75-DF-99-0040

AN EVALUATIVE CASE STUDY OF THE TRUST PROJECT

(AN INTERACTIVE MEDIA CITIZENS

PARTICIPATION PROGRAM)

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Field of Educational Administration

by

Jane Marie Browne

Evanston, Illinois

June, 1976

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

AN EVALUATIVE CASE STUDY OF THE TRUST PROJECT

(AN INTERACTIVE MEDIA CITIZENS

PARTICIPATION PROGRAM)

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Field of Educational Administration

by

JANE MARIE BROWNE

Evanston, Illinois

June 1976

ABSTRACT

This is an evaluative case study of the TRUST pro-
ject, a citizens participation project based on the inter-
active media (also called "listening group," "viewer-
discussion group," "viewing post") concept. The study was
concerned with evaluation both as product and process and
sought to describe the following:

1. the results of an attempt to implement an
    interactive media citizens participation pro-
    ject with the objectives, resources, and con-
    straints that were a part of TRUST;

2. the factors which influenced the evaluation pro-
    cess of an interactive media citizens partici-
    pation project carried out under the conditions
    under which the TRUST evaluation was imple-
    mented.

In order to determine some of the results of the
project, three procedures were used:

1. The extent of the attainment of the objectives
    related to viewer-discussion groups was
    measured by two instruments. All of the viewer-
    discussion participants were supposed to com-
    plete a set of questions on a pretest-posttest
    basis on instruments called "Feedback

Questionnaires." The questions were designed primarily to measure the participants' feelings about their knowledge of the dynamics of the criminal justice system and about their commitment and obligation to work for improvement in the system. "Follow-up Questionnaires" were used to survey the viewer-discussion group leaders several months after the project was completed. The questions on these instruments were designed for the purpose of finding out what the viewer-discussion group activity was like and why some groups stayed together for the series of four programs while others apparently did not.

2. The extent of the attainment of the objectives related to cooperating organizations in the project was measured by a survey of organizational representatives carried out several months after the project was completed. This survey provided data on the reasons organizations participated in the project and the extent to which they were helped in the five ways the project was designed to benefit organizations and in other ways.

3. An analysis was done of the major events or processes that were a part of the project; these included: the initiation of the project; the issue-identification phase; citizens

mobilization; group leader training; selected
processes related to the functioning of the
viewer-discussion groups (i.e., paperwork
logistics and feedback/follow-up); and the
Action Fair Conference. The purposes of the
analysis were to clarify some of the findings
that resulted from the two foregoing proce-
dures, to outline the various problems in each
phase of the project, and to give a comprehen-
sive picture of the overall project.

Evaluation was not discussed as a separate activity.
Instead, the factors that determined the format and content
of the evaluation were considered along with the particular
aspect of the project being discussed. Some of these fac-
tors were the concerns of the project director, the con-
straints imposed by the field setting, and the investiga-
tor's state of knowledge about various elements in the pro-
ject.

Thirty-four recommendations were offered related to
the different events and processes in the project and to
evaluation.

Dedicated to my parents, Mr. and Mrs. William P.
Browne, and my two sisters, Margarett and Phiefer Browne

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The following persons deserve special mention for the contributions they made to the production of this dissertation:

Professor Charles W.N. Thompson, who provided my initial contact with the TRUST project and gave direction and support throughout the research and writing stages;

Professor Gustave J. Rath, who supervised my first experience with a "real world" evaluation;

Professor William R. Hazard, who maintained an active interest in my academic career;

Mrs. Janet Malone, Executive Director of TRUST (formerly COPE) who gave me free access to the records and facilities of the TRUST project;

Miss Joann Roseman, who, although doing her own doctoral research, keypunched three sets of my questionnaires, helped me with other problems related to data processing, and graciously shared her closed study space in the library with me;

The group leaders and organizational representatives who responded to my questionnaires.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents (continued)

Table of Contents (continued)

Table of Contents (continued)

Table of Contents (continued)

Table of Contents (continued)

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND AND DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The importance of citizen participation in public policy decision making is generally acknowledged. Such participation can be viewed as having at least three kinds of utility (Cahn and Cahn, 1971); it provides:

1. a way of mobilizing unused resources--a source of labor and production not otherwise tapped;

2. a source of information--a means of getting feedback on policy and programs and a source of novel and creative approaches;

3. an end in itself--a confirmation of democracy and a means of reducing alienation, hostility, and skepticism in relying on the people.

Various processes have been devised to effect citizen participation, one of which involves the use of "listening groups." Ohliger (1966) outlined some of the potential benefits of the listening group and defined its properties as follows:

> Some educational researchers credit the listening group approach with the ability to spread the learning of factual material more efficiently on a mass basis, to promote the development of desired attitudes, to increase interest in various subject matter areas, and to significantly affect motivation toward group and individual action. Mass communication researchers seem in general agreement that there is potentially great educational and persuasive power in the combination of

broadcast followed by small group discussion supple-
mented by printed material. Some political scientists
and public figures believe that a listening group move-
ment might be an important element in moving toward more
direct democracy in an age of pervasive mass media.
(p. 3)

The listening group is referred to by other names; e.g.,
"interactive media," "viewer-discussion group," and "viewing
post," and these are used interchangeably throughout this
report.

The purpose of this report is to present an evalua-
tive case study of a citizen participation project which was
based on the listening group concept. The remainder of this
chapter provides the following:

1. a description of the project that was the focus
    of this research;

2. a description of the design of the present
    study;

3. an outline of the rest of the report.

Description of the Project

This chapter gives the first of two descriptions of
the program under consideration in this study; i.e., the
TRUST project, sponsored by the Council on Population and
Environment. The first description is an objective outline
of the program, the purpose of which is primarily to pro-
vide a frame of reference for Chapters II through V. The
second description, in Chapter VI, is more analytical and
takes into consideration the data in Chapters III-V and
other data necessary for evaluating the program.

Background of the Sponsoring Organization

The Council on Population and Environment (referred to as "COPE" or "the Council") was organized in 1969 to convene the First National Congress on Optimum Population and Environment. The Congress was held in Chicago in 1970 with about one thousand persons from all walks of life in attendance. The participants included both "old" leaders who had been involved with population control and environmental problems for years and "new" leaders. The old leaders were disturbed because several caucuses formed and met. From this experience, COPE recognized a crucial but neglected task was that of bringing about communication among these various groups (Kellman, Note 1).

After the First National Congress, COPE, through a complex evolution and expansion of its Board of Directors, started to focus on problems of the urban environment. COPE is a non-profit organization (501(c) (31)) and is not a private foundation. There are twenty persons on its Board, fourteen of whom are from the Chicago area. Major financial support comes from individuals, corporations, foundations, and, with the advent of TRUST, governmental agencies (COPE, Note 2).

COPE is not an activist organization trying to foster specific solutions to urban social problems; there are already many groups effectively engaged in such efforts. However, the members of these groups are exposed to a single focus of opinion for the most part, and they interact with

others who have views on the issues similar to theirs. COPE
desired to bring about cross-interest group communication in
which a key element would be interaction, rather than agree-
ment, concensus, or resolution (Kellman, Note 1).

A program of Monthly Luncheon Dialogues was estab-
lished in Chicago in 1972 which featured concurrent discus-
sions on major issues in housing, criminal justice, trans-
portation, health care delivery, and energy-environment. In
all, representatives from more than four hundred govern-
mental agencies, community organizations, and businesses
have participated. The Council has always perceived of the
monthly luncheons as a source of human resources and a po-
tential programmatic base as well as a means of satisfying
a need for diverse interest group interaction. However, it
was recognized that the monthly luncheon program could have
only minimal impact at the planning level because of its
limited attendance and scope and its fragmented treatment
of the issues. Therefore, in 1973, COPE began to experiment
with interactive media programs to involve more citizens
and interest groups.

Background of TRUST

Several factors helped determine the nature of
COPE's next undertaking with interactive media which was the
TRUST (To Reshape Urban Systems Together) project. Because of
the experience with the RTA program, COPE saw the possi-
bilities of using the interactive media process as a cata-
lyst for effecting citizen participation in public policy

decision making. However, according to COPE's executive director (who was also the project director for TRUST), she was concerned about the relatively limited impact of their activity because of the Council's late involvement with the RTA issue. Also, she was aware of the importance of the topic or the issue that would be the focus for any proposed interactive media project to the success of that endeavor (Malone, Note 3). The Council's monthly luncheon programs had concurrent discussion workshops going on in five areas and they decided to choose from among them for their next interactive media effort. Criminal justice was chosen because:

> Of the five areas, recent polls indicate that the criminal justice system (and public safety) is a prime citizen concern both nationally and locally. Not only Harris and Gallup surveys, but also the statewide study by the Illinois Council for the Humanities, listed criminal justice/public safety (variously phrased) as number four behind inflation, the accountability of government, and powerlessness of the individual.

> Accountability and 'powerlessness' are better addressed through the process of citizen participation itself, and we see no way in which inflation might be amenable to citizen involvement on a merely regional basis (COPE, Note 4, p. 6).

Specifically, what COPE proposed to accomplish through the TRUST project was as follows:

> To involve between 3,000 and 5,000 citizens in Chicago and outlying Cook County in learning about the many problems that bear on public safety and the justness and effectiveness of our criminal justice system; to help these citizens identify and prioritize what they feel are the most critical issues and choices; to give them access to the experts, professionals and decision makers who have major voice in shaping criminal justice policies; and to help these citizens find channels through which they might be involved in making a more effective system (COPE, Note 4, p. 1).

COPE eventually received the major funding for the TRUST project from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) under its Citizens Initiatives Program. TRUST was classified as an "education to action" program by LEAA and the purposes of such programs are:

> To enlighten citizens as to the nature and scope of criminal justice problems at both the national and local levels and the specific ways they can become involved in 1) improving the quality of criminal justice and 2) implementing programs designed to protect themselves against crime on both an individual and community wide basis (LEAA, Note 5).

The Issue Identification Phase

In discussing the importance of the issue identification component of the TRUST project, the TRUST proposal for funding (COPE, Note 4) asserted:

> The key to the whole citizen participation concept lies in the process which assures that the concerns of a variety of interests are fairly taken into consideration. The decisions about what the event should accomplish, what issues should be dealt with, and the critical choices contained in these issues, must be made by representatives of three basic groups of participants: Outside Experts . . . On-the-Line Professionals . . . [and] Concerned Citizens (pp. 10-11).

The Issue Identification Process

All of the individuals and organizations that were on COPE's regular monthly luncheon mailing list and some fifty other organizations concerned with criminal justice were informed by mail that a new interactive media project was being considered and that this project would be discussed at a special meeting on March 28, 1974, one week after the regular luncheon meeting for that month.

Eventually, a group of some twenty individuals representing law enforcement agencies, other organizations concerned primarily with criminal justice problems, and a variety of community organizations formed an issue identification and content development committee to develop initial plans for the program.

On April 8, 9 and 17, issue identification sessions involving lay citizens were held in a near-Loop location. The general purpose of these meetings was to inform and demonstrate to the participants how to organize issue identification sessions in their communities. Subsequently, some twenty-three groups of ordinary citizens, with a total of about one hundred seventy-five participants, convened at such places as public housing sites, union halls, and suburban homes for the purposes of issue identification (COPE, Note 6). In April, eighty-eight criminal justice "experts" were surveyed by two mailed questionnaires (COPE, Note 7).

In May, the results from the issue identification sessions and the questionnaires that had been received from the experts and professionals were summarized and distributed to the members of the issue identification committee. They were to use these data, as much as possible, to develop some objectives and outlines for the television programs. Then these objectives and outlines were to be given to various producers/directors to get the latters' ideas about achieving the objectives and their budgets for doing so (COPE, Note 8).

The Making of the Films

A series of four films entitled ". . . And Justice For All" was produced for the TRUST project. The individual films were entitled: "Crime, Criminals, and the System"; "Fear, Crime, and Prevention"; "Justice and the Criminal Courts"; and "The Role of the Community."

The production of the films was a collaborative effort between the filmmakers and the Council throughout the development of the films. The rough cuts of the first three films were shown at several preview sessions and various changes were made in the films based on the reactions of those who attended these sessions.

The Viewer Discussion Groups

In July, a citizens mobilization staff hired by the Council began the task of recruiting leaders for viewer-discussion groups. Their goal was the organization of between three hundred to five hundred groups, with ten to fifteen participants, each of whom would watch and give feedback on the ". . . And Justice For All" programs.

Four training sessions were held for prospective viewer-discussion group leaders on October 10, 11 and 15, 1974. The locations for these sessions were in or near the downtown section of Chicago.

The four ". . . And Justice For All" television programs were shown on three Chicago television channels beginning October 25, 1974. Each program was broadcast four separate times--twice on Channel 11 (8 p.m. Mondays and

1:30 p.m. Fridays), once on Channel 32 (11 a.m. Mondays),
and once on Channel 44 (8 p.m. Mondays). There was a week's
interval between the four different films. Viewer discus-
sion groups met in private homes, churches, and schools to
watch and discuss these programs and carry out other activi-
ties that had been designated for them.

