



December 1974

## Conflict and Compromise in Evaluation Research: A Case Study

Joe Hudson

*Minnesota Department of Corrections*

Peter Chommie

*University of Minnesota*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw>

 Part of the [Policy Design, Analysis, and Evaluation Commons](#), and the [Social Work Commons](#)

### Recommended Citation

Hudson, Joe and Chommie, Peter (1974) "Conflict and Compromise in Evaluation Research: A Case Study," *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*: Vol. 2 : Iss. 2 , Article 16.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol2/iss2/16>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Social Work at ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact [maira.bundza@wmich.edu](mailto:maira.bundza@wmich.edu).



## CONFLICT AND COMPROMISE IN EVALUATION RESEARCH: A CASE STUDY

Joe Hudson

Minnesota Department of Corrections  
St. Paul, Minnesota

Peter Chomnie

School of Social Work, University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, Minnesota

### INTRODUCTION

As has been pointed out by a host of writers,<sup>1</sup> a crucial issue in conducting evaluative or action type research is the problem of gearing an appropriate research design into the cogs of organizations, ensuring that once initiated the evaluation is in fact conducted according to the original design, and that the results of the study are utilized in policy formulations and ultimately in program development. The focus of this case study is on the major political and administrative problems and processes involved in planning, conducting, and utilizing the findings from a field experiment dealing with the relative effects of parole supervision as provided to a group of juvenile aged boys and girls.

An assumption of the paper is that many of the problems encountered in the process of conducting evaluation research in the field of Corrections will have relevance to a variety of projects in different substantive fields. Accordingly, there is a need for illustrative case material dealing with the problems involved in planning and conducting the research as well as in utilizing the findings derived from an evaluation project. The hope is that such material will accumulate to provide insight into the peculiar nature of the socio-political processes endemic to this work, help to illuminate issues, suggest general propositions and indicate avenues for conflict resolution.

The case study reported on here centers on an examination of outcomes resulting from the provision of differential parole supervision to juvenile aged boys and girls released from the two major state-level correctional institutions in Minnesota between August 1, 1970 and May 31, 1971.<sup>2</sup> The aim was to determine whether juveniles released from institutional settings would adjust as well on parole without formal supervision from parole officers as a corresponding group receiving conventional parole supervision. Viewed in chronological sequence, five major steps were involved in implementing the research: (1) the identification and assignment of boys and girls from the

two institutions to a study pool, (2) random assignment to experimental or control status from within the study pool, (3) release on parole, (4) provision of either conventional parole supervision or no parole supervision to the respective groups, (5) evaluation of outcomes on parole. In short, the formal design of this research took the form of an "after-only" field experiment.

Prior to the actual implementation of the study design considerable time and effort were devoted to planning with the relevant administrative units of the Department of Corrections. While detailed attention to defining relationships with the various units involved in the conduct of the research at the outset was time consuming and frustrating, none the less it was to be an essential pre-condition to the successful conduct of the project. The assumption was that if the research could be fitted into the normal operations of the agencies concerned, resulting in only mild disruption in routines, the probability of receiving continued on-going administrative support and cooperation would be greatly enhanced.

The pertinent administrative units dealt with included the Parole Division of the Department of Corrections as the administrative unit responsible for providing parole supervision to all juveniles released from state-operated correctional institutions. This division was made up of parole officers, supervisors and administrators scattered throughout the state. The Youth Conservation Commission or parole board was a further key administrative unit as it was responsible for decisions on the placement and release of youth in state correctional institutions. Finally, the two correctional institutions from which samples were to be selected were obviously relevant.

Because the project involved some departures from agency "business as usual" detailed discussions of the general purpose as well as its implementation were carried out to help ensure that the research would be conducted with a minimum of confusion and in accordance with the originally agreed upon procedures.

#### NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE PAROLE BOARD

Once the members of the Parole Board had formally agreed to the conduct of a study that proposed to assess the relative impact of "regular parole supervision" and "no parole supervision" with juvenile boys and girls, two major questions had to be resolved. First, was it necessary for all youth to receive parole or could some youth be given flat discharges from the institutions? A further question concerned the kinds of restrictions to be placed upon the sample selection procedures by this releasing authority (i.e. what youth would not be eligible for no parole supervision)?

