

Principles of Cultural Competency and the Implications for Western Evaluators Using the
Program Evaluation Standards (3rd Edition) in Chinese Cultural Context

Yongfei Wu

Queen's University

Author Note

Yongfei Wu is a Ph.D candidate in the Assessment and Evaluation Group, Faculty of Education, Queen's University.

Correspondence concerning this paper should be addressed to Yongfei Wu, Faculty of Education, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario. Email: yongfei.wu@queensu.ca

Abstract

The importance of cultural competence permeates all phases of evaluation since culture shapes how evaluators conceptualize questions, collect, analyze, and interpret data, and report evaluation results. This paper aims at enriching the understanding of Chinese culture from the perspective of Confucianism for the Western evaluators so that they may work efficiently in the Chinese cultural context. To avoid a general discussion, the author focuses on three subsets of the Program Evaluation Standards (3rd Edition), i.e., U4 Explicit Values, P2 Formal Agreements, and P3 Human Rights and Respect, in order to make an in-depth analysis of the cultural competence that the Western evaluators are expected to have to work in the Chinese cultural context. To this end, this paper compares the differences in Chinese and Western values, legal tradition related to entering into and implementing evaluation agreements, and the way in which people show respect. Finally, this paper provides some suggestions for the Western evaluators on how they may enhance their cultural readiness and achieve success in finishing their evaluation projects in China.

Key words: cross-cultural evaluation, cultural competence, Confucianism, Chinese cultural context, Western evaluators

**Principles of Cultural Competency and the Implications for Western Evaluators Using
the Program Evaluation Standards (3rd Edition) in Chinese Cultural Context**

With individuals of diverse ethnic and racial backgrounds comprising an increasing percentage among the population in the United States (American Psychological Association, 2003) and Canada (Statistics Canada, 2008), evaluation across cultures has become a relatively new, yet rapidly growing, stream of inquiry (Chouinard & Cousins, 2009). Outside North America, there has been a rapid growth of international program evaluation in almost all developing countries (Bamberger, 2000). In China, for example, Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada evaluated its international business development program in 2006 and the World Bank Group had its innovation and entrepreneurship project independently evaluated in 2013. However, many evaluators in North America are unfamiliar with the big differences between the international contexts and their own contexts (Bamberger, 2000; Smith, 2002). Furthermore, exploring the differences across cultural contexts has become a pressing concern to enhance evaluators' competence in cross-cultural evaluation. Merryfield (1985) investigated the challenge of cross-cultural evaluation by interviewing twenty-six experienced evaluators. Data analyses revealed three kinds of problems related to evaluation across cultures: cultural differences, applying Western evaluation methods in non-Western contexts, and ethics in cross-cultural evaluation.

Greater efforts have been made in recent years to address the issues in evaluation

across cultures. In 2002 and 2003, the Cultural Reading Task Force of the American Evaluation Association's (AEA) Diversity Committee reviewed all standards in the Program Evaluation Standards (2nd Edition) from the cultural perspective. Many suggestions in the final report *A Cultural Reading of the Program Evaluation Standards (2nd Edition)* (AEA, 2005) were adopted by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation in the development of the third edition. In 2011, the American Evaluation Association made public the Statement on Cultural Competence in Evaluation (AEA, 2011) with a view to providing guidance for the evaluators who work in different cultural contexts.

Despite these efforts, the applicability of the Program Evaluation Standards needs further exploration with respect to the cultural contexts in Eastern countries. The establishment and revision of the Standards mainly represents the joint efforts made by researchers in the United States and Canada with Western cultural backgrounds. Jang (2000) examined the appropriateness of the Program Evaluation Standards (2nd Edition) in non-Western settings and found that the Standards conflict with Korean values, which are traditionally derived from Confucianism. In addition, the Standards might be misinterpreted or inappropriately implemented by the Western evaluators working in the Eastern cultural contexts. Based upon Confucianism, this paper aims at helping Western *evaluators* to better understand the Chinese culture so they are able to work effectively in China.