The Action Fair Conference

The culmination of the TRUST project was an Action
Fair Conference held on December 7, 1974, on the Chicago cam-
pus of Northwestern University. This conference was a multi-
workshop event whose purpose was to provide citizens further
opportunity to join forces in whatever way they chose to
work for change in the criminal justice system. Moreover,
it was intended to give relevant organizations opportunity
to make available material on their programs and to recruit
new members and volunteers. Plans for this component of the
project were developed at five meetings which involved a
number of individuals representing organizations and agen-
cies concerned with criminal justice.

Design of the Study

Before discussing the design of the present study,
it is necessary to outline some of the characteristics of
evaluation research that distinguish it from other forms
of social research and which in fact influenced the present
research and suggests its limitations.

    1. Evaluation research usually brings together a

researcher and a client who intends to use the research as a basis for decision making.

2. The researcher must address himself to the program being studied from the initial definition of the problem to the final analysis of the findings; therefore, he usually has less latitude in choosing which variables he will study than in research resulting from his own theoretically formulated questions.

3. The researcher rarely has freedom to manipulate the program or its components.

4. The time period for which the researcher's services are called upon and the nature of the program being studied influence the nature of various aspects of the research design.

The questions which guided the research under consideration were related to the objectives for the two target groups in the TRUST project: the "ordinary citizen" and the cooperating organizations. The objectives for citizens were implied in the following quote taken from the evaluation section of the project proposal:

> How did the ordinary citizen-participants regard the experience? Do they feel more informed about the issues? More motivated with regard to working for changes in the system? Would they be inclined to take part in future such interactive media projects focusing on issues other than criminal justice? To what extent did they participate because of the topic, and to what extent because they welcomed an opportunity to join in the citizen participation process? How important was the 'sociability' dimension to their overall satisfaction with the process? (COPE, Note 6, p. 15).

The objectives for cooperating organizations could be inferred from the following:

> [What was] the value of the project to citizens' groups particularly concerned with criminal justice issues? How did they evaluate their own participation? Did the project help them become more visible in the community, advance their agendas, learn from others, gain additional members or volunteers, and so on? (COPE, Note 6, p. 15)

The accomplishment of the objectives related to citizens and cooperating organizations was measured by three kinds of questionnaires:

1. Feedback Questionnaires, which were supposed to be administered to all of the participants in the viewer-discussion groups. There was one Feedback Questionnaire for each of the four ". . . And Justice for All" television programs, the first and the fourth of which contained a set of questions that served as a pretest and posttest for evaluation purposes;

2. A Follow-Up Questionnaire sent to viewer-discussion group leaders;

3. A Follow-Up Questionnaire for representatives of cooperating organizations.

The latter two questionnaires were sent out several months after the project was over.

In addition to the questions that were dictated by the objectives of the TRUST project, this research was concerned with exploring and describing: 1) the activities and problems related to the major events or processes of the

project; and 2) the factors that shape the evaluation of a project like TRUST.

In order to address herself to the aforementioned questions and concerns,[1] the investigator engaged in the following activities:

1. attended previews of the rough cuts of the ". . . And Justice For All" films;

2. assisted in the planning and implementation of the training sessions for viewer-discussion group leaders;

3. collaborated with the project director on the development of the aforementioned questionnaires and a questionnaire for the Action Fair Conference;

4. attended planning meetings for the Action Fair Conference;

5. attended the Action Fair Conference;

6. examined project records;

7. studied tapes of various planning meetings related to the project;

8. conducted some follow-up interviews with selected project staff members; and

9. reviewed literature on other interactive media projects.

---

[1]This investigator's original responsibility was to study the short-range accomplishments of TRUST; i.e., those that occurred up to and inclusive of the Action Fair Conference. Another researcher was to study the post-Action Fair changes as a part of the "Demonstration Evaluation of

An interactive media-citizens participation intervention is a many-faceted phenomenon. Several aspects of this project were studied for the purposes of evaluation and different models, frameworks, or approaches were used; therefore, to speak of a "design" in the singular might be misleading. A few generalities based on some dimensions proposed by Thompson and Rath (1974) can be offered.

According to these authors, the diverse activities carried out "to determine the effects of introducing changes under field conditions," whether these activities be thought of as "field testing," "evaluation," or "experiments" can be classified according to three dimensions. The first dimension is the EXPLORATORY-A PRIORI dimension and may be described as "'variations in the degree to which the researcher . . . predicts the effect of new data (obtained from the phenomenon) on his results'" (p. 2).

Some factors which influence the selection of a method using this dimension are the objectives of the researcher and the state of the art which he finds initially. Exploratory research is appropriate "in the early stages when uncertainty may exist not only with respect to the relationship among the variables of interest but also with respect to a wide variety of parametric conditions and the conditions most appropriate for examining them" (p.2). The situation in which the investigator found herself in undertaking the evaluation of TRUST is aptly described by the

---

Interactive Media Project." However, because of contractual delays and uncertainty concerning funding, she re-directed her major focus to an earlier and narrower question. For the most part the writer has followed her original plan.

immediately preceding quote, therefore the research to be discussed was essentially exploratory.

This research varied along the NORMATIVE-EMPIRICAL dimension, which was defined as "'variations in the degree to which the researcher . . . obtains new data directly from the phenomena.' . . . The critical characteristic which this concerns itself with is the degree of mediation (modification, transformation, etc.) between the real world and the researcher's head" (pp. 4-5). The degree of mediation varied according to the aspect or the component of the project being considered. In some instances, the investigator was a participant or observer such as in the training sessions for the group leaders and the Action Fair Conference. In other instances, the reports of others directly involved such as the reports of the viewer-discussion group leaders were relied upon; in still other instances, literature related to other interactive media projects was the basis for conclusions.

The research can generally be classified as a "study" along the STUDY-EXPERIMENT dimension, which was defined as "variations in 'the degree to which the researcher manipulates the phenomena under investigation'" (p. 6). The investigator did have some influence on certain aspects of the program since some of the planning for the program itself and the planning for the evaluation were interrelated. However, such influence generally was minimal.

Outline of the Remainder of the Report

The remaining chapters of this report are as follows:

Chapter II--Review of Related Literature;

Chapter III--The Evaluation of the Viewer-Discussion Groups by Feedback Questionnaires;

Chapter IV--The Evaluation of the Viewer-Discussion Groups by Follow-Up Questionnaires;

Chapter V--The Evaluation of the Attainment of Objectives for Cooperating Organizations;

Chapter VI--Analysis of the Major Events or Processes in the TRUST Project;

Chapter VII--Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The research under consideration was concerned with the evaluation of a listening group or interactive media project. That fact suggested the two concepts that provided the focus for this review of related literature; i.e., "listening group" and "evaluation." Those two concepts are discussed according to the following topics: 1) an Overview of the Development and Use of the Interactive Media Process in the United States; 2) Some Viewpoints on Evaluation; 3) An Overview of Some Interactive Media Project Evaluations; and 4) Some Concluding Observations on the Evaluation of Listening Group Projects.

An Overview of the Development and Use of the Interactive Media Process in the United States

Early Development and Use

Although Ohliger's historical study of the listening group indicated that this format has been used in over thirty countries, the present overview is confined to its development and some of its uses in the United States. Before proceeding with the overview, however, a precise definition is in order.

16

> When a group of adults meets together on some regular basis to discuss radio or television programs, usually under the leadership of a lay person, sometimes with the assistance of supplemental printed materials and with arrangements for two-way communication (feedback) between the listeners and the broadcasters, the group is said to be participating in a 'listening group' project. (Ohliger, 1966, p. xiv).

Listening groups were in operation in the United States as early as 1926 but it was not until the mid- and late-1930s that widespread use evolved. The National Broadcasting Company, the only network in the early days of radio, had loose arrangements with its local affiliates and there was a lack of concern for educational broadcasting because of the commercial emphasis of most stations. Therefore, most listening group projects before the mid-1930s were organized around local non-commercial offerings (Ohliger, 1966, pp. 60-61).

Women's organizations were directly or indirectly responsible for much of the listening group activity prior to World War II. The League of Women Voters sponsored the first large-scale listening group project. Female suffragettes originated "America's Town Meeting of the Air," the broadcast that had more groups organized around it than any other. Also, PTA's and other child study organizations fostered a large number of groups in the early and mid-1930s (Ohliger, 1966, pp. 62-63).

During this same period various institutions of higher education and educational associations promoted listening group projects and/or were otherwise active in trying to exploit the educational capabilities of radio.

The work of the National Student Federation of America, the Agricultural Extension Service at Ohio State University, the University of Kentucky, the National Committee on Education by Radio, and the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education exemplified the efforts in the educational sector (Ohliger, 1966, pp. 67-72).

Three political and cultural trends encouraged the proliferation of listening groups in the mid- and late-1930s. First, during the mid-1930s, radio became a fundamental element in the American culture and economy. Second, discussion was promoted as one of the cure-alls for the nation's ills brought on by the Great Depression; many felt that discussion might serve as a palliative to deter people from more radical alternatives. Third, both of these trends were reinforced legislatively and financially by the Federal government (Ohliger, 1966, pp. 72-75).

Two projects, the Educational Radio Project and the Federal Forum Project, both sponsored by the United States Office of Education and financed largely by WPA funds, resulted from Federal government efforts. Through the former, the two major networks, NBC and CBS, broadcast over seven hundred U.S. Office of Education programs between 1936 and 1940. The purpose of the latter project was to encourage the formation of public affairs forums in local communities throughout the country. Related activities were carried out by the Departments of Agriculture, Labor, and Commerce, and the Federal Housing Administration.

In 1939, Hill began a study sponsored by the Federal government which was the first extensive survey of radio listening groups in the country. Some of the specifics of Hill's study are discussed later in this chapter, but it is pertinent to point out here that he found there were probably at least 15,000 listening groups in the United States and that their activites involved about 300,000 to 500,000 persons (Hill and Williams, 1941).

By the early 1940s, the three factors that had encouraged the growth of listening groups had ceased to exist. The political and social climate was influenced by the war effort rather than the Depression, and radio time was increasingly required for the Federal government's campaigns to assist the war effort. Moreover, because of the paper shortage, advertisers made greater demands on broadcast time. With the development of the defense industries, the nation's economic problems were alleviated and discussion was no longer needed as a palliative. Finally, in 1940-41, Congress cut off funds for the Educational Radio Project and the Federal Forum Project, thereby ending the Federal government's promotion of radio and discussion activities.

Ohliger (1966) cited several reasons for the difficulties in getting a clear picture of listening group activity in the post-war years. There is a great diversity of sponsorship and purposes for such projects in the United States with minimal governmental interest and no governmental sponsorship. Moreover, non-educational institutions

are responsible for much listening group activity which
makes such projects difficult to locate. This situation was
contrasted with that which prevailed in a group of other
countries which had a central sponsorship for projects;
i.e., UNESCO, and the projects had a single purpose; i.e.,
the fostering of local community action.

According to Ohliger (1966) the strongest forces for
the development of listening groups in the post-war period
were the Fund for Adult Education (FAE) and the work of
Eugene I. Johnson. The Fund for Adult Education was estab-
lished in 1951 by the Ford Foundation. The purpose of FAE
as defined by its Board of Directors was that of "supporting
programs of liberal adult education which will contribute to
the development of mature, wise, and responsible citizens
who can participate intelligently in a free society" (quoted
in Burch, 1960, pp. iii-iv). To accomplish this purpose,
the Fund laid particular emphasis on study discussion pro-
grams in the liberal arts. In addition to developing its
own projects, FAE extended financial assistance to national
organizations, universities, and liberal arts centers which
promoted such programs and Eugene I. Johnson was one such
recipient.

Johnson was the director of the Community Education
Project (CEP), sponsored by the San Bernardino Valley
College, from which the term "Metroplex" was coined.
According to Johnson (1957), "The Community Education Pro-
ject was conceived as a broad, experimental effort to

involve greater numbers of people in the study and improvement of community life" (p. 67). Four significant factors determined the format of the Community Education Project:

> (1) A hunch that the failure of individual Valley communities to solve their problems was directly related to the growing interdependence of the entire cluster of communities, as reflected in the movement of people back and forth for work, play, and school with little regard for municipal boundary lines; (2) a belief that the mass media--particularly radio and newspapers-- offered opportunities to cut through the confusing maze of municipalities and special districts in order to reach people directly with an educational program; (3) the belief that small group discussion provides favorable conditions for learning to take place; and (4) that since social progress ultimately results from individual initiative, the focus of community education should be on the individual person (p. 67).

The core of the Community Education Project was an extensive system of "home discussion groups" which focused on a series of half-hour radio programs and accompanying newspaper articles. The themes for the radio series were topics such as the American heritage, family life, and urbanism. The accomplishments during the first four years of the Community Education Project included the following: the presentation of eight series of programs in which over 2500 people participated; the development of "Metroplex Forum" a "talkback" radio program for the discussion groups; experimentation with various methods for conducting large- scale public meetings; the provision of leadership training in group discussion and human relations; and the extension of educational consultation services to over 100 organizations.

