



PD-ARF-165
8/5/88

is a program of the
Bureau for Science and Technology, Office of Health and Office of Education
Agency for International Development

through a contract with the
Academy for Educational Development

and subcontracts with the
University of Pennsylvania, Applied Communication Technology, Needham Porter Novelli and PATH

Contract #DPE-1013-C-00-5063-00

TRIP REPORT

RECEIVED
BY LAC/DR/HN

AUG 1 1 1988

GUATEMALA

May 19-June 2, 1988
June 20-July 7, 1988

AM PM
7 8 9 10 11 12 1 2 3 4 5 6

Nancy Morris
Healthcom Evaluation Project
Annenberg School of Communications
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

1

Trip Report - Guatemala
May 19-June 2, 1988 and June 20-July 7, 1988
Nancy Morris

I. Introduction

The Investigation Unit of the Promotion Component of the Guatemalan Ministry of Health consists of Eugenia de Pratdesaba and Olga Pineda. They are responsible for pretesting campaign materials and evaluating campaigns. One purpose of my previous trip to Guatemala (April 25-May 6, 1988) had been to teach Pratadesaba and Pineda about sampling procedures for campaign evaluation. As the scope of the necessary training became clear, it became evident that the week scheduled for this activity would be insufficient, and the training was expanded into a small evaluation training workshop.

The Investigation Unit was charged with evaluating the May and June vaccination days, as well as the tetanus toxoid campaign of late 1987 and early 1988. Therefore it was decided that the evaluation training would be a practical exercise in campaign evaluation focused on the two sets of campaigns. The workshop was divided into two trips in order to fit around the other activities and responsibilities of Pratdesaba and Pineda, and to have the data collection phase of the training coincide with the end of the vaccination days. The two trips described in this report comprised that evaluation training.

II. Purpose of trips

The purpose of these trips was twofold:

1) to train the Investigation Unit of the Promotion Component of the Guatemalan Ministry of Health in the process of campaign evaluation.

2) to evaluate Guatemala's recent vaccination days and tetanus toxoid campaigns through a small survey. The survey was conducted as a training exercise in campaign evaluation.

The training and survey were intended to enhance the Promotion Component's process of internal evaluation; along with the focus groups that they regularly use to pretest campaign materials, they sought a mechanism to evaluate the impact of the campaigns and guide future campaigns.

A further activity of these trips was the preliminary search for an agency to carry out the forthcoming impact evaluation of

Healthcom Guatemala campaigns.

III. First trip - May 15-June 2

A. Evaluation training and survey preparation

1. Observed first jornada de vacunacion.

Upon arrival in Guatemala, I assisted investigation unit with the preparation of a brief questionnaire to be used for informal evaluation of first vaccination day. I then accompanied Olga Pineda to Solola, where we interviewed mothers about their knowledge of the vaccination day. We visited San Jorge, Monte Mercedes, Panajachel, and the city of Solola, interviewing mothers and checking vaccination posts for campaign materials. Other promotion component employees did the same in other areas of Guatemala. Upon return to Guatemala City, I assisted the investigation team with hand tabulation of the results. As part of the training project, I prepared a brief reference guide on how to write a final report, and assisted them with the report. (See Appendices 1 and 2).

2. Survey sample selection.

To plan and select the sample for the forthcoming survey, we went to the library of the Direccion General of the Ministry of Health to consult the Diccionario Geografico de Guatemala and other materials, and to INCAP for sampling material. INCAP had a mapped and weighted sampling frame of the entire country that they had used in their Westinghouse survey, and they were willing to provide us with necessary materials for our survey. They provided us with cluster lists from the four departments chosen for our survey from which we were to randomly choose our subsample.

I met with Orlando Marroquin to discuss sampling strategy and survey logistics. (See letter to Marroquin, Appendix 3.)

3. Computer statistical package.

Before arriving in Guatemala, I had looked for a computer software package for the Investigation Unit to use. The criteria for selection of such software were that it be appropriate for the needs of the

Investigation Unit and that it be documented in Spanish to facilitate their use of it. Considerable searching turned up only one suitable software package: Survey Mate by Henry Elkins and Associates. Survey Mate was installed in the promotion component's personal computer, and we began to explore its capabilities for data tabulation and analysis. I also continued to instruct Pradesaba in the use of Wordstar for word processing.

4. Questionnaire.

We began questionnaire design, and worked through several versions of the instrument, discussing concepts and strategies of questionnaire design and question-asking. We began to make arrangements to have the questionnaire translated to the appropriate Maya language once the sample was selected.

B. Other activities

1. Impact evaluation

I called the agencies we had contacted during the previous visit to solicit bids, and visited one new agency - CEDE, the Centro de Estudios para el Desarrollo. I met twice with Hernan Delgado of INCAP to discuss possibilities of INCAP conducting the evaluation.

2. ORS container size

At the request of Jose Romero, Diane Urban, and John Massey, I reviewed several memos and reports about container size for ORS packets. (See Appendix 5 for my memo).

