

Some Criteria for the Evaluation of Implementation Process

—The Case of Korean Agricultural Policies—

Chung, Chung-Kil*

〈Contents〉

- I. Introduction
- II. Process Evaluation and Successful Policy Implementation.
 - 1 Lack of Theories in Process Evaluation.
 - 2 The Meaning of Successful Implementation.
- III. Evaluation Criteria for Agricultural and Rural Development Programs and Policies.
 - 1 Governmental Efforts for Agricultural and Rural Development.
 - 2 Elements Harmful to Successful Implementation
 - 3 Evaluation Criteria Derived
 - 4 Types of Governmental Activities and Their Evaluation Criteria.
- IV. Concluding Remarks
- Appendix

I. Introduction

Many scholars argued that summative evaluation is not enough and formative evaluation or process evaluation must more frequently be employed. Unlike their strong argument, few scholars have offered good guidelines for process evaluation. As a matter of fact, process evaluation has not yet been fully examined by evaluation theorists. Many scholars tried to build up frameworks to examine successful implementation. However, they are still far short of integrating implementation studies into process evaluation.

In order to utilize empirical and descriptive implementation studies for better prescriptive evaluation we must first develop criteria by which we can assess the desirability of imple-

* Associate Professor, Graduate School of Public Administration, Seoul National University

mentation process. I will try, in this paper, to find out some criteria of such a kind from agricultural and rural programs and policies of Korean Government.⁽¹⁾ The paper will also indicate, for hypothetical reasons, that saliency of evaluation criteria depends on types of policy or program, following T. Lowi's framework.

II. Process Evaluation and Successful Policy Implementation.

1. Lack of Theories in Process Evaluation.

Many scholars argue that we must pay more attention to process evaluation of governmental programs. So, it is rather very surprising that we cannot find many good models or guidelines for process evaluation. In fact, the term process evaluation itself is not yet clearly and agreeably conceptualized.

Everyone seems to agree that the purpose of process evaluation is to supply or feed-back information for better implementation of programs or policies.⁽²⁾ However, what to evaluate still remained vague and not frequently mentioned at all. Some scholars emphasize as the object of process evaluation the extent to which a particular policy or program is implemented according to its stated guidelines or intent.⁽³⁾ Others argue that program evaluation must focus on how and why a program or policy works or does not work.⁽⁴⁾ Still others argue that to detect deviations or faults in implementing process must be the major activity of process evaluation.⁽⁵⁾ The last one logically regards process evaluation as one of audit functions and thus includes as its important ingredients the dimension of accountability such as fiscal and legal accountability.⁽⁶⁾

All those elements may be proper objects of process evaluation. Yet, we inevitably notice that the basic question is not fully answered: the question of why some elements must be selected as objects of process evaluation. For example, why process evaluation must assess

(1) I am greatly thankful to officials of Korean Board of Audit and Inspection and the Ministry of Agriculture and Fishery for their frank discussion and full support.

(2) D. Nachmias (ed.), *The Practice of Policy Evaluation* (N.Y.: St. Martin's, 1980), P.5; D. Nachmias, *Public Evaluation* (N.Y.: St. Martin's, 1979), P.5; C.H. Weiss, *Evaluation Research* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972), P.16.

(3) For example, See D. Nachmias (ed.), *op. cit.*, P.4.; E. Bardach, "On Designing Implementable Programs", in F.S. Lane (ed.), *Current Issues in Public Administration*, 2nd ed. (N.Y.: St. Martin's, 1982), P.408.

(4) E.F. Suchman, *Evaluative Research* (N.Y.: Russel Sage Foundation, 1967), PP.66-68.

(5) P.F. Rossi and H.E. Freeman, *Evaluation* (Beverly Hills: SAGE, 1982), P.127; D. Nachmias (ed.), *op. cit.*, P.5.

(6) P.F. Rossi and H.E. Freeman, *op. cit.*, P.127 and the whole part of Chapter 4.

the extent to which a program is implemented according to its stated guidelines or intent? If we want to detect deviations, why are certain activities regarded as deviant ones? The answers to these questions can be numerous.

One clear answer to those questions is that those aspects are implicitly assumed to be necessary for success of a program or policy, or put in more correct words, necessary for successful implementation of a program or policy. This is obvious, because the purpose of process evaluation is to get information for better implementation, as mentioned above.

