



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Services des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

CANADIAN THESES

THÈSES CANADIENNES

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

**THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED**

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

**LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE**

The Evaluation Of Social Programs:
Does Anything Work?

Joseph Heillic

A Thesis
in
The Department
of
Sociology

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts at
Concordia University
Montréal, Québec, Canada

April 1985

© Joseph Heillic, 1985

ABSTRACT

The Evaluation of Social Programs: Does Anything Work?

Joseph Heilig

A high percentage of the evaluations of social programs indicate that these programs have little or no effect on the social problems they set out to ameliorate. This may be because of faulty evaluation methodology, faulty program design, or because both program and evaluation fail to address the root causes of the social problem.

This study compares the evaluation reports of 10 different programs in the health and social service field. Programs and their evaluations are examined through both a "normative" and a "critical" perspective. Six out of ten "normative" evaluations produced conclusive results. Four of ten "normative" programs appeared to achieve their goals, with another two achieving partial success. Factors contributing to conclusive evaluations appear to include the incorporation of evaluation procedures into a program at its inception, a co-operative climate permitting access to data, and use of the classic experimental model.

The results of an evaluation appear to have little effect on the continuation or cancellation of a program. Viewed through a "critical" perspective, "normative" programs fail to address the root causes of social problems, and cannot be evaluated.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to pay tribute to the three teachers who have most influenced my university career.

To Dick McDonald, who ten years ago encouraged me to make the transition from long-time business executive to full-time university student, and who has remained my friend and mentor at every crossroad since;

To Bill Reimer, my Thesis Advisor, whose introductory course first turned me on to Sociology, and who has guided my progress through the Masters program to the present point;

And to John Jackson who showed me how to apply the uses of Sociology to the real world of social service and community organizations;

My sincere thanks for their help, guidance, and encouragement.

Joe Heillig

April, 1985

CONTENTS

List of figures and Tables vii

I INTRODUCTION I

 Methodology
 Source of Data

II EVALUATION RESEARCH 5

 What is Evaluation Research?
 The Growing Need for Evaluation
 Evaluation Methodology
 Compromises to Ideal Methodology
 Political Issues and Climate of the Evaluation
 Summary

 SOCIAL PROBLEMS -- TWO THEORETICAL APPROACHES 9

 What Is A Social Problem?
 Who Decides?
 Five Possible Perspectives
 Two Theoretical Bases
 "Normative" and "Critical" Approaches to Solutions

 SOCIAL PROBLEMS ARISING OUT OF THE "NORMATIVE" 16
 APPROACH

 The Helping Agency's Approach
 The Role of Evaluation Research
 Critique of the "Normative" Approach
 Summary

 SOCIAL PROBLEMS ARISING OUT OF THE "CRITICAL" 20
 APPROACH

 Some Strategies for Social Change
 The Role of Evaluation research
 Evaluation Methodology
 Involvement -- A Goal in Itself?
 Critique of the "Critical" Approach

 OTHER FACTORS 26

 The Issue of Values
 Organizational Issues
 History and Ideology
 Internal and External Pressures
 Expectations Arising Out Of Theoretical Background
 How the Research Questions Will Be Answered

III THE RESEARCH DESIGN	36
The Plan For the Study	
Issues in Evaluation Research	
Issues Which Might Affect Program Delivery	
The "Unfortunately" Factor	
Source of Data	
The Sample	
Further Sources for a Follow-Up Study	
The Process -- Content Analysis	
Strengths and Weaknesses of the Methodology	
The Checklist or Grid	
Definitions of the Typologies	
PROGRAM VARIABLES	44
EVALUATION VARIABLES	46
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	49
"Unfortunately" Factor	
Other Variables	
Hidden Agenda	
Outcome to Agency	
Evaluating Community Organization Programs	
IV SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	72
Issue of Values	
Evaluation of Evaluations	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	79
APPENDIX "A"	84

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

Figure 1. When the Evaluation of a "Normative" Program Shows "No Effect"

Figure 2. When the Evaluation of a "Critical" Program Shows "No Effect"

TABLE 1 Relationship Between Evaluation Results and Program Results

TABLE 2A Relationship Between Type of Social Problem and Evaluation Methodology

TABLE 2B Relationship Between Type of Social Problem and Evaluation Climate

TABLE 2C Relationship Between Type of Social Problem and Evaluation Status

TABLE 3A Relationship Between Type of Program and Evaluation Methodology

TABLE 3B Relationship Between Type of Program and Evaluation Climate

TABLE 3C Relationship Between Type of Program and Evaluation Status

TABLE 4A Relationship Between Program Ideology and Evaluation Methodology

TABLE 4B Relationship Between Program Ideology and Evaluation Climate

TABLE 4C Relationship Between Program Ideology and Evaluation Status

TABLE 5A Relationship Between Program Methodology and Evaluation Methodology

TABLE 5B Relationship Between Program Methodology and Evaluation Climate

TABLE 5C Relationship Between Program Methodology and Evaluation Status

TABLE 6A Relationship Between Project History and Evaluation Methodology

TABLE 6B Relationship Between Project History and Evaluation Climate

TABLE 6C Relationship Between Project History and Evaluation Status

TABLE 7.2 The "Unfortunately" Factor

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

This study arose out of the author's experience as a community worker, involved in and associated with a number of different programs in the health and social services field.

Curiosity about the effectiveness and the outcome of specific projects was matched by disappointment at the superficiality and inconclusiveness of the program evaluations of which the author was aware.

Funding agencies, policy-makers and administrators increasingly demand that some attempt be made to determine the effectiveness of public service and social action programs. In addition, the professionals engaged in running the programs need feedback to guide them.

And yet readings in the field of evaluation research confirm that the results of program evaluations are very often disappointing. For example, Weiss (1972) admits that few examples can be quoted of important contributions to policy and program. Rowe, (1981) states that it is difficult, from evaluation studies, to make definitive statements on the effectiveness of juvenile delinquency prevention programs.

Mann's (1972: 269) study of the evaluation of almost 200 programs in psychotherapy, counselling, human relations, led him to conclude that trying to scientifically evaluate such complex human relations activities is virtually

impossible.

And yet doubts about evaluation research are matched by continuing questions about the programs themselves. To the question: "does anything work?" Fischer (1978) concludes from an appraisal of twenty outcome studies that there is not clear evidence that any form of social work is effective. Wright and Dixon (1979), examining studies of juvenile delinquency prevention programs are led to question the effectiveness of these intervention strategies.

Why is it that such a high percentage of evaluations appear to be unsatisfactory in producing creditable information on which decisions can be based?

Evaluation studies of action programs in the social and health services seem to indicate that a high proportion of these programs fail to solve the social problems to which they are addressed. Three possibilities to be explored are: (1) that the methodology of the evaluation is at fault; (2) that the design of the program is improper; (3) or that both program and evaluation fail to address the root causes of the social problems they are designed to correct.

This study will attempt to discover which of these possibilities is correct.

Methodology

The study will take the form of a review of a selection of evaluations as reported in the literature on crime prevention, delinquency, alcohol and drug addiction, family planning, and other human service

programs.

A typology of programs and of evaluations will be formulated, and the cases will be examined in the light of that typology. By charting the characteristics of both programs and their evaluations, it is hoped that an association may be found between type of evaluation, type of program, success of the program in meeting its objectives, and the effect of the evaluation on the program.

Source of Data

Since this study is to be based on a review of the literature, sources of data will include a range of published reports of evaluations that have been done in the various fields of interest. These will include books of readings on evaluations; studies published by the Solicitor General of Canada and Provincial Ministries, Health and Welfare Canada, and other government agencies if available; journals including Evaluation and Change, Evaluation and Program Planning, Evaluation Review, as well as journals in education, criminology, social work, and other fields which report on evaluations from time to time.

Chapter II will first review the literature on evaluation research. It will examine the growing demand by funding sources for evaluations, the political nature of evaluation research, and various factors which affect the climate in which evaluation is done.

Chapter II will also examine social problems and will focus upon two theoretical approaches through which social

problems may be identified: the "normative" and the "critical."

The critical Theory of Reasons and Perdue (1981) will be used as the basis on which both of these theoretical approaches are explored.

In addition, labelling theory will be examined, with particular attention being focused on the writings of Edelman (1977) and Platt (1969).

Next, we will focus on the application of the two theoretical perspectives, "normative" and "critical," to the design of social programs and to the evaluations of those programs. The issue of values will be examined in the light of its relevance to evaluation research. A critique will be offered on each of the two approaches concerning their usefulness for the examination of social programs and their evaluations.

Finally, this chapter will examine some of the organizational issues which can affect the delivery of social services and the evaluations of those services. Such issues include the history and ideology of the organization, as well as political pressures both inside and outside of the organization which can affect priorities and services.

Chapter III will deal with the research portion of this study. It will describe the methodology, will define the typologies which make up the variables used in the research, and will present the findings of the study.

Chapter IV will conclude the study with observations and conclusions drawn from the findings.

Chapter II. EVALUATION RESEARCH

What is evaluation research?

Suchman (1971: 10) defines evaluation research as "the use of the scientific method for collecting data concerning the degree to which some specified activity achieves some desired effect." Caro (1971: 2) refers to evaluation as "the procedure by which programs are studied to ascertain their effectiveness in the fulfilment of goals." According to Weiss (1972: 4) "the purpose of evaluation research is to measure the effects of a program against the goals it set out to accomplish as a means of contributing to subsequent decision-making about the program and improving further programming."

Another way of putting it might be to say that evaluation research sets out to measure and quantify the effects of human interactions in human service programs, in an attempt to rationalize the expenditure of money and effort on such services.

The growing need for evaluation

As Suchman (1971: 2) reminds us, "all social institutions or subsystems... are required to give proof of their legitimacy and effectiveness in order to justify society's continued support." Pointing to the increasing sums being spent on social service programs at the same time that the effectiveness of many programs is being seriously questioned, Caro (1971) suggests that evaluation has a vital

role to play in strengthening and improving these programs.