The latter issue generated heated discussions between the researchers and the parolling authorities. On grounds of greater potential generalizability of research findings, the investigators preferred that the study be conducted with no restrictions on the kinds of youth to be placed in the sample

selection pool; the simple fact of imminent release on parole would constitute the only logical basis for random assignment. On the other hand, the releasing authority felt responsible for potentially endangering either communities or particular parolees as a result of releasing certain youth without the presumed benefits of parole supervision. Involved here was an overriding concern on the part of the Board members with what they saw as a distinct possibility of engendering negative reactions from community members due to the sampling requirements of the study. This possibility, moreover, had to be of concern to the investigators, for if a youth were released on parole without supervision and subsequently became involved in a serious criminal offense, a cause and effect link - no matter how spurious - might be imputed and lead out to pressures to terminate the study. As political appointees, members of the Parole Board could reasonably be expected to withstand only limited pressures from the community; particularly if those pressures were directed against research. This issue was finally resolved by the two parties agreeing that certain categories of youth would be kept out of the pool from which samples were to be drawn.

Given this constraint, it was then necessary to develop clear criteria on the basis of which such youth could be identified and excluded from the random selection pool. The researchers were concerned that too wide a set of invalidating criteria would be defined by the releasing authority; in contrast, the Board members were concerned that too narrow a set of invalidating criteria would be defined by the researchers, thus allowing an unacceptably broad spectrum of youth the chance of being included in the experimental or "no supervision" group. To avoid a stalemate over these differing perspectives it was necessary to negotiate a compromise.

From a number of criteria, five were finally filtered out by the Board members as being especially troublesome. These remaining criteria were then used to exclude youth from the study pool: (1) officially known involvement in an act of arson, (2) officially known involvement in an act of rape; (3) formal diagnosis of 'severe emotional disturbance', (4) parole to a living situation other than to the legal parental home, (5) a consistent record of assaultive behaviors. While each of these criteria reflect some degree of vagueness, they were seen by the researchers as reflecting the best compromise that could be developed under existing conditions.

A second major issue that had to be negotiated with the paroling authorities prior to the implementation of the project was that of determining the exact nature of parole for the experimental and control groups. The investigators preferred that the experimental group members be given flat release from the institutions to eliminate the possible confounding effect of parole status, itself. The design of the research would simply involve first assessing whether or not prospective parolees met the study criteria and second, given that these were met, randomly assigning them to either the conventional parole supervision group or to the experimental group - the members of which would be provided with outright discharges upon release from the institution. With the intruding factor of 'parole' eliminated for the experimental group, the potential effects of parole supervision as compared to no parole supervision could be accurately and fairly easily assessed.

Because standing policy dictated against flat release from institutions for juveniles, the members of the Youth Commission felt that they could not accept this proposal. As a result, parole had to remain a constant for both study groups with modifications made around the relative degree of supervision received while on this status. Because the conventional parole agreement stipulated conditions requiring the parolee and parole agent to maintain contact, a modified parole agreement form had to be developed by the investigators for those youth assigned to experimental status. The major modification made was to eliminate the requirements for parole agent-parolee contact. Clearly, however, ethical requirements demanded that in a somewhat subjectively defined 'crisis', the youth would have the option of contacting the parole officer. As a consequence, procedures had to be developed for monitoring parole contacts made by members of the experimental and control groups.

Once the issues of defining excluding criteria and maintaining the fact of parole as a constant were dealt with, the eventual size of samples had to be negotiated. These issues were all inter-related inasmuch as the specified criteria would directly affect the proportion of all released from the two institutions that could be assigned to either the experimental or control groups. Thus, if the five criteria eliminated a large proportion of the total number of released from possible inclusion in these study groups, the time period set for obtaining a sizeable sample would be considerably lengthened. Compounding this problem was a lack of information on the proportion of youth being released from the relevant institutions falling within the five study criteria.

For similar reasons the members of the Parole Board, the administrators of the parole division and the administrators of the institutions were concerned with this question. The Board members were not prepared to sanction a study which would take an interminable length of time to complete. Furthermore, agency administrators were not disposed to tolerate research-caused disruptions in the normal routine of their programs for any prolonged period of time. As a result of these considerations a ten-month follow-up period was agreed upon. While this follow-up was far too short to obtain information on all sample members who would eventually return to correctional settings, it did cover the average length of the parole period for juveniles in the state.

A more pervasive type of public relations issue had to be dealt with once the above questions had been resolved. During the initial planning stages, the Board members and the administrators of the parole division had raised persistent concerns about the manner in which local police and juvenile court officers were to be informed about the proposed investigation. In particular, concern was expressed about the possibility of generating negative reactions from these local officials if the proposed study were conducted without their explicit approval.

