe they do too many qualitative studies at present, like too many quantitative ones some time ago," and "I would like to get more background information - why it is like it is. I can't get the feeling," are two more examples of statements related to this. Some more ideas should be displayed: "As BRAC is working with the approach of gender, the gender analysis should be better implemented in all future studies!" Even if only two interviewees mentioned this, it seems to be a very important point. Closely connected to the issue of interaction is the following suggestion: "The researchers should discuss their findings with the program people before making their conclusions and the raw data should be available as the researchers sometimes haven't got the holistic insight in the programs which might be necessary." Lastly it is obvious that nearly everybody "would like more studies directly related to his job."

4.2.2 The study reports

The interviewees see some advantages of the study papers in comparison to the presentations of the study findings in a seminar: A very simple but nevertheless important one is that "the reports will remain with me," and "I add them to my own library, so I might refresh my knowledge whenever it's necessary. I also use them for my own writing." By far the most mentioned was what is summarized in the following quotation: "In the papers one might read between the lines. They are more specific and more concrete, go more into details, where the seminars are more like a summary. For the full picture you have to read the reports." A very practical point seems to be that the writing of reports is a condition given by the donors.

As the expositions are written in English, their circulation is widened beyond the Bengali speaking audience. Many foreign volunteers are working with the organization, and the studies in English improve their capacity for work, it's indirectly benefiting BRAC. There is also the potential

them, it's a giving and getting of advice and ideas. Both sides, the program people and the researchers, might profit." The last statement is surely also valid for the study presentations. "In the seminars we confront them with our interpretation and take their suggestions and critiques."

Interaction between RED and the program people is the one area where most interviewees would like to see improvement.

"One proposal meeting at the beginning of the study is not enough! We need more interaction and communication during the research process. So far there's no update during the research." This is seen as essential, since it is not possible to foresee the problems which inevitably occur and make partial changes of the original proposal necessary. This "gap in perspective" might easily lead to a gap between the original purpose and the outcome of the study. "They should talk very early to the program people when they start to make a proposal."

Regarding the presentations, there are also some specific things to say. One person said, "sometimes I don't get the documents for the seminars. That should be regularized." It is not clear if this is something related to RED, but another more general statement connected to the above was given: "The papers should be delivered ahead of time, so one might find the time to read them and then the seminars would be improved." Here an important idea is implicated, which the following answer points out very well: "The audience has to make a contribution. The kind of participation is a major constraint." Since only a "few people go to seminars which are not directly related to their field of work" the number of different views, a potential advantage, might be very limited.

Some statements related to both types of workshops. These deal mostly with the issue of interaction. One interviewee mentioned: "We recently had a meeting with RED to exchange ideas which was very good and productive, we need more meetings like this." "We had a field-workshop which was very good. A lot of field staff participated and this more freely than in the workshops at the head office" is another example for improved interaction. The participation of field staff is seen as a very important point. "The meetings with high-level managers are not enough. More mid-level staff from the field should participate since they might have different ideas and priorities than the people working in the head office. In some workshops they do, but some are not enough."

Everybody is aware that time is the major constraint, but agreed more time should be spared. "I know we are all very busy, but the seminars are too short. Within two, maybe three hours not enough feedback is possible."

This section closes with a quotation that illustrates the majorities opinion: "I'm quite satisfied, but more interaction would be helpful. It has recently improved, but it is still not enough."

4.2.4 Some main publications

In the following, *Nirjash*, the research compendium in Bengali, will be discussed first before examining some facts about the using and opinion of some more main publications.

4.2.4.1 *Nirjash*

First of all, it is important to mention that all interviewees except one, who hadn't read the compendium and consequently could offer no opinion, agreed "*Nirjash* is a good thing." Most of them even used the words "very good" or "excellent" to prescribe their ideas about it. "I read it regularly." "I read the whole book," or "it's very useful," are usual statements. The main point of it is generally seen in the fact that it is written in Bengali, which makes it much easier for the field staff to read. "It's good and essential for the people from the field. As it is shorter and in Bengali it's better for them, because they are very busy and not that good in English. We always felt there is a need for this." The seen advantage for the field staff - "in brief the main findings of the study" - is also considered as a restriction of its use for the high-level management. "Although it gives an insight and broader information about what's going on in BRAC, it's not fulfilling for us because it's too short." Additionally, one interviewee complained that "it's usually delayed and the data is two to three years old".

The staff disagreed on, whether the Bengali used in *Nirjash* is easy to read or not. The reason for this might be a different perspective, as the later ones seems to represent the view of the field staff: "The Bengali is very intellectual which is difficult to read for the field staff. So far I had to sit with them quite a few times to explain things." Other statements include: "It's good because it's simple Bengali." or even "It's easy to understand, it's written in an easy language, almost like storytelling."