Thus, scholars such as Suchman clearly indicate some criteria for evaluating success or failure of a program.⁽⁷⁾ However, it is not clear at all why those criteria can indicate success or failure of a program. Actually, Suchman has not explicitly clarified the meaning of program's success or failure.

As the process evaluation aims at better implementation, program success or failure in the context of process evaluation must be conceptualized in terms of success or failure of program implementation.

The above argument can be summarized as follows: Process evaluation is not well explored and what to evaluate, not to mention how to, remains vague. Since process evaluation aims at successful implementation of program or policy, those elements critical to it must be studied as proper objects of process evaluation.

2. The Meaning of Successful Implementation.

Even after great number of books and articles have been written in the area of policy implementation with the name "Implementation" in title, we have difficulty to find out what "successful implementation" means. Many scholars implicitly assume a certain state as successful implementation. But, few have explicitly conceptualized it.

Successful implementation may mean that implementers faithfully follow whatever guidelines stated at the stage of policymaking and to accomplish whatever objectives or sub-objectives specified in a policy or program. The problem with this kind of definition is that policy objectives or means or any guidelines may not clearly be stated at the time of policy making. It is a well-known fact that policymakers can not always have enough knowledge and skill to specify contents of policy, and that they may not agree on goals or means to leave them vague and unclear. Sometimes uncertainty due either to dynamics and complexity of policy context or to lack of adequate information makes it inevitable to delay the specification of policy contents. All these lead to vague and unclear policy

(7) E.A. Suchman, *op. cit.*, PP. 61-68.

contents, and so, we cannot define or find stated guidelines at all.

Thus, we need more than simple guidelines stated for the definition of successful implementation. Many scholars gave up the idea of employing guidelines or contents stated. Instead, they try to find out, for the term "successful" implementation, some other concepts: concepts sometimes independent of policy contents. Let us see some criteria.

Most popular criterion is effectiveness or goal attainment. This idea regards a certain implementation as successful, if it is effective in terms of maximizing policy goals intended at the stage of policymaking. The implicit assumption here is that any policy will have certain goals, although they may be very vague. If there is no goal, then, the word "implementation" does not make any sense.

However, it quickly comes to mind that effectiveness alone is not enough even when there are certain goals to define successful implementation. Efficiency is obviously another desirable element for successful implementation. Thus, logical extension of such reasoning opens up a new approach to the definition of successful implementation: to define it in terms of desirable status or evaluation criteria.

Some scholar mentions effort, performance, adequacy of performance, efficiency and process.⁽⁸⁾ Others emphasize effectiveness, efficiency, constituency satisfaction, clientele responsiveness and system maintenance.⁽⁹⁾ Yet, many others do not even mention those criteria when they try to find out determinants of successful policy implementation. These scholars usually assume, though implicitly, that effectiveness is the most important criterion to judge success of policy implementation.⁽¹⁰⁾

All those criteria undoubtedly have their own utilities as evaluative criteria for some policy or program. And it is also doubtless that some of them are more appropriate for some program or policy and some are for others. However, those scholars have not made very clear which of those criteria are appropriate for what kind of policy or program. We need empirical study of implementation process.

(8) *Ibid.*, PP. 61-66.

(9) F. Nakamura & F. Smallwood, *The Politics of Policy Implementation* (N.Y.: St. Martin's Press), PP. 146-151.

(10) See followings. R. Ripley and G. Franklin, *Bureaucracy and Policy Implementation* (Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press), 1982), P. 85. G. Edwards III, *Implementing Public Policy* (Washington D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press), 1980, PP. 8-9. D. Mazmanian and P. Sabatier, *Effective Policy Implementation* (Lexington: Heath and Company), 1981. P. 6. C. Bullock III C. Lumb, *Implementation of Civil Rights Policy* (Monterey, Cal.: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company), 1984, PP. 4-17. I. Sharkansky, *Public Administration* (San Francisco: Freeman and Company), 1982, PP. 241-254.

Moreover, in order to utilize those evaluation criteria to clarify the meaning of successful implementation and to evaluate implementation process (i.e., process evaluation), we must examine actual implementation process of policy or program. Such an empirical study will enable us to detect those elements which are crucial to, and thus, constitute some aspects of evaluation criteria. It will, thus, enable us to derive inductively those evaluation criteria. And, by reversing the work, we can transform abstract evaluation criteria into concrete elements of program activities and elements for process evaluation.