Chinese Cultural Context

With economic reforms and the open-door policy started in 1978, China has become

the world's fastest-growing major economy, with its Gross Domestic Product climbing to second in the world in 2010. With roughly 1.37 billion people in China, approximately 91.5% of these belong to the Han ethnic group, with the remaining population belonging to 55 minority ethnic groups (National Bureau of Statistic of China, 2011). For well over 2,000 years, Confucianism has "served as the source of inspiration as well as the court of appeal for human interaction between individuals, communities, and nations in the Sinitic world" (Ames & Tu, 2012, p. 3). Although it has been transformed over time, "many people continue to identify Confucianism as the mainstream, even the definitive core, of Chinese culture" (Tan, 2008, p. 135).

A brief introduction of Confucius may help Western evaluators better understand Confucian values. Confucius (551-479 BC), a Latinized form of his Chinese name Kong Fuzi ("*fuzi*" meaning "master" and used as a reverent title in ancient Chinese), lived in an era of social chaos and disorder with the general public suffering from endless misery. As one of the most famous thinkers in that era, he attributed the chaos and disorder to the misuse and abuse of *li* (ritual/propriety) and devoted his life to propagating the rules of *li* and restoring social and moral excellence (Yao, 2000). Known as a private educator and master, Confucius and his disciples travelled to many states over thirteen years, "hoping his words would be heeded, his politics carried out and his ideal realized" (Yao, 2000, p. 24).

Returning home in despair, he spent his later years teaching students and editing ancient classics. His ideas were inherited and developed by his followers, and a century after his death, Confucianism was adopted as the ruling philosophy and began to influence Chinese

culture generation after generation.

Family plays a central role in Confucian theories on social relationships. “Family relationships are in the Confucian understanding the prototypes of all human relations” (Fang, 2010, p. 29). According to Ames and Tu (2012), *xiao* (filial piety) was critical to ensure the integrity of ritual performance within a family and was an essential step toward *ren* (humanity). Filial piety was not intended to compel children to unconditionally submit to parents’ authority, but to help both parents and children to flourish. The whole society was like a family with the emperor construed as *tianzi* (the son of heaven) and the government officials as the *fumuguan* (father-mother officials). Although such social structure has undergone transformation, the doctrinal and idealistic values of Confucianism remain entrenched in Chinese psychology (Yao, 2000).

Understanding Cultural Competency

“All individuals are cultural beings and have a cultural, ethnic, and racial heritage” (American Psychological Association, 2003, p. 380) and “all evaluation reflects culturally influenced norms, values, and ways of knowing” (AEA, 2011, p. 5). The beliefs, values, ways of knowing, and ways of communicating of program evaluators and stakeholders are all rooted in their specific cultures. As the subject of evaluation, social programs *per se* are embedded within specific social, cultural, political, and historical contexts (Chouinard & Cousins, 2009). Therefore, cultural competence is indispensable for evaluators to enhance their credibility and engage meaningfully with stakeholders in cross-cultural evaluation. Lack of cultural competence can become a source of conflict, frustration, and ultimately

program failure.

Cultural competence is used interchangeably with other concepts including intercultural effectiveness and ethnic competence. All these concepts refer to ways of thinking and behaving that enable members of one culture, ethnic or linguistic group to work effectively with members of another. Ethnic competence includes, among other things, an awareness of one's own cultural limitations; an openness, respect and appreciation for cultural differences; regard for intercultural diversity as a source of learning opportunities; the ability to use cultural resources in interventions; an acknowledgement of the integrity and value of all cultures (Lynch & Hanson, 1999).

Cultural competence does not imply changing one's cultural values, adopting another group's values, attitudes, beliefs, customs, or manners of speech, dress or conduct, and becoming a member of another culture. Nor does cultural competence imply knowing everything about different cultures. It means "an active demonstration of respect for differences, an enthusiastic eagerness to learn about other cultures, an acceptance of different viewpoints on reality, and a flexibility and willingness to adjust, change and reorient where required" (Lynch & Hanson, 1999, p. 493). Liang Shuming (1893-1988), a representative of the early 'New Confucian' school of thought, expressed in his lecture *Eastern and Western Cultures and Their Philosophies* published in 1922, that "no culture is inherently superior to others; each is suited to particular circumstances. Cultures cannot be blended but one may need to give way to another as circumstances change" (Tan, 2008, p. 145). Identifying with this attitude towards culture could make it easier for the evaluators

to accept the cultural differences and adopt an appropriate cultural stance when they are working in a different cultural context.