Weiss (1972) agrees that decision makers at all levels want and need some rational basis on which to decide on the continuation, expansion or cancellation of specific social programs, and that evaluation research appears well suited to the task of producing the requisite information.

On the simplest level, then, we see that evaluation research is increasingly being used to provide "scientific" information on which sound decisions about funding and programming can be based.

On another level, as we shall see later, evaluation research is also being used to rationalize or justify a wide variety of political decisions, not necessarily related to the optimum delivery of social or health services.

Evaluation Methodology

Evaluation applies the methods of social research. Principles and methods that apply to all other types of research apply here as well. Weiss notes that everything we know about design, measurement and analysis comes into play in planning and conducting an evaluation study.

Under ideal circumstances, and following the standard experimental model, the goals of the social program or project are clearly spelled out, agreement is reached between program operators and evaluation researchers on the factors defining "success" and the indices which measure progress or improvement; methods of recording and

measuring those indices are established.

A control group is found which matches the client group receiving treatment. Both groups are measured before, during, and at intervals after treatment. Differences in performance of the two groups are attributed to the program's treatment.

But evaluators must often work in circumstances less than ideal for scientific research, and frequently encounter a wide variety of problems of measurement and design. Some of these, cited in reports, include:

- the inability to find a control group;
- the absence of pertinent records or data;
- lack of support by those funding the evaluation, leading to insufficient money or time to do adequate research;
- hostility of workers on the project being evaluated, often leading to the withholding of needed information.

Compromises to ideal methodology

Where the ideal is impossible, the ingenuity of the researcher is brought into play. Weiss describes a number of quasi-experimental and non-experimental designs in which researchers do the best they can with the data available.

It must be remembered, though, that the further removed from the ideal experimental design, the more doubtful the validity of the findings, and thus the more difficult it is to attribute changes in the client group to the agency's

program.

Political issues and climate of the evaluation;

Suchman (1971: 16) argues that, unlike basic research in the behavioral sciences, evaluation research applies the scientific method to problems that have administrative consequences. This is to say, in effect, that evaluation research is a political act, since the outcome of an evaluation can affect the life or death of a program, and the careers of its administrators and workers.

What are some of the implications of this for the quality of the research?

There are circumstances, particularly in new pilot projects, where it is in the political interest of program operators to work closely and harmoniously with the evaluators in order to project good results and encourage continued funding.

On the other hand, there are other issues that combine to make the whole question of evaluation research suspect in the eyes of the program workers on whom the evaluator depends for data. For example; program administrators and workers may resent the time and energy required to provide data for the evaluation: time taken from providing services to clients; friction can arise from differences in personality between the humanist-oriented practitioner and the detached and uncommitted researcher; the adversary or judgmental nature of evaluation is likely to provoke anxiety and hostility on the part of

agency staff whose program may be viewed as threatened; there may be hidden agendas behind the evaluation; for example, evaluations have been used as an excuse to delay or postpone a decision, as a way of getting an administrator "off the hook," and as justification for an unpopular decision.

Supposedly neutral evaluations can be used to decide between the wishes of two opposing factions; as an excuse to kill a politically dangerous program; or as a form of public relations to make governments or funding bodies look good.

Political issues such as these have a powerful effect on the cooperative or hostile atmosphere surrounding the research. Thus we might expect that the climate in which the work is done would have a strong bearing on the quality of the evaluation research.

SUMMARY

In summary, the practice of sound evaluation research is often beset by methodological problems, and coloured by political and interpersonal issues. These are among the factors we must keep in mind as we study the evaluation of programs, organizations, and agencies which deal with social problems.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS - TWO THEORETICAL APPROACHES

What is a social problem?

Henshel & Henshel (1973) define social problems as "situations related to social factors that adversely affect significant numbers of individuals in a similar way."

In Horton & Leslie's (1970) definition, a social problem is "a condition affecting a significant number of people in ways considered undesirable, about which it is felt something can be done through collective social action."

Blumer (1971) states that social problems are fundamentally products of a process of collective definition instead of existing independently as a set of objective social arrangements with an intrinsic makeup. In his view, social problems are the product of a collective process. This process is responsible for the emergence of social problems, for the way in which they are seen, for the way in which they are approached and considered, for the kind of official remedial plan which is laid out, and and for the transformation of this plan in its application.

Clearly, a social problem exists because a "significant number" of people say it does. Horton and Leslie point out that no condition, no matter how dramatic or shocking to someone else, is a social problem unless and until the values of a considerable number of people in the society define it as a problem.

Who decides?

Clearly, too, the question of values is of prime importance to the identifying of such a problem. Whose values are offended? Whose interests are at stake? This question, a most significant one in the search for an understanding of social problems, is signalled by Reasons

and Perdue:

"The student of social problems must critically assess the interests of those perceiving a phenomenon and attempting to make it a social problem, and those vying interests that attempt to keep the phenomenon from being designated a social problem." (1981: 53).

Five possible perspectives

Since the identification of social problems is a collective process, it is not surprising that there should exist a variety of views on their causes.

Rubington and Weinberg (1971) offer five perspectives through which social problems may be viewed:

1. SOCIAL PATHOLOGY: which follows the organic analogy of early sociology, described by Mills (1943). "What exists is defined according to what ought to be." Health is good, deviation is sick and bad; thus a social problem is a violation of moral expectations. Under this perspective, juvenile delinquency, for example, is held to result from the bad character, or evil nature of the young perpetrator.

2. SOCIAL DISORGANIZATION: believed to be caused by population movement, urban living, factory work, conflict between rural and urban values, this perspective arises out of the work of Park and others of the Chicago School. "Taken together, three factors - immigration, urbanization, industrialization - establish a broad social and cultural base for a host of undesirable conditions that came to be known as social

problems." Juvenile delinquency would be seen here as resulting from growing up in slum conditions and the pressures of inner-city life.

3. DEVIANT BEHAVIOR: Based on the anomic theories of Durkheim and Merton and on Sutherland's theory of differential association. As sociological theories became more systematic and more tested, sociology gained the right to define the problems in need of study. Social problems became defined almost exclusively by the notion of a departure from the rules. Juvenile delinquents would be viewed, under this perspective, as alienated, rebellious "drop-outs" taking out their hostility towards society through deviant behavior.

4. VALUE CONFLICT: Where the earlier perspectives emphasized order, and located disorder in the inadequacies of individuals, of "background" or of rules, conflict theorists such as Coser, Simmel and Dahrendorf turn immorality (disorder) on its head by claiming that there is a morality in an individual's defense of his or her own interests against those of persons, groups, creeds, or norms that differ from his or her own. This perspective suggests that juvenile delinquents should be seen as victims of an oppressive social system which has made them the way they are. Their "acting out" is an understandable and justified form of protest.

5. LABELLING: The sociology of labelling, arising out of the symbolic interactionist perspective, examines the social definition of deviant behaviour. Most sociologists

have agreed that a social problem consists of a subjective definition, an objective condition, and a desire for a solution. Until recently, however, sociologists have paid more attention to the objective condition than to the subjective definition. Labelling theorists such as Blumer, Edelman and Ryan, reversing the emphasis, take a closer look at the process of subjective definition. Labelling young people as "juvenile delinquents" or "trouble-makers" is a device used by an oppressive society to divert attention away from the economic causes of their deprived and disadvantaged situation.

Two Theoretical Bases

Reasons and Perdue (1981) relate these five perspectives to two underlying approaches to the study of social problems; they call these two approaches the "objective" and the "ideological." This study will focus on those two theoretical approaches, but for reasons of clarity, we intend to use the terms "normative" and "critical."

The "normative" approach views society as order and a social problem is seen as a threat to the existing status quo.

The "critical" approach sees society as conflict and a social problem is viewed as the result of an unequal distribution of power or resources.

As identified by Reasons and Perdue (1981), the "normative" approach focuses on an identified condition, with the emphasis on describing and explaining

the occurrence of that condition. "One typically asks why the problem arose and why it persists." For example, one might ask, "What are the causes for the existence, continuation, and growth of juvenile delinquency?"

The "critical" approach poses a somewhat different question: "How and why is a specific condition labelled a social problem while other conditions are ignored? Why, for example, are drug addiction and drug abuse generally considered problematic and other issues such as worker safety, neo-colonialism and economic inequality less often the focus of public concern?" In short, the "normative" approach takes for granted what the "critical" approach views as problematic.

According to Reasons and Perdue, objective or "normative" theorists take a "kinds of people," "kinds of environment" position on criminals and other problematics. Students of crime have focused much of their time and effort on studying the criminal to find the causes of crime. Their tendency is to find the source of the individual's predicament in his or her personal shortcomings; a stance which is known as 'blaming the victim'.

A thoroughgoing examination of blaming the victim, is performed by Ryan (1971) who documents the way stereotypes and myths are used under the "normative" approach to explain a variety of different social problems. The causes of deviance in inner-city schools, for example, are ascribed to "limited background," or "parental lack of values" or

"culturally-deprived families."

"Normative" and "Critical" Approaches to Solutions

How does this play out in the identification and treatment of social problems? If we follow Ryan's explanation, "normative" theorists would ascribe the low academic record of poor Black children to "slow learning" or to "lack of drive." "Critical" theorists, on the other hand, would focus on the problem of crowded, budget-starved, badly-taught schools. Looking at the problem of illegitimacy among the poor, one would ascribe the high rate to "wanton morals," the other would address the lack of access to abortion, and to birth-control clinics.

Obviously, the way the problem is perceived affects the way solutions are approached. To blame the victim, which is in effect the net result of labelling or stereotyping, is to focus curative measures on changing the labelled person or group. Change efforts are directed towards bringing the "delinquent" or "deviant" into line, to producing conformity to norms. In the area of juvenile delinquency, for example, such efforts include street work, and leadership training, individual and family counselling, vocational training and rehabilitation programs, psychotherapy, plus the whole structure of the juvenile court system.