In discussing the effects of this project, Johnson (1957) concluded the following:

The restoration of a sense of community was perhaps the
largest single contribution of the CEP to the develop-
ment of San Bernardino Valley. A sense of isolation,
of helplessness and frustration often haunts the resi-
dents of a modern city, and it is necessary to shatter
this shell before any specific progress can be achieved
in solving community problems. When many citizens of a
city begin to share the feeling that the city is their
handiwork and reflects their character, then it becomes
possible to focus the interest and energies of divergent
peoples and institutions on common civic concerns (p.
68).

Johnson cited various manifestations of the growing

sense of community in the San Bernardino Valley. Service

clubs and other civic organizations gradually began to focus

their efforts on the study of local conditions and problems.

Public meetings on community matters had increased atten-

dance. All segments of the community were drawn together by

the various Metroplex activities, which resulted in the

realization that the community was composed of people with

different backgrounds, perceptions of civic problems, and

acceptance of proposed solutions. Willingness to serve on

committees concerned with community problems increased and

such committees more and more began to reflect the diverse

elements of the total population.

Under Johnson's direction, the Civic Education Cen-

ter of Washington University in St. Louis began "Metroplex

Assembly" which was the first interactive media project to

use television. According to Johnson (1965), the basic aim

of Metroplex was "to help the people of a metropolitan area

reestablish a sense of community and to carry on an inquiry

about the fundamental values and issues related to the

quality of living in contemporary urban America" (p. 8).

An annual series of weekly television programs, each
dealing with a different aspect of a common problem or
theme, was the focus of Metroplex Assembly. These weekly
half-hour broadcasts were aimed primarily at informal dis-
cussion groups, called Viewing Posts, which gathered in pri-
vate homes and various other places in the community. The
half-hour television broadcast was followed by an hour
discussion period in the Viewing Posts. Following this dis-
cussion period was a second half-hour broadcast during which
a panel of experts responded to questions and comments which
were phoned into the station during the discussion period.
Of this latter component Johnson (1965) stated: "In this
way, television served to link the discussion groups, which
were scattered throughout the St. Louis metropolitan area
. . . with one another in a kind of modern 'Town Meeting'"
(p. 8).

Some Recent Projects

According to Ohliger (1966) "[the] influence [of
Johnson's projects] lives on as a model for whatever modest
listening group activity there is in this country today"
(p. 184). The final portion of this overview discusses
three other citizen participation-listening group projects,
similar in varying degrees to Johnson's. These projects
were not selected as a random sample of such projects;
Ohliger reported in a 1971 publication that he had dis-
covered nineteen listening group projects which had taken
place since his 1966 dissertation. However, these three

projects were some of the ones for which reports were obtained in time to be considered in this research, and they do illustrate the diversity there can be in projects that are based to one extent or another, on the interactive media concept.

Project Understanding

Of the three recent projects to be discussed, Project Understanding took place first and was the one that had a format most similar to Johnson's Metroplex Assembly. Project Understanding, implemented in Milwaukee in 1970, was sponsored by the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, the Wisconsin Region of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the Wisconsin-Milwaukee Religious Broadcasting Ministry, the Institute of Human Relations, WMUS-TV, and a number of other community organizations, institutions, and groups. This project was funded partially (one-third) by a grant from Title I of the Higher Education Act and partially (two-thirds) by the sponsors (1970 Project Understanding, Note 9).

The 1970 Project Understanding was an outgrowth of a 1969 project that was similarly sponsored and funded. The 1969 project was based on a four-part telecast on the subjects of prejudice and discrimination. Over 4,000 persons in some 300 viewing posts participated in the first Project Understanding. More than 200 viewing posts with around 4,000 participants were involved in the 1970 project. Eighty percent of the participants in the 1970 project had not participated the previous year.

The stated purposes of the 1970 Project Understanding were as follows:

To help each participant to

1. obtain accurate information on human survival issues related to people, poverty, pollution, and politics;
2. think through the implications of these issues and examine their own opinions about them;
3. change his own opinions, attitudes and behavior as it relates to these issues; and
4. take more effective citizen action in bringing about improvement in his own community. (1970 Project Understanding, Note 9, p. 2).

The first objective was to be achieved by the viewing post discussions and the input from a televised discussion group. Objectives three and four were also to be accomplished through the viewing post activity. The viewing post session components were arranged as follows: 1) the viewing of a half-hour documentary; 2) one half-hour of discussion on the content of the program and the written materials; 3) viewing of a group in the television studio discussing the same issues for one-half hour; and 4) one-half hour of further discussion.

CHOICES for '76

A second citizen participation project that made use of listening groups, although they were not as pivotal in this instance, was CHOICES for '76 which was sponsored by the Regional Plan Association (RPA) and financed in part by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. Through this project, information on fifty-one critical policy choices was presented to the people of the New York Urban Region (from Trenton to New Haven).

Several means were used to relay this information. Five topics--Housing, Transportation, Environment, Poverty, and Cities and Suburbs--were discussed on one-hour television programs every two weeks, beginning March 17, 1973. Every single television channel in the Region plus two in Hartford carried these programs; six daily newspapers and one or two radio stations provided summaries; a background book, How to Save Urban America, was available in bookstores and on newsstands and distributed to many social studies teachers and by some businesses to their employees.

Citizens were able to express their opinions on the CHOICES issues through the use of ballots that were available in many libraries and banks, run in almost all the Region's newspapers, and distributed to employees by many corporations and the New York City government. The public was also encouraged to discuss the issues in small groups meeting in homes, churches, schools, and other such locations in the community. It was estimated that around 20,000 persons participated in a discussion group at least once.

The whole CHOICES for '76 process was referred to as a Regional Town Meeting. This process was not viewed as a means of directly influencing public officials but a way of testing RPA's research and recommendations and apprising the public about them in such a manner that the public would be better equipped to support actively or oppose the policies as numerous private and governmental organizations in the Region were making day-to-day decisions (RPA, Note 10).

The Second Mile Project

The Criminal Justice Public Awareness Project (also referred to as the "Second Mile" Project), the project that had the most influence on the objectives and format of TRUST, was implemented in eight counties of the Puget Sound area in the state of Washington in April and May, 1973.

The sponsor was the Puget Sound Coalition, a consortium composed of Seattle University Institute of Urban Affairs, Pacific Lutheran University Center for Human Organization in a Changing Environment (CHOICE), and Western Washington State College Center for Continuing Studies. Funding came from the Omhibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration mechanism of the state of Washington.

In this project, over 100 citizen groups involving about 1,000 persons and 19 school groups with a total of about 1,700 individuals formed viewing posts around a series of six television programs entitled "The Second Mile."

The objectives of the Second Mile project could be inferred from the following: "The true evaluation of the effectiveness of the Second Mile can only be made over a long period of time: were a substantial number of group leaders and participants . . . made sufficiently aware and informed and did they, as a result, become so motivated as to lead them to continuing involvement in some aspect of the criminal justice system?" (Seattle, Note 11, p. 18).

Two elements which were not a part of the projects

previously discussed were introduced in the Second Mile.
The participants were encouraged to do "task assignments"
which would give them actual contact and experience with
some aspect of the criminal justice system.   The task assign-
ments suggested were related to a different component of
the criminal justice system each week; i.e., week II--law
enforcement; week III--the courts; week IV--corrections;
week V--juvenile delinquency.   Examples of suggested task
assignments were as follows (Seattle, Note 11, pp. 46-47):

> [law enforcement]   After making arrangements through
> the chief of police in your area, ride for part of a
> shift in a patrol car.
>
> [the courts] Visit a police station. Gather all the
> forms required to file a criminal complaint.
>
> [corrections] Go to the personnel office of a city or
> county jail. What are the minimum qualifications for a
> jail guard? Is he given any training after being hired?
>
> [juvenile delinquency] Talk to a Juvenile Court judge
> about the disposition options he has open to him in
> handling dependent, delinquent, and incorrigible chil-
> dren.

The second novel element was a Volunteer Action Fair
held immediately after the sixth week of the viewing-
discussion process. The general purposes of this event
were to give private organizations working for change in
the criminal justice system a further chance to publicize
their activities and citizens a chance to get involved with
these organizations if they desired to do so.

Summary of Listening Group Overview

The listening group is a phenomenon that has been
a part of American culture almost as long as broadcast media

have existed. Its promoters have sought to use it for a
variety of purposes, one of the most prevalent of which, at
least in recent years, has been to increase citizen partici-
pation. The question of whether, in fact, it was useful
for that purpose in a specific situation gave direction to
the research that is under consideration in this report.
To come to some conclusions about this question "evaluation"
was the process used, and some aspects of that process are
discussed in the next section.

Some Viewpoints on Evaluation

Definitions of Evaluation

Before beginning any discussion of evaluation, the
state of the art in regard to delimiting this term should
be described. Suchman's assessment of the situation seems
sufficient since he is a generally acknowledged authority
on evaluation. Moreover, his assessment confirmed the state
of affairs the investigator found in doing a selective
review of the literature on evaluation. According to
Suchman (1967, p. 28):

> An examination of the use of the term 'evaluation' in
> the literature reveals an inextricable mixture of con-
> ceptual and operational definitions--with the greater
> emphasis being upon the latter. The conceptual defini-
> tions, for the most part, do not attempt any logical
> formality but rather offer a list of characteristics
> descriptive of evaluation as a cognitive and affective
> process. The operational definitions concentrate upon
> the purposes of evaluation and the procedures involved
> in conducting an evaluation study. This is not espec-
> ially surprising in an area lacking any formalization
> of theory or method and is probably a necessary pre-
> cursor to the development of a more systematic approach.

Suchman gave his definition as follows: "Evaluation connotes some judgment concerning the effects of planned social change . . . a measurement of effectiveness in reaching some predetermined goal" (1971, p. 98). He asserted that following from his definition three elements must be present before an evaluation can take place: 1) a goal or objective which has some positive value or is regarded as desirable; 2) a deliberate intervention which one assumes capable of accomplishing the desired goal; 3) a procedure for determining the extent to which the desired objective is a result of the intervention.

The definition offered by Riecken (1952) embodied the three elements specified by Suchman. "Evaluation is the measurement of desirable and undesirable consequences of an action that has been taken in order to forward some goal that we value. . . . '[A]ction' . . . [refers] to whatever is being done knowingly and purposefully to the participants. . . . 'objectives' refers to what the agency sponsoring or conducting the program is trying to achieve; 'effects' refers to the changes and developments of whatever sort that are observed as a result of or at least as a sequel to the action taken" (pp. 4-5).

A distinction can be made between "evaluation" and "evaluation research." Evaluation is a generic term that covers judgments of many kinds. "Evaluation research" is a specific method of evaluation in which the tools of research are used to make the judging process more objective

and accurate. The evaluator is advised to design his tool according to the function it is to perform and not to substitute a subjective appraisal where scientific approach is required. The definitions discussed on the foregoing page incorporate the elements necessary for evaluation research. To quote Suchman again (1967, p. 32):

> The need today is for more scientific evaluative research and that greater progress in evaluation will be made the more one attempts to examine the objectives of a particular program including the underlying assumptions, develops measurable criteria specifically related to these objectives, and then sets up a controlled situation to determine the extent to which these objectives, and any negative side effects, are achieved. The satisfaction of these three basic requirements is the sine qua non of evaluative research that is truly research and not just subjective judgement.

Models of Evaluation

Some writers have attempted to categorize the various evaluation models. In this discussion the word "model" refers to "a conceptual framework for a set of comparison or measurement procedures" (Adams, Note 12, p. 122), and is used interchangeably with the terms "approach" and "framework." According to Schulberg and Baker (1971) basically two research models can be distinguished when one attempts to conceptualize approaches to evaluation: the goal attainment model and the system model. These writers asserted that there are characteristics of the goal attainment approach that militate against the subsequent findings being used by the program administrator and that the system model is preferable. Some differences between these two types of models can be inferred from the following:

[With the system model] the starting point . . . is not the program's goals. . . . Instead [it] is concerned with establishing a working model of a social unit which is capable of achieving a goal. Unlike the study of a single goal, or even a set of goal activities, the system model is that of a multifunctional unit. . . . In addition to the achievement of goals and subgoals, the system model is concerned with: the effective coordination of organizational subunits; the acquisition and maintenance of necessary resources; and the adaptation of the organization to the environment and to its own internal demands.

. . . In contrast to the goal-attainment model of evaluation which is concerned with the degree of success in reaching a specific objective, the system model establishes the degree to which an organization reaches its goals under a given set of conditions (p. 77).