Analyzing the Principles of Cultural Competency

The importance of cultural competence permeates all phases of evaluation since culture shapes how evaluators conceptualize questions, collect, analyze, and interpret data, and report evaluation results (AEA, 2011). However, it is beyond the scope of this paper to analyze all program evaluation standards. It is feasible, however, to choose those standards whose implementation is more culturally bound. With this idea in mind, three subsets of the Program Evaluation Standards (3rd Edition) have been chosen for in-depth analysis: U4 Explicit Values, P2 Formal Agreements, and P3 Human Rights and Respect. The implementation of these standards places high requirements on Western evaluators' cultural competence when they are working within the Chinese cultural context.

U4 Explicit Values: Evaluations should clarify and specify the individual and cultural values underpinning purposes, processes, and judgments.

The standard U4 Explicit Values “reflects the core of cultural competency” and “sets the stage for examining cultural perspectives taken in evaluation” (AEA, 2005, p. 12). Values implicitly or explicitly vary across cultures and determine the evaluator's cultural understanding (AEA, 2005). Clarifying and specifying values is important for the whole process of evaluation, including identifying the stakeholders, justifying the selection of the sources and forms of information, negotiating the evaluation purposes, perceiving and communicating information, and reporting findings with recommendations (Yarbrough et

al., 2011). "Valuing is at the heart of each decision and judgment made throughout an evaluation." (p. 37). Therefore, a substantial revision has been made to the standard U4 Values Identification in the Program Evaluation Standard (2nd Edition) as suggested by the Diversity Committee of AEA. The previous standard "leaves the impression that values are only important in the interpretation of findings, versus the entire process (AEA, 2005, p. 11).

Obvious discrepancies exist between Chinese cultural values and the Western counterparts. "Chinese culture emphasizes morality and arts, human responsibilities and unity, while western culture stresses science and religion, individuals' freedom and differentiation" (Yao, 2000, p. 268). Pan (1994) compared traditional Chinese cultural values based on Confucian principles with American cultural values in a deductive method and identified six primary differences. In addition, Lee (1997) held the view that the Eastern cultural values are predominantly agricultural and the Western cultural values are predominantly industrial and listed a set of contrasting cultural values. Their findings are summarized in Table 1.

People holding different values tend to behave in different ways and make different judgments and decisions based on the same information in evaluation. Yarbrough and coauthors (2011) provided a vivid example showcasing how different values influence evaluators' description of a community. On the same phenomenon, one evaluator reported that children were roaming around in packs without adults' supervision while another evaluator described that the children were playing with others in groups and treating the

whole neighborhood like their home.

Table 1.

Comparison of Chinese Cultural Values and Western Cultural Values

Chinese Cultural Values	Western Cultural Values
Family and group oriented	Upholding individual’s liberty and privacy
Extended family	Nuclear or blended family
Multiple parenting	Couple parenting
Primary relationship: parent-child bond	Primary relationship: marital bond
Status determined by age and role in family	Status achieved by individual’s efforts
Well-defined family member roles	Flexible family member roles
Favoritism toward males	Increasing opportunities for females
Authoritarian orientation	Democratic orientation
Suppression of emotions	Expression of emotions
Cooperative orientation	Competitive orientation
Spiritualism	Materialism and consumerism
Emphasizing stability	Changes bring development
Humans are fundamentally virtuous	Man has original sin
Living in harmony with the nature	Conquering nature for development
Past, present, and future orientation	Present and future orientation

Note: Paraphrased from Lee (1997) and Pan(1994)

This difference in description is likely to occur when Western evaluators observe a community in China. An evaluator emphasizing individualism might make the former description while an evaluator identifying with a group-oriented community may describe otherwise. Similarly, Sengupta and colleagues (2004) cited another example to show how different values influence evaluators’ policy analysis. In environment policy analysis, holding a perspective of living in harmony with nature or conquering nature significantly influences an evaluator’s character and content of analysis.