Looking through the "critical" point of view, on the other hand, Ryan identifies the primary causes of social problems as powerlessness and class conflict. Ryan maintains that the ultimate effect of the "normative" approach is always to

distract attention away from the basic causes and to leave the primary social injustices untouched. "Almost all our make-believe liberal programs are off-target," he says; "they are designed to change the poor man, or to cool him out." (1971: 26).

Change agents working under the "critical" perspective, on the other hand, are likely to devote themselves to redressing the social injustices which they feel are the root cause of frustration, despair and anger; their activities would likely take the form of organizing and leading community pressure on a political level.

SOCIAL PROGRAMS ARISING OUT OF THE "NORMATIVE" APPROACH

If we take a "normative" perspective, what kinds of "helping" programs should we expect to find?

As we have seen, if society is viewed in a normative framework, deviance is ascribed to particular types of people who, through personal shortcomings, are unable to adapt to socially-accepted norms, and whose activities are seen as a cause of social problems.

The list of social ills addressed is a broad one, ranging through family breakdown, wife or child abuse, unwanted pregnancy, juvenile delinquency, alcohol and drug abuse, adult crime, to name just a few.

We should expect programs which adopt a "normative" approach to focus on "changing the person" (or

group), with the approach being either rehabilitative or preventive. Some of the implications are outlined below.

The Helping Agency's Approach

1. Rehabilitative -- The objective of these programs is to change behavior from the unacceptable to the acceptable, as defined by the basic assumptions of the "normative" approach. Such programs set out to teach new attitudes and new life skills through such methods as leadership training programs, counselling, psychotherapy, or behavior modification techniques.

2. Preventive -- These programs usually take the form of education. The assumption behind such programs is that if people are given sound information about such subjects as diet, sexual practices, birth control methods, parenting techniques, and other life skills, they will avoid the practices which cause social problems.

The Role of Evaluation Research

From the "normative" perspective, the purpose of evaluation research is to measure the effects of a program against the goals it set out to accomplish. Change programs may be targeted at individuals or groups, at agencies or organizations, or at whole communities.

Whatever the case, the goals must be clearly stated, must be specific, and must be measurable.

Weiss (1972) points out that most evaluations tend to

concentrate on changes in program participants. The changes may be in attitude or, in overt behavior, or both. Evaluators commonly use measures of attitude, values, personality variables, knowledge, or skills.

Changes in behavior can be measured by trained observation, and through records of incidents such as involvement with the law, employment or educational stability, drug use, and so on.

Some basic questions which must be resolved between program operators and the evaluators deal with the identification of program goals, the identification of the changes in attitude or behavior that constitute "success," agreement on the degree of change that counts for success, and on what indices constitute valid measures.

Critique of the "Normative" Approach

As we have seen, those adopting the "normative" approach take the view that social problems are caused by particular types of people whose behaviour is judged to deviate from socially-accepted norms. Corrective measures center on programs designed to change the attitudes and behaviors of such people: to bring them back into line, or cool them out.

Central to this whole concept is the issue of the values of those who do the judging. Wortman (1975) states that "policy formation originates with the values of the policy makers and society, and these values are most immune to feedback." (1975: 566).

Arising out of this issue of values are questions which are key for evaluating program success or failure:

"Who selects program objectives?"

"Who defines 'success'?"

"By whose values are the programs judged?" and

"Whose needs are really being served by the program; those of the organization, those of the workers or action personnel, or those of the target population?"

Wortman (1975) signals the importance of values in selecting the goals that are to be achieved. As he points out, a program or treatment may achieve the goals set for it, but if those goals are themselves worthless, the program cannot be evaluated positively. For example, a job-retraining program that successfully grooms recipients for low-paying, low-advancement positions may not be worth the costs involved in achieving such marginal goals.

Again, a family crisis intervention which persuades the husband and wife to remain together "for the sake of the children" may be seen as a success by the social worker, but as a failure by the wife who was hoping for a way out of an intolerable situation.

The selection of program objectives and methodology are based on the particular views of the social world held by the change agents and their organizations, and this perspective governs the definition of the situation and the

problems requiring solutions. This in turn leads to related and appropriate strategies and tactics. Jackson (1972) has illustrated how three different change agencies, intervening into the affairs of a single community, each imposed its own perspective on the problem. Three different sets of values led to the implantation of three quite different programs.

Summary

To sum up, then, a major weakness of the "normative" approach is that the identification of a social problem, the prescription of a treatment, the implementation of an intervention program, and the evaluation of results all arise out of the value system of normative organizations and workers, a value system based on maintaining the status quo. Thus the "normative" perspective ascribes deviant or problem behavior to shortcomings in individuals or groups and fails to examine the socio-economic bases of some social problems.

SOCIAL PROGRAMS ARISING OUT OF THE "CRITICAL" APPROACH

"A recent study entitled Work in America finds that the work adults do is usually central in their lives, critical to their self-conception and their self-esteem; but this research also shows that many workers at all occupational levels find their work so stultifying and demeaning that it is a major contributor to physical illness, emotional disturbance, alcoholism and drug abuse." (Edelman, 1977: 27).

Here Edelman is quoting a U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare study to support his contention that

the various social problems we treat separately are very largely symptoms of the same problem: an economic system that produces too few jobs, too little income and security, and too few opportunities for self-fulfilment.

Labelling theorists such as Edelman maintain that terms like "mental illness," "criminal," "drug abuse" focus attention on the alleged weakness and pathology of the individual, while diverting attention from their pathological social and economic environments. Such theory is in accord with the views of Reasons and Perdue (1981) who suggest that the idea systems prevailing in contemporary North America are those that are in the interests of power and wealth. Social problems, in their view, are the result of the maldistribution of power and wealth.

The solution, therefore, lies not in changing the person labelled as deviant, but in changing society to correct the injustices which cause misery.

Some Strategies for Social Change

Approaching change from the "critical" perspective, we enter into the realm of community organization practice. Here the methodologies include a variety of intervention practices, ranging from the low-key "planned change" concepts inspired by Lewin to the highly confrontational actions based on Marxian analysis.

Rothman (1979) proposes a useful three-model approach to intervention into communities:

1. Locality development which pre-supposes that

community change can be pursued most effectively by involving a wide spectrum of local people in goal determination and action. The emphasis is on democratic procedures, self-help, indigenous leadership.

2. The social planning model emphasizes a technical process of solving social problems. Rational deliberation, controlled change, and the use of experts with technical skills have a central place in this model.

3. Social action pre-supposes a disadvantaged segment of the population that needs to be organized to make adequate demands on the larger community for increased resources or treatment more in accordance with social justice. Its practitioners aim at basic changes in major institutions or community practices and policies. Notable practitioners of this last model would include Saul Alinsky and Martin Luther King in the U.S., Gandhi in India, Lech Walesa in Poland.

The Role of Evaluation Research

Does evaluation have a role to play in the area of social change programs? Caro (1971) suggests that it does not, because action-oriented groups that demand radical and rapid social change have neither the time nor the inclination to wait for the results of evaluation studies. He further signals the difficulties imposed on evaluation researchers faced with the hostility of activist leaders. "The poverty spokesman resents that social research on poverty has nearly always been initiated by outsiders and is

addressed to issues defined by outsiders." Caro (1971: 16) concludes that many activists cynically view research as a substitute for needed action.

On the other hand, a number of writers and practitioners of community organization feel that evaluation of social change programs is essential in guiding the choice of strategies, and in answering the general question: "Are we accomplishing what we set out to do?"

Key, Hudson and Armstrong (1976) describe goal model evaluation in which a program of action is planned and later assessed in strict relation to stated general aims and to the objectives that are specified in order to contribute to the achievements of those aims. Weiss and Rein (1972) offer a systems model for judging the effectiveness of a community intervention.

Furthermore, Cox (1970) points out that the question of accountability may apply to social change programs which, increasingly, are being funded by various levels of governments and by foundations.

Evaluation Methodology

Unlike the methodology for evaluating "normative" programs which measures changes to individuals or groups, the methodology for measuring the effectiveness of social change programs must use completely different criteria and methodologies. For one thing, the standard experimental model is inappropriate because a control group is most likely not available.

It is sometimes possible to "measure" the extent of social changes using such indicators as new or increased government funding for programs, increased social acceptance for groups or movements (e.g.: the number of times Morgentaler has been acquitted on abortion charges; the decreasing incidence of gays being harassed; the new willingness of governments to fund tenant associations). But gains in such areas, though they may represent triumphs to the movements involved, can rarely be subjected to precise measurement.

Since the great majority of the evaluations which are funded, supported, and get published appear to be "normative," we would not expect "critical" evaluations to be found in the literature on evaluation research. Where evaluations of social change programs are published, they take the form of case histories and the authors make no attempt to be scientific, according to the canons of the experimental model. Such reports would likely be found under the library index categories of "community organizing," "pressure groups" and similar classifications.

Involvement -- A Goal In Itself?

Community development workers and agencies face problems in finding ways to measure change because of the difficulty of being convincing about qualitative data. Cawley (1979) has pointed out the need for a model of the community development process so that "the informed hunches, intuitive insights and thoughtful philosophical rationales

are supplemented by researches that result in tested generalizable descriptions." (1979: 5).

A model has been developed for use in an evaluation system called SHAPES; an acronym for the Shared Process Evaluation System. SHAPES is based on the conviction that the process is at least as important as the task in community development. It sets out, in effect, to document and record the level of involvement of significant actors during a series of key stages in a community development program. It thus differs significantly from the usual type of evaluation in which the ideal methodology is the controlled experimental model.

One evaluation using the SHAPES methodology has been included in the data of the present study.

Critique of the "Critical" Approach

Here, as in the "normative" approach, the issue of values emerges as significant. The concept of social change for the purpose of redistributing power and wealth raises questions as "Who will benefit?," "Who will lose?," "Will the proposed change truly correct a social injustice, or will it simply replace one set of elites with another?"

Warwick and Kelman (1976) distinguish four aspects of any social intervention that raise major ethical issues:

- (1) the choice of goals to which the change effort is directed;
- (2) the definition of the target of change;
- (3) the choice of means used to implement the intervention;

(4) the assessment of the consequences of the intervention.

