AN EFFECT EVALUATION OF THE PLANNING AND EVALUATION WORKSHOP FOR REGIONAL PLANNING UNIT PERSONNEL IN L. E. A. A. -REGION V

Thesis for the Degree of M. S.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

ROBERT A. SMITH

1977

AN EFFECT EVALUATION OF THE PLANNING AND EVALUATION WORKSHOP FOR REGIONAL PLANNING UNIT PERSONNEL IN L.E.A.A.-REGION V

By

Robert A. Smith

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Social Science

1977

ABSTRACT

AN EFFECT EVALUATION OF THE PLANNING AND EVALUATION WORKSHOP FOR REGIONAL PLANNING UNIT PERSONNEL IN L.E.A.A.-REGION V

By

Robert A. Smith

In recent years there has been an increased emphasis within the criminal justice system on both evaluation and training programs such as workshops. Unfortunately, however, there has been a tendency towards under-utilization of the former in regard to the latter.

In an effort to correct this trend several types of evaluation were conducted for a training workshop which was developed for Region V-R.P.U. personnel in which various planning and evaluation concepts, techniques, and strategies were stressed. This study reflects one of those types of evaluation, effect evaluation. It was designed to measure the effectiveness of the workshop in regard to the transference of technology that would be put to use in the field.

All of the R.P.U.'s in Region V were surveyed and assigned to either the experimental or control group depending on whether they had sent a representative to the workshop or not. The survey, itself, consisted of a mailed questionnaire whose format contained

mostly Likert Scales, but also a few other questions of assorted construction, all dealing with key concepts, techniques and strategies that were presented at the workshop. The intent of the survey was to determine knowledge and various levels of use of these key items by both groups, upon which the effectiveness of the workshop could be ascertained.

Fifty-six percent of those surveyed responded to one of the two mailings. From these responses comparisons were made both within and between groups for both before and after the workshop in order to determine its effectiveness. These comparisons were accomplished through the use of t-tests, frequency distributions and contingency tables.

Although some of the control hypotheses could not be accepted, it was determined that the workshop was indeed effective. This conclusion was based on the discovery that the agencies who sent representatives to the workshop demonstrated significant increases in the utilization of many of the concepts, techniques and strategies presented at the workshop, both in terms of the number of agencies using them and the degree of that use.

Approved: Ralph G. Lewis
Dr. Ralph G. Lewis

Dr. John H. McNamara

Dave Kalinich
Mr. David B. Kalinich

AN EFFECT EVALUATION OF THE PLANNING AND EVALUATION WORKSHOP FOR REGIONAL PLANNING UNIT PERSONNEL IN L.E.A.A.-REGION V

By

Robert A. Smith

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

College of Social Science

1977

DEDICATION

To Debbie who encouraged me to further my education, stood by me unfailingly during a most crucial period, and who above everyone else gave my life meaning during the short time I knew her.

To my stepfather who got stuck with a new son "almost" fully grown, but who still loved me just as much as though I had been his very own.

And especially to my Mother, to whom I owe all that I am and all that I ever can be! "Mere words could never fully express . . . ."

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In retrospect it seems that I really played only a minor role in the development of this thesis. The various people who were involved in this project could probably have gotten along just as well without me, but I never could have made it without them!

Several "work-study" people helped arrange questionnaires and did some initial typing for me. Unfortunately, I didn't know most of them.

Fellow Graduate Assistants, Lynn Miller and Thomas Austin, provided that extra element of expertise which was necessary in order to "make sense" of the computer. In addition, Tom was always that "friend in need . . . ."

Secretaries Jan Baggett and Mary-Jane Knoll worked miracles whenever there was "dirty work" to be done. They also added a touch of humanity to otherwise impersonal tasks.

Typist Harriet Wever turned a mass of "indecipherable Sanskrit" into a final draft that anyone could be proud of, and she never once complained.

Committee members, Dr. John H. McNamara and David Kalinich, offered the benefit of their knowledge, wisdom and experience whenever I had the sense to realize that I needed help.

Finally, but most importantly, the Chairman of my Committee, Dr. Ralph G. Lewis, gave me the idea for this thesis and provided

direction for my efforts. He had all the right answers and even some pretty good questions. Without his technical skills, realistic insights and constant encouragement, I would never have finished. However, even more important than the study which he was so instrumental in providing, was his contribution towards developing me into a competent researcher.

To all of these people, I owe a debt of gratitude, not only for their assistance, but also for their gifts of friendship and teamwork. My thanks to them all!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Statement of Problem and Overview

In December, 1975, a training workshop was held in Chicago, Illinois, for Regional Planning Unit personnel throughout Region V, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration regional jurisdiction that is composed of the states of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio and Michigan. It was co-sponsored by LEAA Region V and the Criminal Justice Systems Center at Michigan State University who developed it to improve the quality (and in some instances, the quantity) of planning and evaluation at the RPU level. Of the 73 RPU's or their equivalent that are distributed throughout the region, 34 sent representatives to the three-day workshop. While there, these attendees were exposed to a format of lectures, a rather involved planning exercise and open discussions, all dealing with usable planning and evaluation concepts, techniques and strategies.

At the conclusion of the workshop, the attendees were requested to provide some feedback by filling out questionnaires pertaining to the workshop's content, presentation and relevance. However, it was not feasible at that time to evaluate the effects of the workshop either in terms of knowledge gained or ultimate utilization of the concepts, techniques, and strategies presented during the workshop. Ultimately, such evaluation procedures are

necessary in order to determine if the workshop was successful in attaining its overall goal to improve and increase the use of planning and evaluation technologies. Providing this needed evaluation component constitutes the problem to be addressed by this study.

In order to deal with this problem and properly evaluate the workshop numerous procedures were taken. For the sake of presentation, these steps have been arranged into the five chapters of which this study consists. The following is a brief overview outlining these various procedures.

In the remainder of Chapter I, a Background of the growing emphasis for, and types of, evaluation is discussed along with the Need for the study. A brief Explanation is also offered pertaining to the particular type of evaluation employed. Finally, the Purpose, Conceptual Framework and Hypotheses are presented along with the definitions of key terms.

In Chapter II an Introduction into the relevant literature is made, an actual Study, is examined, and a Discussion and Summary of the chapter is presented.

Chapter III discusses the methodology of the study including the Sample, Measurement and Data Collection, Research Design, formal Hypotheses, and Data Analysis, followed by a Summary.

Chapter IV presents the analysis of the data and includes the Response Rate, Representativeness of the Experimental Group, Hypotheses Tests, Supplemental Analyses, some State of the Art information and a Summary.

In Chapter V a Summary of the whole study is made, Conclusions are drawn, a Discussion is presented and several Recommendations are offered.

There are also several Appendices which contain various letters, relevant questionnaires and some information obtained through this study which is useful in regard to another somewhat unrelated evaluation of the workshop.

Background and Need

As part of a comprehensive effort to improve the criminal the criminal justic system initiated by the "Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968,"[1] legislation was enacted for the creation of a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice which, among its other duties, would "carry out programs of instructional assistance consisting of . . . special workshops for the presentation and dissemination of information . . . ."[2]

This provision was repeated in both the "Crime Control Act of 1973"[3] and the "Crime Control Act of 1976"[4] with the addition that the Institute:

> assist in conducting at the request of a state or local unit of government or a combination thereof, local or regional training programs for the training of state and

---

[1] P.L. 90-351, 1968.

[2] P.L. 90-351, sec. 402.b.5.

[3] P.L. 93-83, 1973, sec. 402.b.5.

[4] P.L. 94-503, 1976, sec. 402.b.5.

> local law enforcement and criminal justice personnel . . . . Such training activities shall be designed to supplement and improve rather than supplant the training activities of the state and local government . . . .[5]

In a similar vein, the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals in its 1973 report, Criminal Justice System, called for criminal justice agencies and agencies of education to "develop educational curricula and training programs."[6] This sentiment has been shared by some state-level advisory commissions such as Michigan's.[7]

Largely as a result of the impetus created by (1) these and other related laws, standards, and recommendations, (2) a growing nationwide awareness of the need for in-service training within the criminal justice system, and (3) the availability of federal funding for such training,[8] there has been a slow but steadily increasing emphasis on the utilization of training programs in general and training workshops in particular.

---

[5]P.L. 93-83, sec. 402.b.6., and P.L. 94-503, sec. 402.b.6.

[6]National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Criminal Justice System (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973), p. 168.

[7]Michigan Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice, Criminal Justice Goals and Standards for the State of Michigan (Lansing: State of Michigan, 1974), p. 210.

[8]For example, in the "Crime Control Act of 1976" the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice is authorized to make grants to, or enter into contracts with, agencies, institutions or organizations for the purpose of conducting special projects including training programs such as workshops (P.L. 94-503, sec. 402.b.1). Also, travel expenses and a per diem allowance are provided in this bill for people associated with such projects (P.L. 94-503, sec. 402.b.6).

The workshop is one of the more widely advocated types of in-service training programs.[9] It is a short, but intense, training session that is conducted for practitioners from within the various segments of the criminal justice system and is developed for the transfer of technology to these individuals with the goal that it will be utilized by them in the field. In essence, then, its purpose is to upgrade the skills and capabilities of in-service personnel so that they can return to their respective agency settings and subsequently improve the quality and/or quantity of services which they are expected to provide within their jurisdictions.

It should be apparent from this brief description that a workshop is a goal-oriented activity. And, as is the case for most goal-oriented activities, there is a valuable component that should be incorporated into most, if not all, workshops. This component is evaluation. In fact, the "Crime Control Act of 1973" was largely developed "to require increased evaluation of programs"[10] and the "Crime Control Act of 1976" provided authorization for the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice:

> to make evaluations and to receive and review the results of evaluations of the various programs and projects carried out under this title . . . . The Institute shall in consultation with State Planning Agencies develop criteria and

---

[9] As evidenced by the fact that the "Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968," the "Crime Control Act of 1973," and the "Crime Control Act of 1976" all specifically prescribe for its use.

[10] United States Code Congressional and Administrative News, October 15 to October 20, 1976 (St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Co., 1976), p. 5809.

> procedures for the performance and reporting of the evaluation of programs and projects carried out under this title . . . .[11]

Similarly, the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals has recognized the importance of evaluation and urged that "evaluation plans be designed as an integral part of all projects."[12] More specifically, it has called for the appropriate agencies to "develop and implement techniques and plans for evaluating the effectiveness of education and training programs as they relate to on-the-job performances."[13]

There are several reasons why the evaluation of training programs (especially workshops) has received all of this emphasis and why it is so important. It can:

1. determine whether the training program is accomplishing its assigned objectives.
2. identify strengths and weaknesses of training activities.
3. determine a cost/benefit ratio of the training program.
4. establish a data base which organization leaders can use to demonstrate the productivity and efficiency of their operational procedures.
5. establish a data base which can assist organization managers in making decisions.[14]

---

[11] P.L. 94-503, sec. 402.c.

[12] National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, A National Strategy to Reduce Crime (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973), p. 150.

[13] National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Criminal Justice System, p. 168.

[14] Kent J. Chabotar and Lawrence J. Lad, Evaluation Guidelines for Training Programs (Lansing: Midwest Intergovernmental Training Council, 1974), pp. 19-23.

In order to carry out these functions, an evaluation must deal with at least one, and possibly several or all, of the following questions:

1. What was done?
2. Did it work?
3. Why did it work?
4. How large were the results?
5. What would be the best alternative?[15]

In any attempt to answer these questions, there are several forms that the evaluation process may take, each focusing on a specific question. These forms, or types, of evaluations are:

1. effort
2. effect
3. process
4. impact
5. efficiency.[16]

It should be noted that although these types are different in nature, they are not by necessity operationally dissimilar. A researcher may go about conducting them in slightly different ways, but the same basic rules apply to all of them and often the same raw data is generated from them. Their primary distinction from each other then is in the separate issues that they address, not the manner in which they are conducted. This is not to say that they need be mutually exclusive of each other or that they must be conducted separately. For example, the results from a process evaluation might be application to an effect evaluation, or vice versa. Also, any combination of these types can be conducted together in

---

[15]Ralph G. Lewis, The Evaluation Process in Criminal Justice Programs (East Lansing, Mich.: Criminal Justice Systems Center, Michigan State University, 1975), p. 7.

[16]Ibid., p. 10.

evaluating a workshop, naturally depending on which questions are to be answered. In such a case, it is simply a matter of gearing the data collection to obtain all the data relevant to the types involved. And, of course, the analysis techniques may have to differ somewhat, depending on the nature of the data collected and the information desired.

Unfortunately, in spite of all the lip-service within the criminal justice system that has been given to evaluation both as a general concept and as any specific type,[17] there has been a serious under-utilization of it in reference to workshops. Although there has not been much done in the way of research to support this claim, discussions with "experts" on the subject and general observations in the field tend to bear it out.

Notwithstanding the arguments that not every workshop may need to be evaluated nor that all types of evaluations should be conducted for any given workshop, there is still a general neglect for conducting evaluations, even when needed. In fact, it is not uncommon for an evaluation component to be largely ignored in the actual planning and conducting of a workshop, and often it is introduced only as an afterthought. And, as though this wasn't bad enough, the quality of some evaluations that are attempted may be seriously questioned.

---

[17] The reader is referred back to an earlier comment by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals which called for evaluation of the effectiveness of training programs (effect evaluation). N.A.C.C.J.S.G., Criminal Justice System, p. 168.

In trying to understand the reasons for this neglect and poor quality, there are a myriad of explanations which may be offered. Summarized, they fall into the following categories:

1. The people directly involved with conducting a workshop do not have the skills with which to properly conduct an evaluation(s) of whatever type(s) is necessary.

2. The people directly involved with conducting a workshop do not have resources available to them with which to properly conduct appropriate evaluation(s). This often refers to constraints on such resources as manpower and money.

3. The people who are either in a position to authorize or to conduct an evaluation do not realize the importance of doing so or are just too apathetic.

4. The people who are in a position to make use of the results of evaluations or to make policy decisions based on them either refuse or simply fail to do so.

Although these reasons might provide a slightly better understanding of the situation, they in no way justify it. In fact, such lack of proper evaluation may even serve to defeat the purpose of a given workshop. In any event, it certainly leaves an open question as to such a workshop's worth.

This uncertainty can be somewhat exemplified in the case of the Region V Planning and Evaluation Workshop which was previously discussed in the first section of this chapter, although the preceding arguments do not necessarily hold true in this case. Initial consideration was given for an effect evaluation of the workshop and

some preliminary planning was made. However, the actual effect evaluation could not be carried out immediately following the workshop. Therefore the workshop's effectiveness is only now being determined in this study.

Acknowledging the fact that the effectiveness of the workshop is unknown, a very logical and pragmatic question arises: Why bother to find out if it was effective? (I.e., what important need is really served by conducting an effect evaluation?)

Earlier in this section, several reasons for conducting evaluations were cited. The first of these, "determine whether the training program is accomplishing its assigned objectives," implies two things: the use of effect evaluation and a need to know the results of the training. Appropriately, then, it provides a good starting point for discussing the need for an effect evaluation and, ultimately, the rationale for this study.

The concern for wanting to know if the objectives of the workshop were met (i.e., whether the overall goal to improve planning and evaluation was attained) is quite understandable. Assuming that there was either a demonstrated or an attributed need for the workshop in the first place (hopefully, the powers-that-be wouldn't sanction this one without good reason), then people at all levels within the criminal justice system who were in some way involved with the workshop itself, or who might be affected by it, will be interested in the results of an effect evaluation to determine whether the initial need was satisfied and the situation improved upon. In this regard, they will use effect evaluation as a

tool to ascertain and measure any progress which, hopefully, will result.

This holds true even though these people, within the context of their own job roles, may be concerned with the potential effects of the workshop for different reasons. For instance, the upper-level administrators may be mostly concerned with the far-reaching effects in the field which the workshop may produce, while RPU representatives who actually attended the workshop may be interested in just improving their own abilities. Also, the "experts" who developed and conducted the workshop are probably very much concerned with turning out a useful product, but the heads of the various RPU's in Region V (not to mention state planning agencies, Region V headquarters itself, or even LEAA) may be primarily interested with resultant performance levels within their jurisdictions.

Whatever their concerns may be, the outcome of the workshop can have some bearing on them, so that all these people can benefit from the information generated from an effect evaluation. And regardless of the effects or implications that the workshop may or may not have for the criminal justice system in general, or for them in particular, they need to know the findings of an effect evaluation in order to realize what these effects or implications are or could be (assuming, of course, that they won't be self-evident).

In essence, then, effect evaluation can satisfy the need to know the effects of the workshop by various criminal justice personnel for whatever reasons they may have (even including simple

curiosity and ego satisfaction that may be derived from positive findings).

Aside from this, effect evaluation can also meet the need to justify the workshop itself. In a general sense, such justification is reached if the workshop is successful in transferring technology that is subsequently used. However, there are more pragmatic considerations involved. Justification of the workshop as a whole depends on the justification of costs in terms of resources that were committed to the development and execution of the workshop. Heading the list of resources whose use must be justified is, as one might expect, money. LEAA provided a grant to the Criminal Justice Systems Center at Michigan State University to develop and conduct the workshop and to reimburse all participants for travel and accommodation expenses.[18] Not surprisingly, LEAA officials want something to show for the investment, preferably favorable findings, but some findings regardless.