A profound understanding of the aforementioned differences between Chinese

cultural values and Western cultural values is also crucial for Western evaluators so they may make culturally appropriate judgments and recommendations. "Acting on the assumption that the values guiding the evaluation will be easily understood could be a serious detriment to utility" (Yarbrough et al., 2011, p. 37). In the United States, older employees and job applicants might suffer from age-based discrimination in employment and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 was enacted to protect their rights (Kogan, 1983). However, it is a Confucian tradition that old people are respected in Chinese society; older age is often understood to mean greater wisdom, experience, seniority, and ability to maintain stability in China. Given equal expertise, a man in his fifties often takes precedence over another man in his thirties and is more likely to be promoted to a higher position in universities, hospitals, and government agencies. An elder doctor often enjoys greater popularity among patients and a senior teacher is often more popular to students and their parents. Without understanding the different values placed upon age, a Western evaluator might make inappropriate judgments and suggestions.

P2 Formal Agreements: Evaluation agreements should be negotiated to make obligations explicit and take into account the needs, expectations, and cultural contexts of clients and other stakeholders.

This standard represents a great improvement by comparison with its predecessor in the Program Evaluation Standards (2nd Edition), although both standards have a shared title. According to the previous standard, the formal parties involved in the evaluation should have all conditions of the agreement (e.g., what is to be done, how, by whom, and

when) agreed to in writing so that these parties will comply with the agreement or renegotiate it formally. The problem with this standard was that it recommended the agreement to be reached only in writing. The revised version takes into account the cultural contexts and allows the possibility of entering into oral agreement in cross-cultural evaluation. Negotiating with clients for entering into agreements is culturally bound in itself since legal tradition varies from culture to culture. Cultural difference might also exist in documenting agreements. "In many cultures, a man's word is his bond and the request for 'paper' is considered insulting" (AEA, 2005, p.36). The standard of formal agreements should be "understood and interpreted within cultural context" (AEA, 2005, p. 36).

Although "formal agreements are part of the fabric that binds us as societies to the rule of law" (Yarbrough et al., 2011, p. 119), the rule of law does not have as long a history in China as in the West. Chinese history was mainly dominated by *ren zhi* (the rule of individuals) which emphasized the morality of the rulers. A core concept of Confucianism is *ren* (benevolence, human love) and a good ruler should love the people with morality. "Confucianism infuses law with moral qualities" and "good morals alone, especially when practiced by the rulers of a political state, are in themselves sufficient to provide social order without relying on the enforcement of positive legal rules and principles at all" (Orts, 2001, p. 46). Even today in China, morality still enjoys priority over competence, commitment, and achievement among the four widely used criteria for evaluating the performance of government officials, university administrators, heads of state-run enterprises, and many other important positions.

Although the Chinese government has strengthened its efforts to establish the rule of law in order to develop the market economy and accelerate the industrialization process, *guanxi* (social networks) sometimes plays a more important role in Chinese people's social activities than the negotiation of formal contracts. The social networks are often built and expanded among relatives, classmates, regional mates, and workmates. These social networks involve intimacy, closeness, and informality, cut across class lines and interest groups, and permeate all political, economic, legal, and educational institutions (Fang, 2010). These relatively stable networks provide reliable and lasting support to get things done in a time-saving and cost-effective manner. Within these networks, a promise often means a bond and requiring a written agreement could imply distrust. However, using these relationships for private gains often receives public criticism due to the negative impact on social fairness. In addition, these social networks are also an impediment to building a civil society in China with cordial and trustful relations among people outside the networks (Fan, 2010).

An awareness of a long Chinese history with the rule of individuals emphasizing Confucian morality and some knowledge of the prevalent social networks in Chinese society are helpful for Western evaluators to engage in negotiating agreements with Chinese clients. But it must be pointed out that there are merits in Western evaluators entering into written agreements with Chinese clients. Formal evaluation agreements "make ethical, legal, and professional stipulations and obligations explicit" and "help clarify differences in assumptions and cultural influences that might otherwise remain below the

surface” (Yarbrough et al., 2011, p. 120). Knowing the status quo with regard to law in China will help Western evaluators to better understand the behaviors of Chinese clients and stakeholders and establish a healthy and lasting relationship with them.

P3 Human Rights and Respect: Evaluation should be designed and conducted to protect human and legal rights and maintain the dignity of participants and other stakeholders.