One of the weakness inherent in the "critical" approach is that such choices and assessments are based on the values of the activist-leaders of the intervention or movement. This must always raise the question of how representative are the leaders of a given social change movement. Pressure movements designed to right major social wrongs must have the backing of large groups of ordinary citizens. This does not always happen. For example Gilbert and Eaton (1976) describe how a small group of local activists, claiming to speak for a majority in a community, can spear-head change movements which few may want.

Not all social problems stem from economic insecurity or deprivation; we cannot assert that a re-distribution of power and wealth would solve all of society's ills. Upper middle class youth are not less susceptible than any other group to juvenile crime, drug abuse and other "deviant" behavior; as an example, the well-publicized problems of the Kennedy family in the U.S. can hardly be attributed to lack of either wealth or power.

Finally, we should point to the risks inherent in the type of social engineering which often emerges with a new social order.

The Quiet Revolution in Quebec, as an example, has indeed altered the old power structures and has resulted in a broader distribution of social benefits, particularly in

the areas of health and social services. But it has brought with it a breed of technocrats, social engineers, who administer the system and who decide how, where, and to whom services will be given.

OTHER FACTORS

In addition to the issues posed by the two theoretical frameworks described above, there are other factors which affect the delivery of social services and the evaluations of those services.

THE ISSUE OF VALUES

We have seen that the issue of values plays a crucial role in the study of evaluation research. How "scientific" can evaluation research be when the measures of change, success or failure are determined in every case by the values of the researcher?

The question of value-free science was raised by Weber (1949), who first pointed out the distinction between "existential knowledge," i.e., knowledge of what "is," and "normative knowledge," i.e., knowledge of what "should be."

While admitting that in the social sciences, value judgements arising out of personal ideals may tend to influence scientific arguments, Weber maintained that such value judgements have no place in empirical science.

Researchers in the cultural sciences, he felt, must consider that analysis of the data is an end in itself, and must refrain from assessing the value of the individual facts in terms of their relationships to ultimate values.

In attempting to create a gulf between science and values, Weber's doctrine of a value-free sociology sparked a debate between those who agree that the knowledge of what "is" must not be contaminated by the knowledge of what "should be," and those who argue that value-free sociology is neither desirable nor, indeed, possible.

Gouldner (1963) suggests that social science has an obligation to manifest both its relevance and its concern for the contemporary human predicament that forms the basis of its study, or risk losing credibility.

"Unless the value relevances of sociological enquiry are made plainly evident, unless there are at least some bridges between it and larger human hopes and purposes, it must inevitably be scorned by laymen as pretentious word-mongering." (1963: 43).

Hampden-Turner (1971) disputes the norms of value-free science (detachment and objectivity), declaring that "affirmation and involvement are appropriate to existential enquiry."

"Where men choose between aspects of their past experience to create their preferred combinations, the moral choice is at the very heart of existence and cannot be exorcised from the investigator or his subjects."
" (1971: 34).

In addition, Becker (1966) refuses even to accept the possibility of a value-free sociology, maintaining that there is no position from which sociological research can be done that is not biased in one way or another. We must always look at the matter from someone's point of view.

"Almost all the topics that sociologists study, at least those that have some relationship to the real world around us, are seen by society as morality plays and we shall find ourselves, willy-nilly, taking part in those plays on one side or another." (1966: 45).

Since sociologists cannot avoid taking sides, Becker counsels that their problem is to make sure that, whatever point of view they take, their research meets the standard of good scientific work so that their unavoidable sympathies do not render their results invalid.

Since the word "value" forms the central concept in the word "evaluation," it should not surprise us that the issue must be recognized and dealt with. It can be expected to arise and play a key role in the study that follows.

ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES

Also important among the factors which affect the delivery of social services are organizational issues, issues of history and ideology that govern the selection and delivery of programs; political issues both inside and outside the organization which affect the way services are delivered, as well as the way the process of evaluation is perceived.

History and Ideology

Jackson's (1972) research demonstrates how an organization's ideological approach governs its definition of the situation, the problems requiring solution, and the strategies and tactics that seem appropriate. In his study

of three different service-oriented organizations working in the same community, Jackson shows how a difference in historical backgrounds plus ongoing internal conflict colored the outlook of each organization in different ways, leading each of the three to adopt widely differing choices of social action within the same community.

Internal and External Pressures

Benson (1973: 376) points to the effect of contradictions within organizations which include incompatible structural arrangements, conflicting goals, and vested interests of distinct groups or divisions in the organization, and conflicting perspectives or ideologies held by participants. These contradictory elements play crucial roles in shaping and reshaping the organization and its approach to the delivery of services.

The effects of a variety of internal contradictions upon the direction, and indeed the survival of organizations has been documented by a number of writers. Both Thompson (1967) and Brager (1969) discuss the effects of threats from the external community and of uncertainty upon a system; conditions which lead in some cases to internal conflict.

Marchant (1980) describes the polarization and conflict between professionals and bureaucrats that occurs when an agency is faced with survival issues. The results in the particular case under study were that services to clients, which should have been a primary concern became peripheral.

Merton (1949: 151) has identified the negative effect that bureaucratic structures may have upon the services delivered by an organization, pointing out that where officials are supposed to serve the public, the very norms of impersonality which govern their behavior may cause conflict with individual citizens.

In short, there is much evidence to support an analysis of organizational development which suggests that organizations are at all times unstable, containing contradictions which are not resolved, providing the basis for organizational change. It is evident that any study of services delivered by organizations, and evaluations of those services must take such issues into consideration.

Expectations Arising Out Of Theoretical Background

Based on the foregoing discussion of the two theoretical perspectives, and issues around values and organization, we will look at reports of evaluation studies and ask: "Was the program planned in a 'normative' or 'critical' perspective?" and "Was the evaluation done in a 'normative' or a 'critical' perspective?"

1. If the program is "normative," we should expect the social problem to be identified as being caused by a particular type of person or behavior. We would expect the stated objectives of the program to be a change in behavior and/or attitudes. A successful outcome of the program would be identified as a significant, measureable change in

behavior.

If the evaluation of a "normative" program is also "normative," we would expect the evaluation research to accept the above definition of the problem and objectives of the program, and to use the standard experimental model to measure results.

If the evaluation of a "normative" program is "critical," we would expect the researchers to reject the definition of the social problem and the objectives of the program as inappropriate; we would expect a report of "evaluation impossible" given the absence of agreed-upon goals.

2. If the program is "critical," we expect the social problem to be perceived as rooted in socio-economic conditions; we would expect the objective of the program to be some form of social change, brought about by organized social or political pressure; a successful outcome of the program would be identified as a qualitative change in the conditions of the affected group or population.

If the evaluation of a "critical" program is also "critical," we would expect a report which describes changes in terms of new rights, concessions, or other gains, as defined by the program objectives.

If the evaluation of a "critical" program is "normative," we would expect the researchers to reject the identification of the problem and the objectives of the program as inappropriate; we would expect a report of "evaluation impossible" given the absence of agreed-upon goals.

How The Research Questions Will Be Answered

This study set out to answer the following questions:

Where an evaluation of a social program indicates "no effect," is this because, 1) the program design is faulty? or 2) the evaluation methodology is faulty? or 3) because the program fails to address the root cause of the social problem?

It is expected that the answers to these questions may be obtained by examining and charting the reported results of evaluation studies, as shown in Figures 1 and 2.

Figure 1 shows the reasons for a "no effect" result of a "normative" and a "critical" evaluation of a "normative" program.

Figure 2 shows the reasons for a "no effect" result of a "normative" and a "critical" evaluation of a "critical" program.

Figure 1

When the Evaluation of a "Normative" Program Shows "No Effect."

Evaluation report of "Normative" Evaluation

Evaluation produces clear results, but data show that the indicators of program success (change to person or groups) are not being met. No significant, measureable improvement shown.

Reasons for "No Effect"

Faulty program design

Standard experimental model was not followed. Evaluation results reported as "mixed" because of gaps in data, or as "sound evaluation impossible."

Faulty evaluation methodology

Evaluation Report of "Critical" Evaluation.

Evaluation impossible, since stated objectives of the program are faulty.

"Normative" program fails to address the root causes of the social problem.

Figure 2

When the Evaluation of a "Critical"
Program Shows "No Effect."

Evaluation Report of
"Normative" Evaluation

Evaluation impossible since objectives of the program are faulty.

Reasons for "No
Effect"

Program fails to address root causes of the social problem

Evaluation Report of
"Critical" Evaluation

Goal model evaluation indicated that stated goals not being met. No social change reported.

Faulty program design

Evaluation impossible since indicators inappropriate.

Faulty evaluation methodology

Chapter III

THE RESEARCH DESIGN

The Plan For The Study

To recapitulate: the field of evaluation research, includes a growing body of literature critical of the evaluation of programs designed to alleviate social problems. A high percentage of the evaluations done seem to suggest that such programs have little or no effect on the social problems at which they are targeted.

This may be because many of these programs are indeed ineffectual; being either badly designed or badly carried out. It may also be because the evaluations were badly executed.

A third possibility, posed by "critical" theorists, is that both programs and evaluations fail to address the root causes of the social problems they are designed to ameliorate, setting out, as they do, to change the deviant or troubled person, rather than to change the economic conditions that cause the problem.

This study, then, sought to address three specific questions: "Is the perceived failure of evaluations caused by 1) faulty program design? 2) faulty evaluation methodology? or 3) failure to address the root causes of the problem?"

A fourth question was also asked: "Where the project is evaluated as 'successful,' what is the combination of elements in program and evaluation that appear to be

significant?"

Issues in Evaluation Research

Out of the literature on evaluation research, cited earlier, arose a number of issues or factors that appear to affect the effectiveness of any given evaluation study. Some of these might be grouped under the general concept of "climate of the evaluation." They include a variety of factors which influence the personal relationships between the evaluators and the staff of the agency; relationships which may affect the researcher's access to data. Evaluators who were members of the agency's own staff might be expected to be working in a co-operative atmosphere, and to have ready access to data, while those sent in from outside by a funding source, for instance, might find a hostile reception and have difficulty obtaining the information needed to do a sound evaluation.