Money was only one of the expenditures, however. A good deal of research, planning, coordination, communication and miscellaneous details and arrangements went into the workshop, which means considerable amounts of time, effort and manpower were invested. These resources, like money, require justification (rationalization?) and, to reiterate, such justification can be facilitated through effect evaluation.

The need to justify all this commitment of money, time, effort and manpower is an important and pressing issue because of

---

[18]Training Workshop, Grant #75 TN 05 004.

(1) the limited supply and availability of these resources and (2) a demand for their use on numerous other projects and programs in the field of criminal justice. For example, LEAA has a fixed budget per year with which to disperse funds to worthy projects and programs, but there are literally hundreds of grant applications made to it annually for such funding. Similarly, both Region V and the Crminal Justice Systems Center have many responsibilities to attend to other than the workshop, but they also have just so many staff members "to go around." As a result there's a limit to the number of personnel who could be "spared" for the workshop. In addition, most of the people who do contribute to the workshop (including guest speakers) had other job-related responsibilities requiring their attention which in turn affected the amount of time and effort they could devote to the workshop.

Considering the constraints on these resources and a host of potential uses for them, it is not difficult to understand the importance of allocating them wisely and being able to tell via some form of feedback loop (i.e., evaluation) if they had been used productively.

At first glance the logic behind this need to justify the expense of the workshop in terms of the resources committed to it may appear somewhat unclear. Granted, it is pragmatic to make the best possible use of the resources available and to avoid wasting them on this workshop if its goal if unattainable, especially when they might be better utilized elsewhere. However, it would seem a little late to worry about this "after the fact." Why attempt to

justify the workshop after it is already history? What real good can come from the knowledge of whether the expense was worthwhile? The answer to these questions lies in the possibility that the workshop might be replicated or that it might serve as a model for other workshops to be developed later.

This workshop represents one of the first attempts to increase and improve the use of planning and evaluation at the RPU level, so for all practical purposes it could be considered a pilot program. Therefore, the future of other potential workshops of this type may depend on the success of this one. In fact, the success of this workshop would provide a strong argument in favor of identical workshops for RPU personnel in Region V who didn't attend this one or for RPU personnel in other regions where there is a need for better planning and evaluation. Perhaps even a workshop for SPA or regional personnel would be in order. Such workshops could use this one as a blueprint to follow.

However, if this one is not successful and the expense cannot be justified, then no useful purpose would be served by repeating it and making the same investments in future workshops. After all, why make the same costly mistake twice (or more)?

This line of reasoning can be extended to include potential workshops dealing with different subjects (e.g., information systems or research techniques) since the formats of such workshops and the resources needed to develop them would be very similar to the format and resources associated with this particular workshop. The only major difference would be in the type of information presented.

Needless to say, the future of all criminal justice training workshops does not depend on the outcome of this one. Others will be developed and conducted regardless. In doing so, however, wise planners will refer to previous workshops to gain from their experience, much in the same way a researcher will conduct a review of the literature before undertaking a new study. Although the use of workshops has been increasing, the practice is still in its infancy and there are relatively few workshops described in criminal justice literature to be referred to. As a result, there is a good chance that this workshop will be among those used as guidelines for future workshops. In such a case, the preceding arguments would have some relevance; if this workshop cannot be justified, it should not be used as a model for another one, at least in its present form.

However, this is not to automatically say that the Planning and Evaluation Workshop should never be repeated or that others should never be based on it just because it might not be successful and justifiable.[19] Perhaps additions, deletions, revisions or modifications in the content, format or presentation--or better timing (yes, timing is important)--would enhance the chances that desired effects could be attained. If such were the case, possible solutions might be inferred from the results of the effect evaluation itself

---

[19]Just for the record, keep in mind that there may be external or situational factors, such as politics, that may have a bearing on the outcome of the workshop. For instance, the head of an RPU may not allow an employee who attended the workshop to apply new skills or implement new techniques. Although this deserves mentioning, it is beyond the focus of this study and will not be further addressed or elaborated on.

or it might be necessary to develop another type of evaluation such as one measuring cost-effectiveness, from the groundwork laid by this one. In any event (and as a fitting conclusion to this section), it should be emphasized that the first step toward either correcting the workshop so that it would serve as a model, or simply determining that it should be "written off" as a noble failure, is to ascertain what effects it did have. Hence, even another reason for the need to conduct an effect evaluation.

Explanation

In the preceding section the need for an effect evaluation of the Revion V Planning and Evaluation Workshop was established. The implication was also made that both the quality and quantity of evaluations in general has traditionally failed to meet ideal standards and the review of literature in Chapter II will further support this contention. This study will attempt to deal with both of these issues by providing an effect evaluation which will be an improvement over past practices.

Towards this end it is appropriate to discuss the delay of several months that occurred in conducting this particular study after the workshop. Such a delay might give the initial impression that the evaluation of this workshop suffered from the same neglect as has been previously mentioned. However, this is not the case, at least in regard to this study, because a time lapse between the conclusion of the workshop and the onset of data collection is necessary whenever conducting an effect evaluation.

There are several steps that must take place before the information presented in the workshop can be put to use. The attendees must carry it back to their respective RPU's, digest it themselves and share it with other members of the staff. The merits of using it must then be contemplated and a decision made to do so or not. If it is to be put to some use plans must be made and eventually implemented.

The time required for all these steps would vary among RPU's but several months would pass before all the RPU's could make use of the information. Therefore, it would be impractical to attempt to actually conduct an effect evaluation before enough time has passed for the potential effects to be realized. That is why no such attempt was initiated at the conclusion of the Region V Planning and Evaluation Workshop.

Purpose, Conceptual Framework and Hypotheses

The purpose and overall goal of this study is to provide proper effect evaluation of the December 1975 Planning and Evaluation Workshop for Region V RPU personnel.

Within this context, there are two primary objectives of the study. The first one is to determine whether or not any of the information that was presented at the workshop was actually learned by those who attended, and, if so, how much and in what particular areas.

The second objective is to determine if any of the information that may have been learned by the attendees is currently being

put to use by their respective agencies, and if so, what particular areas and at what stage of use (e.g., planning to use, some use, or much use). Note that this second objective is of greater practical importance than the first since in the "action world" there is more concern for increased utilization than with just increased knowledge. Ultimately, then, the overall success of the workshop could even be judged solely on the basis of changes in utilization of the various concepts, techniques and strategies and not on changes in knowledge of them.

It may also be appropriate to note at this time that these objectives do not directly address the issue of skills, as such. Rather, only knowledge and the application of that knowledge is to be measured. At first glance this may appear to be an oversight for a couple of important reasons. First, a skill, by definition, is the ability to apply knowledge; therefore, skills are necessary in order to put any knowledge to proper use. Second, the development of skills, as opposed to just the acquisition of knowledge and the attempt to use it, is ultimately the desired outcome of the workshop.

However, this study will not attempt to directly measure skills, because of the difficulty associated in doing so. For reasons to be elaborated on later in this study, data collection will be made by way of mailed questionnaires, which are not conducive to the objective measurement of the ability to put knowledge to use. Therefore, only knowledge and the use of that knowledge will be measured, <u>not how well</u> the knowledge may be used. Inferences about skill levels might be made from information obtained in

this study, but it would be too ambitious a venture to try to incorporate into this study an instrumentation that could measure skills without actually observing them in action in the field.

There is a possible second use of this study as already alluded to. Since the workshop itself was basically a pioneer effort, this study will also be one of the first of its kind. Therefore, anyone who may decide to conduct an effect evaluation of a future workshop could benefit from the experience provided by this one by using this study as a guide to follow (or even not follow it, as the case may be). In addition, the outcome of this study might be instrumental in the actual decision to conduct an effect evaluation at all for some future workshop. Hypothetically, the decision to conduct other workshops like this past one could even be affected by the results of this study.

There is one more potential service which this study can provide, although not directly related by evaluating the effectiveness of the workshop itself. As a useful by-product of this study, baseline data will be generated which, in turn, can provide a "state of the art" of planning and evaluation technologies in use at the RPU level, at least for Region V (including the RPU's that were not represented at the workshop, since they will be surveyed, too). Such information has never been available in aggregate form before.

Although "state of the art" information may have little or no intrinsic value itself, it could be applied to various activities. For instance, had such information existed before the workshop, it could have been used to objectively support the claim that there was

a need for the workshop or even to show the need in the first place, and once it has been collected it can serve in a similar capacity for the future. In any event, this study will make such information available for concerned criminal justice officials to use as they see fit.

There are a variety of formal theories concerning exposure to information in educational settings and their subsequent utilization upon which this study could be based. However, the primary concern of this study is not really related to issues of theory testing. All that is necessary for purposes of this study is to establish a conceptual framework within which to operate. Such a framework in its simplest form would be somewhat as follows: in-service training workshops for criminal justice practitioners facilitate improved performance in the field.

This conceptual framework would rest on two basic assumptions from which testable hypotheses could be derived. The first of these assumptions is that the transfer of usable technology can be made in a workshop setting. In other words, criminal justice personnel can actually be taught in a workshop to do a better job.

The second assumption is contingent on the first and states that the technology, once learned, will be put to use. This means that attendees of a workshop will employ their newly acquired skills on the job since such utilization is the reason for learning them in the first place.

Although this simplified description of the conceptual framework for the study could be expounded upon in greater detail,

such elaboration is unnecessary and would contribute little to either the study or the reader. However, it would be beneficial to clarify the hypotheses at this point as follows: It is expected that the people who attended the workshop will know more about planning and evaluation afterwards than they did before. Their agencies will, in turn, put this increased knowledge to use. It is also believed that those who attended will know more about planning and evaluation after the workshop than selected representatives of the agencies not chosen to participate in the workshop. As a result, the attendees' agencies will use more planning and evaluation concepts, techniques and strategies than will the nonparticipating agencies.

In attempting to test these hypotheses there are several terms used in this study whose definitions it would be beneficial to know. In addition, the independent and dependent variables of the study should be differentiated. The following is a list of these definitions and variables:

Definitions

Representatives: Employees of agencies selected by those agencies to be respondents for this study. The representatives of the agencies in the experimental group attended the workshop. The representatives of the agencies in the control group did not.

Knowledge: The accumulation of factors or information on planning and evaluation.

Concepts: Abstract or generic ideas relating to planning and/or evaluation which are generalized from specific instances.

Strategies: Plans or means to achieve planning and/or evaluation related objectives.

Workshop: The brief, intensive, training program conducted in December 1975 for selected Regional Planning Unit personnel in Region V and dealing with the transfer of usable planning and evaluation technologies.

Techniques: Specific technical methods for accomplishing planning and/or evaluation related goals or aims.

Agencies: Regional Planning Units or their equivalent within Region V.

Variables

Independent variable: The training provided at the workshop.

Dependent variables: (1) The knowledge gained as a result of the training at the workshop; (2) subsequent utilization of the new knowledge gained.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

There is a multitude of examples of literature from other disciplines which deals with evaluations of training programs and workshops. However, since this study is not concerned with broad theory or with comparing training programs or methods of evaluating them, it would not serve much purpose to delve into other fields. Therefore, the scope of this review is confined to the field of criminal justice.

Evaluation is a subject that currently proliferates in criminal justice literature. Almost every imaginable facet of law enforcement or criminal justice has been addressed by some form of evaluation related literature, ranging from general planning and day-to-day activities to specific projects and programs. However, these readings seldom differentiate evaluation by types, so effect evaluation is rarely treated as a separate topic or issue. This does not mean that it is never dealt with, because most descriptions of the evaluation process include an implicit description of effect evaluation. However, as a rule, it is not labeled and discussed as a specific type. Such a distinction becomes the responsibility of the reader.

In addition to a lack of readings pertaining to effect evaluation as such, the overwhelming majority of literature in circulation is not even research oriented (i.e., actual evaluation research studies). Instead, most of the writings are intended to promote the use of evaluation and/or show how and when to conduct it. A couple of noteworthy examples of this kind of literature are Ralph G. Lewis's The Evaluation Process in Criminal Justice Programs and Intensive Evaluation for Criminal Justice Planning Agencies by Donald R. Weidman.[20]

Likewise, most writings that specifically relate to the evaluation of training programs (including workshops) are not designed to describe actual evaluations or show the results of them, but rather are meant to advocate evaluation and provide guidelines for it, as is well done in Evaluation Guidelines for Training Programs by Kent J. Chabotar and Lawrence J. Lad, and Planning, Conducting, Evaluating Workshops by Larry Davis and Earl McCullon.[21] Unfortunately, these readings contain few examples of such evaluation. In fact, there is a dearth of available accounts of evaluations in this area that have been conducted. Although our search for research related material was not an exhaustive one, we were hard pressed to find relevant literature. Most of the writings

---

[20]Donald R. Weidman, Intensive Evaluation for Criminal Justice Planning Agencies (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, 1975).

[21]Larry N. Davis and Earl McCullon, Planning, Conducting, Evaluating Workshops (Austin, Texas: Learning Concepts, Inc., 1975).

examined were similar to those mentioned above, "cookbooks" for planning, conducting and evaluating workshops. A few studies were alluded to but were impossible to locate or obtain. (Judging from the brief descriptions of those studies in the readings, we are suspicious of the quality of most of them.)

One real piece of research containing an effect evaluation of a criminal justice training workshop was discovered. The evaluation[22] was fairly comprehensive, including aspects of other types of evaluation, but effect evaluation was clearly the primary concern (although implicit). The remainder of this chapter will center around a detailed examination of this study.

Study

An evaluation was conducted of four separate series of workshops that were sponsored by the Office of Technology Transfer of the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice within LEAA[23] and conducted for various criminal justice planning and decision-making personnel throughout the country to promote the use of certain programs.

---

[22]C. Dennis Fink, "An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Workshops for Facilitating the Transfer of Technology" (Alexandria, Va.: Human Resources Research Organization, March, 1976).

[23]The reader is referred back to the Background and Need section of Chapter I of this study where it was established that the NILECJ was responsible for promoting training workshops. The office of Technology Transfer (OTT) is the specific subunit within the NILECJ that generally takes the active role in sponsoring such workshops.

The workshops were similar to each other in many respects. Formats and presentations varied somewhat, but for the most part they all were intensive training sessions of approximately two and one-half days in length and were composed of lectures, discussions and group exercises. The major difference between the series was in their content. For each of the four series of workshops a separate criminal justice exemplary project or concept was discussed. They were:

1. "Des Moines, Iowa Community-Based Corrections (CBC) System," which provides alternatives to penal institutions.

2. "Columbus, Ohio Citizen Dispute Settlement (CDS) Program" which provides out-of-court mediation for neighborhood and family disputes.

3. "Sacramento, California 601 Juvenile Diversion Project (601 Project)" which provides crisis counseling instead of juvenile court processing for status offenders.

4. Police Department Crime Analysis Units (CAU) which provide statistical data for the identification of crime patterns and the allocation of police manpower.

Each series of workshops was conducted in each of the ten LEAA regions throughout the country, totaling nearly 40 separate workshops (some regions declined to host certain workshops). The selection of individuals within a region to attend a workshop was made by the LEAA Regional Office and was based on an individual's interest in the project or concept and his/her authority to initiate it within his/her jurisdiction. Approximately 35-50 such people were chosen for each workshop.

The overall objective of the study was to evaluate the effectiveness of all four series of workshops in regard to:

1. the degree to which the attendees tried to implement the projects or concepts that were presented in the workshop they attended,
2. especially liked or disliked workshop materials and techniques,
3. ways to improve future workshops,
4. identification of potential workshop follow-up activities that might facilitate the transfer of criminal justice technology in regard to programs and concepts.

The evaluation itself began with a mailed survey to all attendees of all workshops. The survey instrument was a standardized questionnaire developed with the help of NILECJ personnel, which was modified for each series of workshops. The questions were of assorted construction, mostly Likert-type scales, checklists and open-ended fill-ins, and they pertained to the four issues listed above.

Questionnaires were mailed approximately two and one-half months after the conclusion of the workshops. Enclosed with each questionnaire was a cover letter explaining the survey. The initial return rate was 49.3% overall (see Table 1) and no follow-up was attempted.

Analysis was fairly straightforward and simple. Average scores and percentages were computed for some answers and tabulation and ordering of the most frequent responses were made for others. There were no formal test hypotheses and no control group

TABLE 1.--Survey Rate-of-Return Data for Each Workshop Series.

Workshop Series	Number of Questionnaires Distributed	Number of Questionnaires Distributed	Rate of Return
Community-Based Corrections System (CBC)	379	197	49.3%
Citizen Dispute Settlement Program (CDS)	400	153	38.3
California Diversion Program for Juvenile Status Offenders (601 Program)	235	128	54.5
Crime Analysis Unit (CAU)	316	188	59.5
All workshop series combined	1,330	656	49.5

to compare with. There was, however, an attempt, mentioned but not elaborated on, to obtain pretest information.