Adams (Note 12) suggested that one way of classifying evaluation models is according to the principle by which they are named. He specified as types of models the following:

1. methodological models; i.e., those named according to the method they employ; e.g., experimental model, benefit-cost model

2. subject matter models; i.e., those named according to the aspect of the subject under study; i.e., outcome models which investigate results (similar to Schulberg and Baker's goal attainment model), the input-output model which focuses on results in relation to effort and initial materials, the means-ends model whose emphasis is on the extent to which the processes that cause results have been provided, the process model which studies procedures or the ways in which results are being pursued, the systems

model which examines the overall structure and organization (same as Schluberg and Baker). According to Adams, perhaps the best known of the subject matter models is the outcome model

3. actor oriented models; i.e., those named according to the role the researcher or evaluator assumes. One example of this type is the apprenticeship model which is more concerned with the process of developing and employing capable evaluators than with methodology and subject matter. Another example is the advocacy model according to which the researcher/evaluator presents, in addition to his findings, recommendations for implementation and plans for action, if possible. Moreover, apparently the researcher/evaluator actively promotes the system or program that appears to be indicated by his findings

4. goal oriented models; i.e., those which concentrate on the ultimate goal of measurement such as efficiency or effectiveness

5. broad strategy models; i.e., those which serve the purposes of exploration, innovation, experimentation and adjustment (pp. 123-133).

According to Steele (1973) "We're at the pre-taxonomic stage in [classifying evaluation strategies]. Little has been done in categorizing approaches" (p. 40).

She pointed out that there has been a proliferation of approaches which, in part, represents a search for appropriate models that results from a perceived lack in the established frameworks. While acceptance and stabilization might decrease the number of approaches, the proliferation does indicate the awareness that many types of evaluation are needed.

Steele was able to identify more than 50 approaches to evaluation, which she grouped into six categories. To arrive at the six categories, she first separated the approaches that outline a functioning system from those that focus on program results. The approaches that describe a system were then divided into two groups--one dealing with patterning of programs and the other with patterning of evaluation. Then each of those groupings was subdivided. The program patterns were categorized into those that stress evaluation as input into decision making and those that pattern components of programs. The approaches that focus on evaluation activities were divided into those that deal with types of data and those that consider evaluation processes. Finally, the numerous approaches that focus on program results were divided into those concerned with objectives and those concerned with a more inclusive approach to outcomes and effects. Her six categories summarized are as follows: 1) evaluation as an input into decision making; 2) evaluation of program parts; 3) evaluation--kinds of data, types of activities; 4) evaluation processes;

5) results--attainment of objectives; 6) results--
evaluation of outcomes and effects.

In discussing her categorization scheme, Steele
pointed out that the different approaches are not substi-
tutes for each other, that combinations of two or more can
be used in many cases, and that even the approaches in a
category are not different ways of doing the same thing.
She suggested that one could perhaps use all of the
approaches in the first group over the course of a program.

Selection Criteria for Choosing a Model

Since there are so many approaches, frameworks, and
models of evaluation obviously one has to have some basis
for making a selection. As with the other aspects of eval-
uation that have been considered, there is a variety of
opinion on the criteria for selection. This discussion
considers three points of view that help provide a rationale
for the kind of evaluation that was done in relation to
TRUST.

Suchman (1971) argued that the objectives and re-
search design for an evaluation should be determined by the
stage of development and/or the state of knowledge related
to the program to be evaluated. He suggested that the same
approach is inappropriate for evaluating a demonstration pro-
gram and an on-going program because there are different
purposes for each. The purpose of a demonstration program
is to develop a prototype or model for future operational
programs or to test the effectiveness of some large-scale

program on a small scale. The demonstration program almost
by definition has a evaluative research objective because
" . . . demonstration without evaluation is meaningless"
(p. 104). On the other hand, the purpose of an operational
program is to try to meet some existing need through what-
ever programs can be feasibly set up. Immediate service is
its primary orientation. Misunderstanding of the two may
lead the administrator to use a demonstration program to
meet a service need and as operational program to meet a
research need--usually with minimal success. Although a
demonstration program might have an element of service and
an operational program an element of research, the essen-
tial differences in their main purposes must be kept clear.

Demonstration programs can be classified as:
1) pilot programs; 2) model programs; 3) prototype programs;
each representing different stages of development. The
pilot program provides an opportunity for trying out new
organizational structures and proceeds on a trial-and-error
basis; as such, it should be flexible and easily revisable.
Variation, innovation, reorganization, and redirection all
are desirable in pilot programs. Of the evaluation of a
program at this stage, the following was stated:

> The pilot project requires 'quick-and-easy' evaluation
> with primary emphasis upon the 'feedback' of results
> for program changes. This does not mean that success
> or failure are not to be judged, but that the basis for
> such judgements need not depend upon rigorous experi-
> mental designs. This pilot stage is one of exploratory
> research and the main objective is to learn enough to
> be able to move ahead to the development of a program
> which can then be evaluated in a more systematic manner
> (Suchman, 1971, p. 106).

The investigator would suggest that TRUST was a
pilot program from the way it developed and possibly in the
way that the sponsors conceived of it although they never
applied this term to it. The proposal stated as a long-
range goal of TRUST the following:

> Creation of an interactive media/citizen participation
> center which can experiment with a variety of methods
> for involving citizens in identifying and relating to
> public policy issues facing the Chicago metropolitan
> region. . . . The Council feels that this should be
> an important on-going process rather than an occasional
> special event (COPE, Note 4, p. 2).

TRUST, viewed in relation to the foreoing long-range goal,
was indeed a pilot project.

The model program is the end product of a series of
fruitful pilot projects; a program can be devised which has
the greatest chance of success based on the knowledge gained
in the pilot stage. However, the administrator who sets up
a model project is still groping in a sense. He thinks that,
given the right situation, he can accomplish the desired
objectives but he is not confident enough to want to test
out the program under normal operating conditions. Now he
is ready, in a sense, to design a conclusive experiment to
try out the hypothesis that the program's objectives can
be achieved by the program's activities. However, he needs
assurance that the activities have been carried out under
optimum conditions.

The evaluation framework for a model program is
almost the exact opposite of that for a pilot project. A
carefully controlled experiment is now called for with

well-defined and highly controlled program input, closely
matched experimental and control groups, and valid and
reliable instruments to measure criteria of effectiveness.
"This is when experimental design for evaluative research
is most appropriate" (Suchman, 1971, p. 7).

The conclusions from the evaluation of model pro-
grams should not be generalized to standard programs.
Disappointment often results when programs which have been
demonstrated to have likelihood of success under the right
circumstances are set up without controlling these circum-
stances and result in failure.

To find out whether programs are operationally
feasible, a third type of demonstration program is necessary
--the prototype. Prototype programs establish what can
realistically be done on a large scale with available
resources. An experimental approach should be used for
evaluation of the program that would use the traditional
program as a control. However, it is absolutely necessary
that the prototype program be evaluated under conditions
resembling those of the proposed operational program as
much as possible in order for the results to be generaliza-
ble to these programs. Under such circumstances, one may
not be able to obtain strict control over matched experi-
mental and control groups. Nevertheless, a research ele-
ment can be added to find out how and why the prototype
program was a success or a failure and to point out which
parts of the program were more successful than others and
among which subgroups of the population.

The evaluation process should be viewed as a two-fold test of 1) the validity of a particular approach for accomplishing some desired objective or change; and 2) the feasibility of establishing a workable program based on that approach. Therefore, the first condition is evaluated through the model demonstration program and the second condition through the prototype. Failure of an operational program may stem from either the use of a wrong or invalid approach (which the model program could determine) or the impracticability of the approach, even though valid, as a viable method of operationalizing the approach (which could be determined by the prototype program).

The operational program needs yet another type of evaluation than that for demonstration programs. An experimental design is neither required nor permitted because of the continuous service expected of an on-going program. The improvement of service is of more concern than whether or not a service is worth keeping. Therefore, an evaluation model that can provide a steady flow of information back into the on-going program is most appropriate. Such a model has been referred to as a process model and has had its major development in operations research.

Steele (1973) suggested that the various problems of the program administrator should determine the approach taken to evaluation, that generally one should take an eclectic approach rather than trying to reduce evaluation to one specific procedure or framework. The emerging

emphasis is on models that consider both product and process and more significantly the interrelatedness of the two.

The nature of the program dictates the approach to selecting an evaluation model that Steele advocated. In this regard she said:

> In many ways programs are like a mountain. They're complex with many planes and facets. These planes and facets can be examined in a variety of ways. People have varying needs and purposes in relation to describing and evaluating them. Many types of information exist that are useful to those purposes. Therefore, just as there are many ways in which a mountain can be described, analyzed, and evaluated, so are there many ways that programs can be examined and evaluated. The approach you take depends on your particular needs. . . . By recognizing their [i.e., programs'] complex and dynamic topography and by accepting evaluation as a complex set of tools from which appropriate ones are selected to fit the aspect that is being examined, we may actually make evaluation simple and less frustrating (p. 40).

Weiss' thesis was that while the tools and methods of social research are used in evaluation they are applied in an action setting that is essentially hostile to them. She pointed out that there is no cut and dried prescription available for evaluators as to the best way to carry out their studies. The uses to be made of the study, the pending decisions, and the decision maker's information needs are some determining factors. The constraints in the program setting also have to be considered, such as the limits imposed by the realities of place, time, and people. Moreover, funding which inevitably restricts how much can be studied over how long a period is a crucial factor. "Thus," she concludes, "evaluation methods often represent a compromise between the ideal and the feasible" (Weiss, 1972, p. 9).

Summary of Viewpoints on Evaluation

In summary, the term "evaluation" is applied to a variety of processes for judging the value of an activity undertaken to accomplish some desired goal. In order for evaluation to take place, at least three elements appear necessary: 1) an objective; 2) a strategy for accomplishing the objective; and 3) a way of deciding the extent to which the accomplishment of the objective resulted from the strategy. Those processes for judging which rely on the tools and methods of social research are sometimes referred to as "evaluative research."

Numerous models, frameworks, and approaches are available for carrying out evaluation. Efforts have been made to categorize the various approaches, but such categorization appears to be at the "pretaxonomic" stage of development. The proliferation of models apparently results from a dissatisfaction with the more established methods of doing evaluation. The most developed and probably most widely used are models which focus on outcomes or accomplishment of objects. However, since other aspects of the programming situation are important for understanding outcomes, increasing use is being made of approaches that consider process as well as product.

The selection of an approach to evaluation can be based on different considerations. One writer suggested that the stage of development or state of knowledge about a program should determine the kind of evaluation carried

out in relation to it. Therefore, demonstration programs, of which there are three kinds, should not be evaluated the same as operational programs. Moreover, each kind of demonstration program should be evaluated differently. Another way of choosing an evaluation framework is to start with the various questions one has about the program and select components of different frameworks according to their usefulness for answering these questions, rather than simply applying one given model. Finally, the constraints imposed by time, place, people, and funding inevitably must be considered in choosing an approach to evaluation.

An Overview of Some Interactive Media Project Evaluations

The First Survey of Listening Groups

The first study considered was Radio's Listening Groups: The United States and Great Britain (Hill and Williams, 1941). This study was not explicitly an evaluation but it was of interest here because the survey methodology used suggested ways of evaluating listening group projects. In this book, Hill described the first attempt to gather extensive data about radio listening groups in the United States. Williams carried out a parallel study in Great Britain but it is not considered here.

When Hill began his study in the spring of 1939, little reliable information was available on listening groups in America. He stated, "With a few exceptions, such bodies were lost in the invisible mass of our one hundred

million radio listeners. The chances for locating them seemed little better than those of an ornithologist trying to determine the number of banded birds among the millions of wild ducks that visit American lakes, bays, and rivers" (p. 3). The stated objectives of his study were: 1) to obtain some reasonable information about the number and kinds of listening groups then active in the United States; 2) to visit a sample of groups, observe them in action, and talk with their leaders and those who might aid in their promotion; 3) to get written data from a larger sample of group members and leaders than those actually visited. These data would be concerned with the groups' organization and procedure, their use of study aids, and with positive and negative aspects of radio programs to which they listened and their own activity as listeners.

Hill described the activities he undertook to achieve his first objective. The first was to send out a questionnaire to find out which groups were definitely known to be operating and to get names and addresses of leaders. A second activity was a canvass, either by letter or personal visit, of persons knowledgeable about broadcasting conditions, national organizations involved in broadcasting, heads of governmental units with radio responsibilities, and directors of various educational and semi-educational programs.

Also, three questionnaires were utilized to get direct testimony--one for group members, one for leaders,

and one for registered listeners. Hill described in detail
the problems of getting the questionnaires distributed and
returned and analyzed some reasons why he received a rela-
tively low return. Finally, Hill visited groups in six
states and the District of Columbia and interviewed a number
of group organizers whose groups could not be visited.

Hill was able to suggest from his data such things
as: 1) how groups came into being; 2) the geographical
range and kinds of physical settings for groups and what
kinds of people participated; 3) what happened in listening
group sessions; 4) what services needed to be provided to
groups in order to keep them viable; 5) why groups fail;
6) what benefits accrue to listening group members and
educational broadcasters; 7) advice about starting and main-
taining a listening group.