To handle this problem the Board members suggested that a description of the proposed study be provided to local police and court officials prior to

initiating the research effort. The rationale for proceeding in this way was to provide local authorities with an opportunity to react to the study before it was formally implemented. The investigators, on the other hand, were wary. They saw the suggestion as a catalyst stirring up negative sentiment among local officials and possibly undermining or even aborting the project before it got off the ground.

As a less disastrous alternative, the researchers proposed that following the actual implementation of the study, copies of a form letter describing the research be provided to each parole officer in the state who would then be free to use his own personal discretion in providing it to the local police and court authorities. Proceeding in this way had several advantages. First, because the local parole officers would be better able to assess potential reactions to such a letter, they would be in a better position to make an informed judgement about making it available. Also, informing local officials after the actual initiation of the project might discourage - if not eliminate - action to terminate it since they would be faced with a fait accompli. Furthermore, since the field agent was closely involved with these local officials, there would be a greater opportunity to explain on a more intimate basis those issues which were seen as requiring further clarification. Finally, the process of having the parole officer explain the nature of the study to these local officials was expected to diminish the possibility of the research being interpreted as a case of local youth being "victimized" through "depriving" some of them of parole services.

After frequent and lengthy discussions with the members of the Parole Board and the administrators of the parole division, this issue was resolved in the manner proposed by the investigators. After the first monthly group had been randomly assigned, the parole officers were equipped with form letters which at their own discretion they provided to local authorities. The low probability of field agents having an experimental group member assigned to their caseload was a point that was forcefully stressed in this material.

#### NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE INSTITUTIONS

Upon receiving the formal consent of the Parole Board for the conduct of the proposed study, the investigators contacted the administrators of the two institutions which were to function as sample selection sites and received tentative assurances of cooperation. A series of meetings were then conducted with the supervisory and administrative staff members at these institutions in order to deal with the kinds of demands that this study would place upon the staff. The content of these discussions ranged from very practical concerns such as the use of the study instruments and procedures to be followed in informing the field agent of a youth's assignment to the experimental group, to the more general question concerning the extent to which the research itself might conflict with the service orientation of the staff. Generally, staff members at both institutions could agree with the proposed conduct of the

study but not unreservedly. There were still major reservations about the possible compromise of service goals.

Specifically, the sets of priorities under which the staff at the institutions operated were viewed as conflicting with the research being proposed. The practitioner concern with what Wright has called a "strategy of activity" which was manifested in providing service to youth committed to their care, was seen by some staff members as antithetical to a "strategy of research". This concern was most graphically expressed by a few who indicated that they felt the researchers were "playing dice" with human lives by randomly assigning children to experimental and control groups. This statement seemed to reflect a nagging concern over the conflict between providing services to young people and evaluating the effects of such services; the choice presumably prioritized as one of helping young people as against gathering information on them.<sup>5</sup> From the researcher's perspective, however, the conflict was more apparent than real. For without adequate information and testing, there would seem to be little to ensure that the service being provided was really a "service" or that the help being offered was actually helping anyone - assumptions which the practitioners adhered to in defending the service priority.

Another problem was to develop ways to gear the random selection procedures of the study design in with the administrative procedures of the two institutions without either violating the design or grossly interfering with the normal administrative functioning of the institutions. By working closely with the pertinent administrative staff at the two institutions, this problem was resolved to the mutual satisfaction of both the researchers and the staff members.

#### NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE FIELD STAFF

Concurrent with the meetings held with the administrative staff at the pertinent institutions and those with the Parole Board over a six-week period prior to the formal initiation of the study, meetings were arranged with all supervisory and administrative staff members in the parole division. The initial meeting held with representatives from this Division involved the researchers and the four top administrative staff members. The general nature of the proposed study as well as the procedures to be followed as those related to parole supervision were presented and discussed. Once general approval was received at this meeting, sessions were scheduled with each supervisory staff member throughout the state.

The purpose of meeting with supervisory staff members was explicitly to provide information on the proposed research and solicit reactions to the kinds of problems that could be anticipated as arising during the conduct of the study. Questions relating to the general design of the study were not a major concern at these meetings; however, questions on the specific procedures as to how experimental group members were to be handled by the individual parole officers did arise. How, for example, would agents handle the common

school requirement that all returning parolees be accompanied to school by the parole officer? Now would placement plans formulated at the institution prior to release be affected by assignment to experimental status? How would "contacts" be defined? Not unexpectedly, field also wanted a clear understanding of how they were to be notified of the youth's placement in the experimental group as well as how the family was to be notified of such placements. Finally, questions were raised regarding the amount of extra work which would be involved for the agent in handling experimental cases and how to deal with the anticipated community pressures from law enforcement, court, or school officials over not actively supervising certain parolees.