Issues Which Might Affect Program Delivery

Readings on organizational theory helped to signal some of the issues which bear on the identification of social problems and the design of programs to deal with them, as well as illuminating the importance of the political issues surrounding the agency. In assessing the effectiveness of any program, it would be important to be aware of threats to the agency's funding, for example, or of power struggles within the organization itself.

The writer's own experience as a worker in four different social agencies and community organizations was

also useful in identifying factors that have a bearing on program concept and delivery of services. These include the agency's choice of prevention or treatment methods, the values used in setting goals and objectives for treatment, the program's status and history within the agency; specifically, whether the program is a pilot project or an ongoing service, and other factors.

The "Unfortunately" Factor

In reports of evaluations, the word "unfortunately" appears with frequency. It is used to signal departures from the ideal, situations where compromises had to be made, where important data was unavailable or withheld, and where differences of opinion occurred between evaluation researchers and program staff, or between program staff and clients.

The "unfortunately" factor has been included as a variable in this study to find out if there is a significant relationship between its use in a report and the success of the project.

Source of Data

Since this study was to be an evaluation of the existing evaluations of social programs, and since virtually every evaluation project results in a written report submitted by the researcher, the logical source of data was deemed to be a selection of those written reports.

It was assumed that the sources of such reports would be the organizations funding social research, such as

federal and provincial departments of health and welfare; the individual organizations which had been the subjects of evaluation; and university and other libraries. It was also assumed that such reports would be readily available to researchers interested in studying evaluation methodology.

Unfortunately, the second assumption turned out to be wrong. A high percentage of evaluation studies are done on a contract basis, and the results are deemed to be confidential. Furthermore, because of the political nature of the evaluation process (an issue to be discussed more fully later on) many organizations and funding bodies refuse to make public the results of their studies. For example, Health & Welfare Canada, which requires an evaluation of every project it funds, refused access to those reports on the grounds that the information is confidential.

The data for this study, then, was limited to the material to be found in libraries. A search was made of the holdings listed under "Evaluation Studies," and similar classifications, in the libraries of Concordia University; McGill (McLennan, School of Medicine, and School of Social Work); Carleton; as well as in the Bibliothèque Nationale du Québec and the Bibliothèque de la Ville de Montréal.

Even here, very few useful studies were found. The majority of the holdings listed turned out to be outside the field of this study. Four useable research reports were eventually found, one in Concordia, and three in the library of the McGill School of Social Work. An additional

two were supplied to the writer by colleagues.

An additional source was discovered in these same libraries in the form of reports published in the professional journals dealing with evaluation research, and with the health and social sciences. These include The Canadian Journal of Public Health, Evaluation, Evaluation & Program Planning, Evaluation & Change, and Evaluation Review.

The Sample

Based upon the material that was available within the time allotted to the search, ten studies were selected. The number of ten was imposed by the limitations of time and resources.

The sample included six published reports, and four reports written as journal articles. The programs that were examined dealt with juvenile delinquency, parole and probation, drug addiction, nutrition education, battered children, needs of senior citizens, families in crisis, low-income citizen activists. Geographically the programs ranged from Langley B.C., through Winnipeg, Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal, and the state of Nebraska in the U.S.

The advantage of using these reports as sources of data lies in the fact that they are professionally researched observations of the workings of social programs, and that the information they provide is offered in a structured and organized manner. This lends itself to categorization and content analysis.

The disadvantage stems from the fact that each report is written by the evaluator who did the research: a possible source of bias.

The reports published in journals have the additional disadvantage that such articles tend to focus on evaluation methodology, and to ignore completely the important organizational, ideological, and political issues. For example, the outcome of the evaluation on the agency and its program is not discussed in the journal articles we analysed.

Given the political nature of the evaluation process, and the evident reluctance of organizations to make studies available, the very fact that a study is published at all is a statement about the openness of the organizations involved. It also suggests that an attitude of wariness be adopted by those using such reports as a source of data, since they were written to be read by those responsible for funding the evaluation, or for funding the program or agency.

Further Sources for a Follow-Up Study

At a stage too late to be of use in the present study, an additional source of evaluation reports was discovered. The library of the Canadian Council on Social Development in Ottawa contains evaluations which are available to students of social issues, a number of which appear to be relevant to the present study.

There are also legal and political avenues which might

be explored through approaches to the research directors and the planning and evaluation officers of federal and provincial health and social service departments.

On the whole, though, the writer's experienced difficulty in obtaining examples of evaluation reports is confirmed by Prof. Shiner of McGill and Prof. Rutman of Carleton, both of whom are involved in evaluation research.

The Process -- Content Analysis

Content analysis, according to Holsti (1969) is a methodology particularly suited to research questions which can be answered directly by a description of the attributes of contents, and frequency of occurrence. It was the method selected for this study because it involves the systematic coding and categorizing of information contained in documents.

Strengths and Weaknesses of the Methodology

An advantage of content analysis, according to Holsti (1969) is that it presents few problems of inference because validity does not require comparison with data outside those under analysis; the research question can be answered directly from a description of communication content (1969: 67).

Furthermore, since the data in the present study are presented in the form of research reports which are in themselves formalized structures, the analysing and coding of the information is facilitated.

However, content analysis stands or falls by the

clarity and appropriateness of its categories. In collapsing data into ideal types, or categories, there is always the need to make judgements, with its attendant danger. There is also the risk of losing sharpness of definition. It is possible, for example, that there are in the present study, instances of "reading between the lines" in assigning information to a particular category, or that assumptions were made that are not, in fact, correct. For example, in the frequent absence of any mention of "evaluation climate," the assumption was made, mainly from the general tone of the report, that the climate was co-operative.

The Checklist or Grid

The next step in the design of this study was to crystalize the various generalized issues and factors, identified in the above sources, into a set of specific questions around the operations of the agency, the program, the evaluation and the results. These questions were organized into the form of a checklist or grid (Appendix "A").

As an example, the question on "The theoretical basis of the program" was intended to find out whether the program set out to rehabilitate its client through counselling, or by teaching skills for coping with life's problems; or whether the aim was prevention through a cognitive model.

This checklist or grid was pre-tested and some modifications were made. The revised grid then became the instrument used to analyse the contents of each of the

reports forming the data of this study.

The information produced from each report was then coded, categorized, and collapsed into typologies, which are defined below.

Categories to which no answers appeared in the data (i.e., "political climate," "hidden agenda") were eliminated from the findings. The significance of their absence from evaluation reports is dealt with under the Discussion section.

Definitions of the Typologies

The typologies defined here are divided into Program Variables and Evaluation Variables.

For example, "Type of Social Problem" is a Program Variable. "Deviance," "Un-coping" and "Dissatisfaction" are values of this variable. Their definitions are as follows:

PROGRAM VARIABLES:

Type of Social Problem

"Deviance" -- exemplified by drug addiction, delinquency, crime

"Un-coping" -- inability of persons or families to deal with the problems, pressures, requirements of society, leading to what is identified in social-work terms as personal or family crisis.

"Dissatisfaction" -- with the way things are in society, expressed by individuals or groups in terms of proposed action for change.

Type of Program

"Rehab" -- designed to bring the person or group back to accepted social behavior and norms.

"Prevention" -- designed to identify and remedy potential sources of deviance.

"Community Org." -- programs designed to help groups to organize and take action on their own behalf to bring about change.

Ideology Behind Programs

"Life Skills" -- assumes that people can be changed, and helped to conform to "normal," acceptable behavior through psychotherapy or counselling; that behaviors can be changed, learning capabilities improved, personality traits altered, attitudes towards society improved, that individuals and groups can be taught to manage the various skills needed to cope with life in this society.

"Cognitive" -- assumes that the learning of information about a social practice (such as birth control, eating habits, smoking, drug use, child-rearing, etc.) will affect beliefs and feelings about the practice, which in turn will lead to "healthy" behaviors.

"Take Charge" -- focuses on the democratic activity of people participating in the solution of their own problems, "for the common good"? the process of reaching the goal is sometimes viewed as important as the goal itself.

Program Methodology

"Multi-intensive Therapy" -- use by the helping agency of treatments that are multi-disciplinary, highly flexible, breaking the usual boundaries of agency jurisdiction, intensive, accessible, available on demand; characterized by small case-loads, close frequent contacts, one worker playing many roles.

"Traditional Counselling" -- the traditional model of therapy or other counselling sessions on a programmed basis.

"Educational" -- the programmed teaching of information and skills.

"Pressure" -- the organizing of activist groups to pressure the authorities into changing conditions deemed unsatisfactory.

Project History

"Pilot/experiment" -- a program designed to test a new theory or method.

"Ongoing" -- a continuing, established program.

EVALUATION VARIABLES:

Evaluation Methodology

"Experimental" -- the classic experimental model, in which samples are randomly assigned to control or experimental groups; pre- and post-tests are administered to both groups, and follow-up tests are administered to both groups at intervals subsequent to treatment.

"Non-experimental" -- any other methodology which varies from of the experimental model.

Evaluation Climate

"Co-operative" -- where it is evident from the written report that program workers and evaluators are freely sharing objectives and data.

"Hostile" -- where the evaluator reports having experienced difficulty in obtaining access to data, or where other obstacles to the study are raised by program staff.

"Not reported" -- where the report makes no mention of the attitude of program staff.

Evaluation Status

"Built-in" -- where the evaluation procedure is built into the planning of the program and the evaluator forms part of the program staff.

"Imposed" -- where the evaluation is done as an afterthought, often by an outside consultant or group.

Evaluation Results

"Program Goals Achieved" -- A significant amount of positive change was measured along the agreed-upon indicators of "success." For example: "Participation (in the program) resulted in a downward trend in number of offences; increases in re-entry into employment or education; reduced psychiatric hospitalization, as measured by official records and client self-report."

"Results Mixed" -- Some portion of the stated goals

was achieved, or improvement was demonstrated in a portion of the target group. For example: "The (nutrition education program) produced large positive effects on knowledge and behaviors but no changes on food preferences."