Standard P3 requires respectful interaction with evaluation stakeholders to protect their human and legal rights and maintain their dignity. Interestingly, the standard P3 Rights of Human Subjects and the standard P4 Human Interactions in the Program Evaluation Standards (2nd Edition) were combined and made into one standard P3 Human Rights and Respect in the Program Evaluation Standards (3rd Edition). The essence remains unchanged since standards in both editions are intended to protect stakeholders’ rights and dignity. It is morally and ethically correct for evaluators to respect human dignity in the process of communicating with the stakeholders (AEA, 2005). Respecting the dignity and self-worth of clients and stakeholders in evaluation is one of the five guiding principles suggested by the American Evaluation Association in 2004.

To meet this requirement in Standard P3 Human Rights and Respect, complying with applicable laws and regulations is important but insufficient. Evaluators also need to comprehensively understand the contextual elements, including the stakeholders’ cultural and social background, values, manners, and mores. However, “social manners, mores, and ways of expressing respect and individual rights are sometimes bound by the cultural

contexts of participants, the organization, or the community” (Yarbrough et al., 2011, p. 126). Behavior considered respectful and polite in one cultural context might appear disrespectful in another culture (Yarbrough et al., 2011). People in a Confucianism-dominated society interact in a way that sometimes explicitly differ from the way people in the West do. Knowing this interaction difference might help Western evaluators to engage in conversations with Chinese stakeholders in a proper and polite manner.

Reece (2007) vividly compared the Western conversational style to tennis and the Chinese style to bowling. Chinese and Western speakers take turns to carry on the conversational ballgames in different ways. In the West, people talk in a reciprocal way with the conversational ‘ball’ bounding back and forth in the court. Speakers are responsible for taking their turns to keep the ball in motion. By contrast, Chinese talk in turns, just like playing bowling. Abrupt interruption might cause discomfort on the part of the speaker. This might also mean rudeness and lack of patience if the speaker is elderly, or occupies a senior position like a boss, principal, or dean. In the Chinese conversational style, maintaining silence, listening attentively, smiling and nodding from time to time, and echoing views typically demonstrate the audience’s respect. One important point not mentioned by Reece (2007) is that in a Chinese group conversation, usually the speaker of the highest ranked position starts the conversation, followed by the other speakers based on their social status and/or age. Sometimes, speakers of lower ranks start and carry on the conversation and speaker of the highest rank makes a summary in the end. It is a Confucian tradition that people show greater respect for those of senior position and/or older age. For

example, children pay respect to parents, younger sisters and brothers to elder siblings, students to teachers, teachers to deans and principals, employees to boss. Western evaluators may have difficulty in identifying with this inequality in conversation. Nevertheless, remaining culturally insensitive to this different way of showing respect in interpersonal communication may result in social displeasure and hinder stakeholders' cooperation.

Communicating with stakeholders in cross-cultural evaluation inevitably involves the use of titles to greet them. To the Western evaluators, a noticeable difference exists in the choice of titles to show respect for Chinese stakeholders. On one occasion, a Chinese university president chose one out of three titles available to greet a guest speaker in a public lecture. The invited guest speaker was 1) a professor from Tsinghua University in Beijing (one of the most prestigious universities in China); 2) the holder of a doctoral degree; and 3) a director of a research center at Tsinghua. His third title was chosen by the university president to show respect to the guest in public. This choice is widely acceptable in China and can be interpreted by the Confucian favoritism toward administrative titles. It is written in *the Analects (lunyu)*, a collection of sayings and ideas attributed to Confucius and his contemporaries, that "He who excels in study should apply himself to be an officer" (*xue er you ze shi*). Administrative positions like dean, department head, and director of a research center are often reserved for teachers who stand out in academics and possess substantial leadership. In cases where a person from academia, governmental agencies, or business corporations possesses more than one title, choosing the title showing the highest

administrative position tend to express greatest respect, although using titles prevalent in the West like professor and doctor is also acceptable. Incidentally, it is important to note that, unlike North America, it is not a general practice to greet a person of higher position or older age by his/her given name, especially when the gap in position or age is obvious.