These questions required clear responses on a practical level, an expression of understanding by the investigators of the kinds of problems the study would create for these staff members, along with a clearly expressed willingness to help whenever possible in resolving difficulties. The cooperation and active assistance of the field agents, which was crucial for the conduct of the research, was not likely to be forthcoming if the researchers were seen as callously shoving problems off on them without actively involving themselves in working toward mutually satisfying solutions.

Some of the questions presented at these meetings may have been prompted by an underlying concern. While not explicitly stated as such, the thrust of the proposed investigation was likely perceived as a test of the competency of the field staff. Similarly, the roles of the evaluators seemed to be viewed as those of inspectors or management spies. The fact that the Parole Board and top administrators of the parole division had given their sanction did little to minimize the problem, in fact, their interest in this study may have exacerbated it. To help reduce tension, the investigators found it necessary to explain repeatedly who they were, what their intentions were, and what the potential implications of the research might be in terms of the role and function of the field agent. Moreover, attempts were made to underscore the idea that the program's impact was the focus of evaluation and not the individual practitioner's ability or competence. While anonymity was assured, the mere fact of conducting the study nonetheless constituted a threat by calling into question a rather basic assumption: namely, does parole supervision have an effect on the further delinquent behavior of young people?

Of great help in overcoming these sources of resistance was one of the researcher's prior work experience in the Department of Corrections, and consequently, his familiarity with many of the parole staff. Perhaps because of this, he was not perceived so much as a stranger coming into the setting from the alien world of the university but more as a former colleague who could be expected to have some appreciation of, and sympathy for, the difficulties of the parole officer role.

#### INVOLVEMENT OF THE PAROLE BOARD IN THE CONDUCT OF THE STUDY

A number of problems directly involving the parole board arose during the course of this project. A minor but pervasive problem concerned the on-



going articulation of the random selection procedures at the t institutions with the mutual tasks of the institutional staff and the parole board members at the time of the parole hearings.

Other concerns developed around the availability of the random assignment schedules to either the members of the parole board or institutional staff and the possible slippage of the agreed-upon study criteria. To protect against these concerns becoming serious problems, careful monitoring by the researchers was required on an on-going basis.

As indicated previously, the conduct of this research tended to place local parole officers in a difficult position relative to the local police and court authorities. This was most obviously the case in rural communities where the local police and court tried to remain closely involved in the general progress of a youth released back to the community on parole. On a number of occasions the fact that a parolee was returned on an unsupervised basis seems to have been interpreted by these local officials as a threat to their authority over the local county probation officer and, ultimately, over the youth he was supposed to serve.

For example, over the course of the third and fourth months of the study, a number of letters were received from county probation officers who had experimental group members assigned to their caseloads. These letters tended to express concerns around the methods used in assigning youth to the experimental group as well as the lack of involvement on the part of the local juvenile court judge in planning and the research. Reinforcing these letters were similar types of concern communicated by local judges directly to parole supervisors and administrators.

These individually communicated concerns were more forcefully brought to our attention approximately six months after initiating the study. At a regular meeting of Juvenile Judges from throughout the State, the Chairman of the Parole Board who "happened" to be present was questioned about the nature of the assignments made to the study and, in particular, why the Judges had not been informed prior to beginning the research. As a result of apparent concern over maintaining a good working relationship with the jurists, this official proposed that the investigators meet with each juvenile judge in the State and inform him of the nature and purpose of the study. The implication was clear that if further concerns were raised by the Judges, modifications would have to be made in the procedures used for assigning youth to the study groups. While politically expedient, this suggestion was unrealistic in view of the excessive travel time that would be required. The message, however, was quite clear; this was the first real indication that the Parole Board was prepared to terminate the study in response to pressure from influential publics.

Never completely resolved, this issue was diminished somewhat by the

researchers agreeing to provide the Judges with copies of all information pertinent to the study. Because, in most cases, they had already received this material from the local parole officer, this procedure simply amounted to providing them with an additional copy.

#### THE INVOLVEMENT OF THE PAROLE STAFF AND INSTITUTIONAL STAFF IN THE CONDUCT OF THE STUDY

The investigators attempted to maintain continuous contact with parole staff over the life of the project. To accomplish this, reports providing general information on the conduct of the study were sent out to all staff on a monthly basis. These reports noted the kinds of problems various parole officers encountered and pointed out possible ways in which they might be handled.