Although specific results varied among the different series, the overall findings were favorable. The combined figures showed that 71 percent of the communities from which there were responses to the questionnaires had already adopted, were planning to adopt, or were still considering adopting all or portions of the project or concept presented in the workshop to which they sent a representative. And 19 percent of the total responses indicated that their communities had already adopted all or portions of specific projects or concepts prior to the workshop dealing with it. Only 10 percent of the respondents indicated no plans in their communities to adopt one of the four programs (See Table 2 for the breakdown for each

TABLE 2.--Percentage of Attendees Who Reported That Their Community Had Adopted or Had Made Plans to Adopt All or Portions of a Program Discussed at a Workshop.[a]

	Workshop Program				All Programs Combined
	CBC[b]	CDS[c]	CAU[c]	601[b]	
Number of respondents	164	137	154	116	571
No plans to adopt program	4%	23%	10%	4%	10%
Already had adopted all or portions of program prior to workshop	24	12	16	26	19
Adoption of all or portions of program still under consideration	33	42	31	28	34
Decision had been made to adopt all or portions of program	9	4	31	7	13
Already had adopted or was in the process of adopting all or portions of the program apparently as the result of attending the workshop	30	19	13	35	24

[a]A respondent for the CBC or 601 workshop might have reported that his community had adopted component A of a program prior to the workshop, was in the process of considering adoption of component B, had made a decision to adopt component C and was in the process of adopting component D. Such a response would be recorded only once and would be recorded under the most concrete evidence that adoption had occurred as a result of attending the workshop. In this example the response would be recorded as "was in the process of adopting."

[b]CBC and 601 programs contained 6 and 5 components, respectively.

[c]CDS and CAU programs are essentially one-component programs.

series.) Twenty-four percent went so far as to state that implementation was primarily the result of the workshops themselves. Also, interestingly enough, the most successful workshop series (the CBC and 601) were also the most complicated in terms of components that made up the programs discussed.

As far as the final implementation status for the programs described in the four series of workshops is concerned, the findings were also encouraging. Overall, 37 percent of those who responded to the questionnaires indicated that their communities had adopted, were in the process of adopting, or had decided to adopt all of the portions of the program discussed in the workshop they attended. A total of 68 percent indicated a commitment to adopt at least some portions of a program. (See Table 3 for the breakdown for each series.)

There were several other findings made (although of less consequence to this study). The workshops were rated fairly well by the attendees as indicated in Table 4, but 29 percent of the attendees wanted more information than was provided in the workshops.

Several barriers to implementation were discovered. Such a list included a lack of money, a lack of manpower, jurisdictional disputes between agencies cooperating on a program, conflicts with local or state laws, and a lack of adequate caseloads.

Finally, several benefits derived from attending the workshops were listed. The most common of these as indicated by the attendees were new contacts with people from other agencies, new

TABLE 3.--Estimated Final Implementation Status for Programs as Reported on by Workshop Attendees.[a]

Implementation Status Categories	Program				All Programs Combined
	CBC[b]	CDS[c]	CAU[c]	601[b]	
1. Already had, in process of adopting, or decision made to adopt all program components	23%	37%	60%	26%	37%
2. Already had, in process of adopting, or decision made to adopt a majority or program components	44	NA	NA	33	19
3. Already had, in process of adopting, or decision made to adopt one or a few program components	23	NA	NA	27	12
4. Consideration still being given to the adoption of one or more program components, or all of program	6	40	30	10	22
5. No plans to adopt all or any part of program	4	23	10	4	10

[a]A respondent might have reported that his community had adopted one component of the 601 program prior to the workshop, was in the process of adopting two components, had made a decision to adopt a fourth component of the program, and was still considering adoption of a fifth program component. From this information it appears certain that eventually that community will have adopted four or five or a majority of the 601 program components. The response representing this community would be recorded under the second implementation category. A response wuld be recorded under the fourth implementation category only when one or a few program components were under consideration and there were no plans to adopt any other portions of the program nor were any program components already in existence.

[b]CBC and 601 programs contain 6 and 5 components, respectively.

[c]CDS and CAU programs are essentially one-component programs.

TABLE 4.--Attendee Ratings of Workshop and of Documents Distributed at Workshop.

	Workshop			
	CBC	CDS	CAU	601
1. Usefulness of workshop for acquiring new ideas and information	3.77[a]	3.84	3.90	4.02
2. Usefulness of workshop in comparison with other recently attended workshops	3.73	3.52	3.66	3.68
3. Overall reaction to workshop program and style of presentation	4.06	3.94	4.14	4.22
4. Judged usefulness of training manual distributed at workshop	4.08	3.88	3.81	3.90
5. Judged usefulness of exemplary program handbook or prescriptive package	3.75	3.77	3.90	NA

[a]Average rating based on a 5-point scale.

solutions to problems, the increased availability of desired information and improved techniques.

As a result of the findings, the conclusion was made that the workshops were successful in regard to facilitating the transfer of technology. Several recommendations to improve workshops were also offered. Summarized, they are:

1. emphasize specially liked training techniques,
2. develop improved pre-workshop materials,
3. provide increased information about related programs,
4. provide detailed information on program implementation,

5. avoid over-use of small group problem-solving exercises,

6. eliminate leaderless discussions.

Some suggestions were also made regarding the improvement of technology transfer in general. They are:

1. on-site, specially tailored workshops,

2. technical assistance,

3. NILECJ-sponsored "program selling" assistance and material,

4. improved information dissemination methods,

5. funding assistance,

6. additional miscellaneous information on programs (e.g., applications, alternatives, etc.).

The study concluded with a brief description of six replication efforts of the CBC program and a Technology Transfer Conference held in Denver, Colorado in March 1975, which was conducted for the purpose of opening communication channels between the people working on the six separate replication programs. A recommendation was made for the use of similar conferences to coordinate the efforts of identical programs undertaken by various communities that have sent representatives to a workshop. However, this recommendation was further qualified to state that such follow-up conferences would only be necessary if the different communities attempted to implement all components of a particular program (as opposed to just some of them). Otherwise, the initial workshop describing the program would be sufficient.

Discussion and Summary

Effect evaluation was obviously not the only concern of the study (it seldom is) and of the very least elements of effort and efficiency evaluations were incorporated into it. (One could even make an argument that all five types of evaluations were included.)

Given the procedures that were taken, the study appears to have been conducted fairly well. However, there are some shortcomings, at least methodologically. For the most part, the research design was pre-experimental[24] in nature. Although it was maintained that a "one-group, pre-test post-test"[25] design was employed, it was unclear as to how pre-test information was obtained or even if it really existed at all. Therefore, the design more closely resembled a "one-shot case study"[26] type. This type of design, in turn, has "such a total absence of control as to be of almost no scientific value."[27] Even if the "one-group, pre-test post-test" design was used, it would methodologically be less than ideal because of its lack of controls against threats to internal validity.[28] And although both of these designs are often still employed in the field, they are basically unacceptable from a scientific point of

---

[24]Donald T. Campbell and Julian C. Stanley, Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1963), p. 6.

[25]Ibid., p. 7.

[26]Ibid., p. 6.

[27]Ibid.

[28]Ibid., p. 7.

view because they cannot ensure that any change in the dependent variable is solely the result of the introduction of the independent variable.

No follow-up questionnaires were sent out. Although the initial response rate of 49.3% was fairly good, it might have been desirable to have made one more mailing.

Finally, the analysis of the data may have been over-simplified. The study was supposed to be an experimental study but there was no real hypothesis testing (which is what one would expect to find in a descriptive study). Also, statistical techniques such as t-testing were lacking. Change was determined by the magnitude of the percentages of certain responses to questions and this alone is subjective to say the least.

We would hesitate to call the study inadequate, but there are several improvements that could have been made. However, in spite of its shortcomings, there are some aspects of the study such as the survey questionnaire itself which could have been very useful to us in the development of the Planning and Evaluation Workshop study. Unfortunately, publication of the study was not made until after the first mailing for this study, so there is little in which the latter can actually benefit from the former. However, as was already mentioned in the Explanation section of the first chapter, it is our intention to build on this previous study in an effort to improve the validity and reliability of this type of evaluation research as it is conducted in the field.

In summation, there is very little evaluation research of criminal justice training workshops in circulation and almost none specifically addressing effect evaluation. If the one study examined is indicative of the quality of evaluation of programs in the field of criminal justice (as we suspect it too often is), then considerable methodological improvements are vital to the credibility and utility of the evaluation process in criminal justice.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Sample

The population that was relevant to the evaluation included (1) all 73 Regional Planning Units (or comparable agencies, such as Local Planning Units) within Region V, and (2) the individuals within these agencies who were somehow directly involved with the planning and/or evaluation process.

A complete census was taken of the Regional Planning Units. All were included in either the experimental or the control group. The only sampling, as such, involved the choice of the individual within each unit to represent that unit at the workshop and for testing purposes.

Assignment of agencies to respective experimental and control groups was as follows: the 34 agencies that sent representatives to the workshop composed the experimental group and those 39 that did not, comprised the control group.

The actual selection of the agencies to be represented at the workshop was made before the onset of this study and was, therefore, beyond our control. It was known that no concerted efforts towards randomization in the selection process were made, since the agencies chosen to attend were selected at the discretion of their particular state planning agencies. However, letters (see

Appendix A) were sent to each of the state planning agencies involved, in an attempt to determine what selection criteria or sampling techniques were employed. In this way, it was possible to discover biases that might have resulted in the experimental group being nonrepresentative of the whole population (or, more appropriately in this case, the two groups being significantly different).

As with the assignment of agencies to respective groups, the selection of individuals within the agencies to represent them was largely beyond our control. However, for purposes of this study, it did not matter how these people were chosen to attend the workshop. It was sufficient (not to mention necessary) to accept them as the ones from the experimental group that this study was focused on.

The people who represented the agencies in the control group were also selected by the agencies themselves. However, we had input into the decisions because it was requested that the person in each agency with the most expertise in planning and evaluation be the one to respond to the questionnaire. It was hoped, in turn, that this would roughly match all of the respondents in terms of competence, thereby making both groups somewhat equivalent, at least at the level of the individuals involved. However, there was no assurance that this would indeed take place.

Data Collection and Measurement

Data collection was made through the use of written questionnaires (Appendix B). Two separate ones were developed; one went to the representatives in both the experimental and control

groups and the other went to only those in the experimental group.

The first questionnaire (sent to representatives in both groups) was designed to obtain the bulk of the data. It consisted of approximately 40 items or terms, representing key concepts, strategies and techniques that were presented at the workshop. The determination of these "major points" was made by reviewing tape recordings of the sessions, lecture notes, and prescribed readings. In addition, consultation was made with some of the guest speakers and the coordinators of the workshop. From these efforts the most important concepts, techniques and strategies were chosen as the items to be included in the questionnaire.

Next to each of the items were two Likert scales designed to measure familiarity with and use of the term. The scales were numerical (1-5) and each formed a continuum ranging from "not familiar with" to "much use." The first scale (pre-test) attempted to measure whether the term was understood and/or used before 1976 (before the workshop), and the second (post-test) sought the same information for 1976 (after the workshop).

Some blank space was also provided for respondents to fill in concepts, strategies or techniques that they considered important but might not have been included as items elsewhere in the questionnaire. There were scales provided for these also.

There were also a couple of questions that requested certain information to be listed (this was necessary because some information could not be obtained through scales).

Finally, there was a section of the questionnaire devoted to identifying intervening variables. Since the scales were intended to measure knowledge and/or use of a particular term, and different responses between the scales tended to indicate an increase in knowledge and/or use, it was important to know if that increase was the result of the workshop or some other factor(s). Therefore, this section, in essence, asked the respondents to explain any changes in the knowledge and/or use of a term by listing all terms in which there was some change and then describing the source of the change. It is only fair to add, however, that this section was an innovation on our part and it was not known how reliable this section would turn out to be.

As is probably already evident, the pre-workshop and the post-workshop data were obtained together. Ideally, pre-workshop information should have been obtained before the workshop, but for reasons to be mentioned in the Design section it was not.

Since the pre-workshop information was actually obtained after the workshop it would really be somewhat inappropriate to call it pre-test data. Actually, it would constitute a makeshift "ex post facto" pre-test. However, for simplicity, this information will be hereafter termed pre-test data.

Whenever a pre-test is given there exists the possibility of a sensitizing effect which may adversely affect internal validity. This possibility would increase when the pre-test and post-test are presented together, because the respondent would have an opportunity to compare pre-test and post-test responses and systematically bias

them (even if unconsciously doing so). In addition, when the pre-test is given "after the fact," a question of reliability arises because the respondent's memory may not be accurate. Although it is not known if these potentital problems actually occurred, the possibility did exist and had to be considered. Unfortunately, there was little that could be done to get around them.

The section questionnaire (sent only to those agencies who sent a representative to the workshop) was short and different in nature from the first. It also was basically unrelated to this particular study because it did not involve effect evaluation, as such. Instead it was designed to assist in conducting process, effort, impact and efficiency evaluations of the same workshop and was included in our mailing for budgetary and expediency purposes. (The reader is reminded that this particular study, an effect evaluation, was merely a subset of a more comprehensive evaluation which was conducted for the workshop. Ultimately, the results of this evaluation were to be combined with those of the others to form an Evaluation Report to be presented to LEAA.)

The questions on this supplemental questionnaire were of assorted construction and were developed as discretely as possible so that they would not bias any of the responses for the first questionnaire which otherwise might occur. The appearance was that the two questionnaires were unrelated. Although the results of this supplemental questionnaire did not directly relate to this study, they are succinctly presented in Appendix C because they do provide additional information about the workshop itself. They are

offered in this study solely for the benefit of the interested reader.

After the questionnaires were constructed, they were pre-tested by two people who attended the workshop, but who were not members of the target population. This pre-test was made in an attempt to assure that the instructions were understandable and that the questionnaires themselves were easy and quick to complete. (It was not expected that it would take more than 15 minutes to fill out the questionnaires nor that much work would be necessary to do so.) Revisions were then made as needed.

Although we took steps to ensure the reliability of the questionnaires, no real test was made to ascertain how reliable it was. This was not considered necessary because the questionnaires were very similar in most respects to various other types of questionnaires which have been used in the past with success and reliability (with the exception of one section which was noted earlier). The only foreseeable threats to the reliability of administering this particular questionnaire were the same as one might expect when conducting any mailed survey of this nature and therefore do not require elaboration. It was expected that any systematic bias in responses which might occur would probably tend to be in the direction of more favorable responses (i.e., higher scores on the Likert scales) because of the respondents' desire to be cooperative.

The questionnaires were mailed to all the agencies, complete with cover letters (Appendix D) and self-addressed, stamped, return envelopes. There were two mailings (a follow-up was

necessary and a telephone follow-up was considered, but ultimately was not required).

Research Design

The traditional research design for evaluations of this sort generally has been pre-experimental and either the "one-shot case study" or the "one group, pre-test/post-test" (as indicated in the Review of the Literature). However, in keeping with our commitment to upgrade the quality of such evaluations, more sophisticated research designs were desired.

From a methodological point of view, the ideal research design for this study should have been truly experimental (e.g., a randomly assigned pre-test/post-test control group design[29]). Realistically, however, a post-test only control group design would have been satisfactory if the experimental and control groups had been randomly selected. Unfortunately, this was not the case. Thus, the research design of preference was a quasi-experimental, non-equivalent control group design.[30]

Although the latter was somewhat less desirable than the former in terms of controlling against threats to validity and insuring generalizability, it was acceptable, assuming that the two groups were basically similar in regard to criteria of interest to this study, However, if the pre-test data were to show significant

---

[29]Chabotar and Lad, p. 85.

[30]Ibid., p. 83.

differences between the groups, subsequent comparison would probably prove meaningless.

Since this particular design was adopted, it was necessary to obtain some kind of pre-test information. It should be pointed out again at this time that all such pre-test data had to be obtained after the workshop training instead of before it, because there was not any relevant baseline data available on the agencies prior to the workshop, nor had this study been officially undertaken until after it. This did not appear to have created any noticeable problems of the nature already discussed but because of the potential influence that this might have had on the outcome of the study, it should be again stressed that awareness was important in order to deal with these problems had they arisen. If they were to occur the validity of the results would be no better than that which could be obtained through the pre-experimental, one-shot case study design that was used for the study described in the Review of the Literature.[31] In such a case, our confidence in the findings would necessarily be of a lesser degree than for the more powerful non-equivalent control group design.

Hypotheses

There were four formal test hypotheses around which this study was based. They were as follows:

---

[31] Ibid., p. 79.

Hypothesis 1: The representatives who attended the workshop have knowledge of more planning and evaluation concepts, strategies and techniques (as indicated by medium scores on related questionnaires) now than before they attended the workshop.

Hypothesis 2: The agencies of the representatives who attended the workshop put more planning and evaluation concepts, strategies and techniques to use (as indicated by high scores on related questionnaires) now than before the workshop.

Hypothesis 3: The representatives who attended the workshop have knowledge of more planning and evaluation concepts, strategies and techniques (as indicated by medium scores on related questionnaires) than the representatives who did not attend the workshop.