An Outsider's View of Metroplex Assembly

A review of Metroplex Assembly: An Experiment in
Community Living by Leonard S. Stein (1966) gave an indica-
tion of the nature of the evaluation that was done on this
listening group project. More importantly, however, it
provided insight into the types of evaluative issues that
might be raised by an outsider.

Stein commended the report on Metroplex for being
an excellent "how-we-did-it" description of the project
within the limits of its length. However, he viewed the
brevity as one of the chief weaknesses for the following
reasons: "There is included very little social analysis--

i.e., analysis of the community's situation, structure, and developmental stage—as this might affect program, and no systematic evaluation of Metroplex's effectiveness (not even a report on the numbers of people involved in Viewing Posts or simply viewing the various television broadcasts)" (p. 277). Stein concluded that the main truth demonstrated by Metroplex was that television is a poor instrument for bringing about the mutual consideration of shared problems by the many segments in a complex urban society. He stated that, in spite of the absence of a systematic evaluation, three facts substantiated his unfavorable assessment:

1. Metroplex was abandoned by Washington University three years before the FAE grant which supported it had run out

2. At the time of Stein's writing, KETC, the station which broadcast the Metroplex Assembly programs, had a minuscule viewership and was almost irrelevant to the civic and cultural life of St. Louis

3. Stein was unaware of any demands for Metroplex Assembly or a similar activity to help solve the various urban problems that St. Louis faced. Moreover, he had met many people, including lay and professional adult educators, who did not even recall Metroplex.

Stein gave some reasons why, in spite of the high degree of professionalism with which Metroplex was carried

out and the very evident interest and enthusiasm a number
of citizens had for this project, it apparently had so little
impact. First, it was felt that the project cost too much
(100,000 dollars per year of FAE and Washington University
funds) for the number of participants reached. Secondly,
many local leaders viewed the on-going work of permanent
agencies as being more essential than a series of television
programs with no follow-up. Evidently Stein judged Metro-
plex Assembly according to different objectives from those
conceived of by its project director. According to Johnson
(1965), "[The] basic aim [of Metroplex Assembly] was to
help the people of a metropolitan area reestablish a sense
of community and to carry on an inquiry about fundamental
values and issues related to the quality of living in con-
temporary urban America" (p. 8). The three facts supporting
Stein's negative appraisal seem to have little bearing on
whether this objective was accomplished or not. Also, while
Stein complimented the "how-we-did-it" aspects of the re-
port, which covered such things as the selection of a gen-
eral theme, selection and training of staff, the develop-
ment of an overall plan for recruiting and training Viewing
Post organizers, and the procedures developed for any speci-
fic theme, he apparently did not consider such discussion
as legitimately a part of evaluation.

The outcomes of the San Bernardino project, which
was the precursor to Metroplex, were discussed previously
in this chapter; however, Johnson does not tell how those

outcomes were measured. He commented in discussing Metroplex that "community education is . . . a long way from having effective and reliable means for measuring whether the objectives have been reached" (1965, p. 47).

The Evaluation of Project Understanding

The Project Understanding report was divided into four sections: I Description of the Project; II Research; III Evaluation; IV Appendix. The Research section discussed what was done to measure the impact of Project Understanding. A pretest and posttest opinionnaire was administered to a random, stratified sample of participants in 22 Viewing Posts. An experimental group was designated which was made up of the 104 participants from whom both the pretest and posttest were received. The control group was made up of 104 randomly selected participants from whom only pretest data were obtained. The control group and the experimental group were compared to determine whether the latter were representative of the total population of participants. A 42-item opinionnaire was used to measure whether three of the four objectives of the project were accomplished. Those objectives are given on page 25 of this report. Evidence of the accomplishment of the fourth objective and the part of the third objective related to behavior was not a part of the study.

Six null hypotheses were formulated--two to test the representativeness of the experimental group, two to test whether there were any differences between the opinions

indicated on the pretest and those of the posttest for the experimental group, one to test changes in opinions on miscellaneous statements not dealt with specifically by the programs, and one to test whether there were any differences between pretest and posttest scores when the experimental group was subgrouped according to certain demographic variables.

The findings of interest here were those related to the first two sets of hypotheses. The experimental group appeared to be representative of the population that participated in the project in that the null hypotheses were sustained that were formulated to determine the representativeness of the experimental group. Moreover, it was found that posttest responses were statistically significantly different from pretest responses and all in the direction aimed for in the program series. Therefore, it was concluded that "clearly . . . the multi-media method of television, discussion groups, and study materials is effective in changing expressed opinions about social and political issues. Insofar as the opinionnaire was an appropriate measure representative of the content and purposes of the program, the research findings demonstrate that Project Understanding accomplished its purpose in considerable measure" (1970 Project Understanding, Note 9, p. 26).

The section entitled "Evaluation" gave the results of an evaluation sheet that was returned by 50 percent of the viewing post hosts and 20 percent of the participants.

The information covered such matters as characteristics
of the participants. how they became acquainted with Project
Understanding, viewing post locations, attendance, reactions
to the programs, action decisions, and suggestions for
improving the programs and miscellaneous comments.

The Evaluation of CHOICES for '76

The report on CHOICES for '76 Project conformed
well to the criteria for a good system evaluation suggested
by Schulberg and Baker, and discussed previously in this
chapter. A very insightful analysis was provided of all
aspects of the project including requirements for getting
started initially, organizing and maintaining discussion
groups, developing the contents of the programs, internal
management, general publicity, and the design, distribution,
collection and processing of the ballots.

It should be kept in mind that the viewer-discussion
groups were not the focal point for this project as they
were in the other projects discussed. Several sources of
information were used to try to assess the success of this
project in ". . . reaching a large and broad audience . . .
with adequately balanced information on only the funda-
mental issues" (RPA, Note 10, pp. 27-28):

1. the RPA staff's perception of the material

2. Nielsen ratings

3. effect of reading the book and seeing the tele-
   vision programs on the ballot results

4. the issues on which the voters said they needed

more information

5. a Gallup Survey of the general public

6. a Gallup Survey and an RPA Survey of those who

   registered to host viewer discussion groups

7. comments from individuals who wrote in

8. comments from subject matter experts

9. comments from political leaders

10. comments from professional observers.

The stated purposes for the viewer-discussion groups
were to:

> (1) add information, (2) apply the generalized ideas to
> participants' personal lives and their own neighborhood,
> (3) test the participants' ideas, (4) give them a time
> to consider the presentation before voting, particularly
> since many people remarked that the film did not allow
> time for thought, (5) demonstrate that these decisions
> must meld diverse needs and viewpoints, (6) convey the
> impression that changes in the Region will depend on
> group action more than on a single set of ballots, and
> (7) open the possibility of group action based on that
> discussion group (RPA, Note 10, p. 64).

It was pointed out that the foregoing outcomes
seemed reasonable based on other projects by the same spon-
sor, but that none was scientifically validated. Trained
social scientists observed fourteen of the discussion groups
and found that each of the purposes was achieved by one or
another of the groups. However, it was concluded that many
groups apparently did not achieve any of these purposes.
Also, the observers rated these groups in three categories:
1) "intensity" ("high," "medium," or "low"); 2) "emotional,
cognitive, or mixed"; 3) "Regional planning consciousness
raising" ("high," "medium," or "low"). After discussion

of how the fourteen groups were rated and some anecdotal observations, it was conceded that, based on the observers' reports, many groups experienced little change from the process.

A Gallup survey and an RPA survey obtained hosts' ratings of the discussion groups on various dimensions. It was concluded from these data that:

> Clearly, most discussion groups had a value, and RPA feels that their value can be much greater in processes like this. We did not try to help people use the process--in part because of inadequate resources, in part because HUD wanted to see whether discussion groups could function without much guidance. One host in eight told Gallup he needed more information to run the meeting well. Furthermore, group discussion of serious policy issues with strangers or near strangers is new to many people and must be practiced (RPA, Note 10, p. 66).

The Evaluation of the Second Mile Project

The report from the Seattle Second Mile project was a compilation of data gathered for "management control" rather than "evaluation." According to this report, "project evaluation is defined as an assessment of the extent to which a project has served long-term goals [therefore] it is only appropriate that such an assessment be performed by those who are not directly involved in the operation of that project. On the other hand, the collection and analysis of data which indicates the extent to which short-term objectives are satisfied is very much within the purview of project personnel and constitutes the basis for management control" (Seattle, Note 11, p. 18). It was felt that a true evaluation of the effectiveness of this project

would have to measure whether a substantial number of participants and group leaders from the Second Mile project became sufficiently informed and aware and whether, as a result, they became so motivated as to engage in a continuing involvement with some aspect of the criminal justice system.

Discussion was provided related to the following aspects of the Second Mile project: 1) administration; 2) media; 3) discussion; 4) action; 5) a summary of group leaders' reports. The short-term effects of the viewer-discussion groups were measured by a pre-program and post-program opinion inventory the findings from which would ". . . describe changes in opinion, of belief, of attitudes [with respect to various aspects of the criminal justice system] that occur over a period of time" (p. 50).

Participants were required to respond to the opinion items in two ways: "endorsement" and "estimation." The endorsement would indicate whether or not the respondent personally agreed with one of 36 statements. The estimation would indicate how the respondent thought another group of people--in this instance a group of law enforcement personnel--had answered the same questions. In general, it was concluded from the analysis of the opinionnaire data that there was little measurable attitude change in the majority of cases (p. 25).

Some Concluding Observations on the Evaluation
of Listening Group Projects

In this section, the evaluations of a selected group of listening group projects were discussed and the purpose was to show the variety of questions on which such evaluations can focus and approaches which can be used to answer them. Perhaps a distinction should be made between "evaluation" as a process used by organizations for various purposes and "evaluation" as written report. The latter may vary in how well it describes the former and the reader may be left with an incomplete picture of the various evaluation purposes and processes that were actually a part of a given project.

The next chapter of this report discusses such purposes and processes and the outcomes in relation to one of the targets of TRUST; i.e., the viewer-discussion groups.

CHAPTER III

THE EVALUATION OF THE VIEWER-DISCUSSION GROUPS
BY FEEDBACK QUESTIONNAIRES

This chapter discusses one of the evaluation proce-
dures that were used in relation to the viewer-discussion
groups in the TRUST project. Matters pertaining to this
procedure are presented in the following order: 1) Back-
ground on the Development of the Evaluation Procedure for
Viewer-Discussion Groups; 2) Preliminary Discussion of
Attendance and Demographic Data; 3) Findings from the
Pretest-Posttest Data; 4) Findings from the Evaluation of
Program Inputs; and 5) Selected Characteristics of Select
and Non-Select Participants.

Background on the Development of the Evaluation Procedure for Viewer-Discussion Groups

The development of an evaluation design ideally
should involve both the administrator of the program to be
evaluated and the evaluator. There should be agreement
between the two at least on the objectives of the program
and the criteria by which the attainment of the objectives
will be measured. Also, the planning for the project and
for the evaluation should go on at the same time, if pos-
sible. Such collaboration between the administrator and

the evaluator (i.e., the investigator) did go on in the TRUST project, although the extent of the collaboration varied with the aspect of the project being evaluated.

Some of the evaluation plans for TRUST were influenced by several meetings which involved all or some of the following: the investigator, the project director and her administrative assistant, an associate of the Survey Research Laboratory of the Chicago Circle Campus of the University of Illinois, the project team from Northwestern University (i.e., the project director and three graduate students working on the "Demonstration Evaluation of Interactive Media Project" mentioned on p. 12, footnote 1), the citizens mobilization staff, other project staff members, and outside consultants. A recapitulation of two of these meetings is useful for at least three reasons: 1) it shows at what stage of development the plans for the TRUST project (and the evaluation) were at a certain point in time which is of interest because time constraints affected the success of the project; 2) what the bases were for some of the decisions that were made about various elements in the project; 3) how the evaluators interacted with the project director.

Although activities related to the TRUST project had been going on since March, 1974, the first discussion of the evaluation process that included the investigator took place on July 31, 1974 (COPE, Note 13). Those attending this meeting included the project director, her administrative assistant, the Survey Research Laboratory associate,

and three members of the project group from Northwestern University. The general purpose of the meeting was to discuss the kind of research that should be carried out in relation to the participants in the viewer-discussion groups. The concerns of the project director that came out at various points in the discussion can be summarized as follows: 1) the basic purpose for any data--or more specifically, how to insure that the data would be useful to the viewer-discussion participants; 2) whether "hard" or "soft" data should be gathered; 3) whether the data should be used as a means of influencing criminal justice decision makers or simply as a tool for discussion and a means of informing the viewer-discussion participants; 4) whether arrangements should be made for involving the general public in some way, either by telephone or newspaper ballots; 5) whether a survey should be made of the general population in order to have a control group whose views vis-a-vis the criminal justice system could be compared with those of the participants in the viewer-discussion groups.