From now on, we will try an empirical study of such a kind, using programs and policies for agricultural and rural development of Korean Government. We will not, however, examine actual implementation process of those programs or policies, but analyze evaluation materials which Korean Board of Audit and Inspection had accumulated. KBAI has tried to inspect implementation process of agricultural policies and programs, mainly focusing on deviant cases which, KBAI assumes, hurts successful implementation.

Thus, our study has several methodological weaknesses. First, we accept as components of evaluation criteria those elements or aspects which KBAI auditors regard as crucial to successful implementation. We will not try any kind of rigorous analysis of those elements and theoretically rigorous conceptualization of "successful" implementation. Analysis and conceptualization of such a kind, we intend, will be followed in another paper after we sort out whatever elements are regarded as crucial to successful implementation by practitioners (what we want in this paper).

Second, those elements or aspects of implementation process have been checked by KBAI not because their presence guarantees success of program or policy, but because their absence hurts successful implementation. Auditor's focus on deviant cases inevitably emphasizes those elements. Thus, we do not claim that those elements will guarantee the most successful implementation. Readers familiar with implementation studies will easily recollect that almost all the studies in the field have the same problem: focus on those elements which do not guarantee, but whose absence hurts, successful implementation.

These two weaknesses may greatly hurt the validity of empirical study, but not seriously that of this paper. Our purpose here is not to verify or test any hypothesis, but simply to sort out those elements of evaluation criteria from accumulated documents and see some difference in evaluation criteria among different programs or policies.

III. Evaluation Criteria for Agricultural and Rural Development Programs and Policies.

1. Governmental Efforts for Agricultural and Rural Development.

Agricultural policies or programs usually are of various kind, and of great complexity. For our purpose, we examine what Korean Government frequently made public. Korean government has emphasized agricultural development because of its contribution or importance to national development.

The single most important contribution of agricultural sector to the national industrialization effort will be the supply of enough agricultural products, especially enough food. And this can be accomplished either by increasing the cultivated land or by raising its productivity. The expansion of cultivated land can be accomplished by various ways of reclamation: Cultivating hills, forests, etc. All these require intensive human efforts and large amount of money. Government usually supports these projects, offering loans or subsidies to those needed.

In order to raise the productivity of agricultural sector, four different sorts of means are critical: the sound agricultural infrastructure, high labor productivity, high-yield variety of seed and appropriate farming materials.

Farming materials, such as fertilizer and insecticides, are the key factors to affect the agricultural products in the short run. Sufficient supply of fertilizer and insecticide at appropriate time is a must to keep agricultural product at certain level. Government tries to build factories, to encourage private merchants, or to intervene in the market for farmers to obtain fertilizer, insecticide or other farming materials at low price, in adequate amount and at needed time. Governments, thus, inevitably regulates brokers or retailers of the farming materials.

On the other hand, agricultural infrastructure determines the lower and upper bound of agricultural products in the long run. Irrigation facilities are necessary elements for agricultural production in drought-prone area. Dam, water reservoir, water pipe and tube well are all essential parts of agricultural infrastructure, especially for rice production. Roads and paths in cultivated land and between farm land and villages are also important when agricultural mechanization begins. Roads must be broad enough to drive and move combines or other machines. If roads are zig-zag and narrow, they must be broadened and

straightened. And thus, this necessitates land-rearrangement which in fact does accomplish more than that, as the word land-consolidation implies. Most probably, agricultural infrastructure is where government pours into the largest amount of public money. Huge amount of public money is spent for the construction of water reservoir, dam, water pipeline, and other irrigation facilities. Land consolidation, reclamation and roads construction also requires tremendous amount of money. And, it is this area which is very prone to inefficiency and ineffectiveness.

To develop and diffuse high-yield variety of seed was the main factor which made the green revolution successful in Korea. Thus, it is obvious that there must be this kind of continuous effort for rapid agricultural development. Governmental effort for R & D in agricultural sector largely focuses on this area. Government also tries to rapidly diffuse new seeds.