Hypothesis 4: The agencies of the representatives who attended the workshop put more planning and evaluation concepts, strategies and techniques to use (as indicated by high scores on related questionnaires) than those agencies whose representatives did not attend the workshop.

Data Analysis

The collected data was tabulated, coded, keypunched, and stored in the CDC 6500 computer at Michigan State University which aided in making analytical comparisons.

The scores for the scaled items were looked at on an overall, individual and grouped[32] basis and mean scores and standard deviations were computed for them.

T-tests were then made as appropriate to compare the scores (1) between the two sample groups for both the pre-test and the post-test and (2) within each sample group for both the pre-test and the post-test. Frequency distributions and contingency tables were

---

[32]Selected groupings will be made of certain items relating to a common conceptual area, such as types of planning.

also employed as necessary to further facilitate analysis and show trends since the workshop.

For the three questions on the main questionnaire and those on the second (supplemental) questionnaire that were not scaled, analysis did not require the use of the computer or most of the above-mentioned techniques. For the forced-choice questions, percentages of the various responses were computed and compared between the experimental and control groups as appropriate. For the fill-in questions, the different responses were listed, simple frequency distributions of those responses were made and the results were also compared between groups as necessary.

In order to properly evaluate the workshop, the data collected had to be amenable to the techniques employed to analyze it. Some of the statistical techniques to be used in this study were most appropriate for use on interval type data. However, due to the nature and quantity of the desired information, it was necessary to construct Likert scales in the questionnaire in such a way as to obtain ordinal type data (at best). To use statistical techniques geared toward interval data on ordinal data would be methodologically somewhat inappropriate, but we wanted to use the most powerful statistics possible. Therefore, the ordinal data was treated like interval data for purposes of this study. In defense of this decision, a quick look at other research from the field would show that there is ample precedent for this type of "bootlegging" and that acceptance of this practice is common.

Summary

In this chapter, we have attempted to show what methodological steps were taken in this study. The summary will briefly review those steps.

All of the Regional Planning Units in Region V were surveyed. Those who were represented at the workshop were relegated to the experimental group and those who weren't formed the control group. (Note again that the initial selection of agencies and individuals to participate in the workshop was made prior to and independent of this study and was not random.)

Data collection was made via written questionnaires which were developed specifically relevant to the workshop. They were mailed with cover letters and a follow-up was made.

There were two questionnaires. The experimental group received both, the control group only one.

Measurement was primarily made through use of Likert-type scales relating to key items for the workshop. They were set up so as to provide a "makeshift" pre-test. However, there were also some questions requiring forced-choice and fill-in answers.

Efforts were made to control (or at least discover) extraneous variables that might have accounted for measured changes. They were also made to determine how similar the two sample groups were to each other (since their selection was not random).

Ideally, the research design should have taken the form of a truly experimental pre-test/post-test control group design. More practically, a post-test only control group design was sufficient.

However, due to some methodological problems, a non-equivalent control group design was adopted out of necessity.

The hypotheses simply stated that the people who attended the workshop would know more about planning and evaluation and their agencies would use more of this information as a result of the workshop. These people and agencies would, in turn, know and use more planning and evaluation related information than would people and agencies who were not involved in the workshop.

Most of the data analysis involved the use of a computer and statistical techniques such as t-tests and cross-tabulations were employed. However, simpler methods to compare groups such as percentages, contingency tables and frequency distributions were also included as appropriate.

From the findings, conclusions were to be drawn, the hypotheses were to be accepted or rejected, and recommendations were to be made.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

Response Rate

The initial response rate for the first mailing was only about 33 percent. Therefore, a second mailing was made, from which an overall response rate of 56 percent was attained. (It was decided that a telephone follow-up probably would not be very successful.) The actual breakdown of response rate by experimental (attendees) and control (nonattendees) groups was idential as indicated in Table 5.

TABLE 5.--Response Rate.

	Attendees	Nonattendees	Total
Number sent questionnaires	34	39	73
Number of respondents	19	22	41
Percentage	55.8%	56.4%	56.1%

There were two additional questionnaires received, one from each group. However, they were grossly incomplete and improperly filled out. One was the result of a copying error that went unnoticed. The other appeared to be the fault of the respondent for

failure to follow directions. For all practical purposes, they were useless, so they were regrettably discarded.

A brief caveat would be in order at this time. Although a response rate of 56 percent is considered acceptable, the absolute number of respondents was smaller than hoped for. The smaller the sample size, the greater is the possibility that the results will not be generalizable to the population as a whole (external validity). Therefore, it would ordinarily be wise to interpret the results with caution. However, since the population itself is relatively small, this will probably not be as crucial an issue but it still merits consideration.

Representativeness of Experimental Group

In addition to adequate sample size, it is important that the experimental group be representative of the general population in order to ensure external validity. Such representativeness can be best obtained by random assignment of the experimental group. However, as mentioned before, the selection of the people who make up the experimental group in this study (the workshop attendees) was not made randomly. Nor were any other uniform attempts made to guarantee representativeness.

Even though there is little that can actually be done to control representativeness in this study, it is still both possible and desirable to measure it. Regardless of how the experimental group was obtained, it is important to know just how representative of the whole this sample is. If it turns out that there are

significant differences between it and the general population in the fist place, then these differences should receive serious consideration before making any definitive statements based on the findings. If the two groups are extremely different, it is even possible that no valid generalizations can be made at all. In essence, then, attempts should be made to determine if external validity exists even though no controls were implemented to ensure it.

There is another reason why representativeness of the experimental group is important to this particular study (although it is somewhat related to the first). The research design employed (Quasi-Experimental Control Group) requires that the experimental and control groups be basically similar to each other in respect to characteristics of relevance. Since the control group in this study consists of the rest of the population, its similarity to the experimental group can be equated with the representativeness of the experimental group to the whole population. Therefore, knowing how representative the experimental group is will also tell how similar to the control group it is. This, in turn, will show if the right conditions exist for the research design to be used properly.

Relating to these reasons several efforts were made to determine how representative the two groups were of each other. These efforts will be discussed in the rest of this section.

Although there were no overall uniform criteria for the selection of representatives to the workshop, there still had to be some basis for choosing. Since SPA's actually selected the RPU's in their states to attend the workshop, and each had its own selection

criteria, letters were sent to all six of them inquiring as to their methods of selection. It was not anticipated that these inquiries would actually reveal that the experimental group was representative of the population. On the contrary, it was more likely that the selection criteria of the different states would neither be consistent with each other nor necessarily be conducive to representativeness. The effort, then, was really an attempt to measure any systematic biases that may have occurred, which, in turn, might adversely affect representativeness.

Only two SPA's responded to the inquiry. One stated that since there were only seven RPU's in the state, all of them were selected. The other indicated that those RPU's were selected which showed interest in the workshop and whose designated representatives were competent to benefit from it.

Since only two SPA's responded, it would be difficult to say whether there was systematic bias in the selection process or not. However, it is likely that interest, ability and need were strong considerations. Although these criteria would be extremely relevant to the selection of a target group for the workshop, they would not tend to indicate the representativeness of the experimental group. In fact, they would probably imply qualitative differences between the experimental group and the general population. However, this is only speculation due to the inconclusive results obtained from the inquiry.

There are other means of determining similarities or differences between the groups. One possible method is to compare

pre-test data from both groups to demonstrate whether the groups prior to the workshop were similar in the extent of their knowledge and use of the concepts, techniques, and strategies presented at it. Such a comparison would in turn, be made from statistical analysis of the information contained on the scales for the various items. (For better understanding, this format is demonstrated by the following example. Also, see Appendix B.)

Example:

Item	Before 1976	1976
Monitoring	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
Intensive evaluation	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

KEY: (1) not familiar with term
(2) familiar with, but no use
(3) planning to use
(4) some use
(5) much use

Such an examination was made of both the overall mean scores and the mean scores of the individual items as is presented in Tables 6 and 7. The results indicated basic similarities between the groups in terms of scores. There was no statistically determined significant difference between the groups on the overall scores.

TABLE 6.--Comparison of Attendees' and Nonattendees' Overall Pre-Test Scores.[a]

	Mean	S.D.	T-Value
Attendees	87.1579	14.557	1.59
Nonattendees	95.9545	20.790	

[a]Range 34-170.

TABLE 7.--Comparison of Attendees' and Nonattendees' Individual Pre-Test Scores.

Item	Attendees		Nonattendees		T-Value
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Monitoring	3.8947	.937	4.0455	1.214	.45
Intensive evaluation	2.3158	.820	2.5455	.912	.85
Process evaluation	2.1053	1.243	2.8182	1.220	1.85*
Effort evaluation	2.0000	1.202	2.2213	.973	.66
Impact evaluation	2.7895	1.134	3.1364	1.167	.96
Efficiency evaluation	1.9474	1.026	2.9545	.950	3.24*
Effect evaluation	2.0526	1.026	2.7727	1.066	2.20*
Crime trend analysis	3.1579	1.463	4.1364	.990	2.47*
Data needs analysis	3.0526	1.258	3.8182	1.220	1.96*
Socioeconomic and demographic data analysis	3.6316	.895	4.0455	.844	1.52
Criminal justice system flow data	2.6316	.955	3.5000	1.058	2.76*
Calls for service data	2.6842	1.416	3.0455	1.327	.84
Criminal history data	2.6316	.895	2.2273	.685	1.60
Criminal justice agency resource data	3.5263	1.219	3.9091	1.231	1.00
Offender-based transactional statistics	2.1579	1.068	2.4545	.912	.95
Normative planning	1.9474	1.026	2.4545	1.371	1.35
Strategic planning	2.8421	1.344	2.9545	1.527	.25
Operation planning	3.1053	1.524	3.3182	1.524	.45
Uniform crime report data in frequencies	4.2632	.812	4.0455	1.214	.67
Uniform crime report data in rates	4.2632	.994	4.4545	.800	1.23
Ratios of offenses to potential targets	2.7368	1.046	2.8182	1.368	.22
Relationship of no. of crimes to no. of criminals	2.5263	.964	2.5455	1.224	.06
Linear extrapolation	2.1579	1.015	2.0455	1.090	.34
Controls against threats to external validity	1.8421	.898	1.7273	.703	.45
Controls against threats to internal validity	1.7368	.806	1.6364	.727	.42
Controls against threats to reliability	1.6842	.820	1.8182	1.006	.47
Delphi technique	1.5789	.961	1.9545	1.327	1.05
Scenarios	1.4211	.507	2.0000	1.000	2.53*
Simulations	1.8947	.567	2.0909	.868	.87
Impact models of social interventions	1.7368	.653	1.6364	.902	.41
Amoeba model of criminal justice system	1.5263	.772	1.5909	.959	.24
Community assessment approach	2.7368	1.240	2.4091	1.221	.85
Citizen involvement in the planning process	3.5263	1.020	3.1818	1.296	.95
Feedback to local units as to quality of their work	3.2105	1.084	3.6364	1.049	1.27

*Significant difference at .05 level of significance for one-tailed probability of separate variance.

For 27 of the 34 individual items there were also no significant differences. However, the control group did score significantly higher on seven items (which might tend to support the contention that the selection of representatives to the workshiop was based on need). In addition, there was a detectable pattern of these differences in two specific areas--types of evaluation and types of analysis.

In spite of the two areas in which the control group surpassed the experimental group, it was apparent that the two groups were roughly equivalent in their knowledge and use of most of the relevant variables prior to the workshop. Therefore (and with some reservation), it was ascertained that the experimental group could be considered fairly representative of the general population, at least in this regard. (Note also that this finding adds credibility to the Quasi-Experimental Control Group Design which was discussed earlier.)

The attitudes of the two groups toward the idea of the Planning and Evaluation Workshop are also potentially important in determining representativeness, so they were compared also. One of the three questions at the end of the primary questionnaire asked if the agencies would send a representative to such a workshop (costs not being a consideration). The question also asked why. The overwhelming majority of both groups indicated an interest in attending such a workshop as indicated in Table 8.

Similarly, both groups were in strong agreement on the reasons why they would become involved in such a workshop. The

TABLE 8.--Send a Representative to a Planning and Evaluation Workshop.

	Attendees		Nonattendees	
	#	%	#	%
Yes	16	84	19	86
No	0	0	1	5
No answer	3	16	2	9

consistent answers were (1) make contacts with other agencies, (2) gain relevant knowledge, and (3) improve skills.

The possibility also exists that there were undetected, extraneous variables which might have influenced the response rate of either group. There may have been some characteristic(s) unique to the people in either group who did respond which might have also affected their responses. Either of these possibilities could have an adverse effect on the representativeness of the sample groups to each other. Hence, the importance of identifying these potential problems, if they exist. However, as already indicated in Table 5, the response rate was fairly good and was comparable between groups, so there were no foreseeable difficulties in this regard.

However, there is one potential factor which merits special scrutiny; that is geography. In order to determine if there were any major geographical differences in the response rates of the groups, these rates were broken down by states. The primary concern

here was to determine if agencies in one part of the region were more likely to cooperate in the survey than were agencies in another part, and if so, why. However, when employing this technique, it was also possible to tell if the initial selection of the agencies to be included in the workshop was geographically influenced, thereby affecting the representativeness of the experimental group. The results of this examination indicated that both the initial selection of attendee agencies and the response rates were fairly well dispersed throughout Region V as Tables 9 and 10 show. No geographic patterns were detected, at least at the state level.

For the most part, this investigation into the representativeness of the experimental group supported the claim that the experimental group was basically representative of the population as a whole and that it was similar to the control group. However, there were a couple of differences that may have bearing on the

TABLE 9.--Workshop Attendance by State.

State	Number of RPU's	Number Represented at Workshop	%
Illinois	20	6	30
Wisconsin	12	6	50
Michigan	17	5	29
Ohio	7	7	100
Indiana	8	4	50
Minnesota	9	6	67
Total	73	34	47

TABLE 10.--Questionnaire Response Rate by State.

	Attendees			Nonattendees			Combined		
	Total	# Responded	%	Total	# Responded	%	Total	# Responded	%
Illinois	6	5	83	14	7	50	20	12	60
Wisconsin	6	2	33	6	4	67	12	6	50
Michigan	5	4	80	12	8	67	17	12	71
Ohio	7	3	43	0	0	0	7	3	43
Indiana	4	2	50	4	2	50	8	4	50
Minnesota	6	3	50	3	1	30	9	4	44
Totals	34	19	56	39	22	56	73	41	56

comparison of the groups in particular areas and they will be dealt with later, as necessary.

Hypotheses Tests

Before actually presenting the results of the hypotheses tests, it should be clarified that the primary concern in the development of the hypotheses was in determining increases in knowledge (Hypothesis 1) and use (Hypothesis 2) of the experimental group. Similar increases for the control group (Hypotheses 3 and 4) were important only for their utility as methodological controls.

There is logic behind the order in which the hypotheses have been stated (i.e., addressing one group at a time) and ordinarily the presentation of the analysis of those hypotheses should follow that order. However, since the last two hypotheses are only important in regard to their relationship to the first two, we have rearranged the presentation of the hypotheses tests in this section so that the order will be Hypotheses 1, 3, 2, 4. In this way it will be possible to maintain a consistent line of thought (knowledge for both, then use for both). This rearrangement has no real consequence in regard to the study itself, but may be helpful to the reader in following the issues that are being addressed.

Hypothesis 1: The attendees have knowledge of more planning and evaluation concepts, techniques and strategies as a result of the workshop.

Overall mean scores and standard deviations (out of a possible score of 170 based on 34 five-point scales) were computed for the attendees as a group both before and after the workshop. These

mean scores were then tested against each other using the difference of means tests that was part of the SPSS package of the CDC 6500 Computer (hereafter, these tests will simply be called t-tests). As Table 11 shows, the attendees experienced a 16-point increase. The t-value associated with this increase was 3.29 which was statistically significant at or below the .05 level of significance for one-tailed tests of separate variance with 30 degrees of freedom. (Note that all subsequent testing will also be at the .05 level with approximately the same degrees of freedom.)

TABLE 11.--Comparison of Attendees' Overall Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores.[a]

	Pre-Test		Post-Test		T-Value
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Attendees	87.1579	14.557	103.2632	15.581	3.29*

[a]Range 34-170.

*Significant difference at .05 level of significance for one-tailed probability of separate variance.

T-testing the overall mean scores revealed an increase in the accumulated scores of all the items for the attendees, but it did not differentiate specific items for which improvements occurred. Therefore, the same procedures were employed for each individual item, as shown in Table 12.

There were 12 of these items for which significant increases were measured. (Interestingly, all the items showed increases even though the rates were not statistically significant.) Although most

TABLE 12.--Comparison of Attendees' Individual Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores.