"Program Goals Not Achieved" -- A successfully conducted evaluation, which followed the classic experimental model, failed to demonstrate that the program effected any change in the target population.

"Evaluation Impossible" -- The evaluator reports that, for any of a number of reasons, the data required to measure program effectiveness were not available, and no valid conclusions can be drawn.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Of the ten programs examined, eight operated out of a "normative" framework, in which the objective was to change the person.

The reason for this, it is apparent, lies in the source of the data used in this study. The whole field of evaluation research, as discussed by Weiss, Suchman, Caro, and others, and as written up in library and journal sources, operates within the "normative" framework. The programs evaluated set out to "change the person" in some way, and the evaluation methodologies set out to measure the extent of change.

Our findings, therefore, expressed in terms of success or failure of program or of evaluation, must be viewed in a "normative" perspective.

Table 1 shows that four of the ten programs achieved the goals established for them, and another four achieved mixed, or partial success. This tends to refute the critics of evaluation research who suggest that a high proportion of programs fail to solve the problems to which they are addressed.

It will be noted, too, that six of ten evaluations used methodologies which produced seemingly clear results. Where the evaluation results are in doubt, the program results can only be in doubt also. Where a sound evaluation was impossible, no results can be projected for the program.

There were no cases, within the sample of ten, where a successfully conducted evaluation found a program to have

TABLE 1

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EVALUATION RESULTS AND PROGRAM RESULTS N=10

Program results	Evaluation results		
	Evaluation clear*	Evaluation results in doubt*	Evaluation impossible*
	6	2	2
Goals achieved	4	0	0
Results mixed	2	2	1
Program failed	0	0	1
	6	2	2

*As reported by the evaluator

failed completely.

Tables 2 to 6 indicate what might be the optimum combination of elements; of the four programs which achieved their goals, three are rehabilitation programs (Tables 3A, 3B, 3C).¹ They arise out of a "life-skills" ideology (Tables 4A, 4B, 4C). They use multi-intensive therapies (Tables 5A, 5B, 5C) as innovative experiments (Tables 6A, 6B, 6C).

In all four cases, the evaluation climate was either ~~operative~~ operative, or not reported (Tables 2B to 6B). In three cases, the evaluations were built into the program (Tables 2C to 6C), and the evaluation methodology was the classic experimental model (Tables 2A to 6A.).

The fourth case in which goals were achieved was a community organization project, where the evaluation was an after-thought and was conducted by the SHAPES method described earlier.

We note that none of the three "prevention" programs achieved their goals (Table 3); nor did either of the "cognitive" (Table 4). "Traditional counselling" and "education" methodologies failed to achieve better than mixed results (Table 5). None of the on-going programs were among those evaluated as "successful" (Table 6).

1. Tables 2A to 6A show a relationship between program variables and evaluation methodology. Tables 2B to 6B show a relationship between those same variables and evaluation climate. Tables 2C to 6C show a relationship between program variables and evaluation status.

TABLE 2A

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TYPE OF SOCIAL PROBLEM AND EVALUATION METHODOLOGY N=10

Type of social problem	Evaluation results		Methodology		Evaluation impossible	
	Program goals achieved	Results, mixed	Methodology	Methodology	Experimental	Non-experim.
Deviance	2	0	2	1	0	1
Un-coping	1	0	0	1	0	0
Dissatisfaction	0	1	0	0	0	1
	3	1	2	2	0	2
						10

V

TABLE 2B

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TYPE OF SOCIAL PROBLEM AND EVALUATION CLIMATE N=10

Type of social problem	Evaluation results						
	Program goals achieved		Results mixed		Evaluation impossible		
	Climate	Co-op' Hostile	Climate	Co-op Hostile	Climate	Co-op Hostile	
Deviance	2	0	3	0	0	1	6
Un-coping	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
Dissatisfaction	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
	4	0	4	0	0	2	10

TABLE 2C

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TYPE OF SOCIAL PROBLEM AND EVALUATION STATUS N=10

Type of social problem	Program goals achieved		Evaluation results		Evaluation impossible		
	Status	Status	Results mixed	Status			
	Built-in	Imposed	Built-in	Imposed	Built-in	Imposed	
Deviance	2	0	1	2	0	1	6
Un-coping	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
Dissatisfaction	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
	3	1	1	3	0	2	10

TABLE 3A

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TYPE OF PROGRAM AND EVALUATION METHODOLOGY N=10

		Evaluation results		
Program goals achieved		Results mixed	Evaluation impossible	
Methodology		Methodology	Methodology	

Type of program	Experimental	Non-experim.	Experimental	Non-experim.	Experimental	Non-experim.
55 Rehabilitation	3	0	1	1	0	0
Prevention	0	0	1	1	0	1
Community Org.	0	1	0	0	0	1
	3	1	2	2	0	2
						10

TABLE 3B

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TYPE OF PROGRAM AND EVALUATION CLIMATE

N=10

Type of program	Program goals achieved				Evaluation results				Evaluation impossible			
	Climate		Climate		Climate		Climate		Climate		Climate	
	Co-op	Hostile	Co-op	Hostile	Co-op	Hostile	Co-op	Hostile	Co-op	Hostile	Co-op	Hostile
Rehabilitation	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Prevention	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	3	3
Community org.	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2
	4	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	2	2	10	10

TABLE 3C

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TYPE OF PROGRAM AND EVALUATION STATUS N=10

Type of Program	Program goals achieved				Evaluation results			
	Status		Status		Status		Status	
	Built-in	Imposed	Built-in	Imposed	Built-in	Imposed	Built-in	Imposed
Rehabilitation	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	5
Prevention	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	3
Community org.	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
	3	1	1	3	0	0	2	10

TABLE 4A

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROGRAM IDEOLOGY AND EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

N=10

Program ideology	Program goals achieved		Evaluation results	
	Experimental	Non-experim.	Results mixed	Evaluation impossible
	Methodology		Methodology	
	Experimental	Non-experim.	Experimental	Non-experim.
Life skills	3	0	1	0
Cognitive	0	0	1	0
Take charge	0	1	0	0
	3	1	2	0
				2
				10

TABLE 4B

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROGRAM IDEOLOGY AND EVALUATION CLIMATE N=10

	Evaluation results					
	Program goals achieved		Results mixed		Evaluation impossible	
	Co-op	Hostile	Co-op	Hostile	Co-op	Hostile
Life skills	3	0	2	0	0	1
Cognitive	0	0	2	0	0	0
Take charge	1	0	0	0	0	1
	4	0	4	0	0	2
						10

TABLE 4C

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROGRAM IDEOLOGY AND EVALUATION STATUS N=10

Program ideology	Program goals achieved		Evaluation results		Evaluation impossible	
	Built-in	Imposed	Results mixed	Status	Built-in	Imposed
Life skills	3	0	1	1	0	1
Cognitive	0	0	0	2	0	0
Take charge	0	1	0	0	0	1
	3	1	1	3	0	2
						10

TABLE 5A

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROGRAM METHODOLOGY AND EVALUATION METHODOLOGY N=10

Program methodology	Program goals achieved		Evaluation results		Evaluation impossible	
	Methodology Experimental	Methodology Non-experim.	Methodology Experimental	Methodology Non-experim.	Methodology Experimental	Methodology Non-experim.
Multi-intensive therapy	3	0	1	0	0	4
Traditional counselling	0	0	0	1	0	2
Education	0	0	1	1	0	3
Pressure	0	1	0	0	0	1
	3	1	1	1	0	10

TABLE 5B

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROGRAM METHODOLOGY AND EVALUATION CLIMATE

N=10

Program methodology	Program goals achieved		Evaluation results		Evaluation impossible	
	Climate		Climate		Climate	
	Co-op	Hostile	Co-op	Hostile	Co-op	Hostile
Multi-intensive therapy	3	0	1	0	0	4
Traditional counselling	0	0	1	0	0	2
Education	0	0	2	0	0	3
Pressure	1	0	0	0	0	1
	4	0	4	0	0	10

TABLE 5C

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROGRAM METHODOLOGY AND EVALUATION STATUS

N=10

Program methodology	Program goals achieved		Evaluation results		Evaluation impossible	
	Status		Results mixed		Status	
	Built-in	Imposed	Built-in	Imposed	Built-in	Imposed
Multi-intensive therapy	3	0	1	0	0	0
Traditional counselling	0	0	0	1	0	1
Education	0	0	0	2	0	1
Pressure	0	1	0	0	0	0
	3	1	1	3	0	2
						10

TABLE 6A

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROJECT HISTORY AND EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

N=10

Project history	Evaluation results			Evaluation impossible
	Program goals achieved	Results mixed	Evaluation impossible	
	Methodology	Methodology	Methodology	Methodology
	Experimental Non-experim.	Experimental Non-experim.	Experimental Non-experim.	Experimental Non-experim.
Pilot-experiment	3	0	2	0
On-going	0	2	0	0
	3	2	2	0
	1			1
	0			1
	1			2
				10

TABLE 6B

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROJECT HISTORY AND EVALUATION CLIMATE N=10

Project history	Program goals achieved		Evaluation results		Evaluation impossible		
	Climate		Climate		Climate		
	co-op	Hostile	Co-op	Hostile	Co-op	Hostile	
Pilot-experiment	4	0	2	0	0	1	7
On-going	0	0	2	0	0	1	3
	4	0	4	0	2	2	10

TABLE 6C

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROJECT HISTORY AND EVALUATION STATUS

N=10

Project history	Program goals achieved		Evaluation results		Evaluation impossible		
	Built-in	Imposed	Results mixed	Status	Built-in	Imposed	
Pilot-experiment	3	1	0	2	0	1	7
On-going	0	0	1	1	0	1	3
	3	1	1	3	0	2	10

Looking at the evaluation methodology (Tables 2A-6A), we see that three of the four successful evaluations used the "experimental" model, with a wide variety of indices agreed upon by practitioners at the beginning of the programs. Evidently, it is possible to conduct sound evaluation research, at least where innovative pilot projects are being tested.