When national industrialization reaches a certain threshold (probably take-off stage, as W. W. Rostow named it), low-wage labor must be supplied to the manufactural sector from agricultural sector. This usually creates labor shortage in agricultural sector at some critical period of year, at the time of planting and harvesting, for example. Replacement of labor by machines becomes necessary. Here, government does almost the same activities as those for adequate, cheap, timely supply of farming material such as fertilizer and insecticide.

Stable agricultural development requires still another condition: quite different from those mentioned till now. Farmers need some incentives to increase agricultural products. There must be a higher probability that if they increase farm products, they can be well off. Farmer's better life can be guaranteed, if their income is reasonably good and if they can easily get access to public utilities for better life.

The most important means for better life is better income. Farmer's income can become higher either by the increase in agricultural product or by the rise of its price at given cost. It is not at all surprising that the farmers are not willing to work hard if the price of agricultural products is unreasonably low. As agricultural products are usually daily necessities, however, their price must not be higher for consumers. These two opposite requirements can sometimes be satisfied by dual price system. Dual price system maintains lower price for consumers and higher price for farmers either by government's subsidy or government's purchase.

As the dual price system is costly, many governments try two strategies to guarantee

reasonable price for farmers and consumers: (a) Trying to stabilize price of agricultural products throughout the year; and (b) trying to cut down market processing cost of agricultural products.

Let us start from the second one. Many kinds of agricultural products are by their nature hard to store and easy to get rotten. Moreover, so many intermediary groups in between farmers and consumers try to get as high margin as possible. As a whole, market process must somehow be improved in order to protect both farmers and consumers. Government tries various ways to improve the situation: offering subsidies or loans for construction of village store house or even for buying freezers; helping Farmers' Cooperatives exclude intermediary brokers or dealers; and regulating those brokers or dealers.

Going back to the first strategy mentioned above, government tries to prevent a big downfall of price of agricultural product right after harvest and its unreasonable rise shortly before harvest, because both phenomena are usually harmful to both farmers and consumers, the first being particularly painful to farmers, the latter to consumers. The governmental effort to stabilize the price of agricultural product usually adopts the strategy of purchasing agricultural products when the price is too low and of selling them when the price is too high.

2. Elements Harmful to Successful Implementation

It can easily be imagined that various sort of undesirable plans, activities and implementers' behavior can create innumerable problems, frequently resulting in speculation and waste of public money, and inefficient, ineffective, irresponsible, inequitable, inadequate, and untimely execution of projects for agricultural and rural development. Let us see in detail more of those problems which hurt successful implementation. As mentioned earlier, we utilize materials Korean Board of Audit and Inspection accumulated. Major deviant cases from KBAI's report are summarized in Appendix.

When large amount of public money is spent, it can be speculated or wasted. In public construction project such as construction of water reservoir, dams, etc. construction companies can buy corrupted public officials with bribery and then play every kind of foul trick (such as using low-quality materials, changing structures of constructs, etc.) to speculate money, hurting the effectness of project. These kinds of irregularities are not uncommon in many agricultural development projects. Loans and subsidies may be offered to some unqualified persons for other purposes than those specified in laws and regulations. These kinds of irregularities are what traditional legality audit is supposed to prevent,

saving a lot of valuable public money.

However, public money may be much more efficiently and effectively utilized, if other undesirable phenomena can be avoided. Lack of comprehensive rational planning or decision-making can often lead to many avoidable failures. Government must examine both desirability and feasibility of project in advance and then must decide target areas of project. But, in many cases and because of many unreasonable reasons, government starts some project (such as water reservoir construction project or land consolidation project) simultaneously in too many target areas, often ending up with incomplete constructs. Government must have examined financial feasibility, sufficiency of materials, technical specialist, etc. Whatever the reason may be, incomplete constructs can make no effect at all. Moreover, big flood, strong typhoon or hurricane, and even strong wind may easily destroy half-built constructs: complete loss of invested public money from incomplete constructs.

Insufficient size of project or amount of money for loans and subsidies frequently ends up with complete waste of money. Subsidies and loans to individual farmers sometimes are so small that they are spent for trivial living expenses. Governmental purchase of agricultural product for price support and stability is often so small in amount that it does not affect the price at all. Thus, inadequate amount or size of project greatly hurts effectiveness and results in waste of public money.