Item	Pre-Test		Post-Test		T-Value
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Monitoring	3.8947	.937	4.4737	.513	2.36*
Intensive evaluation	2.3158	.820	3.3158	1.108	3.16*
Process evaluation	2.1053	1.243	2.4737	1.389	.86
Effort evaluation	2.0000	1.202	2.1579	1.302	.39
Impact evaluation	2.7895	1.134	3.5263	1.219	1.93*
Efficiency evaluation	1.9474	1.026	2.4211	1.346	1.22
Effect evaluation	2.0526	1.026	2.5789	1.502	1.26
Crime trend analysis	3.1579	1.463	4.1579	.834	2.59*
Data needs analysis	3.0526	1.258	3.7368	.991	1.85*
Socioeconomic and demographic data analysis	3.6316	.895	4.2106	.419	2.55*
Criminal justice system flow data	2.6316	.955	3.4211	.902	2.62*
Calls for service data	2.6842	1.416	2.8421	1.463	.34
Criminal history data	2.6316	.895	3.1579	.898	1.81*
Criminal justice agency resource data	3.5263	1.219	3.9474	.848	1.24
Offender-based transaction statistics	2.1579	1.068	2.4211	1.071	.76
Normative planning	1.9474	1.026	2.1579	1.157	.59
Strategic planning	2.8421	1.344	3.2632	1.284	.99
Operational planning	3.1053	1.524	3.4737	1.611	.72
Uniform crime report data in frequencies	4.2632	8.72	4.4211	.607	.65
Uniform crime report data in rates	4.1053	.994	4.3158	.671	.77
Ratios of offenses to potential targets	2.7368	1.046	3.4737	1.073	2.14*
Relationship between no. of crimes and no. of criminals	2.5263	.964	3.1053	1.150	1.68
Linear extrapolation	2.579	1.015	3.1579	1.214	2.76*
Controls against threats to external validity	1.8421	.898	2.0526	1.026	.67
Controls against threats to internal validity	1.7368	.806	2.0526	1.079	1.02
Controls against threats to reliability	1.6842	.820	1.9474	1.079	.85
Delphi technique	1.5789	.961	2.0526	1.311	1.27
Scenarios	1.4211	.507	1.6316	.831	.94
Simulations	1.8947	.567	2.1579	.834	1.14
Impact models of social interventions	1.7368	.653	2.1579	.958	1.58
Amoeba model of criminal justice system	1.5263	.772	2.2105	1.273	2.00*
Community assessment approach	2.7368	1.240	2.9474	1.268	.52
Citizen involvement in the planning process	3.5263	1.020	3.9474	.848	1.38
Feedback to local units as to quality of their work	3.2105	1.084	2.8947	.737	2.27*

*Significant difference at .05 level of significance for one-tailed probability of separate variance.

of the 12 items were basically unrelated to each other, there were two specific areas (groupings) that underwent improvement. They were (1) general types of evaluations (Monitoring and Intensive evaluation) and (2) types of analyses (Crime trend analysis, Data needs analysis, and Socioeconomic and demographic analysis).

Since the scales for the different items (refer back to the Example on page 53) were used to measure both differences in knowledge and utilization as well as degrees of use, the determination of change as measured by t-testing was not sufficient in itself to accept or reject the hypotheses as they are stated. This is because t-testing can only establish upward shifts; it cannot distinguish between knowledge and use. In order to distinguish the mere acquisition of knowledge (Hypotheses 1 and 3) from use or increased use (Hypotheses 2 and 4) it was necessary to construct and examine frequency distributions and contingency tables for the separate items. Although this procedure is admittedly somewhat more subjective than t-testing (which would have been sufficient if the scales were truly interval in nature), it was adequate to demonstrate any trends upon which acceptance or rejection of the hypothesis could be ultimately made. Only the 12 items for which the t-tests indicated significant improvements were examined in this way (see Table 13) because there weren't any changes to speak of for the other 22 items.

Before proceeding, a brief aside is in order concerning one reason why some of the other 22 items had no significant increases. Measurement was made of mean scores based on a five-point scale. Some of these mean scores (e.g., those for Uniform crime report data

TABLE 13.--Frequency Distributions for Attendees' Individual Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores.

Item		No 1	Know 2	Plan to Use 3	Some Use 4	Much Use 5
Monitoring	Pre	0	2	3	9	5
	Post	0	0	0	10	9
Intensive evaluation	Pre	1	14	1	3	0
	Post	0	6	4	6	3
Impact evaluation	Pre	1	10	1	6	1
	Post	1	4	2	8	4
Crime trend analysis	Pre	3	5	1	6	4
	Post	0	0	5	6	8
Data needs analysis	Pre	2	6	2	7	2
	Post	1	1	3	11	3
Socioeconomic demographic data analysis	Pre	0	3	3	11	2
	Post	0	0	0	15	4
Criminal justice systems flow data	Pre	1	10	3	5	0
	Post	0	3	7	7	2
Criminal history data	Pre	0	12	2	5	0
	Post	0	6	4	9	0
Ratio of offenses to potential targets	Pre	0	12	1	5	1
	Post	0	5	3	8	3
Linear extrapolation	Pre	5	9	2	3	0
	Post	2	4	4	7	2
Amoeba model of criminal justice system	Pre	11	7	0	1	0
	Post	8	4	2	5	0
Feedback to local units as to quality of their work	Pre	0	7	3	7	2
	Post	0	1	3	12	3

in both rates and frequencies) were so high to begin with that there was no room within the parameters of the scales for statistically significant increases. This was not the case for most of the items since they had more room for change, but it still was a real factor that existed in some cases and should be considered throughout the rest of this study because of its tendency to statistically minimize the effect of the workshop.

It was discovered that the attendees did not really learn more planning and evaluation concepts, techniques or strategies.[33] There were only six items for which acquired knowledge was demonstrated and the maximum number of attendees who actually learned about any particular item was three. In fact, there were four items which were unknown to some attendees even after the workshop. On the other hand, with the exception of the Amoeba Model of the Criminal Justice System (which was a novel concept introduced at the workshop, anyway), at least three-quarters of the attendees were familiar with all 12 items prior to the workshop. Therefore, the null hypothesis (i.e., the attendees did <u>not</u> learn more) was accepted and the alternate hypothesis (Hypothesis 1) was rejected.

---

[33]This does not mean that the attendees did not learn more about specific items which they were basically familiar with in the first place. However, the scales were not designed to measure increased knowledge, but rather basic knowledge (familiarity) as opposed to no knowledge (ignorance).

Hypothesis 3: The attendees have knowledge of more planning and evaluation concepts, techniques and strategies than the nonattendees.

As Table 14 shows, the t-test of the overall mean post-test scores of the two groups revealed no significant differences; the scores were practically identical.

TABLE 14.--Comparison of Attendees' and Nonattendees' Overall Post-Test Scores.[a]

	Mean	S.D.	T-Value
Attendees	103.2632	15.581	.06
Nonattendees	102.9091	22.271	

[a]Range 34-170.

T-testing the individual post-test scores of the two groups showed similar results (see Table 15). In fact, there were only four items for which significant differences were determined, three of them in favor of the attendees and one in favor of the non-attendees (which was also significantly higher for them prior to the workshop). There was also no discernible pattern to these differences (i.e., no specific area or grouping in which the attendees surpassed the nonattendees.

Examination of the frequency distributions (Table 16) and contingency tables for these four items revealed that there was no significant difference in the numbers of respondents between the groups who were familiar with Criminal justice system flow data, Citizen involvement in the planning process, and Criminal history

TABLE 15.--Comparison of Attendees' and Nonattendees' Individual Post-Test Scores.

Item	Attendees		Nonattendees		T-Value
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Monitoring	4.4737	.513	4.1818	1.140	1.08
Intensive evaluation	3.3158	1.108	2.909	1.231	1.11
Process evaluation	2.4737	1.389	2.8636	1.246	.94
Effort evaluation	2.1574	1.302	2.5000	.964	.94
Impact evaluation	3.5263	1.219	3.2273	1.232	.78
Efficiency evaluation	2.4211	1.346	3.0000	1.113	1.49
Effect evaluation	2.5789	1.502	2.9545	1.214	.87
Crime trend analysis	4.1579	.834	4.3182	1.041	.55
Data needs analysis	3.7368	.991	3.9545	.397	.58
Socioeconomic and demographic data analysis	4.2106	.419	4.1364	.899	.35
Criminal justice system flow data	3.4211	.902	4.0909	.811	2.48*
Calls for service data	2.8421	1.463	3.3182	1.325	1.09
Criminal history data	3.1579	.898	2.5455	1.011	2.05*
Criminal justice agency resource data	3.9474	.848	4.0909	1.269	.43
Offender-based transaction statistics	2.4211	1.071	2.7818	1.041	.79
Normative planning	2.1579	1.157	2.5455	1.371	.98
Strategic planning	3.2632	1.284	3.1364	1.583	.28
Operational planning	3.4737	1.611	3.4091	1.563	.13
Uniform crime report data in frequencies	4.4211	.607	4.2273	1.152	.69
Uniform crime report data in rates	4.3158	.671	4.5909	.590	1.38
Ratio of offenses to potential targets	3.4737	1.073	3.6364	1.329	.43
Relationship between no. of crimes and no. of criminals	3.1053	1.150	2.9545	1.253	.40
Linear extrapolation	3.1579	1.214	2.2727	1.202	2.34*
Controls against threats to external validity	2.056	1.026	1.7727	.685	1.01
Controls against threats to internal validity	2.0526	1.079	1.6818	.716	1.28
Controls against threats to reliability	1.9474	1.079	1.8636	.990	.26
Delphi technique	2.0526	1.311	2.1364	1.320	.20
Scenarios	1.6316	.831	2.000	1.000	1.34
Simulations	2.1579	.834	2.1818	.958	.09
Impact models of social interventions	2.1579	.958	1.8636	1.125	.90
Amoeba model of criminal justice system	2.2105	1.273	1.9091	1.231	.77
Community assessment approach	2.9474	1.268	2.8182	1.332	.32
Citizen involvement in planning process	3.9474	.848	3.3636	1.217	1.80*
Feedback to local units as to quality of their work	3.8947	.737	3.7727	.922	.47

*Significant difference at .05 level of significance for one-tailed probability of separate variance.

TABLE 16.--Frequency Distributions for the Attendees' and Non-attendees' Individual Post-Test Scores.

		1	2	3	4	5
Criminal justice systems flow data	Att	0	3	7	7	2
	Non	0	1	3	11	7
Criminal history data	Att	0	6	4	9	0
	Non	1	14	2	4	1
Linear extrapolation	Att	2	4	4	7	2
	Non	7	8	1	6	0
Citizen involvement in planning process	Att	0	2	1	12	4
	Non	1	6	3	8	4

Exp. n -19
Cont. n -22

data. The only one which the attendees, as a group, knew better than the nonattendees was Linear extrapolation. For the most part, however, both groups were familiar with all four items.

Taking into account the aforementioned t-tests, frequency distributions, and contingency tables, it was clear that the attendees did not know more planning and evaluation concepts, techniques and strategies than the nonattendees. Hence, Hypothesis 3 did not hold true and was rejected.

Hypothesis 2: The agencies represented by the attendees use more planning and evaluation concepts, techniques and strategies as a result of the workshop.

The fact that the attendees didn't actually learn more concepts, techniques or strategies did not necessarily exclude the possibility that their agencies use them more. Hypothetically, the

workshop could have been instrumental in just convincing the agencies to put them to use or it might have provided them with enough additional information to make it practical to do so. (It's even possible that the agencies had already decided to use them prior to the workshop and sent representatives there to "polish up" beforehand.) In any event, it was still possible to ascertain a trend towards use (including plans to use) or increase use in basically the same manner as was done for knowledge.

Once again, only the 12 items with significant increases in scores were examined, since the initial t-testing singled them out as the only ones for which any statistically significant improvements had occurred. The same frequency distributions and contingency tables that had been previously constructed for these items were also employed because they were still applicable.

Examination of these distributions and tables revealed that virtually all of the items were receiving use in some form before the workshop (understandably, only one agency was using the Amoeba Model), and five of them were receiving various degrees of use by over half of the agencies. Even though they were generally receiving such considerable attention in the first place, the evidence indicated fairly uniform increases after the workshop, both in the total number of agencies putting them to use and in the degree of use they were receiving. (Refer back to Table 13.)

Then looking at all three degrees of use (Planning to Use, Some Use, and Much Use) collectively, it was discovered that there were substantial increases in the number of agencies that fell into

this general category after the workshop. With the exception of the Amoeba Model (which also showed a large proportionate increase), all of the items were receiving some degree of use by over two-thirds of the respondents' agencies after the workshop. Except for the five items which were originally receiving some degree of use by over half of the respondents' agencies, the increases were at least double the pre-workshop figures and even these five were receiving more use with three of them receiving use by all 19 agencies, one by 18, and the other by 17. These increases were also evident when considering only Some Use and Much Use together. (Since Planning to Use doesn't assure ultimate utilization, which really was the primary purpose of the workshop.) As Table 17 shows, there were increases in use of at least 21 percent for all 12 items.

TABLE 17.--Increases in Attendees' Pre-Test/Post-Test Use of Items.

Item	Pre-Test	Post-Test
	Percent of Respondents Using	Percent of Respondents Using
Monitoring	74%	100%
Intensive evaluation	16	47
Impact evaluation	37	63
Crime trend analysis	53	74
Data needs analysis	47	74
Socioeconomic and demographic data analysis	68	100
Criminal justice systems flow data	26	47
Criminal history data	26	47
Ratio of offenses to potential targets	32	58
Linear extrapolation	16	47
Amoeba Model of criminal justice system	5	26
Feedback to local units as to quality of their work	47	79

There were similar findings regarding increases in the degrees of use. Eight items had increases in Planning to Use although the actual numbers of agencies in this category was not large in the first place and did not increase very much. One remained constant and three had decreases (indicating increases in Some Use or Much Use).

Some Use was the most commonly cited category both before and after the workshop. It also had the largest average numerical increase per item. In all, 11 items in this category had increases, the other one remained constant.

Finally, in the Much Use category, 10 of the 12 items had increases. The other two remained constant (no agencies were giving much use to these).

The individual items which received the most overall use were Monitoring crime trend analysis and Socioeconomic and demographic data analysis. The items with the greatest increases were Intensive evaluation, Linear extrapolation, and the Amoeba Model of the criminal justice system. Therefore, as was the case when measuring knowledge (hypothesis 1), the most noteworthy areas (groupings) appeared to be types of evaluations and types of analysis, although this distinction was somewhat less evident when measuring use.

From these results it was easily discernible that the attendees' agencies are now using more planning and evaluation concepts, techniques and strategies than before the workshop. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was accepted as true.

The same statistical techniques were applied to the scores of the nonattendee group to determine if this group also showed improvement over time. This was done as a "double check" before testing Hypothesis 4 which concerns the utilization of the items by experimental and control groups after the workshop. Theoretically, the control group (nonattendees) should not experience as much significant change in use as did the experimental group (attendees). If it does show change there were probably extraneous variables introduced which either (1) affected the attendees also and thereby raises a question as to the actual influence of the workshop or (2) affected only the nonattendees, but which would still invalidate a conclusion based on the post-test comparison with the attendees due to lack of control over the nonattendees. In essence, then, this endeavor was intended as a control measure much like Hypotheses 3 and 4.

T-testing both the overall mean scores and the individual mean scores of the nonattendees revealed no significant change (Tables 18 and 19). As Table 19 shows, there were two individual

TABLE 18.--Comparison of Nonattendees' Overall Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores.[a]

	Mean	S.D.	T-Value
Pre-test	95.9545	20.790	1.07
Post-test	109.9091	22.271	

[a]Range 34-170.

TABLE 19.--Comparison of Nonattendees' Individual Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores.

Item	Pre-Test		Post-Test		T-Value
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Monitoring	4.0554	1.214	4.1818	1.140	.38
Intensive evaluation	2.5455	.912	2.9091	1.231	1.11
Process evaluation	2.8182	1.220	2.8636	1.246	.12
Effort evaluation	2.2273	.973	2.5000	.964	.93
Impact evaluation	3.1364	1.167	3.2273	1.232	.25
Efficiency evaluation	2.9545	.950	3.0000	1.113	.15
Effect evaluation	2.7727	1.066	2.9545	1.214	.53
Crime trend analysis	4.1364	.990	4.3182	1.041	.59
Data needs analysis	3.8182	1.330	3.9545	1.397	.34
Socioeconomic and demographic data analysis	4.0455	.844	4.1364	.899	.35
Criminal justice system flow data	3.5000	1.058	4.0909	.811	2.08*
Calls for service data	3.0455	1.327	3.3182	1.323	.68
Criminal history data	2.2273	.685	2.5455	1.041	1.22
Criminal justice agency resource data	3.9091	1.231	4.0909	1.269	.48
Offender-based transaction statistics	2.4545	.912	2.6818	1.041	.77
Normative planning	2.4545	1.371	2.5455	1.371	1.22
Strategic planning	2.9545	1.527	3.1364	1.583	.39
Operational planning	3.3182	1.524	3.4091	1.563	.20
Uniform crime report data in frequencies	4.0455	1.214	4.2273	1.152	.51
Uniform crime report data in rates	4.4515	.800	4.5909	.590	.64
Ratios of offenses to potential targets	2.8182	1.368	3.6364	1.329	2.01*
Relationship between no. of crimes and no. of criminals	2.5455	1.224	2.9545	1.253	1.10
Linear extrapolation	2.0455	1.090	2.2727	1.202	.66
Controls against threats to external validity	1.7273	.703	1.7727	.685	.22
Controls against threats to internal validity	1.6364	.727	1.6818	.716	.21
Controls against threats to reliability	1.8182	1.006	1.8636	.990	.15
Delphi technique	1.9545	1.327	2.1364	1.320	.46
Scenarios	2.0000	.926	2.0000	.926	0.00
Simulations	2.0909	.868	2.1818	.958	.33
Impact models of interventions	1.6364	.902	1.8636	1.125	.74
Amoeba model of criminal justice system	1.5909	.959	1.9091	1.231	.96
Community assessment approach	2.4091	1.221	2.8182	1.332	1.06
Citizen involvement in planning process	3.1818	1.296	3.3636	1.217	.48
Feedback to local units as to quality of their work	3.6364	1.049	3.7727	.922	.46

*Significant difference at .05 level of significance for one-tailed probability of separate variance.

exceptions for which there were significant changes. These two items, Criminal justice system flow data and Ratios of offenses to potential targets, were further examined using frequency distributions (see Table 20) and contingency tables. It was found that they were understood by practically all the respondents prior to the workshop and that no increase in knowledge had occurred. However, there were considerable increases in both the number of agencies using them and in the amount of use they were receiving.