Before reading any conclusions about the foregoing concerns, the role of the evaluators vis-a-vis the project director had to be clarified. The term "evaluators" here is used to refer to everyone at this meeting except the project director and her administrative assistant. The former were primarily concerned with, and would be responsible for carrying out some aspect of, the evaluation of TRUST. The evaluators were in agreement that the

decisions on these concerns would have to be the project director's and should be based on her purposes for the program. The evaluators took the position that they did not have a separate set of objectives; i.e., a set independent of the project director's, but it was pointed out that problems might arise if it were not clear to them just what her objectives were. A ground rule was established that the evaluators would tell the project director if they thought she were wrong on some matter but that all final decisions would be hers.

Several ways of proceeding in our thinking about the project director's concerns were proposed. One suggestion was that the choice of the content of the research instrument used at the viewer-discussion session for the first program be a function of two things: 1) those pieces of data which, if not gathered at that first meeting, would unlikely be obtainable later; 2) the project director's priorities or her perceptions of what she wanted measured.

Another suggestion was that some decisions would have to be based on the time line for the project. The associate from the Survey Research Laboratory pointed out that all of the instruments that were to be used with the viewer-discussion groups should be completed by the middle of September in order to have two weeks for the reproduction of these instruments. Also, it had to be more clearly defined what role the project director intended that the Survey Research Laboratory play in regard to the research

instruments. Determination of that role and the signing of
a letter of agreement or contract would force some decisions,
on such matters as the number and length of instruments, and
how to handle some of the logistics in order to develop a
schedule for processing and returning the data.

Another approach presented to the project director
was for her to think about what she wanted to be able to say
at the Action Fair Conference. The project director indi-
cated that the Conference should help the participants
identify the underlying commonalities in their concerns about
the criminal justice system. The issue identification pro-
cess had revealed that the concerns of citizens and profes-
sionals were quite similar although they were arrived at
from different perspectives. Moreover, that process had
shown that citizens' concerns were similar whether they
came from the affluent suburbs or the inner city. She felt
it would be highly desirable if the participants in the
TRUST project came away from their experience with the pro-
ject with a deeper realization of their underlying common-
alities.

It was pointed out from what she had said that the
Action Fair Conference was an important part of her experi-
mental variable and not an event having no essential
bearing on the change the project was designed to bring
about, like a post-election victory celebration, for exam-
ple. Since at the time of the meeting being discussed the
Action Fair Conference was scheduled to be a week or two

after the last ". . . And Justice For All" telecast, the question was raised whether the project director would have had a chance to study the data from the groups thoroughly and formulate any suggestions for action based on that data.

There were two points of view on the date for the Action Fair Conference. One view was that the Conference should be scheduled for a later date than it was set for at that time. It was suggested that a mini-conference might be held for just the viewer-discussion group leaders. At that event, the group leaders could be presented some preliminary findings from the data, asked for information that might help explain any anomalies in the data, and perhaps be given a posttest questionnaire and a packet of materials that they could use to invite their group members to the Action Fair Conference. This point of view was based on the feeling that the viewer-discussion participants would likely be more concerned about the certainty of their getting data than when they were going to get it.

It was the project director's point of view, however, that the participants were unlikely to function on the basis of feedback data from the viewer-discussion groups, but on whatever was actually happening around them and that, therefore, they would be relatively uninterested in the findings from these data. She felt that what was crucial was that the participants be able, as soon as possible after the viewer-discussion activity, to make connections with other people and get information that they felt was

up-to-date rather than having to wait several weeks after the Chrismas holidays to get feedback information from the viewer-discussion groups.

In addition to the date for the Action Fair Conference and its purpose in the project, some conclusions were reached on the matters of trying to involve the general public and of doing a survey of the general public. The project director was advised that a survey would be required of the scope that the project budget did not allow. Moreover, since her overall purpose was to get people together to explore common values and to develop courses of action, the views of the general public would be irrelevant.

Another meeting that influenced the evaluation process occurred on August 29, 1974 (COPE, Note 14). This meeting included the same persons who were present at the one just discussed in addition to the three citizens mobilization staff members and some other staff members. The stated purpose of the meeting was to discuss how the feedback instrument would fit into the viewer-discussion process. The reason the citizens mobilization staff was present was that they reportedly had been getting feedback from the people they were recruiting to be group leaders that the latter and/or their group members would be reluctant about filling out questionnaires. One citizens mobilization staff member apparently was ambivalent about the possible intrusiveness of questionnaires, however. He said that some of the persons he had recruited asked questions

about what the responsibilities of a group leader would be and the length of time their duties would require. This staff member felt that requiring a half-day of group leader training, the recruitment of members for one's group, and making one's home available to the group was asking a lot of prospective leaders in addition to having requirements related to questionnaires. On the other hand, he said he was getting some questions about what kinds of information was going to come out of the process that would be useful for the participants' purposes, which implied to him that depending on the content of the questionnaires they might be perceived of as useful by the groups.

The project director expressed the importance of designing questionnaires that would be useful to the viewer-discussion groups as well as to the project staff and evaluators. One citizens mobilization staff member proposed that the questionnaires be individualized, in a sense, to allow for the various differences in areas of the city and for individual participants or groups to make input. For example, he suggested that one questionnaire could include items based on the crime statistics for each police district, which of course would have required a different questionnaire for each district. Such a questionnaire could be used to elicit neighborhood priorities for crime control efforts; then those findings could be given to the police commanders of each district so that they would know the citizens' feelings.

The idea of trying to individualize the questionnaires in some way was generally intriguing to the group and was explored at some length in the discussion. However, few useful suggestions were offered as to how it could practically be done and this notion was not pursued in subsequent discussions on the questionnaires. It was decided, however, at this meeting to make the questionnaires something that would facilitate discussion within the groups, as much as possible, rather than extraneous elements useful only for gathering data.

After the discussions that took place as described in the foregoing paragraphs, the investigator began to draft questionnaire items. Two types of items were to be included on these questionnaires: 1) items to be used for evaluation purposes; 2) items related to the contents of the television programs which could be used for discussion and feedback.

Essentially, there were two sources for the content of these questionnaires (which came to be called "Feedback Questionnaires"): 1) the Project TRUST proposal for funding; 2) the contents of the ". . . And Justice For All" television programs. The proposal had a section that explicitly stated the evaluation questions for the several target groups. The portion of the proposal that suggested some of the evaluation questions for viewer-discussion participants read as follows:

> How did the ordinary citizen-participant regard the experience? Do they feel more informed about the issues? More motivated with regard to working for changes in the system? Would they be inclined to take part in future such interactive media projects focusing

on issues other than criminal justice? To what extent did they participate because of the topic, and to what extent because they welcomed an opportunity to join in the citizen participation process? How important was the 'sociability' dimension to their overall satisfaction with the process? (COPE, Note 4, p. 15).

Also, the rest of the proposal was read for explicitly stated goals about how participation in the interactive media process would benefit the ordinary citizen or assertions from which such goals might be inferred. Examples of those kinds of statements were as follows (the first two were listed as some of the short-range goals of the project):

. . . to give [citizens] access to experts, professionals and decision makers who have a major voice in shaping criminal justice policies (p. 1).

. . . and to help these citizens find channels through which they might be involved in making a more effective system (p. 1).

. . . true citizen participation . . . gives people access to one another, to information, to experts and decision makers . . . (p. 4).

It could be inferred from the proposal that there were several variables for which it would be desirable to compare initial conditions and post-program conditions. Those variables and the questionnaire items that were used to measure them were as follows:

Variables	Feedback Questionnaire Items
1. participant's perception of his knowledge about criminal justice issues	I know how the criminal justice system works. I know why the criminal justice system does not seem to work as it should. I know what changes need to be made in the criminal justice system.

2. participant's
    perception of
    his knowledge
    about alterna-
    tives for
    personal
    involvement

    I know what I can do to help
    improve the criminal justice
    system.

3. participant's
    perception of his
    obligation for
    personal
    involvement

    I should work personally for
    improvements in the criminal
    justice system.

4. participant's
    feelings about
    his involvement
    in the inter-
    active media
    process

    In the future, I would like to
    participate in another TV-
    discussion group like this one,
    on another topic.

5. participant's
    perception of
    his knowledge
    of how to get
    information about
    the criminal
    justice system

    I know how to get information
    about the criminal justice
    system.

6. participant's
    perception of
    his knowledge
    about how to
    get in contact
    with concerned
    citizens

    I know how to get in contact with
    other people interested in
    improving the criminal justice
    system.

7. participant's
    perception of
    his degree of
    access to
    decision makers

    I feel free to make my feelings
    about the criminal justice
    system known to public officials.

8. participant's
    perception of
    the importance
    of his views to
    decision makers

    I feel my views about the crim-
    inal justice system will make
    a difference to public officials.

The foregoing items were to make up the pretest
which was to be included on the first of the four

questionnaires designed for the ". . . And Justice For All"
programs, and the posttest to be included on the last.

The scripts and the rough cuts of the first two
". . . And Justice For All" films provided some ideas for
the program-related questions that were supposed to be use-
ful both for feedback and discussion. Also, A National
Strategy to Reduce Crime (National Advisory Commission,
1973) gave some direction, especially to the questionnaire
for the first program. Items were constructed that would
require the respondents to express attitudes or opinions
rather than factual knowledge, so that discussion might be
better stimulated; also, cognitive items might have created
a threatening test-type situation. The investigator drafted
questionnaires for the first two programs and refined them
with the assistance of the project director and her adminis-
trative assistant. The associate from the University of
Illinois Survey Research Laboratory became involved in the
drafting of the third and fourth questionnaires and advised
on the structure and content of the final drafts of all
four questionnaires. The investigator saw her overall role
in the development of the Feedback Questionnaires, espec-
ially the program-realted items, as that of translating the
ideas of the project director into questionnaire items
rather than that of creating the original ideas. The de-
sired outcomes of the viewer-discussion groups would help
determine the content of Feedback Questionnaires and the
definitions of these outcomes, at that point, were largely

in the mind of the project director. The various drafts
were viewed mainly as a means of drawing out and clarifying
those ideas.

There was a concern that the Feedback Questionnaires
make minimum demands on the discussion leaders for record-
keeping. It was at first considered assigning each group
member an identification number that he would use on all
four questionnaires; that procedure would have allowed each
individual's pretest and posttest scores to be compared.
However, assigning individual numbers would have required
either than the group leaders keep track of the numbers or
that each set of four questionnaires be pre-numbered. In
the latter case, the group leader would have had to make
sure that each participant got the correctly numbered
questionnaire (for programs I and IV at least), that is, if
the participants were not given all four questionnaires at
the first meeting to keep track of for themselves. More-
over, the latter procedure would have necessitated getting
all four questionnaires printed in time so that each set of
four could be numbered by the printer or by hand at the
project office in time for distribution at the group leader
training. For various reasons, the idea of assigning each
participant a separate number was discarded and it was
decided to identify each questionnaire by a group identifi-
cation number and measure group changes. It was assumed
that the groups would remain relatively stable in composi-
tion and size over the four-program sequence.

The Feedback Questionaires and other printed materials to be used in the viewer-discussion groups were distributed in the group leader training sessions and subsequently to various other individuals and organizations by the citizens mobilization staff. General information on the purpose and use of the questionnaires was given orally at the training sessions; also a one-page instruction sheet containing essentially the same information was included with the printed material. How the Feedback Questionnaires were to fit into the viewer-discussion sessions was as follows:

Session I

a. fill out first portion of the Feedback Questionnaire (this section contained the pretest and some demographic items)
b. watch the television program
c. fill out the remainder of the Feedback Questionnaire (program-related items)
d. discussion

Sessions II and III

a. watch the television program
b. fill out Feedback Questionnaires (program-related items and demographics)
c. discussion

Session IV

a. watch television program
b. fill out first portion of Feedback Questionnaire (program-related items)
c. discussion
d. fill out remainder of the Questionnaire (posttest and other evaluation items).

Preliminary Discussion of the Attendance
and Demographic Data

In addition to giving the project staff feedback on
the participants' views on some criminal justice issues and
data that could be used to find out whether some of the
desired outcomes of the viewer-discussion sessions had been
achieved, the Feedback Questionnaires turned out to be the
chief means of determining participation figures for the
viewer-discussion component of the TRUST project. Since the
project had some numerical goals for viewer-discussion
groups in addition to the cognitive, attitudinal, and be-
havioral changes to be accomplished by these groups, and
since interpreting the data from the Feedback Questionnaires
and subsequent follow-up efforts were made complicated by
attendance variables, it seems pertinent to discuss certain
matters pertaining to attendance at this point.

There were conceivably at least two ways of knowing
how many people participated in the viewer-discussion
groups: 1) from the number of Feedback Questionnaires
received after each of the four programs, assuming that each
participant completed one and that, in turn, the question-
naires were mailed into the project office; 2) from the
forms specifically designed to record attendance. The lat-
ter proved not to be useful for this purpose for reasons
that will be discussed in Chapter VI.