Poor design, inappropriate materials, irrational execution plan, delayed activities can all lead to inefficiency and ineffectiveness of construction project for agricultural and rural developments. Timeliness is another critical factor in agricultural sector. Governmental purchase of agricultural products, governmental support for sufficient supply of fertilizer and insecticide, and many kinds of subsidies and loans for farmers, all these projects are greatly constrained in their effects by the timeliness of their execution. Loss of timing sometimes completely wipe out the intended effects of those projects.

Lack of responsiveness to beneficiary group's need can also result in big waste of public money without any effect. Loans, subsidies, public facilities, etc. may be offered and built without taking into account what beneficiary group really needs, with the result of wasted money or deserted facilities. Sometimes, inequity in distribution of loans and subsidies and in selection of project sites can cause many serious problems. Inequitable handling of those matters can create undesirable political impact, bad social conflict and unbalanced economic growth.

3. Evaluation Criteria Derived

From the discussion above we can easily derive many evaluation criteria for agricultural and rural policy implementation.

Efficiency, effectiveness and legality are doubtlessly important evaluation criteria to assess the desirability of governmental activities. However, they are not the only criteria. Let us summarize those criteria derived from the above discussion.

(1) Effectiveness...Effectiveness is defined as the degree of goal attainment. Goals are what governmental activities intend to achieve. For example, increase in rice productivity is a goal of water reservoir construction project, and prevention of the down-fall of rice price is a goal of governmental purchase of rice at harvest time. The more the degree of goal achievement is, the higher the effectiveness, and the better it is.

(2) Adequacy...Adequacy is defined as the actual degree of goal achievement (or activities carried out) relative to the desirable degree. For example, it is not adequate to offer only 10% of requested amount of money as loans to farmers when farmers really need all the requested money. In this way, adequacy frequently is used to assess the sufficiency of policy means, which is critical to the attainment of desirable degree of goals.

(3) Timeliness...Timeliness refers to the timing of performance or activities. Thus, this is a critical factor which sharply affects effectiveness and other desirable consequences of governmental activities. Therefore, it can be regarded as an instrumental criterion. It is almost useless and sometimes harmful to purchase a large amount of rice before or long after harvest time. It does not help productivity to supply insecticide after insects eat most of crops. Land cannot be farmed if consolidation project is not finished during off-season period of year.

(4) Responsiveness...Responsiveness refers to the degree of government's acceptance of what beneficiary group wants. Governmental activities are more responsive, if their goals and ways to achieve goals are closer to what farmers want. Materials, subsidies, loans, information and the like supplied and offered by government sometimes are not exactly what farmers badly need. Although we cannot always accept as criteria what beneficiary group wants, we sometimes neglect them too much.

(5) Efficiency...Efficiency refers to the degree of goal achievement with given resources or the degree of resource consumption to achieve a given degree of goal, since efficiency is usually defined as the ratio of output to input. It is more efficient to achieve more goal (or more correctly, to produce more output) with a given amount of resources, or to use

less resources to attain a given level of goal. As mentioned several times, this criterion of efficiency is the most important criterion for rapid agricultural development.

(6) Equity...Equity refers to distributory justice in allocating benefit and cost among people. In agricultural and rural development, allocation of benefit is the major issue. Is it desirable in terms of social justice or equity to build dam, water reservoir, or the like in one area but not in others? Is it equitable to give loans, subsidies or the like in kind or in money to some farmers but not to others? As may easily be understood, this criterion of equity may be in conflict with those criteria of effectiveness, efficiency, and others.

(7) Legality...Legality refers to compliance of governmental activities with laws and regulations. As discussed earlier, legality as evaluative criterion aims at protecting public money from peculation and waste during public construction such as dam, water reservoir, etc. Sometimes, laws and regulations specify some means to promote effectiveness, adequacy, responsiveness, timeliness, efficiency and equity of governmental activities but they have other aspects of their own.

Among those criteria we surveyed above, some are instrumental to others. For example, adequacy, timeliness, responsiveness can be viewed as instrumental to and so can be subsumed under those criteria of effectiveness, efficiency and legality. This is not always so, however. Sometimes, those evaluative criteria are in conflict among themselves. And classification of or structural relationships among them will be left for another paper. For now, we have other important job to finish.