TABLE 20.--Frequency Distributions for Nonattendees' Individual Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores.

		1	2	3	4	5
Criminal justice system flow data	Pre	0	6	2	11	3
	Post	0	1	3	11	7
Ratio of offenses to potential targets	Pre	1	14	0	2	5
	Post	1	6	0	8	7

n=22

In spite of these exceptions, it was obvious that the nonattendee group did not improve much, which in turn means that for all practical purposes the nonattendees did not learn more planning and evaluation concepts, techniques and strategies since the time the workshop was conducted, nor do their agencies use them more. Although this does not assure that there were no extraneous variables which may have affected only the attendees, it does provide reassurance that there was some degree of control over the nonattendees, at least at the level of statistical significance.

(In the next section, the results of efforts to identify extraneous variables which might have affected the attendees will be discussed.)

Hypothesis 4: The agencies represented by the attendees use more planning and evaluation concepts, techniques and strategies than the agencies represented by the nonattendees.

The statistical techniques employed for Hypothesis 3 revealed no significant statistical differences between groups from which differences in the amount of use could be derived. Therefore, it stands to reason that Hypothesis 4 could not be accepted, either.

However, the four items for which frequency distributions and contingency tables were constructed for Hypothesis 3 were still examined. (Refer back to Table 16.) Since significant differences were registered for these items (and only these items) but these differences did not relate to an increase in knowledge, it was almost certain that the increases would be in terms of use. Examination revealed that this belief was true.

For Criminal history data, more of the attendees' agencies were Planning to Use and giving Some Use than were the nonattendees' agencies. (However, none of them were giving it Much Use while one nonattendee was.) For Linear extrapolation, the attendees' agencies surpassed the nonattendees' agencies in all three categories. For Citizen involvement in the planning process, more attendees' agencies were giving Some Use. The groups were the same regarding Much Use and more attendees' agencies were Planning to Use. For Criminal justice system flow data (the item for which the nonattendees surpassed the attendees both statistically and in terms of Some

Use and Much Use), more attendees' agencies were still Planning to Use.

These findings indicated that there were some areas where the attendees' agencies as a group were giving more use than the nonattendees' agencies. However, the converse was also true in some cases and the overall results were not dramatic enough to warrant acceptance of the hypothesis.

Since Hypothesis 4 was merely designed for control purposes, the fact that the attendees' agencies did not demonstrate more use than the nonattendees does not necessarily mean that the attendees and their respective agencies did not benefit from the workshop. In fact, confirmation of Hypothesis 2 would tend to indicate otherwise. In addition, when looking over the tables, we noticed what appeared to be a trend supporting the contention that the workshop had a positive effect on those who attended. Apparently, (1) both groups increased their knowledge and use of most of the items between the pre-test and post-test, and (2) the rate of increase was greater for the attendees as a whole than for the nonattendees. It was apparent even upon initial observation that these trends were not statistically significant. However, since statistical significance is merely a tool with which to facilitate evaluations and does not always reflect on practical significance, we decided to investigate further.

Both the overall and individual pre-workshop mean scores for each group were compared to their post-workshop mean scores and

the differences between them were computed. Then these differences were compared between groups as shown in Tables 21 and 22.

From these tables, it was discovered that the rate of increase for attendees was indeed greater than for nonattendees. This includes the mean overall score of attendees as well as 29 of the 34 mean individual scores. For only five items did the non-attendees' rates of increase surpass that of attendees and there was no pattern or common grouping to them.

Although these findings do not show that the attendees as a group know or use more planning and evaluation concepts, techniques and strategies than nonattendees, they do indicate greater progress on the part of the attendees and their agencies. This, in turn, implies that the workshop was at least somewhat effective in the transferring of planning and evaluation technologies ath the RPU level.

Supplemental Analyses

In addition to the 34 items whose analysis was just described, the questionnaire contained space in which respondents could add more concepts, techniques or strategies which they felt were particularly interesting, important or relevant. The rationale for this section was twofold: (1) to obtain information on

TABLE 21.--Comparison of Rates of Increase of Overall Mean Scores Between the Attendees and Nonattendees.

Attendees	Nonattendees	Greater Increase
16.11	6.95	Attendees

TABLE 22.--Comparison of Rates of Increase in Individual Mean Scores Between Attendees and Nonattendees.

Item	Attendees	Non-attendees	Greater Increase
Monitoring	.58	.14	ATT
Intensive evaluation	1.00	.4	ATT
Process evaluation	.37	.05	ATT
Effort evaluation	.15	.28	NON
Impact evaluation	.74	.09	ATT
Efficiency evaluation	.48	.05	ATT
Effect evaluation	.52	.18	ATT
Crime trend analysis	.68	.14	ATT
Socioeconomic and demographic data analysis	.58	.09	ATT
Criminal justice system flow data	.79	.59	ATT
Calls for service data	.16	.31	NON
Criminal history data	.52	.32	ATT
Criminal justice agency resource data	.42	.19	ATT
Offender-based transaction statistics	.27	.23	ATT
Normative planning	.21	.09	ATT
Strategic planning	.42	.19	ATT
Operational planning	.37	.09	ATT
Uniform crime report data in frequencies	.16	.18	NON
Uniform crime report data in rates	.21	.14	ATT
Ratio of offenses to potential targets	.74	.82	NON
Relationship between no. of crimes and no. of criminals	.58	.41	ATT
Linear extrapolation	1.00	.23	ATT
Controls against threats to external validity	.21	.05	ATT
Controls against threats to internal validity	.32	.05	ATT
Controls against threats to reliability	.26	.05	ATT
Delphi technique	.48	.18	ATT
Scenarios	.21	.00	ATT
Simulations	.26	.09	ATT
Impact models of social interventions	.42	.23	ATT
Amoeba model of criminal justice system	.69	.31	ATT
Community assessment approach	.21	.41	NON
Citizen involvement in planning process	.42	.18	ATT
Feedback to local units as to quality of their work	.68	.14	ATT

on certain approaches towards planning and evaluation that were being planned or used throughout the region, but which were not specifically addressed in the workshop, and (2) to allow for input of concepts, techniques or strategies which were presented at the workshop but not included elsewhere in the questionnaire.

The format for this section was identical to that for the first 34 items, hence the same type of analysis was possible. However, observation of the responses made revealed that this would be neither necessary nor meaningful, since only 5 of the 19 respondents in the attendee group and 6 of the 22 respondents in the nonattendee group provided items.

The only duplication of items within groups related to Nominal group approach (listed twice for the nonattendee group)! The only duplication between groups was in reference to Planning based on Crime specific data (listed once for each group). This indicated that none of the items listed were receiving widespread consideration or use throughout the region. It also showed that there was little common ground upon which to compare groups.

With the possible exception of the JUSSIM Simulation Model (listed once for attendee group) all of the items listed by both groups were discussed at the workshop or included in the literature presented at it. (Obviously, the items listed by the nonattendee group were picked up somewhere else, however.) This would tend to indicate that there were probably not any major concepts, techniques or strategies under consideration or in use throughout the region which were not addressed in some way at the workshop.

In addition, a few of the items listed actually were the same as some of the original 34 items; the only difference was in wording. If any conclusions could be drawn from this, they would be that some respondents might have misunderstood particular items initially or they did not give careful consideration to properly completing the questionnaire.

All of the items for both groups (except JUSSIM) were receiving either Some or Much Use prior to the workshop (which would mean that the workshop had little or no actual influence on the attendee group regarding them), and most of them were receiving increased usage in 1976.

During the development of the questionnaire, there was some doubt as to how much this section would actually contribute to the study. This concern was a valid one because the magnitude of results was so small that the significance of the findings was doubtful.

The next section of the questionnaire was devoted to determining what changes (from the previous items) were attributable to the workshop. Some additional information was also generated from this section as byproducts: the number of changes (although not the degrees of change), other reasons for the changes, and areas of most change (quantitatively speaking).

Respondents were asked to list each item for which they had indicated some change in knowledge or use (as determined by circling different numbers on two scales to the right of each item). They

were also asked to identify the reason(s) for or source(s) of the change for that item.

All 19 respondents from the attendee group and 17 of the 22 respondents from the nonattendee groups indicated some changes on their questionnaires. However, only 12 from each group cited reasons for some or all of those changes. Only 7 of those 12 respondents from the attendee group referred to the workshop itself as the source of some or all of their changes (even though this was the most common reason cited).

Areas of change most commonly influenced by the workshop were the Amoebel Model of the criminal justice system, Crime trend analysis and Data needs analysis. The most common areas of change, not influenced by the workshop, were Criminal justice system flow data, Intensive evaluation, Ratios of offenses to potential targets, and Feedback to local units as to the quality of their work. The most common areas of change for the nonattendee group were Criminal justice system flow data, Ratios of offenses to potential targets, Linear extrapolation, Community assessment approach, Relationship of the number of crime and number of criminals, Strategic planning, Offender-based transaction statistics, Criminal history data, and Efficiency evaluation and Effort evaluation.

The most commonly cited reasons for change for both the nonattendee group and the attendee group (other than the workshop) were increased needs and the increased availability of resources.

The results of this section showed that both groups were experiencing change in the direction of use or increased use for

numerous items. All of the attendees showed change, and most (but not all) of the nonattendees changed, too. However, the attendee group showed no evidence of having more actual changes than the nonattendee group. In fact, the nonattendees had more total changes as a group (62 to 53).

Within the attendee group several changes were attributable to the workshop but by no means were all of them. In fact, there was actually more non-workshop-related reasons cited. This showed that the workshop did have some effect on some of the agencies represented, but that there was still a general trend towards change without it. Support for this notion was apparent in that the non-attendees were also changing. (Interestingly enough, however, one respondent from the nonattendee group cited the workshop as the reason for one of its changes.)

As was the case in the preceding section, there is a limitation to the usefulness of the information obtained here because there were relatively few reasons for change and areas of change actually cited. The numbers involved were so small that the only definitive statement that could really be made is that the workshop was not responsible for all of the changes experienced by the attendee group. There were extraneous variables involved which accounted for some of the changes listed. Unfortunately, this raises a serious question concerning internal validity (not to mention the bearing it may have on the acceptance of Hypothesis 2) and had to be given careful consideration before making any conclusions based on the results of the hypothesis testing.

There were two additional questions asked of both groups. They were designed to obtain post-test information only, and the responses from them were compared between groups.

The first question asked the respondents to list the basic steps they would take in the development of a plan. The individual responses were then judged as correct or not, using the four planning steps that were emphasized at the workshop as criteria. The groups were then compared as to the proportion of correct responses from each to determine if the attendee group was more thorough in its planning (or at least more knowledgeable of the proper steps).

Results showed that the attendee group was more knowledgeable of the proper planning steps than the nonattendee group (see Table 23). However, due to both the large percentage of incorrect answers for both groups and the nature of many of the specific responses given, it was determined that the question was probably a bad one (i.e., low in reliability). Many of the responses didn't even deal with the planning process as such, therefore it appeared that the question was largely misinterpreted. Since the results of this question are dubious, they should be viewed with caution.

TABLE 23.--Correct Planning Steps.

	Attendees		Nonattendees	
	#	%	#	%
Correct responses	10	53	8	36
Incorrect responses	7	37	11	50
No response	2	10	3	14

The second question asked the respondents to state how many books and/or articles relating to planning they had read since January 1, 1976, and to list the most important ones.

Proportionately, the attendee group read more books than the nonattendees (see Tables 24 and 25). However, considering that the difference wasn't very great in the first place and that few b-oks were actually read by either group, it is doubtful that any signfificance could be attributed to the difference.

TABLE 24.--Number of Books Read Since January 1, 1976.

	Attendees		Nonattendees	
	#	%	#	%
Read some	16	84	16	73
Read none	2	11	5	22
No response	1	5	1	5

TABLE 25.--Frequency Distribution of Books Read.

	Attendees		Nonattendees	
	#	%	#	%
Unknown	4	21	0	0
1 - 5	7	37	8	36
6 - 10	2	11	3	14
11 - 15	2	11	3	14
16 - 20	0	0	0	0
20 +	1	5	2	9

The overall trend for both groups was not to read many books. In fact, in spite of the numerous books and articles provided or referred to at the workshop, only four were actually listed by the attendee group. It would be safe to say, then, that the literature provided at the workshop was not successful in determining differences between groups.

State of the Art

As a result of the various techniques employed to test the hypotheses, it was possible to derive some basic information on the State of the Art of Planning and Evaluation at the RPU level for Region V.[34] And, although it is not our intention to debate the need for or potential uses of this information, it is presented here as baseline data for possible future reference.

The frequency distributions for each item are included in Table 26. Examination of this table reveals several interesting facts. Well over half the respondents are at least familiar with each and every item. Virtually all of the items are receiving at least some use. A few of them such as Crime trend analysis, Monitoring, and Uniform crime reports in both frequencies and rates are receiving much use by over 50 percent of the respondents. A dozen others are getting either some or much use in the majority of cases.

---

[34]The results are for the experimental and control groups combined. However, since only 41 of the 73 RPU's in the region responded to the questionnaires, any generalizations about the region as a whole are subject to the representativeness of the respondents to the general population, as already discussed in the Representativeness of the Experimental Group section.

TABLE 26.--State of Art (Combined).

Item	No 1	Know 2	Plan to Use 3	Some Use 4	Much Use 5
Monitoring	0	4	0	16	21
Intensive evaluation	1	17	6	11	6
Process evaluation	8	15	4	10	4
Effort evaluation	11	15	5	10	0
Impact evaluation	1	14	3	15	8
Efficiency evaluation	8	13	3	16	1
Crime trend analysis	0	3	5	12	21
Data needs analysis	2	6	3	15	15
Socioeconomic and demographic data analysis	0	2	1	26	12
Criminal justice system flow data	0	4	10	18	9
Calls for service data	7	10	2	16	6
Criminal history data	1	20	6	13	1
Criminal justice agency resource data	2	2	5	16	16
Offender-based statistics	4	22	4	10	1
Normative planning	14	11	4	11	1
Strategic planning	8	6	5	14	8
Operational planning	7	8	1	10	15
Uniform crime report data in frequencies	1	2	1	16	21
Uniform crime report data in rates	0	0	3	16	22
Ratio of offences to potential targets	1	11	3	16	10
Relationship between no. of crimes and no. of criminals	3	14	8	11	5
Linear extrapolation	9	12	5	13	2
Controls against threats to external validity	13	23	1	4	0
Controls against threats to internal validity	16	19	2	4	0
Control against threats to reliability reliability	16	19	1	4	1
Delphi technique	19	10	3	7	2
Scenarios	16	20	1	4	0
Simulations	7	26	2	6	0
Impact models of social inteventions	16	15	4	6	0
Amoeba model of criminal justice system	19	10	5	5	2
Community assessment approach	7	11	7	12	4
Citizen involvement in planning process	1	8	4	20	8
Feedback to local units as to quality of their work	0	4	6	24	7

However, there are eight items which over one-third of the respondents are not even familiar with. The most noteworthy of these are controls against external validity, internal validity and reliability which receive practically no use at all.

Summary

After two mailings of the survey instrument, a fairly good overall response rate of 56 percent was obtained. The breakdown by experimental group (the attendees) and control group (nonattendees) was identical to the overall rate, 56 percent each.

Efforts were made to determine the representativeness of the experimental group to the general population, because there were no controls employed to insure this prior to the onset of the workshop. Since the entire population of RPU's in Region V were included in the survey as part of either the experimental or control group, the representativeness of the experimental sample was equated to its similarity to the control sample.

T-testing the pre-test (pre-workshop) mean overall scores of the two groups revealed no significant difference. T-testing the mean individual scores also indicated that for the most part the two groups were similar. However, there were several items for which the control group scored significantly higher (implying greater knowledge and/or use) than the experimental group. In spite of these few differences, it was apparent that the two groups were roughly equivalent in terms of relevant variables, thereby fulfilling the requirements of the Quasi-Experimental Non-Equivalent Control Group Research Design that was adopted for this study.