In order to determine how many groups could be
verified as having met each week and who the group leader
was, the investigator used the group numbers that were on

the computer printout for the Feedback Questionnaires. The group numbers could be matched with group leaders by checking the records kept by the citizens mobilization staff. These records were contained in a notebook which was supposed to have a form for each group leader recruited and the number he had been assigned. However, there were several group numbers that appeared on the printout for which there was no form in the citizens mobilization records and no attendance records had been mailed in. Those unidentified numbers were taken to represent actual groups if they appeared to represent more than one questionnaire, according to the printout. For example, if a group number appeared on the printout but only one questionnaire had reported that number, it was assumed that this was a clerical error of some kind. On the other hand, if a group number had several questionnaires assigned to it, it was assumed that it represented an actual group.

According to the procedure just described, 102 viewer-discussion groups met at least once in the TRUST project; however, the highest number meeting for any one session was 95 because there were seven groups which did not send in the questionnaires for the first program which sent them in for one or more of the other three. (See Table 1.)

Tables 4-8 in the Appendices provide data on the distribution of the TRUST viewer-discussion participants according to the variables sex, age, racial/ethnic background, education and residence area. Nearly half (46.9 percent) of the participants in the viewer-discussion groups for the first program were twenty years of age or less which suggested that there was a large representation by school groups. In fact,

this age category had the largest percentage of respondents
for the other three programs, although the percentages were
not as large as for the first program. The age category
having the second highest percentage alternated between 21-29
and 30-39.

Table 1

Identified and Unidentified Viewer-Discussion
Groups and Participants for Each Session

Viewer Discussion Session	Number of Groups Sending in Questionnaires	Number of Participants Represented by Groups	Number of Groups Not Identified	Percentage of Groups Not Identified	Percentage of Participants in Unidentified Groups
I	95	1,338	12	12.6%	38.7%
II	76	806	6	7.8%	22.0%
III	68	686	4	5.7%	24.7%
IV	60	567	2	3.3%	19.0%

Most of the respondents indicated that the highest
educational level they had completed was "some college" or
"college graduate or more." The combined percentages for
these two categories for the four programs were as follows:
54.8 percent, 71.5 percent, 70.9 percent, and 74.4 percent.
Those indicating "college graduate or more" appeared to be
the most persistent in that they did not drop out in as large
percentages as the other educational levels. The "college
graduate or more" category represented 22.1 percent at the
first program and 41.6 percent at the fourth. Those report-
ing "some high school" showed the most drastic decrease,
doing from 23.2 percent in the first program to 7.2 percent
in the second.

Slightly more than half of the participants were female for each of the four programs and the proportion for each sex remainded stable; i.e., males and females appeared to be equally persistent in attendance.

Most of the participants were white. This racial category ranged from a low of 69.9 percent of the respondents for the first program to 81.1 percent for the fourth program. Whites appeared to be more persistent in that larger percentages of blacks dropped out for each of the first three programs.

The largest proportion of the participants were from the north suburbs for each of the four programs. The percentage of the participants from the north suburbs ranged from 35.4 percent for the first program to 41.6 percent for the fourth program. Black areas of the south side of the city accounted for the next highest proportion of the participants; these areas had 17.3 percent and 17.6 percent for the first and fourth programs, respectively, and 14.9 percent for the second and third programs. In general, suburban areas accounted for more of the participants than city areas. The zip code areas designated as "west suburbs," "north suburbs," and "south suburbs" by the Survey Research Laboratory which processed the data had from a high of 69.9 percent to a low of 59.9 percent of the participants for the four programs compared to the six zip code areas that were designated as being in the city.

Findings from the Pretest-Posttest Data

In order to evaluate the attainment of the objectives for the viewer-discussion groups, as it has already been stated, changes in the pretest and posttest scores on a series of questions on the first and fourth Feedback Questionnaires were used. Before discussing these measures, it should be pointed out again that no changes in individual participant's scores could be determined. Questionnaires were identified by group numbers only. However, little could be stated with any confidence about group changes because of the fluctuation in the sizes of the groups from week to week. There were 95 groups with 1,338 participants who answered the first questionnaire and 60 groups with 567 participants who answered the fourth questionnaire. There were 57 groups which answered both the pre-test and posttest.

The Follow-Up Questionnaire indicated that the "program" was not the same for all of the groups. For example, some groups met for discussion only, after having watched the programs on another occasion. Some groups watched the television discussion that took place after the ". . . And Justice For All" programs. Some watched all four programs on film at one meeting. Groups ranged in size from small face-to-face groups to groups numbering nearly a hundred. Some groups were brought together specifically for the purpose of being a viewer-discussion group in the TRUST project; others were previously organized groups that

substituted the viewer-discussion activity for, or added it to, their regularly scheduled activity.

The program was intended to be carried out according to a given set of variables. The "typical" program was envisioned by the project staff as involving a small (10-15 persons) face-to-face group which would meet four times. At each session the group would watch a half-hour television program, fill out a questionnaire, and have a discussion. It was probably because these variables were in operation in other programs of this type or seemed to be reasonable according to common sense rather than being ones for which there is empirical evidence for asserting that they would most likely accomplish the objectives for the viewer-discussion groups.

It was decided to look at the pretest and posttest data for a number of the "typical" groups separately from the remainder of the groups from which there were such data. Only those groups whose leaders had returned the Follow-Up Questionnaire could be included in the sample of "typical" groups or "select" groups as they are referred to in this discussion. These were the only groups for which there were some data on what the program was like. The groups selected for this sample had to meet the following criteria also:

1. They watched the four television programs together.

2. They met four times.

3. They were not school groups. The project was
designed for adult citizens, although such
groups were encouraged to participate. Another
reason for eliminating school groups was that
their participants were a captive audience, in
a sense, and the degree of motivation and
interest might have to be higher on the part of
the participants and the skills of the leaders
greater for groups that had free choice in par-
ticipating. Also, school groups tended to be
large, and size could affect the extent to which
each member could participate in the discussions.

4. They did not watch the discussions that took
place on television after the ". . . And Jus-
tice For All" programs. The participants in
the viewer-discussion groups were instructed
by the moderator of those discussions not to
watch them but to proceed with their group
activity. For those who did watch, those dis-
cussions would have been a potential means of
affecting their knowledge and attitudes to
which those who did not watch the discussions
would not have been exposed.

5. They had no direct involvement with the criminal
justice system, either through employment or
volunteer work. Such persons might be expected
to participate in a viewer-discussion group with

certain knowledge about and perspectives on
criminal justice issues that the average citizen
would not have and might not therefore be
affected by participation the way the typical
citizen might.

Using the aforementioned criteria to define the
sample, 16 groups were selected from the 40 that responded
to the Follow-Up Questionnaire. There were 41 other groups
for which there were pretest and posttest scores available,
37 of which had sent in all four Feedback Questionnaires.
The scores of the 37 groups were used because it could be
assumed that they saw all four ". . . And Justice For All"
programs, although little else was known about their group
activity. These 37 groups were referred to as the "non-
select" groups.

Table 2 shows the distribution of the responses of
the viewer-discussion-participants on the pretest. The
items are listed according to the percentage of select par-
ticipants that were in agreement with the item (i.e., who
responded either "strongly agree" or "agree"), since this
was the desired response on all items. The rankings were
the same for both the select and non-select particpants
except on items 5, 6, and 7. The numbers in parentheses
show where these three items would be ranked according to
the non-select participants' responses.

In general, fewer participants were in agreement
with statements related to their knowledge about the

Table 2

Distribution of Select and Non-Select Participants' Responses on the Pretest

Feedback Questionnaire Evaluation Items	Strongly Agree		Agree		Uncertain		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		No Answer	
	S	NS	S	NS	S	NS	S	NS	S	NS	S	NS
1. I should work personally for improvement in the criminal justice system.	16.5	16.3	55.4	45.8	20.7	24.8	3.3	8.7	.8	1.3	3.3	3.1
2. I feel free to make my feelings about the criminal justice system known to public officials.	16.5	16.3	46.3	41.6	24.0	23.6	6.6	12.9	3.3	2.2	3.3	3.3
3. In the future, I would like to participate in another TV-discussion group like this one on another topic.	17.4	18.3	38.8	36.4	33.9	35.1	3.3	5.9	2.5	.9	4.1	3.5
4. I know how to get information about the criminal justice system.	12.4	8.1	33.1	35.1	28.1	34.2	19.8	15.7	2.5	3.7	4.1	3.3

Table 2 (continued)

Feedback Questionnaire Evaluation Items	Strongly Agree		Agree		Uncertain		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		No Answer	
	S	NS	S	NS	S	NS	S	NS	S	NS	S	NS
5. I know how to get in contact with other people interested in improving the criminal justice system. (6)	13.2	8.1	26.4	27.2	28.9	32.2	23.1	23.3	4.1	5.2	4.1	3.9
6. I know how the criminal justice system works. (7)	5.0	4.1	28.1	26.8	51.2	47.9	6.6	12.4	5.8	6.1	3.3	2.6
7. I know why the criminal justice system does not seem to work as it should. (5)	5.8	6.1	24.8	33.6	47.1	40.1	14.0	14.2	4.1	2.8	4.1	3.3
8. I know what changes need to be made in the criminal justice system.	5.8	7.4	14.0	19.8	52.1	49.0	18.2	15.9	5.8	4.8	4.1	3.1
9. I know what I can do to help improve the criminal justice system.	5.0	4.4	9.9	19.8	45.5	47.1	28.9	20.0	5.8	5.2	5.0	3.5

Table 2 (continued)

Feedback Questionnaire Evaluation Items	Strongly Agree		Agree		Uncertain		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		No Answer	
	S	NS	S	NS	S	NS	S	NS	S	NS	S	NS
10. I feel my views about the criminal justice system will make a difference to public officials.	5.0	4.6	9.1	14.8	50.4	41.8	24.0	25.9	7.4	9.2	4.1	3.7

   S = Select Participants
 NS = Non-Select Participants

79

dynamics of the criminal justice system (i.e., items 6, 7, and 8) than with statements related to their feelings about involvement in the criminal justice system or citizen participation (items 1, 2, and 3). Also, although 39.9 percent of the select participants and 35.3 percent of the non-select participants were in agreement with the statement "I know how to get in contact with other people interested in improving the criminal justice system," and 45.5 percent of the select participants and 43.2 percent of the non-select participants were in agreement with the statement "I know how to get information about the criminal justice system," only 14.4 percent of the select participants and 24.2 percent of the non-select participants were in agreement with the statement "I know what I can do to help improve the criminal justice system." Perhaps this discrepancy meant that the respondents were more certain about the means for bringing about changes than about ends or what those changes ought to be. Finally, it seems ironic that, although the second highest percentages of both types of respondents were in agreement with the statement "I feel free to make my feelings about the criminal justice system known to public officials," the smallest percentages of both types of participants were in agreement with the statement "I feel my views about the criminal justice system will make a difference to public officials."

In considering the posttest changes, only the scores from the select participants were used. In the case

of the select participants and the non-select participants the populations on the pretest and posttest were not the same. The select participants numbered 121 for the first questionnaire, 115 for second and third questionnaires, and 124 for the fourth questionnaire. For the non-select participants the questionnaires received were 459, 413, 427, and 371 for the four program sessions, respectively. The total number of participants fluctuated less in the select groups from meeting to meeting than in the non-select groups, but this stability was more apparent than real. The 16 select groups were not the same size from week to week. Moreover, only 57.3 percent of the select participants (contrasted with 64.4 percent of the non-select participants) indicated on the fourth questionnaire that they had attended the first viewer-discussion session. However, in considering the differences between the pretest and posttest scores one was at least dealing with almost the same base figure for the select participants, whereas there was a 19 percent drop from the pretest to the posttest for the non-select participants.

Table 3 shows the distribution of the posttest responses for the select participants. The third column indicates the percentage increase in the number of respondents that were in agreement (i.e., responded either "strongly agree" or "agree") with the item over the pretest.