A very interesting question was raised by one of the staff: "I would like to know how many people from the field really read *Nirjash*, as I have the impression they are not many. A study should be done to answer this question." In his opinion it should still be published, even if they are only few, because sometimes one might have a look in it, learn something or start reading it regularly.

4.2.4.2 *Other main publications*

The most important fact about the other main publications (see Appendix 1, Question 17 and References 7.2) is that the three oldest ones (*Who Gets What and Why*, *The Net* and *A Tale of Two Wings*) didn't lose any attractiveness for the participants. Nine interviewees chose one out of them. Six chose *A Tale of Two Wings* as their favorite publication. Even if the sample is too small to generalize, this number is very impressive, since "only" twelve of the staff questioned

read them. Ten said they would appreciate updated versions of these studies very much, since "things change." The reason for the ongoing attractiveness is, that they represents "what's basically happening in the field." One gets a "total picture of what's going on in our villages," a better understanding of the environment for development projects seems to be a very big demand.

A Simple Solution was read by thirteen participants, while twelve read *The Second Assessment Study*. Besides the four people working in the Non Formal Primary Education (NFPE) division, only three more read the publication *Getting Started* and four more *Hope not Complacency*, which directly deal with education. It's striking that all three respondents in the first case and three in the second were women.

Questions 23 and 24 (see appendix 1) were only asked in the first 10 interviews, since everybody agreed the publications were very useful for other NGOs, the government of Bangladesh and foreign countries. Mostly made statements like "Obviously they are."

Regarding the questions of which publication represents BRAC best and which would be the one to read to get an insight into BRAC (see appendix 1, question 25), *A Simple Solution* received six votes, followed by *The Second Assessment Study* with four. Besides these two, *Breaking the Cycle of Poverty* from Lovell, a non-RED publication, was mentioned quite often, but always with the remark that it's too old. Two interviewees suggested, "as people still read Lovell, which is quite old and BRAC changed a lot, the RED should do more on this. A report should be done with a researcher from RED and an outsider working together to document the BRAC experiences. Building a BRAC knowledge bank should be RED's first priority."

4.3 Additional remarks

As mentioned before the sample is too small to be representative, but some numbers regarding the seminars and study reports should be given:

On average, the respondents attended six to seven workshops in 1999, with a minimum of one and a maximum of twelve. Nearly half of the participants attended only seminars which directly dealt with their field of work, while the majority took part in additional seminars to gain more information about what's going on in BRAC.

Respondents read an average of three study papers in 1999, although the range varied between one and seven papers. Of the 15 respondents, seven only read papers in connection with workshops. All participants read at least the summaries of papers sent by RED. The main reason for this seems to be a lack of time. Only reports related to the interviewee's field of work are read completely.

The time used to read the studies is outside the office, mostly while traveling or at home. Two explanations were mentioned: Respondents said they didn't have enough time to read reports at the office and that the office was not an appropriate place to read a report carefully due to many interruptions from telephone calls or similar distractions.

The majority of the respondents received their copy of a report from the RED. Only a few said they asked for the studies from the library or RED employees themselves.

Nearly all of the participants get their general information about recently published reports from either list distributed by RED or through their personal contacts with RED staff. Two people said they got their information from the RED's annual report, while two others mentioned the list in the library. Two people were not asked question 12 (see Appendix 1) and question 15 due to time constraints.

When asked what subject they would choose to study if they had the chance, three different statements were given. Four people said they would do very special studies, while five said they would do impact studies related to their own field work. One of the five wanted to do a cost effectiveness study of a program. The other four ideas were studies on "*Voluntarism and incentives*," the "*Management system of our own division*," the "*Linkage between head office and field staff*" and an anthropological study on "*Why certain things don't work in the field*." These four suggestions represent the demand for more knowledge about the organizational structure of project planning and management, which was seen as a necessary background information.

5. Conclusions and personal remarks

The most striking point about the findings is that the internal communication in the head office is based on personal contacts, an informal network. Besides, RED's formal invitation for seminars, studies and the study-list, most information about its work is distributed by personal contacts between staff from the different divisions. Informal networks can be quite effective, so this is not necessarily a problem. However the importance of it implies a lack of a formal network. This means that the very busy high level employees have to spend some of their valuable time to maintain an information system, which is not part of their job description. The remarks dealing with the presentation seminars as a platform for general discussion and network building seem very positive at first, but their aim is to provide information about a very focused subject. The often mentioned lack of time in the seminars might be a result of this "shifting from topic to topic." To improve the seminars efficiency and to relieve the high level employees in the different departments, the building of a formal network might be a very good idea.

I maintain that BRAC's head office would benefit from a formal network. For example, the network might include special meetings for general discussions or a "Head Office Newsletter" published by a few employees whose task is the improvement of internal communication. During one of my talks with BRAC staff from different levels, I discovered that "communication is not very strong in the Bangladeshi Culture." This might be a reason, but it should not be an excuse. This statement emphasizes the importance of formal networks and future efforts to improve them.