A question was also asked of the respondents relating to their agencies' attitudes towards a workshop. The percentages in favor of one were very close between groups, adding support to the contention that the groups were similar enough to each other to make subsequent and valid comparisons.

The four hypotheses for the study were tested by means of t-tests at the .05 level of significance, frequency distributions and contingency tables. Both the mean overall scores and the mean individual scores were t-tested to determine statistical significance. Then the individual items were examined via frequency distributions and contingency tables in order to interpret the numerical differences in terms of changes in knowledge and/or use of those items. These techniques were conducted for (1) the attendees' pre-test and post-test scores, (2) the nonattendees' pre-test and post-test scores, and (3) the attendees' and nonattendees' post-test scores as appropriate for the hypothesis under consideration.

Hypothesis 1 stated that the attendees would know more planning and evaluation concepts, techniques and strategies (items) after the workshop. Even though t-testing revealed significant statistical improvements in this regard in both the overall and individual scores, it was discovered through examination of the frequency distributions and contingency tables that the changes did not relate to knowledge. Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 3 stated that the attendees would know more planning and evaluation concepts, techniques and strategies than would the nonattendees. This claim was not supported by t-testing although

there were a few items for which significant differences were registered between the groups. However, these differences did not relate to knowledge and it was necessary to reject the hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2 stated that the attendees' agencies would use more planning and evaluation concepts, techniques and strategies after the workshop. Verification of this hypothesis relied on the same results that were obtained for Hypothesis 1 (since the scales of measurement addressed both knowledge and use simultaneously). However, it was discovered that there were increases in Plans to Use, Some Use, and Much Use for several of the items. Therefore, this hypothesis was accepted as true.

Hypothesis 4 stated that the attendees' agencies would use more planning and evaluation concepts, techniques and strategies than would the nonattendees' agencies. Verification of this hypothesis also depended on the groundwork laid when testing the previous one. Since t-testing for Hypothesis 4 failed to show much in the way of significant differences, it was obvious that hypothesis had to be rejected also. The few items for which significant differences were measured did show a very slight difference in use between the groups. However, it was not sufficient for acceptance of the hypothesis. It should be noted that Hypotheses 3 and 4 were actually of less importance to this study than were Hypotheses 1 and 2. This is not to say that they were useless, but rather that their value stemmed primarily from their use as controls within the research design.

The following tables have been arranged to provide a summary of findings of statistical significance pertaining to the aforementioned procedures (Tables 27, 28, and 29).

Even though there were very few differences between groups for Hypotheses 3 and 4 that were statistically supportable, there still appeared to be a couple of relevant trends. The first was that the scores of both groups did increase regardless of how little, and the second was that the rate of increase for the attendees was greater than that for nonattendees. By measuring the difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of every item within each group, then comparing these differences between groups, it was determined that these trends did, indeed, exist. More specifically, it was found that the rates of increase were greater for attendees for 29 of the 34 items. Since the rate of increase was greater for attendees, there was additional support for Hypothesis 2 which in essence purported that the workshop had a definite and positive effect on attendees and their agencies.

A section of the questionnaire was developed to allow the respondents to include additional concepts, techniques and

TABLE 27.--Significant Differences and Increases for Overall Scores.

Attendees' pre-test/post-test	Significance increase
Nonattendees' pre-test/post-test	No significant increase
Attendees'/Nonattendees' pre-test	No significant difference
Attendees'/Nonattendees' post-test	No significant difference

TABLE 28.--Significant Differences (Increases) Within Groups for Pre-Test/Post-Test Individual Scores.

Items, Attendees	Items, Nonattendees
Number: 12 (out of 34)	Number: 2 (out of 34)
Monitoring Intensive evaluation Crime trend analysis Data needs analysis Socioeconomic and demographic data analysis Criminal justice system flow data Criminal history data Ratios of offenses to potential targets Linear extrapolation Amoeba Model of criminal justice system Feedback to local units as to quality of their work	Criminal justice system flow data Ratio of offenses to potential targets

Table 29.--Significant Differences (Higher Scores) Between Groups for Individual Scores.

Items, Attendees	Items, Nonattendees	Items, No Sig. Difference
Pre-test		
Number: 0	Number: 7	Number: 27
None	Process evaluation Efficiency evaluation Effect evaluation Crime trend analysis Data needs analysis Criminal justice systems flow data Scenarios	All the rest
Post-test		
Number: 3	Number: 1	Number: 30
Criminal history data Linear extrapolation Citizen involvement in planning process	Criminal justice systems flow data	All the rest

strategies and to score them in the same way as was done for the original 34 items. However, there was little in the way of meaningful information provided and analysis produced no important results.

Another section was devoted to ascertaining the relative influence of the workshop on the attendees and identifying extraneous variables which might have accounted for changes in scores. The results of analysis of this section revealed that many of the changes were attributable to the workshop, but several others were not, so it was evident that the actual influence of the workshop itself was somewhat limited.

Two additional questions were asked regarding the steps that the respondents would take in the development of a plan and the number of books, etc., about planning that they had read recently. It was found that the attendees had a slight edge relating to the correct steps to be taken and the number of books read. However, due to some problems in both the response rate and the inherent quality of the questions themselves, the findings were dubious and of little value one way or another.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Summary

This study originated specifically as an attempt to provide a needed effect evaluation component for the Revion V Planning and Evaluation Workshop. However, since this particular component of the evaluation process is very often neglected in the development and presentation of workshops (despite the fact that evaluation has received considerable attention and support at all levels of government), this study has evolved in a broader sense to also advocate and serve as a model for the use of effect evaluation for such workshops in the future. The importance of this second function is enhanced by the fact that there is little in the way of related literature in circulation.

The 34 representatives who were involved in the workshop and who also constituted the experimental group were chosen from the 73 Regional Planning Units within the six-state region. The other 39 were assigned to the control group.

Since the actual selection process of the sample who attended the workshop was made before the commencement of this study and was somewhat vague as to relevant criteria, the most powerful research design possible for this study was a quasi-experimental non-equivalent control group design. Subsequent comparison of the

groups revealed some differences in regard to relevant variables but for the most part the groups were similar. Therefore, this design was considered appropriate under the circumstances.

Data collection and measurement were facilitated through use of a survey instrument which was developed specifically for this study. The instrument itself consisted of a questionnaire containing key concepts, techniques and strategies presented at the workshop. After each one, two Likert-type scales were presented to measure familiarity of and degrees of use for that item. The first scale was intended as a makeshift pre-test to obtain information prior to the workshop and the second was to obtain similar information afterwards (post-test). In addition, there were sections developed both to allow for more items to be included and to ascertain the relative influence of the workshop itself for any changes that might have been measured. Finally, a few questions were asked because the nature of some of the desired information was not readily amenable to measurement by the scales. (A second questionnaire was also developed, but it was not directly relevant to the purposes of this study.)

The questionnaires were mailed to all the agencies in both groups, complete with appropriate cover letters and return envelopes. Approximately one-third of the agencies responded to the initial inquiry, therefore a second mailing was made. From this a satisfactory response rate of 56 percent was obtained with an identical breakdown for each group.

The testable hypotheses were developed within the context of the research design and basically stated that:

1. The attendees would learn more concepts, techniques and strategies.
2. The attendees' agencies would use more concepts, techniques and strategies.
3. The attendees would know more concepts, techniques and strategies than would the non-attendees.
4. The attendees' agencies would use more concepts, techniques and strategies than would the non-attendees' agencies.

Analysis was primarily accomplished through the aid of a computer which determined mean overall and individual scores and standard deviations, conducted appropriate t-tests and produced frequency distributions and contingency tables. However, further tabulations, matchings and assorted other techniques were employed as necessary and did not require the use of the computer.

In order to test the hypotheses, the format for the comparisons were as follows:

1. Attendees' pre-test/post-test
2. Nonattendees' pre-test/post-test
3. Attendees' and nonattendees' pre-test
4. Attendees' and nonattendees' post-test

For each of these types of comparisons, the appropriate t-tests were made to determine statistical significance. Based on the results of the t-tests, frequency distributions and contingency tables were developed and examined from which ultimate acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses was made. In addition, comparison of some

discernible trends which did not have statistical significance was also made.

Statistically speaking, only one of the four alternate hypotheses could be accepted: the attendees used more planning and evaluation concepts, techniques and strategies after the workshop. However, it was also determined that absolute rates of increase (improvement) for the attendees was greater than that for non-attendees. Finally, some basic state-of-the-art information pertaining to the knowledge and use of various planning and evaluation technologies within Region V was generated as a by-product of the analyses.

Conclusions

1. The workshop reached the agencies that needed it most.

Although t-testing of the pre-test scores of both groups showed that they were basically similar prior to the workshop, there were seven items dealing with types of evaluations and analyses for which the nonattendee group demonstrated superiority. There were no iems for which the attendee group surpassed the nonattendees. Therefore, it is relatively safe to conclude that attendees had more to gain by attending the workshop than did nonattendees.

Assuming that the attendee group eventually demonstrated improvements after the workshop, this discovery would also be useful toward refuting a claim that attendees were more progressive as a group than nonattendees in the first place, which might cast doubt on the influence of the workshop itself.

2. Very few new planning and evaluation concepts, techniques or strategies were actually introduced to the people who attended the workshop.

Although the overwhelming majority of the respondents in the attendee group indicated at least one item which they were initially introduced to at the workshop, there was no general trend to learn many new areas. In fact, most of the respondents already were basically familiar with most of the items prior to the workshop. However, some even indicated "No Knowledge" after the workshop.

This does not mean that the attendees didn't learn more about the concepts, techniques and strategies at the workshop. As a matter of fact, the contrary would probably be true. However, due to the large amount of information needed for purposes of this study, it was largely impractical to try to develop scales that would measure how familiar respondents were with any particular item. Instead, the decision was made to measure only "knowledge" as opposed to "no knowledge."

3. There was increased use in the field of planning and evaluation concepts, techniques and strategies as a result of the workshop.

Each and every item received increased usage (in terms of Planning to Use, Some Use, or Much Use) by at least one of the attendees' agencies. However, when viewing the attendees as a group there was not a uniform, statistically significant increase. In

spite of this there were 12 items with recorded significant increases (which also formed the basis for accepting Hypothesis 2).

From the section of the questionnaire that was devoted to identifying extraneous variables it was apparent that the workshop itself was not the only influential factor in this increase in usage. Numerous other factors were cited. However, the workshop was by far the most common factor, so in spite of its somewhat limited effect it still was relatively influential.

Since the attendees were already familiar with most of the ideas presented at the workshop, the question arises as to why they weren't put in use before the workshop or regardless of it. As the previous paragraph indicates, some of them may indeed have been adopted without influence from the workshop. However, for those which were influenced by the workshop, there remains the question of why it was influential. The answer to this requires some speculation because the attendee respondents did not actually stipulate their reasons for adopting the information they received at the workshop.

Obviously, there was some need(s) that could be met by using the information, but beyond this there were probably three basic reasons upon which the influence of the workshop depended. (1) An attendee(s) was familiar with a particular item(s) but not enough so as to actually put it to use without further instruction, so no decision to do so had been made prior to the workshop. (2) The workshop was responsible for simply convincing the attendee(s) (and, ultimately, his/her agency) that it would be desirable and/or

practical to put a particular item(s) to use or increased use. (3) An agency (or agencies) had already planned to put a concept, technique or strategy to use, prior to the workshop but sent a representative anyway, so as to assure that it was properly prepared for the task.

4. The workshop was responsible for closing the gap that existed between the attendee group and the nonattendee group.

As was already indicated, the attendees were in slightly greater need of the workshop than the nonattendees. Analysis revealed that for the most part the attendees "caught up" to the nonattendees after the workshop. For example, on the post-test, the attendees increased their scores for 6 of the 7 items for which the nonattendees were significantly higher on the pre-test so that there was no longer a significant difference. In fact, there were even 3 items on the post-test for which the attendees scored significantly higher than the nonattendees. In addition, the absolute rates of increase from the pre-test scores to the post-test scores of the attendees were greater than that of the nonattendees for 29 of the 34 items.

From the results of the various analyses, it would not be possible to state that the attendees as a group actually surpassed the nonattendees as a result of their exposure to the workshop. However, it is interesting to note that had the level of significance for the statistical techniques been at .10 instead of .05, such an argument could have been made and validly so.

5. Since the workshop was successful in transferring technology which was subsequently used in the field, its existence was justified.

This study has shown that the workshop attained its overall goal (at least to an acceptable degree); therefore, it was useful and subsequently justifiable (from a utilitarian point of view). Furthermore, the fact that it was successful also serves to justify the various expenditures associated with developing and conducting it. And, as was pointed out in Chapter I, justification of the costs is also necessary in order to justify the workshop even within the context of an effect evaluation.

In the interest of fairness and objectivity, it should be emphasized that justification of the workshop at the level of effect evalution alone does not necessarily ensure that in the final analysis it will be proven to have been a worthwhile endeavor. The results of the process, effort, impact and, especially, efficiency evaluations that were conducted for the workshop must also be considered and weighed into any final decision.

In addition, and from a realistic point of view, the final determination of the overall worth of the workshop will probably rest with an administrator(s) within LEAA, rather than the researchers who evaluated it. Therefore, it would be inappropriate as well as premature to state with authority that the workshop was successful, all things considered. However, solely within the context of this study, the conclusion that the workshop was successful and justifiable would hold true.

Discussion

Since a formal theory was not a major issue in the development of the evaluation of which this study consists, and the conceptual frameowrk employed was not elaborate, a discussion of how the results of evaluation relate to that conceptual framework does not need to be very elaborate either. Basically, the findings are consistent within that framework, and support the theory that workshops for criminal justice practitioners facilitate improved performance in the field (as measured by the utilization or increased utilization of "new and better" concepts, techniques and strategies).

There were two assumptions associated with this conceptual framework which were restated as hypotheses and the results of the evalutation were basically consistent with both of them. One of the assumptions stated that workshop attendees would naturally apply their new skills when back in their ordinary work setting. Notwithstanding the fact that there may have been forces which prevented them from doing so,[35] the results of the study showed that this was, indeed, the case.

The second assumption stated that people can be taught new skills in a workshop setting. From the fact that new skills were actually put to use it can be inferred that this assumption was also correct. It should be noted, however, that there were no tests to measure the competency with which the new skills were being used, i.e., how well the attendees learned them.

---

[35]An example of this can be found in Question 7, Appendix C.

Although not related to the conceptual framework itself, it might be appropriate to further discuss in brief some of the potential problems which were particular to and encountered in this evaluation. We would like to take this opportunity to summarize the potential limitations because of possible negative effects they could have on the validity and reliability of results.

The actual selection of agencies and individuals within them to attend the workshop was made both prior to and without regard to the evaluation, and the criteria for this process was neither uniform nor readily discernible. This raises a question as to the representativeness of the experimental group to the whole population of RPU's in Region V which, in turn, is a major requirement for external validity and the research design employed in this study. Even though efforts to determine selection criteria seemed to show that it may have been on the basis of need, this conclusion could not really be considered very strong. Also, the determination that both groups were roughly equivalent in most respects was made but this was not absolutely certain either.

There was no pre-test or baseline data available prior to the workshop and such information was vital to the research design and hypotheses tests. Therefore, pre-test information was obtained at the same time as the post-test information. This increased the likelihood that responses would be biased.

A combination of both nominal and ordinal data was obtained through the Likert scales in the questionnaire. However, analysis required that this information be treated as though it was

interval data. Such a procedure is somewhat methodologically inappropriate.

Finally, the initial phase of analysis involved tests for statistical significance. Ultimately, however, acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses was based on the subjective process of examining and comparing frequency distributions and contingency tables for the various items which showed significant differences.

It should be pointed out that none of these potential problems necessarily biased the outcome of the study. In fact, numerous attempts were made and have already been cited to minimize or account for these shortcomings. However, it is important to note that since they could not be completely controlled, there is an increased probability that they might have adversely influenced the findings. We do not believe that this was the case, but the possibility still exists.

Recommendations

As a result of this study there are several implications that can be made which deal with both the workshop itself and with the evaluation component. Such implications are presented here in the form of recommendations concerning the future of Criminal Justice In-Service Training Workshops and their evaluations.

The Workshop

1. A second Planning and Evaluation Workshop should be considered for the benefit of those RPU's in Region V which were not included in the first one.

Even though the nonattendee group demonstrated a slight edge over the attendees prior to the workshop, the difference was not functionally significant. Therefore, considering the fact that many of the attendee agencies did benefit from the workshop, it stands to reason that the nonattendee agencies could also derive some benefits from a "repeat performance," so to speak.

In addition, it might be desirable on the part of some of the RPU's who sent a representative to the first workshop to allow a second person the opportunity to attend the workshop. Such first-hand experience would likely prove more advantageous to everyone involved than having to rely on someone else to relate all the information which was presented at the workshop.

The overriding consideration in regard to repeating the workshop would be desire to attend it. Before going so far as to actually plan a second one, it would be wise to contact the agencies which were not involved with the first one and inquire as to their interest in participating in a second one. Similar efforts could be made to those agencies which did send a representative to the first workshop to find out if they would like to send someone else.