It appears to be essential, however, that the evaluating team be built into the design of the program, and that evaluators have a say, from the very beginning, in the selection of the indicators of "success" and in the methodology used to do the evaluation (Tables 2C-6C).

The "experimental" model also produced two cases where program results appear to be mixed (Tables 2A-6A). Presumably, as noted earlier this methodology might, in a larger sample, have revealed examples of programs which failed completely to achieve the desired results.

The "climate" in which the evaluation is carried out appears to be important (Tables 2B-6B). In only two cases was the climate portrayed as "hostile" and in both, a sound evaluation was judged to be impossible, due to the withholding of information or the refusal to permit testing of agency clients.

If there is anything to be learned from the two cases where evaluation proved to be impossible, it is that in both cases the evaluation methodology was non-experimental, the evaluation had been imposed upon the agency by outside sources, and the atmosphere was hostile, with information

being withheld from the researchers (Tables 2 to 6).

"Unfortunately" Factor

The use of the word "unfortunately" in a report signals some departure from the planned procedure, a compromise either in the program or the evaluation. Table 7 shows that the "unfortunately" factor appears nine times in the four cases where results were mixed, and nine times in the two cases where results were impossible to assess. In the four cases where success was achieved, no deviation from the ideal was reported.

Other Variables

It was expected that political pressures within or without the organization might have a significant bearing on the results of the program being delivered. In only three out of ten cases was the "climate" in which the agency operated mentioned by the evaluators. In two cases the "climate" was reported as positive and stable, in the third it was reported as turbulent. The two stable agencies included one in which the evaluation was impossible, the other in which goals were being achieved. There would appear, from this limited sample at any rate, to be no relationship between agency "climate" and the outcome of the evaluation to the agency.

Hidden Agenda

Among the criticisms of evaluation research is the observation that evaluators often bring to their projects a

TABLE 7

THE "UNFORTUNATELY" FACTOR

	Evaluation results		
	Evaluation successful	Results in doubt	Evaluation impossible
Number of cases	4	4	2

Total no. of "unfortunately" mentioned

hidden agenda, of a political nature imposed upon them by outside sources. Although this was one of the variables to be examined in the current study, no instances of hidden agenda of a political nature were reported. Perhaps this is not surprising since all reports were written by the evaluators themselves.

Outcome to Agency

The outcome to the agency as a result of its program evaluation was reported in only two of the ten cases, and these two were both instances where evaluation was judged impossible. One agency whose program could not be evaluated had its project expanded, the other's program was cancelled.

It should be noted that none of the studies of successful pilot or experimental projects reported on whether or not the innovative model was adopted for general use, or whether the program continued after the evaluation was done. It would appear that the outcome of an evaluation upon an agency's program is not considered by evaluators to be a significant variable; the issue is not mentioned in eight out of ten reports studied.

Evaluating Community Organization Programs

Tables 3A, B, and C show that the sample included two community organization programs, one of which appears to have achieved its stated goal, the other proving impossible to evaluate. Since the goals of pressure-group activities and citizen movements are political, the "normative" framework of evaluation used in all but one of these studies

is inappropriate.

The problem of determining variables and methodologies for measuring social change or political gains was discussed earlier. One answer appears to be a model of process evaluation in which steps toward a goal are identified in advance and regular assessments are made of actions taken and progress made.

In one of the cases in this study, the involvement of activist-participants was signaled as one of the goals of the project. In this instance, the use of the SHAPES method of evaluation produced an indication of success.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study was undertaken to clarify the author's views on the effectiveness of social programs and the role of their evaluations.

Reservations about the efficacy of the evaluation process, sparked by experiences in the field, appeared to be supported by Weiss (1972), Guba (1972), Mann (1972) and a number of other critics, who have pointed to the high percentage of evaluations which indicate little positive effect.

Several questions were posed: "Is this the result of faulty program design, unsound evaluation methodology, or because both program and evaluation were inappropriate?"

Furthermore, "If cases can be found of evaluations that appear to indicate successful results of programs, what is the combination of elements which seem to have contributed to success?"

It would appear from this study that the questions can be answered in several ways, depending on which theoretical approach is used to view the data.

Those adopting the "normative" perspective, as we saw earlier, suggest that social ills result from the inability of some individuals or some groups to adapt to the standards of behavior set by society. Deviance, in the words of Reasons and Perdue (1981), arises out of a "kind of person" or "kind of background". The deviant person, it is assumed, is unwilling because of personality traits, or unable

because of weakness, to cope or conform.

Social problems can thus be addressed by programs which set out to teach new living and coping skills, to alter personality traits, or to modify "unacceptable" behaviors.

The assumption behind such programs is that the subject really wants to conform and to change because society's disapproval (and thus his/her stigma) makes life unbearable.

The desired changes can be measured along certain indices, the selection of those indices being governed by the normative values of the program planners and operators.

If we look at the data from our study, we see:

1)-- three rehabilitative programs in which the goals set by agency managers were achieved, where positive behavior changes could be documented, where a significant number of clients went back to school, or got and held jobs, or appeared to resolve family conflicts.

2)-- two additional programs where results are described as "mixed," wherein some positive, measurable gains were made by some clients.

Furthermore, the data suggest that it is possible to do methodologically sound evaluations. Six of the ten evaluations produced assessments that appear to be clear.

This finding would appear to cast some doubt on our premise that sound evaluation is rarely, if ever, possible. Evidently there are circumstances when both evaluations and programs work hand in hand to achieve the desired results.

What are the characteristics of successful evaluations?

Based on the data of this study:

(1) The program is likely to be a pilot project, testing out innovative methods.

(2) It is a rehabilitative program, teaching life skills to individuals or families who have had extreme difficulty adapting to social norms.

(3) The program methodology includes multi-disciplinary techniques: intensified, individualized, round-the-clock attention.

(4) Because it is a pilot project, the evaluation is likely to be built in from the start, with the evaluator a part of the team. Agreement exists on program objectives and measurements of success.

(5) Mechanisms are set up to use the experimental model, with pre-tests and follow-up tests being made to both the treated client population and an untreated control group.

This would appear to answer the questions posed at the beginning of this study.

However, a very different view of these programs emerges if one takes the "critical" approach. At the most cynical, it is possible to suggest that most of these social programs are really exercises in public relations, designed to make the Establishment look caring and concerned. This is the analysis suggested by Edelman (1977).

Ryan (1971: 152) argues that "almost all our make-believe liberal programs are off target ... designed either

to change the poor man or to cool him out." In this view, prescriptions for cure are invariably conceived to revamp and revise the victim, never to change the surrounding circumstances.

Viewed from the "critical" perspective, nine of the ten programs in our data fail to address the root cause of the problem, since they focussed on changing the person.

The more appropriate type of program, under the "critical" approach, would be the community action, or social pressure movement. Our data include two examples: one of them failed to achieve its objective and one was apparently successful in reaching its stated goals.

From the second example, it can be seen that some movements do succeed in changing social structures and in bringing some redistribution of power or benefits to disadvantaged segments of society.

The "critical" approach is a useful tool that provides an alternate view of social problems. It explains in part, at least, how it is that despite the money and energy that have been expended over many years by dedicated and skilled professionals in many agencies, there is still no diminution in the amount of crime, delinquency, family breakdown, addiction, and other social ills.

Insofar as these problems result from deprivation and social injustice, the normative agencies and programs do not address them. In fact, they serve to divert attention away from the true nature of the problems.

However this perspective does not explain that proportion of deviant behavior which is caused by personality factors. It may be true, as Platt (1969) suggests, that the concept of juvenile delinquency was invented to provide justification for the child-saving movement, with its economic underpinnings. But not all delinquency is in the eye of the beholder. Some youngsters' hostility may be the result of personality factors rather than of social injustice.

It must be stressed that there is a portion of social problems which are psychologically inspired, and which, if treatable at all, must be amenable to psychologically based methods rather than social change.

Perhaps the most important single finding to emerge from this study, then, is the key role of the theoretical perspective which is used in viewing any given social problem and in judging any given social program. The skill of the observer lies in deciding which of the "lenses" is the most appropriate.

Issue of Values

In four of the cases studied, clients' opinions on the success or failure of the program differed in some respects from the judgments of the program operators or the findings of the evaluators.

In such cases, client ratings were viewed as suspect by the evaluators, on the assumption that professionals are better able than the actual sufferer to judge improvement.

Note that one of these four was a community organization example.

Aside from allowing us to wonder who these programs are designed to benefit, this points up a key issue that underlies both the theoretical approaches: the question of values.

The identification of a condition as a "social problem", the selection of strategies for dealing with that problem, the measures of success or failure; all these are based on the value systems of the organizational actors involved.

We note that this is every bit as true for community organizers and for social change movements as for rehabilitation and prevention programs. Disputes over values and goals have led to the fragmentation of more than one "progressive" movement.

Evaluation of Evaluations

This study began by questioning the role and the efficacy of evaluation research. One question which has not been satisfactorily answered is the relationship between the evaluation and the program. Perhaps this is because of the small size of the sample.

Only two cases of the ten give a report on the outcome to the agency of the evaluation that was done. Both of these were instances where a sound evaluation proved to be impossible because of the hostile "climate" surrounding the research.

In one of these cases, the inconclusive evaluation was ignored and the program was expanded. In the second case the inconclusive evaluation was used to support an already-made political decision to cancel the project.

On the outcomes of the other eight cases where program goals were judged to have been fully or partially achieved, we can only speculate.

While it would be dangerous to draw conclusions based on the limited findings of two cases, one might say that many evaluations are attempts to rationalize and justify decisions which have already been made on political grounds by program managers or funders.