Recommendations to Western Evaluators

There exists in China “a moderation of the disagreement between Confucian traditionalism and moralism on the one side, and western democracy, capitalism and individualism on the other” (Yao, 2000, p. 275). Tradition and modernization coexist explicitly in the street and implicitly in Chinese people’s minds. The Western evaluators may easily acquaint themselves with the modernization side, but might find it difficult to understand the tradition-based behaviors of Chinese clients and stakeholders. The following general recommendations might help enhance their readiness for culturally responsive evaluation within the Chinese cultural context:

Treating the Chinese culture appropriately. “Cultural competence is a stance toward culture, not a discrete status or simple mastery of particular knowledge and skills” (AEA, 2011, para.3). An appropriate attitude toward Chinese culture is paramount to Western evaluators throughout the entire evaluation process, especially during their interactions with Chinese clients and stakeholders. A stance showing bias, arrogance or imposition is not only a violation of evaluator’s ethics, but also a potential clash with the pride that many Chinese people overtly or covertly cherish toward their own culture. For the Western evaluators to whom China remains a remote and mysterious land, merely

relying on media reports for cultural information is not a reliable approach to developing a proper stance toward the culture rooted in Confucianism. Media bias “has been widely documented, both internationally and within the United States” (Gentzkow & Shapiro, 2006, p.281). Close and personal contact with Chinese culture might help evaluators view their interactions through a different lens and shape a more balanced perspective.

Genuinely understanding the Chinese culture. The efforts for a genuine understanding of Chinese culture might be extrinsically and intrinsically worthwhile to Western evaluators, particularly when they have long-term evaluation projects in China. The current rapid economic growth in China has meant a multitude of job opportunities for evaluators to expand business, apply expertise, and test evaluation theories. A deep understanding of Chinese culture makes it easier for Western evaluators to win trust from, and work effectively with, Chinese clients, stakeholders, and participants. Confucianism is fundamentally about becoming a virtuous person and building a harmonious world. This is a common pursuit in Western culture, which may account for the real interest in Chinese culture that many Western people develop from personal contact with it. Spending festivals with Chinese people may help instill a deeper understanding of Chinese culture. Spending Spring Festival or Mid-autumn Festival with a Chinese family might assist Western evaluators in better appreciating parent-child relationships. The Tomb-sweeping Festival in the spring and the Double Ninth Festival in the fall provide opportunities to understand Chinese respect for their ancestors.

Involving Chinese in the Evaluation Teams. Involving host country people and

using evaluation teams as suggested by Merryfield (1985) are still applicable solutions to the problems in cross-cultural evaluation, although these changes may incur additional costs. The involvement of Chinese in the evaluation process may include a Chinese project coordinator who can “interpret the cultural implications” (p.15) and the cultural consequences of the evaluation design and implementation. It may also include consultancy with people who have expert knowledge of Chinese culture like China Hands.

Conclusion

Cross-cultural evaluation is a construct that has newly emerged in the evaluation community where cultural competence is increasingly emphasized. However, the knowledge about how to implement evaluation across cultures remains limited (Chouinard & Cousins, 2009). This article is an endeavor in this vein. It attempts to enrich the understanding of Chinese culture from the perspective of Confucianism for the Western evaluators so that they may work efficiently in the Chinese cultural context. To avoid a general discussion, the author focuses on three subsets of the Program Evaluation Standards (3rd Edition), namely, U4 Explicit Values, P2 Formal Agreements, and P3 Human Rights and Respect. An in-depth analysis of the three subsets has revealed perspectives about the cultural competence Western evaluators are expected to have to work in Chinese cultural context. This paper compares the differences in Chinese and Western values, legal tradition related to entering into and implementing evaluation agreements, and the way that people show respect. Finally, this paper provides some suggestions for the Western

evaluators on how to enhance their cultural readiness and achieve success in finishing their evaluation projects in China.

Acknowledgement

I sincerely appreciate Dr. Lyn Shulha for her encouragement, ideas, and feedback, without which this article would be impossible. I also thank Dr. Don Klinger for his incisive comments during my presentation at 2013 Rosa Bruno-Jofré's Symposium in Education. I also feel greatly indebted to the two anonymous reviewers for their comments on the content, format, and language of this article. Last, thanks also go to Mr. Sean Cousins for his time and effort expended for this paper and the happy conversations on Chinese culture.