2. <u>The use of the Planning and Evaluation Workshop should be expanded to include the RPU's in other regions</u>.

It is hardly likely that Region V is alone in its need for improvements in the area of planning and evaluation. Many of the needs and problems which the RPU's in this region face are shared

throughout the country. Therefore, in the interests of improving the criminal justice system as a whole, it would be pragmatic to offer this workshop or some variation of it to other interested regions and the RPU's within them.

Of course, it might be necessary to modify the workshop to fit the specific needs of the RPU's who would attend it (in addition to the revisions which will hopefully result from the various evaluations of this workshop). However, the general content of the workshop has "something for everyone" and RPU's throughout the country could undoubtedly benefit from the experience.

3. Workshops with different subject matter and content should be developed and conducted for RPU's and their personnel whenever there is a need for such information.

Workshops dealing with various other subjects are currently being developed and conducted to a limited degree. However, since the primary difference between them and this particular type of workshop is often only in the issue(s) being addressed, the success of the Planning and Evaluation Workshop provides a strong argument in favor of the usefulness of future similar endeavors. This is especially true when referring back to the theory that usable technology can be transferred through the use of training workshops. As was discussed in Chapter I, this workshop could be considered a pioneer effort and as such could have considerable impact and bearing on the future of training workshops.

The Evaluation Component

4. An Effect Evaluation Component should be incorporated into every workshop as a minimum requirement.

Due to the emphasis on the evaluation of criminal justice programs, Effect Evaluation is a must, especially since the first question usually asked about a workshop would be "Does it work?" This is not to say that that the other types of evaluations are less important. On the contrary, Impact and Efficiency Evaluations would probably be considered necessary also (even if Process and Effort Evaluations were not). However, knowing whether the workshop accomplished its goals or not is an indispensable part of the evaluation process.

5. The Evaluation Component should be developed simultaneously with the actual planning and development of a workshop itself.

To avoid the problems that were encountered in this study and to ensure a more valid evaluation of any type (not just effect evaluation), the evaluation component should be given careful consideration "before the fact."

Some of the steps that should be included in this regard are:

a. Make explicity the selection criteria of the agencies or people who would attend a workshop (whatever those criteria may be). In this way it will be easier to establish both the experimental and control groups and the appropriate research design.

b. Develop a questionnaire or other acceptable survey instrument prior to the workshop which can adequately measure the relevant variables (the information to be presented) in regard to the type(s) of evaluation that is desired. It should be developed so as to be usable as both a pre-test and post-test even though some modifications may be necessary.

c. Plan in advance the type of analysis(es) that will be necessary and appropriate for the nature of the data collected.

d. Administer the pre-test to both the experimental and control groups prior to the workshop.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO STATE PLANNING AGENCIES

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE · SCHOOL OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEMS CENTER
BAKER HALL · (517) 353-8603

EAST LANSING · MICHIGAN · 48824

May 17, 1976

Sometime last fall, your agency was informed of a Planning and Evaluation Workshop for State Planning Agency and Regional Planning Unit planners in Region V that would be conducted in December, 1975, in Chicago. You were asked to select some representatives from the Regional Planning Units within your state to attend that workshop.

I am currently in the process of evaluating the impact of that workshop on the agencies who sent representatives. In the research design that I am using, sample subjects will come from the agencies that sent representatives. Therefore, I am very interested in knowing how these particular sample subjects were obtained.

Towards this end, I would be grateful if you would assist me with a short letter explaining your selection criteria for determining which Regional Planning Units would send representatives (i.e., on what basis were the particular agencies chosen?) Also, if you had initially selected an agency to send a representative, but for some reason that agency did not or could not send a representative, please indicate so and briefly state the reason.

If you are interested in the results of the study, mention that in your letter and the results will be mailed to you as soon as possible.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at any time. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated and will be important towards establishing the validity of the study.

Sincerely,

Robert A. Smith
Research Associate
Criminal Justice Systems Center

RAS/j

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRES

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRES

PLANNING AND EVALUATION SURVEY

Name of Your Agency_____

Address_____

Level: SPA_____ RPU_____ Other_____

State_____ Your Name_____

Would you like the results of this survey mailed to you?_____

Part I

Directions: Items 1-39 make up a list of terms representing ideas, approaches and techniques. For each term decide to what extent it was understood and/or put to use by your agency PRIOR TO JANUARY 1, 1976. Then choose the number from the key below that corresponds to your decision, and circle the same number on the scale to the immediate right of the term.

Next, decide to what extent the idea, approach or technique represented by the term has been or will be put to use by your agency DURING THE 1976 CALENDAR YEAR. Using the same key, choose the number that corresponds to your decision and circle the same number on the second scale to the far right of the term.

Example: If before 1976, your agency knew what simulations are but didn't use them, and now you are making some use of them, you would look in the key below at number "2--familiar with but no use." You would then circle the number "2" on the scale (before 1976) to the immediate right of the word "Simulations." Next you would look at number "4--some use" and circle the number "4" on the scale (1976) to the far right of the word "Simulations."

		Before 1976					1976				
29.	Simulations	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

Key: 1--not familiar with term
2--familiar with, but no use
3--(before 1976) planned to use/
1976 planning to use by end of 1976
calendar year
4--some use
5--much use

Key: 1--not familiar with term
2--familiar with, but no use
3--(before 1976) planned to use/
(1976) planning to use by end of 1976 calendar year
4--some use
5--much use

		Before 1976					1976				
1.	Monitoring	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Intensive evaluation (LEAA Defined)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Process evaluation	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Effort evaluation	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Impact evaluation	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Efficiency evaluation	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Effect evaluation	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Crime trend analysis	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Data needs analysis	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Socioeconmic and demographic data analysis	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Criminal justice system flow data	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Calls for service data	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Criminal history data	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Criminal justice agency resource data	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Offender-based transaction statistics	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Normative planning	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Strategic planning	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Operational planning	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Uniform crime report data in frequencies	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

Key: 1--not familiar with term
2--familiar with, but no use
3--(before 1976) planned to use/
(1976) planning to use by end of 1976 calendar year
4--some use
5--much use

		Before 1976					1976				
20.	Uniform crime report data in rates	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
21.	Ratios of offenses to potential targets	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Relationship between the number of crimes and the number of criminals	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
23.	Linear extrapolation	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
24.	Controls against threats to external validity	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
25.	Controls against threats to internal validity	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
26.	Controls against threats to reliability	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
27.	Delphi technique	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
28.	Scenarios	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
29.	Simulations	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
30.	Impact models of social interventions	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
31.	Amoeba Model of the criminal justice system	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
32.	Community assessement approach	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
33.	Citizen involvement in the planning process (not including regional councils)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
34.	Feedback to local units as to the quality of their work	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

Key: 1--not familiar with term
2--familiar with, but no use
3--(before 1976) planned to use/
(1976) planning to use by end of 1976 calendar year
4--some use
5--much use

Please include any additional ideas, approaches or techniques that your agency has used or plans to use during the 1976 calendar year. (Use another sheet of paper, if necessary, and continue the numbering starting with #40.)

Idea, Approach of Technique	Before 1976	1976
35. _____	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
_____		
36. _____	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
_____		
37. _____	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
_____		
38. _____	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
_____		
39. _____	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
_____		

Part II

Directions: Go back and look over each of the terms. For each, and only each, term above that you indicated some degree of change for (i.e., different numbers circled on the two scales to the right of the term), please indicate below what prompted or influenced the change.

First, list the item number of the term and then the influential factor(s) or source(s) of change. You may list two or more item numbers on the same line if they have the same source of change. Also, you may list two or more sources of change on the same line for any item number, if the change was influenced by more than one source. (Use another sheet of paper if necessary.)

Example: If before 1976 your agency was familiar with, but didn't use simulations ("2" from the key) and now makes some use of them ("4" from the key), fill in the item number for "Simulations" (#29) and then indicate briefly what influenced your agency to start making some use of simulations.

Item Number(s)	Source(s) of Change
_____	read a book on simulations

Item Number(s)	Source(s) of Change
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Part III

41. List the major steps that you take in developing a plan._____

_____

_____

42.a. How many books and/or articles concerning criminal justice planning, if any, have you read since January 1, 1976?_____

b. Identify the most important._____

_____

_____

43.a. If a Planning and Evaluation Workshop were held, would your agency send a representative to it (assuming all expenses would be reimbursed)? Yes_____ No_____

b. If yes, why?_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU

PLANNING AND EVALUATION WORKSHOP
SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONNAIRE

We are aware that either you or someone else from your agency attended the LEAA Region V Planning and Evaluation Workshop held December 2-5, 1975. Since we are currently in the process of evaluating that workshop, we would greatly appreciate your further cooperation at this time by providing us with some additional feedback concerning that workshop.

1. Did you personally attend the workshop? Yes_____ No_____

2. Now that some time has passed since the workshop, what is your present judgment (or that of whoever else attended) as to whether the information provided had practical application in regard to your agency's present duties?

   None_____ Some_____ Much_____

3. How intellectually stimulating did you personally (or whoever else attended) find the workshop?

   Not at all_____ Somewhat_____ Very_____

4. Since returning from the workshop, how would you (or whoever else attended) now rate the sessions in terms of their relevance to your agency's regular work setting? (SCALE: 1 = very relevant through 5 = not relevant)

   Problem Identification: Systems Approach _____
   Problem Identification: Data and Data Sources _____
   Planning Exercise _____
   Developing the Plan _____
   Constraints on Planning _____
   Citizen Involvement _____
   Evaluation _____

5. What was your agency's attitude towards the idea of a Planning and Evaluation Workshop before you (or whoever else) attended?

   _____ Favorable
   _____ Indifferent
   _____ Unfavorable
   _____ Other (specify)_____

6. Why did your agency send a representative to the workshop?

_____

_____

7.a. Are there any external factors (i.e., forces outside your agency) that have hindered or prevented your agency from using any of the information that was brought back from the workshop?

Yes_____ No_____

b. If yes, explain. _____

_____

_____

8.a. Has any of the information from the workshop been used, is it being used, or will it be used during 1976 to train anybody?

Yes_____ No_____

b. If yes, explain. _____

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ADDITIONAL COOPERATION

APPENDIX C

RESULTS OF SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX C

RESULTS OF SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Appendix C contains the summarized results of the secondary (supplemental) questionnaire which was sent to the agencies who sent representatives to the workshop.

The workshop was divided into seven separate sessions. Question 4 asks the respondent to rate the 7 sessions in terms of their relevance to the respondents' regular work setting. This same question was asked of 28 attendees at the conclusion of the workshop. Since most of the respondents in both cases identified themselves, it was possible to match the mean scores of 16 people who responded on both occasions. By doing this we were able to determine changes in the attendees' opinions of the relevance of the workshop over time (approximately six months).

The mean scores of both inquiries are included in this summary. Visual comparison of them shows a general trend to view the workshop sessions as less relevant over time.

1. Did you personally attend the workshop?

	#	%
Yes	17	89
No	2	11

2. Now that some time has passed since the workshop, what is your present judgment (or that of whoever attended) as to whether the information provided had practical application in regard to your agencies' present duties?

	#	%
None	0	0
Some	15	79
Much	4	21

3. How intellectually stimulating did you personally (or whoever attended) find the workshop?

	#	%
Not at all	1	5
Somewhat	7	37
Very	11	58

4. Since returning from the workshop, how would you (or whoever attended) now rate the sessions in terms of their relevance to your agencies' regular work setting? (SCALE: 1 = very relevant through 5 = not relevant.)

Session	Total Respondents		Matched Respondents	
	First Inquiry (N=28) M	Second Inquiry (N=19) M	First Inquiry (N=16) M	Second Inquiry (N=16) M
Problem identification systems approach	1.79	2.37	1.56	2.38
Problem identification data & data sources	2.04	2.74	2.19	2.75
Planning exercise	1.93	2.37	2.19	2.38
Developing this plan	2.00	2.84	2.06	2.88
Constraints on planning	2.56	2.74	2.00	2.75
Citizen involvement	3.00	3.00	2.94	3.00
Evaluation	2.35	2.89	2.69	2.88

5. What was your agency's attitude towards the idea of a Planning and Evaluation Workshop before you (or whoever else) attended?

	#	%
Favorable	12	63
Indifferent	6	32
Unfavorable	1	5
Other	0	0

6. Why did your agency send a representative to the workshop?

Reason	No. of Times Cited
1. Self-improvement or increased knowledge	11
2. Develop contacts with others	4
3. Designated by state (either chosen or offered)	4
4. Paid for	3
5. Don't know why	2

7.a. Are there any external factors (i.e., forces outside your agency) that have hindered or prevented your agency from using any of the information brought back from the workshop?

	#	%
Yes	15	79
No	4	21

7.b. If yes, explain.

Factor	No. of Times Cited
Politics	5
Inability to obtain data from other agencies	5
Not enough staff	2
SPA limitations	2
Not enough financial support	2
Not enough time	2

8.a. Has any of the information from the workshop been used, is it being used, or will it be used during 1976 to train anybody?

	#	%
Yes	15	79
No	4	21

8.b. If yes, explain.

Type of Information	No. of Times Cited
Crime trend analysis and linear projections	6
Systems approach	2
Data and data services	2
Comprehensive plan development	2

APPENDIX D

COVER LETTERS

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE • SCHOOL OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
LINTON HALL • (517) 353-8603

EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN • 48824

April 30, 1976

Dear

The Criminal Justice Systems Center at Michigan State University is currently conducting a survey on the utilization of planning and evaluation concepts and techniques at the Regional Planning Unit level of Region V. We would appreciate your assistance in this endeavor by completing and returning the accompanying questionnaire no later than May 14, 1976. A stamped, return envelope is enclosed for this purpose.

We are aware that your agency sent a representative to the LEAA-sponsored Planning and Evaluation Workshop held last December in Chicago. If at all possible, please have the person who attended that workshop complete this "Planning and Evaluation Survey" questionnaire.

We have also enclosed a short questionnaire pertaining to the December workshop itself. We would greatly appreciate it if the person who attended the workshop would also fill out this second questionnaire and return it in the same envelope as the "Planning and Evaluation Survey" questionnaire.

If you have any questions about the questionnaire, or the survey itself, please feel free to contact me for clarification.

Also, if you would be interested in obtaining the results of the survey, please indicate so on the first page of the questionnaire. The results will then be mailed to you upon completion of the study.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Robert A. Smith, Research Associate
Criminal Justice Systems Center

RAS/cc

Enclosures

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE · SCHOOL OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEMS CENTER
BAKER HALL · (517) 353-8603

EAST LANSING · MICHIGAN · 48824

April 30, 1976

The Criminal Justice Systems Center at Michigan State University is currently conducting a survey on the utilization of planning and evaluation concepts and techniques at the Regional Planning Unit level in Region V. We would appreciate your assistance in this endeavor by having the person in your agency with the most expertise in planning and evaluation techniques complete and return the accompanying questionnaire no later than May 14, 1976. A stamped return envelope is enclosed for this purpose.

If you would be interested in obtaining the results of the survey, please indicate so on the first page of the questionnaire. The results will then be mailed to you upon completion of the study.

Also, if you have any questions about the questionnaire or the survey itself, please feel free to contact me for clarification.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Robert A. Smith
Research Associate
Criminal Justice Systems Center

RAS/jb

Enclosure

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE · SCHOOL OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
LINTON HALL · (517) 353-8603

EAST LANSING · MICHIGAN · 48824

June 11, 1976

Enclosed you will find copies of a cover letter and questionnaire(s) that were mailed to you approximately a month ago. Please complete and return the questionnaire(s) by June 30, 1976. Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated. If you have already responded to the first mailing, please disregard this letter and accept my thanks.

Sincerely,

Robert A. Smith
Research Associate
Criminal Justice Center

RAS/wah

Enclosures

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Chabotar, Kent J., and Lad, Lawrence J. Evaluation Guidelines for Training Programs. Lansing: State of Michigan, 1974.

Davis, Larry N., and McCullan, Earl. Planning, Conducting, Evaluating Workshops. Austin, Texas: Learning Concepts, Inc., 1975.

Fink, C. Dennis. "An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Workshops for Facilitating the Transfer of Technology." Alexandria, Va.: Human Resources Research Organization, March 1976.

Hartl, David E. "Technical Assistance Delivery Skills II: Developing Conferences, Workshops and Seminars." Los Angeles: University of Southern California, 1976.

Kimberling, William C., and Fryback, John T. "Systematic Evaluation of Criminal Justice Projects: A State of the Art in the United States." Journal of Criminal Justice 1, No. 2 (Summer 1973).

Lewis, Ralph G. The Evaluation Process in Criminal Justice Programs. East Lansing: Criminal Justice Systems Center, Michigan State University, 1975.

Michigan Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice. Criminal Justice Goals and Standards for the State of Michigan. Lansing: State of Michigan, 1974.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. Criminal Justice System. Washington D.C.: Governmenting Printing Office, 1973.

_____. A National Strategy to Reduce Crime. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973.

United States Code Congressional and Administrative News. October 15 to October 20, 1976. St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Co., 1976, p. 5809.

Weidman, Donald R. Intensive Evaluation for Criminal Justice Planning Agencies. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, 1975.