4. Types of Governmental Activities and Their Evaluation Criteria.

Some scholars have correctly argued that different evaluative criteria must be utilized to evaluate different types of governmental activities. Thus, it is useful to consider what kind of evaluation criteria must be used to evaluate governmental activities for agricultural and rural development.

T. Lowi once classified governmental outputs (what government does for the people) into three categories: distributory, redistributory, and regulatory policies.⁽¹¹⁾ Starting from the second category, redistributory policies intend to redistribute income from higher income groups to lower income groups, collecting more tax from high-income groups to support lower income groups. When we evaluate the output side of governmental activities, we focus on the aspect of support for the poor within redistributory policies. Many countries

(11) T. Lowi, "American Business, Public Policy, Case-Studies, and Political Theory", *World Politics* July, 1964, PP. 677-715.

have some way of delivering grains, food or money to relieve the poor farmers of starvation. However, these are not important policies for agricultural and rural "development".

Regulatory policies intend to regulate, or more specifically, to prohibit certain action or behavior of some people which can harm others. This category of governmental activities for agricultural and rural development usually intends to regulate nonfarmers or prohibit certain behavior harmful to agricultural development. Government in some countries prohibit the non-agricultural use of cultivated land. Government also prohibits price increase, quality deterioration and quantity reduction of farming materials and factors such as fertilizer, insecticide, machines, and the like. Government also prohibits intentional blocking of timely supply of those materials. This is sometimes applied to other materials and goods farmers consume. Government sometimes strongly support farmers' associations such as Farmers Cooperatives, yet, it regulates those associations not to exploit their members.

In evaluating regulatory policies, and their implementation activities, legality is the most important criterion. As discussed earlier, it can be understood, that regulatory policies may unnecessarily be over-implemented to hurt rights and freedom of the regulated, and may easily be under-implemented not to protect the intended beneficiary group. This has necessitated strict control of implementers' behavior. Thus, the compliance of implementers' activities with regulations and laws is very important. Effectiveness, that is, whether a governmental regulatory activity achieves intended goal, is also important criterion, independent from legality, in evaluating the desirability of governmental regulatory activity for agricultural development.

Distributive policies, the first category in Lowi's framework, intend to offer goods and services to the people. Most of governmental activities for agricultural and rural development belong in this category. This category can be divided into two sub-categories: activities offering material goods and those offering non-material services.

Governmental activities offering non-material services include distribution of information about present and predicted future supply and price of certain agricultural products such as sesame, bean, corn, pork, chicken, etc. The information may also be about availability and price of certain farming factors and materials. Government sometimes disseminate new ideas and good ways of raising crops and operating new machines.

Regardless of what they include, non-material services for agricultural and rural development can be evaluated by criteria of effectiveness, responsiveness, and sometimes time-

liness. Responsiveness is important, because services must be what farmers want or want to know. However, notice that legality, efficiency, and equity do not matter much in evaluating governmental activities which offer non-material services to farmers.

However, in case of governmental activities which offer material good to farmers, all evaluative criteria are important, with some being more critical, of course. When government distributes loans and subsidies in kind or in money to farmers there are some purposes to accomplish. It is, then, quite natural that loans and subsidies must be distributed in such a way as to maximally achieve goals. Thus, effectiveness and efficiency are necessary evaluative criteria. Amount of loan or subsidy given to individual farmer must be sufficient (or adequate) to accomplish something. Also they must be responsive to farmer's need and be timely. They must be distributed to farmers on justifiable bases in terms of equity. Finally, implementers must follow legal requirements and procedures to keep the legality of their activities, although in some cases they must try to amend legal requirements, standards or procedures which are conflicting with requirements for effectiveness, efficiency and all other evaluative criteria mentioned above.

The same is true for public construction or similar projects in support of agricultural and rural development. However, there is a slight difference of emphasis in evaluation criteria between distribution of loans and subsidies to individual farmer and construction of public utilities. This difference is due to the difference between private good and public good, the latter being offered usually to anyone who can utilize. In normal case of constructing dams, water reservoir or tube wells (for water) or of consolidating cultivated land, the project pays not so much attention to its responsiveness to individual farmer's want or adequacy of its size as the distribution of loans or subsidy does. Rather, effectiveness and efficiency subsume them as one part of their concept or as a cause which affects them.