What is the explanation of the high percentage of evaluations that show little or no effect? Probably a combination of factors:

- Some programs really do fail to achieve their goals;
- Some programs do help a certain percentage of their clients, but the "climates" or circumstances surrounding their evaluations make a positive evaluation impossible;
- Sometimes a happy combination of circumstances permits both program and evaluation to succeed, at least in the eyes of those doing the judging.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alinsky, Saul, Reveille For Radicals. New York: Vintage Books, 1969.
- Becker, Howard S., "Whose Side Are We On?" Social Problems, 14 (1966): 239-247.
- Bend, E.M., and Vogelfanger, "A New Look at Mills Critique." in Mass Society in Crisis, edited by Rosenberg, Gerner and Houton. New York: Macmillan, 1971, 271-278.
- Bennis, Warren G.; Benne, Kenneth D.; Chin, Robert; and Corey, Kenneth E., The Planning of Change. 3rd. ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.
- Benson, K.J., "The Analysis of Bureaucratic-Professional Conflict: Functional vs Dialectic Approaches." The Sociological Quarterly, 14 (Summer 1973), 376-394.
- Blumer, Herbert, "Social Problems As Collective Behavior." Social Problems, 18 (1971), p. 298.
- Boguslaw, Robert, The New Utopians. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965.
- Brager, G. "Commitment and Conflict in a Normative Organization." American Sociological Review, (1969), 482-491.
- Cain, Glen C., and Hollister, R.G., "The Methodology of Evaluating Social Action Programs." In Evaluating Social Programs, edited by Rossi and Williams, New York: Seminar Press, 1963, p. 109.
- Cain, Glen C., and Watts, Harold W., "Problems in Making Inferences from the Colman Report." In Evaluating Social Programs, edited by Rossi and Williams, New York: Seminar Press, 1963, p. 73.
- Caro, Francis G., ed. Readings In Evaluation Research. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1971.
- Carter, N.M. and Wharf, B. Evaluating Social Development Programs. Ottawa: Canadian Council on Social Development, 1973.
- Cawley, Richard, The Change Process in Community Development: A Descriptive Model. Unpublished Doctoral thesis, University of Toronto, Department of Adult Education, 1979.

- Cox, Fred, M., Erlich, John L., Rothman, Jack, and Tropman, John E. eds. Strategies of Community Organization. Itasca, Ill.: F.E. Peacock Publishers, 1979.
- Davis, Arthur K., "Community Development: Science or Ideology?" Human Organization. 27:56-64.
- Edelman, Murray, Political Language: Words that Succeed and Policies That Fail. New York: Academic Press, 1977.
- Etzioni, Amatai, "Human Beings Are Not Very Easy to Change After All." Saturday Review, June 3, 1972.
- Evans, J.W., and Williams, W., "The Politics of Evaluation: the Case of Head Start," in The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 385:118-132 (September 1969).
- Fischer, J. "Does Anything Work?" Journal of Social Service Research. 1:3, (Spring 1978) p. 219.
- Gilbert, Neil, and Eaton, Joseph W., "Who Speaks for the Poor?" In The Planning of Change, edited by Bennis et al. New York: Holt, Rinehardt and Winston, 1976.
- Goffman, Erving, Asylums. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1961.
- Gouldner, Alvin, "The Sociologist As Partisan." American Sociologist. III (1968), 103-116.
- Guba, Egon, "The Failure of Educational Evaluation." In Evaluating Action Programs, edited by Carol Weiss, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972.
- Hampden-Turner, Charles, Radical Man. Garden City, N.Y.: 1971.
- Henshel, Richard L., and Henshel, Anne-Marie H., Perspectives on Social Problems. Don Mills, Ontario: Longman Canada Ltd., 1973.
- Holsti, Ole R., Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969.
- Horton, Paul B., and Leslie, Gerald R., The Sociology of Social Problems. 3rd ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.
- Hyman, H., and Wright, C. "Evaluating Social Action Programs." In The Uses of Sociology, edited by Paul Lazarsfeld et al. New York: Basic Books, 1967.

- Jackson, John D. Community Development: Ideology and Technology. Montreal: Centre For Human Relations and Community Studies, Sir George Williams University, 1972.
- Key, Michael, Hudson, Peter, and Armstrong, John, "Evaluation Theory and Community Work." In Strategies of Community Organization, edited by Cox et al. Itasca, Ill.: F.E. Peacock Publishers, 1979.
- Kramer, Ralph M. and Harry Specht. Readings in Community Organization Practice. 2nd edition, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall Inc., 1975.
- Krupp, Sherman, Patterns in Organizational Analysis. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
- Law Reform Commission of Canada. Our Criminal Law. Ottawa: Information Canada, 1976.
- Mann, John, "The Outcome of Evaluation Research." In Evaluating Social Programs, edited by Carol H. Weiss. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972.
- Marchant, Helen, "Bureaucratic-Professional Conflict as a Consequence of Welfare Analysis: An Organizational Analysis." Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Concordia University, Montreal, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, 1980.
- Merton, Robert K., Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe, Ill.: the Free Press, 1949.
- Mills, C. Wright, "The Professional Ideology of Social Pathologists." American Journal of Sociology (September 1943), 165-180.
- Morris, Lynn L., and Fitz-Gibbon, Carol T., Evaluator's Handbook. The Program Evaluation Kit, vol. 1. Beverly Hills, Cal.: Sage Publications Inc., 1978.
- Platt, Anthony M., The Child Savers: The Invention of Delinquency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.
- Reasons, Charles E., and Perdue, Wm. D., The Ideology of Social Problems. Sherman Oaks, Ca.: Alfred Publishing Company Inc., 1981.
- Ross, R., and Staines, G.L., "The Politics of Analyzing Social Problems." Social Problems, 20 (Summer), 18-40, and 21 (Fall) p. 154.
- Rossi, P.H., and Williams, W., (eds.) Evaluating Social Programs. New York: Seminar Press, 1963.

- Rothman, Jack, "Three Models of Community Organization Practice." In Strategies of Community Organization, edited by Fred M. Cox et al. Itasca, Ill.: F.E. Peacock Publishers Inc., 1979.
- Rowe, Wendy, A Process Analysis of a Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Program. Vancouver: Ministry of Attorney General, British Columbia, 1981.
- Rubington, Earl, and Weinberg, Martin, ed. The Study of Social Problems: Five Perspectives. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Ryan, William, Blaming the Victim. New York: Pantheon Books, 1971.
- Selltiz, C., et al. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.
- Solicitor General of Canada, Report, Review of Methods for Active Crime Prevention. Montreal, 1979.
- Suchman, Edward A., Evaluative Research: Principles and Practice in Public Service and Social Action Programs. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1971.
- Thompson, James D., Organizations In Action. New York: McGraw Hill, 1967.
- Warwick, Donald P.; and Kelman Herbert, C., "Ethical Issues in Social Intervention." In The Planning of Change, edited by Bennis et al., New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1976.
- Weber, Max, "Objectivity In Social Science and Social Policy." In The Methodology of the Social Sciences, edited by M. Weber. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1949.
- Weiss, Carol H., Evaluation Research. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1972..
- Weiss, Carol H., ed. Evaluating Action Programs: Readings in Social Action and Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc., 1972.
- Weiss, Carol H., "the Politicization of Evaluation Results." In Evaluating Action Programs, edited by Carol Weiss. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972.
- Weiss, R.S., and Rein, M., "The Evaluation of Broad-Aim Programs." In Evaluating Action Programs, edited by Carol Weiss. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972.

Williams, Walter, and Evans, John W., "The Politics of Evaluation: The Case of Head Start." In Evaluating Social Programs, edited by Rossi, P.H., and Williams, W. New York: Seminar Press, 1963, 249 p.

Wolins, Martin, "Measuring the Effect of Social Work Intervention." In Evaluating Social Development Programs, edited by Novia Carter and Brian Wharf. Ottawa: Canadian Council On Social Development, 1973.

Wortman, P.M., "Evaluation Research: A Psychological Perspective." American Psychologist, 30 (1975), 562-575.

Wright, E.W. and Dixon, M.C., "Community Prevention and Treatment of Juvenile Delinquency -- A Review of Evaluations." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. 14 (1977) 35-67.

Zald, M. "The Power and Functions of Boards of Directors: A Theoretical Synthesis." American Journal of Sociology. 75, (1969), 79-111.

APPENDIX A

THE CHECKLIST OR GRID

I. THE AGENCY

Identification

Source of Data . . . library call no.

Type of program (crime prevention, health ed.,
community devel. etc)

Geogr. Area Served

Age of agency when evaluation done

Target population

Background of agency (sponsorship, funding, history,
philosophical approach, accountability, etc.)

"Political climate" in which agency functions (calm and
stable, fighting for survival, under outside
pressure, internal conflicts etc.)

II THE PROGRAM(S)

Stated primary objectives of program

Secondary objectives .

Theoretical basis of program

Assumptions arising from above

Program (actions, services) arising from these
assumptions

Source of clientele (referrals, self-referred, police,
outreach etc.)

III THE EVALUATION

Stated goals of the evaluation -- (process analysis;
desire to improve program; regular accountability;
continued existence, etc.

Any hidden goals/agenda evident?

Eval. generated by (outside; internal)

Eval. funded by (outside: internal)

Checklist -- cont'd

Evaluators (outsiders; insiders; both)
(same discipline as agency; sociologists;
etc.)

Climate of evaluation (fully co-operative; some data
withheld; adversary/defensive/suspicious)

Comparison with other agencies?

THE IDEAL

Program goals (restated from p.1.)

Indicators of success in achieving goals

Assumptions involved in choice of those indicators

Methodology required to measure those indicators
("Ideally, we would measure the following...")

We followed the whole plan... The research was carried
out as planned

OR

Unfortunately ... we were not able to measure the
following...

Reasons why we could not measure those particular
indicators

Indicators we settled for instead

What we actually did measure (methodology)

Results we had to settle for

Admitted shortcomings of the evaluation research
(indirect measurements: low response, etc.)

Checklist -- cont'd

IV RESULTS

Conclusions arrived at, based on what we did

"Rationalizations" -- (we made some assumptions; there were additional spin-off benefits; etc)

If stated goals were met --

-desired change observed in target population

-no change

-change observed, but different from goal

Recommendations of evaluators

Outcome to agency of evaluation (progr. continues unchanged; change: recomm. put into practice; change: progr. discontinued etc.)