In general, the opinions expressed about the RED and its work are favorable. Most employees seem quite satisfied with its performance and feel there has been a lot of improvement over the last few years. The employees working in fields that are not covered by RED studies would like more coverage of the problems they encounter. In addition, three areas where improvement is necessary might be defined:

- 1) the level of interaction
- 2) the timely completion of studies
- 3) the use of an easier language

Since the first three points were examined in Chapter Four, the fourth suggestion will be explained in the following.

Considering the ongoing attractiveness of *Who Gets What and Why*, *The Net* and *A Tale of Two Wings*, the wish to update studies like these and the demand for less specialized studies, more research on general background information should be pursued. Obviously, the increasing demands for very focused studies - nearly everybody would like to get a study dealing with his very special field of work - cannot be satisfied. However, more holistic studies that provide information useful to all staff involved in program planning and management might work better.

6. References

6.1 Examined in the first step

- BRAC: *BRAC Annual Report 1998: Continuity and Change*, Dhaka, BRAC, 1999a.
- BRAC: *BRAC Research 1998*, Dhaka, BRAC, 1999b.
- A. Mushtaque R. Chowdhury and Richard A. Cash: *A Simple Solution: Teaching Millions to Treat Diarrhea at Home*, Dhaka, University Press Limited, 1996.
- Catherine H. Lovell: *Breaking the Cycle of Poverty: The BRAC Strategy*, Dhaka, University Press Limited, 1992.

6.2 Asked in the main publications segment

- Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee: *Who Gets What and Why: Resource Allocation in a Bangladesh Village*, BRAC Rural Study Series 01, 2nd Edition, Dhaka, BRAC, 1986.
- Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee: *The Net: Power Structure in Ten Villages*, BRAC Rural Study Series 02, 2nd Edition, Dhaka, BRAC, 1986.
- Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee: *A Tale of Two Wings: Health and Family Planning Programmes in a Upazilla in Northern Bangladesh*, BRAC Rural Study Series 06, 3rd Edition, Dhaka, BRAC, 1991.
- A. Mushtaque R. Chowdhury and Richard A. Cash: *A Simple Solution: Teaching Millions to Treat Diarrhea at Home*, Dhaka, University Press Limited, 1996.
- A. Mushtaque R. Chowdhury, Rasheda K. Choudhury and Samir R. Nath (Eds.): *Hope Not Complacency: State of Primary Education in Bangladesh 1999*, Dhaka, University Press Limited, 1999.
- A. M. Muazzam Husain (Ed.): *Poverty Alleviation and Empowerment: The Second Assessment Study of BRAC's Rural Development Programme*, Dhaka, BRAC, 1998.
- A. K. Jalaluddin and A. Mushtaque R. Chowdhury (Eds.): *Getting Started: Universalising Quality Primary Education in Bangladesh*, Dhaka, University Press Limited, 1997.

7. Appendix 1: The questionnaire

Position of interviewed person:
Division / Field of work of interviewed person:
Working with BRAC since how many years?

1. Did you took part in any seminars or workshops organized by the RED in 1999? How many?
2. Did they all directly deal with your field of work?
3. How did they support your work?
4. What are the main plus points of the seminars and workshops?
5. What might be improved?

6. How many studies, the whole paper, from the RED did you read in 1999?
7. Did they all deal directly with the seminars you admitted?
8. How did they support your work?
9. What are the main plus points of the studies?
10. What might be improved?
11. Where do you read and get the studies?
12. How do you get information about new publications of the RED?
13. Do you read summaries of studies, and if so in which publication?
14. What do you think about "Nirjash"? Why?
15. If you could wish yourself a study, what would be its subject?
16. Would you prefer studies written in Bengali language?

17. Which ones of the following publications of the RED did you read?
Who gets what and why: resource allocation in a Bangladesh village / The net: power structure in ten villages / A tale of two wings: health and family planning programmes in a upazilla in northern Bangladesh / A simple solution: teaching millions to treat diarrhea at home / Getting started: universalising quality primary education in Bangladesh / Poverty alleviation and empowerment: the second assessment study of BRAC's RDP / Hope not complacency: state of primary education in Bangladesh 1999
18. Which one of these is your favorite one?
19. Why is it your favorite one?
20. Do you think there should be an updated study like this?

21. What do you think are the main plus points of the RED?
22. What, from your point of view might or should be improved?

23. Which RED publication is the most useful one for other NGOs in and the government of Bangladesh?
24. Do you think they are also useful for NGOs and the governments of foreign countries? Why?
25. Which RED publication is the most important one regarding the image of BRAC in and outside Bangladesh?, or
If somebody would ask you for an advice, which publication s/he should read to get a good insight into BRAC and how BRAC works, which one would it be?

Seminar Library
RED. BRAC