The problems that arose at the institutions during the conduct of the research were minor. These included an occasional failure of the institutional staff members to contact the designated parole officers after the parole hearing to inform them of a particular youth's placement in the experimental group and an occasional clerical error in failing to notify the family of a youth's placement in the experimental group.

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Planning and conduct. The process of planning, negotiating, and conducting this evaluative research study presented a number of problems that went beyond the purely technical considerations of research design and analysis. Among the most crucial and exacting of these were integrating the 'strategy of research' concerns of practitioners and the political and administrative concerns of the Parole Division, institutional settings, and the Parole Board. The most difficult and persistent problem was thus to maintain a balance between ensuring that the research would not be severely compromised and the functioning of the various administrative components unnecessarily disrupted. Herzog, for example, has described the process of blending scientific rigor with clinical and administrative practicality as resembling an act of love ". . . in the fact that it is vastly written about and yet when it happens to a person it feels new, unexpected, uncharted."<sup>9</sup>

In order to help avoid some of the potential pitfalls of conducting a field experiment of this magnitude, it was crucial to have a clearly articulated initial working agreement between the researchers and the administrative and service components relevant to the study. A clear understanding of the kind of constraints bearing on the research in relation to what could and what could not be done had to be specified. In turn, the constraints bearing on the clinicians and administrators had to be acknowledged and handled within the limits of the research design. Specifically, it was necessary to deal with political constraints involving groups such as the Probate and Juvenile Court Judges and policy constraints relating to the institutions and field services

components of the Department of Corrections and the Parole Board. Without deliberate planning along with a mutual sense of trust between the relevant bodies and the investigators, the project may well have been aborted on several different occasions. Involved here was the importance of the investigators providing administrators and practitioners with assurances of their technical competency, their understanding of the agency setting, as well as their personal integrity.

Findings and utilization. A major finding of this research was that assigning cases on the basis of providing differential exposure to parole supervision does not have a significant positive effect upon the parole adjustment of juvenile-aged boys and girls.<sup>10</sup> Within the group of boys, significantly more control group members as compared to their experimental counterparts had parole revoked during the ten-month follow-up. Furthermore, with regard to girls, a similar but not statistically significant tendency was apparent.

Unplanned for and unexpected findings included sex-related differentials in treatment afforded juveniles as well as the amount and perceived quality of help sought out and received by juvenile parolees in the community. With regard to the former, it was found that girls as compared to boys experienced fewer opportunities to remain within the local community either on probation status or in county-operated institutional settings and were committed to the state-level Youth Commission and subsequently placed in state operated correctional settings at a younger age and for the commission of less serious types of offenses. In terms of the provision of help within the community context, it was found that close relatives and peers as compared to more professionally defined 'helping sources' were most frequently indicated as people with whom problems were discussed and the fact of experimental status did not significantly relate to either the type of people sought out for help, the frequency they were sought out, or the extent to which they were defined as helpful.

The major conclusions were included in a summary of the project which was distributed to all parole officers, supervisors and administrators, as well as to the members of the Parole Board. In conjunction with this summary of the project findings, the investigators communicated their willingness to meet with and discuss the programmatic implications of the research. Unfortunately, no response to this offer was ever made by either the practitioners, supervisors or administrators of the parole division or by the members of the parole board. Almost totally ignored, the project became in effect, a "non-study" - left to gather dust on a shelf.

Approximately a year after the completion of the study a new administration was appointed to the Department of Corrections. An attempt was made by a new Deputy Commissioner to have the findings of the project discussed and the implications for the delivery of parole services examined. The major focus of discussion by parole supervisors soon came to be the adequacy of the methodology used. Consequently, the Deputy Commissioner contracted with an outside researcher to write a critical appraisal of the study including the methods used and the plausibility of the findings. Faced with a positive

assessment of the study, the supervisors were left with the recourse of making veiled charges of unethical behavior on the part of the researchers along with further methodological nitpicking.

Even with the strong support of the Deputy Commissioner, little more came of using the study findings for the more effective and efficient delivery of parole supervision.