Just like any other public construction project, construction of agricultural infrastructure must be efficient and effective. Water reservoir, for example, must be constructed in such a way as to maximize rice production with given money invested. As repeatedly mentioned, efficiency and effectiveness of public construction for agricultural development can never be overemphasized, since tremendous amount of public money is spent for public construction.

If government has enough money to build many water reservoirs, selection of construction areas must also satisfy the criterion of equity. Actually, selection of project location

must consider equity as a criterion to evaluate alternatives. Construction and maintenance of agricultural infrastructure must also meet legal requirements and procedures.

IV. Concluding Remarks

For good process evaluation, we must first of all conceptualize successful implementation. When we can establish some criteria which can differentiate successful implementation from failed ones, we can operationalize those criteria in terms of concrete elements or aspects of implementation activities. This, in turn, will enable us to monitor or evaluate implementation process (i. e. process evaluation).

With such an implicit frame-work, we tried to sort out evaluation criteria from documents and materials which Korean Board of Audit and Inspection accumulated. programs and policies audited cover almost all the important ones in Agricultural and Rural Development area. We have thus derived several evaluation criteria: effectiveness, efficiency, equity, adequacy, responsiveness, timeliness and legality. We also tried to show that some criteria are more important in certain type of policy and others are in other type.

However, this paper did not try to clarify the relationships among those sometimes conflicting criteria. Also remained for another paper is the very important job of operationalizing these criteria into concrete and observable aspects of implementation. Readers, however, will not be in difficulty to operationalize those criteria for process evaluation in case of agricultural programs or policies, since the job can be accomplished by reversing what we have done in this paper (to sort out criteria from aspects or activities of implementation process).

Appendix: Major Deviant Cases in Agricultural and Rural Development Programs and Their Implementation Activities.

☆☆ Reported by Korean Board of Audit and Inspection in ASOSAI,

Seminar on The Role of SAI for Agricultural/Rural Development, June 12~23, 1984, Seoul, Korea, Papers on Subtheme I, II, III.

1. Irrigation Projects

- Too many target areas at once without considering availability of materials and experts
- Arbitrary change in design of project

—Poor construction material

—Little maintenance effort

2. Land Consolidation Projects

—Delayed execution

—Uncoordinated activities and wasted effort (survey, design, initiation of projects are not well coordinated.)

—Inefficient design and method

—Little coordination with other projects (Reconstruction of roads for mechanization on already consolidated land; Reconstruction of river or stream banks on consolidated areas; etc.)

3. Land Reclamation Projects

—Inadequate selection of target areas (the soil of target area turns out to be too poor; selecting target areas which are already claimed by other purposes; strong opposition from land owners)

—Some abandoned land after the project is finished

—Incomplete tidal land reclamation projects and frequent destruction of partly-built structures (due to lack of fund or lack of adequate financial feasibility test)

—Poor design, poor feasibility study

—Low quality material

4. Special Projects to Increase Farmer's Income

—Too small amount of subsidy (used for trivial living expense)

—Delayed delivery of subsidy

—Unequal distribution of subsidy (Some receive overlapping subsidy, some none).

—Giving subsidies to unqualified applicants

—Lack of appropriate feasibility study of projects.

5. Improving Market System

—Incorrect prediction of agricultural products and miscalculation of the amount of governmental purchase.

—Too Small amount of governmental purchase and supply to affect price of agricultural products

—Allowing subsidy and loan (for price stability of agricultural products) to unqualified applicants

6. Rural Housing Improvement and Community Resettlement Projects

—Too many housing units planned to be constructed at one time, resulting in over-demand for construction materials, and thus raising their price and lowering their quality.

—Inappropriate selection of project areas (top priority goes to those areas along famous highway simply for demonstration)

—Subsidy and loans to unqualified people (non-farmers)

—Insufficient funds

—Poor design and poor technical assistance.

7. Rural Electrification, Telephone Installment and other Living Facilities Construction Projects.

—Insufficient amount of various construction materials due to too many projects starting simultaneously

—Lack of maintenance effort and abandoned facilities largely due to lack of accurate need survey, citizen participation and/or feasibility test (e. g, Community Center, Water Supply and Sanitation facilities, etc.)

—Inadequate planning of implementation activities, leading to delayed construction (in case of electrification and telephone installment projects)