IV. Second trip - June 20-July 7, 1988

A. Preparations

In the period between the two trips, activity continued in preparation for the survey. In Guatemala, Pineda and Pradesaba prepared materials for interviewer training, hired interviewers, and pretested parts of the questionnaire. In Philadelphia, I revised the questionnaire and developed the coding.

B. Conducting the survey

1. Interviewer training

I was supposed to arrive in Guatemala on June 19, in order to begin interviewer training on June 20. However, my June 19 flight was cancelled, causing a one-day delay in my arrival. Therefore, I was not present for the first day of interviewer training, and the interviewers did not have a final copy of the questionnaire to work with. Pineda and Pratdesaba had prepared a schedule of interviewer training, and had done a good job of introducing the interviewers to the concepts of the survey and of interviewing (See Anexos to Appendix 4 for interviewer training materials and questionnaire). On June 21 and 22 we practiced with the questionnaire. Several small changes were incorporated into the questionnaire as a result of this exercise. Most of the interviewers had some previous survey experience, which facilitated the training. Nonetheless, I felt that there were problems with comprehension of the subtleties of the questionnaire and some of the coding. I would have liked to extend the interviewer training, but this was not possible as arrangements for vehicles and drivers for data collection could not be altered.

2. Production of the questionnaire

During the two days of interviewer training, I also worked on incorporating changes into the questionnaire and finalizing the coding. Due to a malfunction of the computer printer, archaic methods were used to produce the final master copy of the questionnaire. Photocopying and collating of the questionnaire were done immediately before going into the field.

3. Data collection

a. Teams

The data was to be collected by three teams of two interviewers and one supervisor/interviewer each. The supervisor/interviewers were Pratdesaba, Pineda, and one other member of the Promotion Component staff, Leonel Ayala.

b. Transport

We had requested a car and driver for each team, but there were problems with transport; only two cars were made available to us, one driver refused to work over the weekend, and there was some

question as to whether enough gasoline had been allocated. These snags were resolved in ad hoc ways.

c. Maps

Bureaucratic snarls had prevented us from getting the necessary maps from INCAP, so Pratdesaba and I developed alternate arrangements for sampling at the community level.

d. Data collection

I spent approximately a day and 1/2 with each of the three teams. I accompanied Pineda's team to Solola for the first day of data collection, and observed interviews in Caserio Chuacruz. On June 24 I went to Retalhuleu to work with Pratdesaba's team, and assisted them with coding. June 27 I went to Alta Verapaz to join Ayala's team, which I accompanied to an isolated area in the Municipio of San Pedro Carcha for interviewing.

4. Data verification and coding

Upon returning from the field, the three supervisors and I spent two days checking the coding on all completed questionnaires. Each interviewer was required to correct coding errors.

5. Data entry

During the process of data collection, I spent one day in the office setting up the data entry file in the computer. After the questionnaires had been checked and were ready to be entered, there were problems of access to the computer which delayed data entry. Once we were able to use the computer, all data were entered by myself and the secretary, Lisbeth de Barrios.

6. Analysis of results

As soon as data entry was completed, we began to work on data analysis. We ran basic frequencies, discussed how to interpret them, and considered which frequencies were most important. We then discussed, planned, and carried out further steps of analysis: crosstabulations and reordering of data.

7. Final report

After discussion of the contents and format of the final report, Pineda and Pratdesaba prepared a draft. At this point, time constraints became paramount. Pratdesaba and Pineda were busy July 4th and 5th with another

activity, so I continued to work on the analysis and report, revising their draft. The last day and a half of my trip were spent with Pineda and Pratdesaba reworking and finalizing this report as much as possible in the limited time available. (See Appendix 5 for our final report).

V. Other activities

A. On July 6, at the request of Jose Romero, I presented a talk about sampling in general and our sampling frame in particular to office staff and two people from the investigation division of Human Resources Dept of the Ministry of Health. There was a question and answer session and ample discussion of issues involved. (See Appendix 6)

B. Met with Dr. Hernan Delgado of INCAP for further discussion of impact evaluation.

VI. Observations

A. Computer training

The weakness in this project in terms of training is the computer analysis. There simply was not time for detailed training in the use of the computer for basic statistical analysis. Pineda and Pratdesaba will need further training in the use of the computer and in data analysis in order to be able to conduct their own computer analysis.

B. Questionnaire translation

Although we had a Kakchiquel-speaking interviewer and the questionnaire had been translated into Kakchiquel, differences in local dialects led to most of the interviews in Kakchiquel-speaking areas being conducted with the assistance of bilingual community members. In Kekchi speaking areas, Leonel Ayala was able to do the interviews himself, as he spoke the appropriate Kekchi dialect. The questionnaire had not been translated into Kekchi; Ayala translated as he went along.

VII. Persons contacted

INCAP - Dr. Hernan Delgado, Dr. Edgar Hidalgo

CEDE - Centro de Estudios para el Desarrollo - Licda. Betty Lobos Bollat, Director

Ministry of Health Human Resources Unit, Investigation
Department - Ricardo Valladares and Anabela Paiz