Why did the findings of this project have so little direct impact on the relevant administrative units? This question is particularly intriguing in view of the excellent cooperation and high degree of trust maintained between the investigators and the administrative, supervisory and line-level parole staff during the course of the project. A primary reason may have been the initial failure on the part of the researchers and the pertinent organizational units to explore and make explicit what each party saw the purpose of the study to be, particularly in relation to functional programmatic decisions.<sup>11</sup> While the researchers viewed the major purpose of the project to be a rigorous test of the validity assumption parole supervision, the relevant organizational units seemed to view the study as one of documenting what they already 'knew' to be true about the program. Negative results were neither seriously entertained by the Parole Board nor raised as a highly probable outcome by the researchers. In turn, the program implications were never dealt with. Consequently, when the negative results were demonstrated, there was no commitment on the part of the parole staff to make modifications in the manner in which services were being delivered. Added to this lack of commitment was a state of uncertainty over what changes would be required in order to more effectively achieve organizational goals. Thus, while the researchers clearly demonstrated that parole efforts were largely ineffective, the effort was of little help in charting clear alternative courses of action. Attention had not been paid in advance to contingency planning of the different ways the results conceivable could turn out as well as the ways in which each set of alternative findings could lead to modifications in the delivery of parole services. Thus, while program personnel might have been able to accept the general accuracy of the findings the substantive implications for using the results to modify service delivery patterns were ambiguous. Program people were left in the untenable position of either concluding that parole services as presently being provided were totally ineffective or that the research was in error. Being unwilling to conclude the former, they chose the latter course and, as a consequence, disregarded the conclusions which were obtained.

FOOTNOTES

The literature on this issue is vast inasmuch as it constitutes a distinctive feature of evaluation research. See in particular: Hyman Rodman and Ralph Kolodny, "Organizational Strains in the Researcher-Practitioner Relationship," in Alvin Gouldner and S.M. Miller, editors, Applied Sociology, New York, the Free Press, 1965, pp. 93-113; Peter H. Rossi, "Evaluating Social Action Programs," Trans-Action, 4, 1967, pp. 51-53; Edward A. Suchman, Evaluative Research, New York, Russell Sage, 1967, esp. pp. 151-166; John Mann, "Technical and Social Difficulties in the Conduct of Evaluative Research," in Francis G. Caro, editor, Readings in Evaluation Research, New York, Russell Sage, 1971, pp. 175-184.

This research was supported by grant NI-052 provided by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

A three year follow-up period in correctional research is generally held to be necessary in order to obtain a high percentage of recidivists. See; Gene Kassebaum, David Ward, Daniel Wilner, Prison Treatment and Parole Survival, New York, John Wiley, 1971, esp. p. 212.

John C. Wright, "Curiosity and Opportunism", Trans-Action, 11, Jan-Feb, 1965, pp. 38-40.

For an incisive treatment of this problem in the evaluation of a social welfare agency see: Sidney H. Aronson and Clarence C. Sherwood "Researcher Versus Practitioners: Problems in Social Action Research," Social Work, October, 1967, pp. 89-96.

See: Edward A. Suchman, "Action for What? A critique of Evaluative Research," in Carole H. Weiss, Ed., Evaluating Action Programs: Readings in Social Action and Education, Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1973, pp. 52-84.

On this point of the definition of the researcher, see; Rensis Likert and Ronald Lippitt, "Utilization of Social Science," in L. Festinger and D. Katz, editors, Research Methods in the Behavioral Sciences, New York, Holt, 1953, p. 611.

Elizabeth Herzog, Some Guide Lines for Evaluative Research, Washington, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1959, p. 88. More specifically on this point with reference to correctional settings, Cressey has clearly described the conflicts faced by correctional workers in formulating their attitudes toward evaluation research and has noted that while these workers are supposed to be in favor of such research they recognize that the findings may threaten the continued existence of their program. See: Donald R. Cressey, "The Nature and Effectiveness of Correctional Techniques," Law and Contemporary Problems, Autumn, 1958, pp. 754-771.

9. See on this point; Roland Warren, Social Research Consultation, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1963, p. 28.
10. This finding is supported by a wide variety of studies using different methodologies, designs, and involving different populations. See, for reviews of this literature; Stuart Adams, "Some Findings From Correctional Caseload Research," Federal Probation, December, 1967, pp. 48-57; H. J. Vetter and Reed Adams, "Effectiveness of Probation Caseload Sizes: A Review of the Empirical Literature," Criminology, February, 1971, pp. 333-343.
11. See on this point of the decision - related function of evaluation and the probability of utilizing findings; Edward A. Suchman, "Action for What? A critique in Evaluative Research," in Carole H. Weiss, editor, Op Cit., p 55; Carole H. Weiss, Evaluation Research; Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1972, p. 119.