References

- American Evaluation Association. (2004). *Guiding principles for evaluators*. Retrieved from <http://www.eval.org/publications/aea06.GPBrochure.pdf>.
- American Evaluation Association. (2005). *A cultural reading of the Program Evaluation Standards (2nd Edition)*. Retrieved from <http://www.eval.org/aea05.cr.BoardApproved2.pdf>
- American Evaluation Association. (2011). *Statement on Cultural Competence in Evaluation*. Retrieved from <http://www.eval.org/ccstatement.asp>
- American Psychological Association. (2003). Guidelines on multicultural education, training, research, practice, and organizational change for psychologists. *American Psychologist*, 58(5), 377-402.
- Ames, R. T., & Tu, W. (2012). Confucianism. In *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved from <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/132104/Confucianism>
- Bamberger, M. (2000). The evaluation of international development programs: A view from the front. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 21, 95-102.
- Bamberger, M. (2001). Evaluation in developing countries: Experience with agricultural research and development. In D. Horton & R. MacKay (Eds.), (special issue of Knowledge, Technology and Policy) and The annotated bibliography of international program evaluation, In C. Russon & K. Russon (Eds.), [Review of journal issue and book]. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 22, 117-122.
- Chan, H., Chen, C., DeWoskin, K., Dull J. L., Elman, B., Feuerwerker, A., Franke,

- H...Zürcher, E. (2012). China. In *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved from <http://www.britannica.com.proxy.queensu.ca/EBchecked/topic/111803/China>
- Chouinard, J. A., & Cousins, J. B. (2009). A review and synthesis of current research on cross-cultural evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 30(4), 457-494.
- Fan, R. (2010). *Reconstructionist Confucianism: Rethinking morality after the West*. London: Springer.
- Gentzkow, M., & Shapiro, J. M. (2006). Media bias and reputation. *Journal of Political Economy*, 114(2), 280-316.
- Green, J. W. (1982). *Cultural awareness in the human services*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Guthrie, D. (2009). *China and globalization: The social, economic and political transformation of Chinese society*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Jang, S. (2000). The appropriateness of Joint Committee Standards in non-Western settings: A case study of South Korea. In C. Russon (Ed.), *The program evaluation standards in international settings*. Occasional Paper Series, No. 17. Kalamazoo, MI: Western Michigan University Evaluation Center.
- Kogan, J. (1983) Age discrimination. *Annual Survey of American Law*, 4, 795-822.
- Lee, E. (1997). Overview: The assessment and treatment of Asian American families. In E. Lee (Ed.), *Working with Asian Americans: A Guide for Clinicians*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Lynch, E. W., & Hanson, M. J. (1999). Steps in the right direction: Implications for

- interventionists. In E. W. Lynch, & M. J. Hanson (Eds.). *Developing cross-cultural competence: A guide for working with children and their families* (2nd Edition). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.
- National Bureau of Statistic of China. (2011). *Announcement on the Major Data from the Sixth National Census in 2010 (No. 1)*. Retrieved from http://www.stats.gov.cn/tjgb/rkpcgb/qgrkpcgb/t20110428_402722232.htm
- Orts, E. W. (2001). The rule of law in China. *Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law*, 34, 43-115.
- Pan, Z. (1994). *To see ourselves: Comparing traditional Chinese and American cultural values*. Boulder Colo: Westview Press.
- Reece, G. (2007). *Conversational ballgames: Why the world doesn't communicate*. Retrieved from <http://www.gabaptist.org>.
- Seefeldt, F. M. (1985). Cultural considerations for evaluation consulting in the Egyptian context. In M. Q. Patton (Ed.). *Culture and Evaluation: New Directions for Program Evaluation*, no. 25. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sengupta, S., Hopson, R, & Thompson-Robinson, M. (2004). Cultural competence in evaluation: An Overview. In M. Thompson-Robinson, S. Hopson, & S. Sengupta (Eds.), *In Search of Cultural Competence in Evaluation: Toward Principles and Practices. New Directions for Evaluation*, 102, 5-19.
- Smith, N. (2002). International Students' Reflections on the Cultural Embeddedness of Evaluation Theory. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 23,481-492.

Statistics Canada. (2008). *Ethnic origin and visible minorities*. Retrieved from

<http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2006/rt-td/eth-eng.cfm>

Tan, S. (2008). Modernizing Confucianism and 'new Confucianism'. In K. Louie (Ed.).

The Cambridge companion to modern Chinese culture (pp. 135-155). Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

Yao, X. (2000). *An introduction to Confucianism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University

Press.