Table 3

Distribution of Select Participants' Responses on the Posttest

Feedback Questionnaire Evaluation Items	Responses						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Increase from Pretest	Uncer-tain	Dis-agree	Strongly Dis-agree	No Response
I should work personally for improvement in the criminal justice system.	26.6	50.8	5.5	16.1	4.8		1.6
I feel free to make my feelings about the criminal justice system known to public officials.	25.0	50.0	12.2	17.7	4.8		2.4
In the future, I would like to participate in another TV-discussion group like this one, on another topic.	29.0	50.8	23.6	14.5	4.0		1.6
I know how to get information about the criminal justice system.	17.7	33.1	18.2	25.8	5.6	2.4	2.4

Table 3 (continued)

Feedback Questionnaire Evaluation Items	Responses						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Increase from Pretest	Uncer- tain	Dis- agree	Strongly Dis- agree	No Response
I know how to get in contact with other people interested in improving the crim- inal justice system.	14.5	36.3	12.1	37.1	8.9	1.6	1.6
I know how the crim- inal justice system works.	8.1	45.2	20.2	37.1	7.3	.8	1.6
I know why the crim- inal justice system does not seem to work as it should.	8.1	50.0	27.5	33.9	5.6	.8	1.6
I know what changes need to be made in the criminal justice system.	8.9	33.9	23.0	45.2	6.5	2.4	3.2
I know what I can do to help improve the criminal justice system.	4.8	27.4	17.3	47.6	13.7	3.2	3.2
I feel my views about the criminal justice system will make a difference to public officials.	7.3	24.2	17.4	41.1	22.6	3.2	1.6

In general, the greatest amount of change came about
in relation to feelings of being informed in relation to
things covered specifically by the television programs; i.e.,
how the criminal justice system works, why the criminal
justice system does not seem to work as it should, and what
changes need to be made in the criminal justice system.
Other areas where an increase in information was intended
but which had to be accomplished by some means other than
the television programs; i.e., how to get in contact with
other people interested in improving the criminal justice
system and how to get information about the criminal jus-
tice system, showed around the average or less than the
average amount of increase.

For example, the statement "I know how to get in
touch with other people interested in improving the system"
got the second lowest increase in the percentage of
respondents agreeing. This was a variable that the viewer-
discussion experience would not necessarily affect. It
would more likely be accomplished by participating in some
of the other activities related to the project such as the
various planning sessions, possibly the training sessions
for group leaders, and perhaps more importantly, the Action
Fair Conference which did not take place until after the
viewer-discussion component of the overall project. The
statement "I know how to get information about the criminal
justice system" was a corollary. "Avenues to Involvement"
(see p. 184) would have been a tool for bringing about the

desired change in relation to both these statements, especially the latter; it was not expected that the viewer-discussion experience would be the only means.

The two statements which had the lowest percentages of participants in agreement on the pretest; i.e., "I feel my views about the criminal justice system will make a difference to public officials," and "I know what I can do to help improve the criminal justice system," showed only the average increase (17.4 percent and 17.3 percent, respectively). The second statement embodied an objective that would have to be accomplished to a great extent through the Action Fair Conference in addition to the viewer-discussion experience. Moreover, carrying out some of the task assignments would have given the participants direct experience that might have suggested possibilities for personal involvement. However, only 10 percent of the respondents to the Follow-Up Questionnaire reported that they tried to motivate group action and only 27.5 percent reported that task assignments were carried out in their groups.

Merely participating in four viewer-discussion sessions was not likely to affect participants' attitudes about the importance of their views to public officials. The viewer discussion groups were only one component of the overall interactive media citizen participation process. A logical next step would have been to pass participants' views on to some public officials, particularly some officials for whom the participants were the constituency.

Knowing that this had been done and possibly that their concerns had been acted upon might have brought about a change in relation to this variable on the part of the participants.

The degree of personal commitment to action was relatively unaffected in that there was only a 5.5 percent increase in agreement with the statement "I should work personally for improvement in the criminal justice system." However, it should be pointed out that the highest percentage of both select and non-select respondents were in agreement with this statement on the pretest.

This finding should be viewed in conjunction with the fact that the statement having next to the lowest amount of increase was "I know what I can do to help improve the criminal justice system." Perhaps more participants would have changed their views in relation to personal commitment to action if it had been made clear exactly what they could do.

The select participants in general must have found the viewer-discussion group experience rewarding in that 79.8 percent on the posttest indicated that in the future they would like to participate in another group on another topic. This statement had the highest percentage of participants in agreement on the posttest and the second highest amount of increase.

Findings from the Evaluation of Program Inputs

On the fourth Feedback Questionnaire, participants were asked to evaluate various components of the viewer

discussion group experience. In this discussion of the findings related to those components, the views of both the select groups and the non-select groups are considered, as with the pretest findings. Since there were post-program measures only on these variables, there was not the difficulty in interpreting them for the non-select group as there was with the posttest scores because of the drop in participation from the first to the fourth program.

The participants were asked to rate how well the television programs helped them to understand the problems of the criminal justice system. The members of the non-select gropps were slightly more favorable toward these programs than those of the select groups. The largest percentage of both groups rated the programs as helping "moderately well" (64.5 percent for the select participants and 58.2 percent for the non-select participants). However, more select participants (8.1 percent) rated the programs as helping "poorly" than did the non-select groups (5.7 percent) and more of the non-select participants (31.8 percent) rated the programs as helping "very well" than did the select participants (22.6 percent).

The data in regard to how well the discussions helped in the understanding of criminal justice problems were more ambiguous. Here again the largest percentage of both kinds of participants chose the middle response; i.e., "moderately well" (63.7 percent of the select group and 58.2 percent of the non-select group). A slightly

larger percentage (27 percent) of the non-select partici-
pants rated the discussions as helping "very well" than did
the select participants (24.2 percent). An almost equal
percentage of both types of participants (8.9 percent select
and 8.1 percent non-select) rated the discussions as help-
ing "poorly." For some reason, there were almost twice
as many non-respondents to this item in the non-select group
(6.7 percent) as in the select group (3.2 percent) whereas
the proportions of non-respondents to the previous question
were about equal for both groups (4.8 percent select parti-
cipants and 4.3 percent non-select participants).

On the next item, the participants were asked to
indicate from which input to the viewer-discussion exper-
ience they learned the most. Over half (52.3 percent) of
the non-select participants indicated the television pro-
gram compared with 35.5 percent of the select participants.
More than twice the percentage (46.8 percent) of the select
participants indicated the discussions as did the non-
select participants (21.8 percent). These differences
could be accounted for by the fact that the non-select
groups were largely composed of students participating in
the program in a school setting. The television programs,
in contrast to group discussions, probably provided a
departure from the usual instructional routine. Moreover,
the size of some of the groups in the non-select category
might have prohibited them from getting a good discussion
going. It is likely that there might have been very little

or no discussion at all in some school groups, since there was probably a definite time limit on their meetings, the television programs were one-half hour long, and the questionnaires had to be filled out. This question also had a relatively larger proportion of non-respondents in the non-select group (8.6 percent) than in the select group (4.0 percent).

In rating which of the four television programs they liked best, the largest percentage (29.8 percent) of the select participants chose the last program "The Role of the Community" and the largest percentage (26.7 percent) of the non-select participants chose the first program ". . . And Justice for All." The responses to this item were of questionable value in that it was not known how many of the respondents saw all four programs and since all of the programs were on the same general topic it might have been difficult to recall them as discrete units. There was a relatively high percentage of non-respondents in both groups for this item (8.9 percent for the select participants and 8.4 percent for the non-select participants).

As it was previously stated, more of the non-select participants (64.4 percent) were in the first discussion session than the select participants (57.3 percent). The item that elicited this information was originally included on the questionnaire so that the pretest and posttest responses of individuals who attended both sessions might be compared, but since there was no individual identification this was not possible. Moreover, there was no way of

knowing whether the individuals who attended the first and fourth sessions attended the second and third and it would be important to know how much of the program an individual had been exposed to in evaluating his pretest and posttest responses.

Selected Characteristics of the Select and Non-Select Participants

Sex

There was a predominance of females in the select group in contrast to the non-select group and the entire population that participated in the viewer-discussion groups. Females made up an average of 74.8 percent of the select group for the four programs and 57.1 percent of the non-select participants.

Age

The largest proportion of the non-select participants (34.9 percent average for the four programs) were in the "20 or less" category which accounted for an average of only 1.25 percent of the select participants. Select participants had more than twice the percentage in the 30-39 category (36.7 percent average for the four programs) as did the non-select group (17.7 percent average); in fact, the largest percentage of the select participants were in this category.

Race

Minorities were under-represented in the select

group . Blacks made up an average of 18.7 percent of the non-select group but only an average of 2.6 percent of the select group . There was only one Latino in the select group for an average of .8. Latinos ranged between 5-7 in the non-select group for an average of 1.4 percent for the four programs. Whites had an average of 78.2 percent of the non-select group to 96.1 percent of the select group .

Education

The highest percentage of both kinds of participants were in the categories representing the highest levels of formal schooling. The select group had an average of 74.5 percent who were "college graduate or more" whereas an average of 32.2 percent of the non-select participants were in this category. The largest proportion of the non-select group (33.6 percent average) were in the "some college" category while an average of 19.5 percent of the select participants were here. An average of 1.2 percent of the select participants were in each of the three educational categories lower than "some college" and an average of 8.2 percent of the non-select participants were in these categories.

Reasons for Participating

The largest percentage of both groups of participants indicated that their most important reason for participating was "I want to learn more about criminal justice

problems"; 33.1 percent of the select group and 30.1 percent of the non-select group chose this answer. The fact that this was the first answer on the list of possible responses and the likelihood that almost all, if not all, of the participants wanted to learn about criminal justice problems-- whether this was their most important reason for participating or not--should be kept in mind. Some respondents might have selected this answer without reading down the rest of the list. The second highest percentage (13.2 percent) of the select participants indicated "as a favor to a friend," but only 4.1 percent of the non-select participants chose this answer. Since a large proportion of the non-select participants were students, it was understandable that "as a favor to a friend" would not be as compelling a reason because they were participating as a class assignment. However, this still did not explain why only 19 (4.1 percent) of the 459 non-select participants chose this response to 16 (13.2 percent) of the 124 select respondents. "The chance to be involved in an activity with my friends" (a related reason) was selected by 8 (6.6 percent) of the select participants but only 5 (1.1 percent) of the non-select participants. Friendship must have been a more significant factor in the original coming together of the select participants than of the non-select participants.

Relations with the Community

Two questions dealt with the participants' relations with their communities. Almost equal percentages of both

types of participants responded that they were "very con-
cerned" (47.9 percent select participants and 46.6 percent
non-select participants) and "somewhat concerned" about
community problems (51.2 percent select participants and
50.1 percent non-select participants). None of the select
participants indicated that they were "not concerned at all"
but 2.8 percent of the non-select participants did.

The responses were not as similar for each type of
participant to the item related to activity in the commun-
ity. Twenty-two percent of the select participants were
"very active" but only 14.2 percent of the non-select parti-
cipants. About equal percentages were "somewhat active"
(59 percent select participants and 55.6 percent non-select
participants). The non-select participants had a higher
percentage (29.6) of those who were "not active at all" than
did the select participants (16.5 percent). On all matters
where the percentages were not close on these two questions,
the differences could probably be accounted for by the stu-
dent status of most of the non-select participants.

Political Views

In relation to political views, it was puzzling why
a slightly larger proportion of the non-select respondents
(5.9 percent) rated themselves as "very conservative" and
"somewhat conservative" (34.9) than did the select partici-
pants (4.1 percent and 33.1 percent, respectively). More-
over, the select group had a larger percentage (14.9 per-
cent) rating their political views as "very liberal" than

the non-select participants (11.8 percent). These find-
ings were puzzling because of the relatively more youthful
status of the non-select group . The largest percentage of
both types of participants rated their political views as
"somewhat liberal" (42.1 percent of the select group and
45.3 percent of the non-select group). There was a larger
percentage (4.1 percent) of non-respondents to this item
for the select group than for the non-select group (1.3
percent).

Prior Contact with the Criminal Justice System

Items about contact with the criminal justice sys-
tem were included on all four questionnaires, and the
figures in this discussion are averages. A higher percent-
age of the select group (16.6 percent) had had contact with
the criminal justice system as jurors than the non-select
group (10.1 percent), which could be accounted for by the
various qualifications for jurors. A slightly larger pro-
portion of the non-select group (22.4 percent) had had con-
tact as witness-complainants than the select group (18.9
percent). Moreover, 8.0 percent of the non-select group
but only 2.7 percent of the select group had had contact
as defendants, which could be accounted for by the relative
youthfulness of the non-select group and their relatively
high percentage of racial minorities. The percentages for
relatives and friends having contact with the criminal jus-
tice system were about the same for both types of partici-
pants.

This chapter has discussed some of the outcomes of the viewer-discussion groups; the next chapter will consider the nature of the activity that brought about these outcomes.

CHAPTER IV

EVALUATION OF THE VIEWER-DISCUSSION GROUPS
BY FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRES

This chapter discusses a survey that was made of
the viewer-discussion group leaders in the TRUST several
months after the project was over. Matters pertaining to
this survey are presented in the following order:
1.) Background of the Survey of Viewer-Discussion Group
Leaders; 2) Survey Procedures; 3) Findings from the Survey
of "Successful" Group Leaders; 4) Findings from the Survey
of "Unsuccessful" Leaders.

Background of the Survey of Viewer-
Discussion Group Leaders

The Project TRUST Follow-Up Questionnaire for group
leaders was developed primarily for two interrelated
reasons:

1. The characteristics of the viewer-discussion
   sessions were not known. There was a general
   idea of what a viewer-discussion session should
   be like, based on the directions given at the
   training sessions for group leaders and in the
   printed materials. Moreover, it could be as-
   certained from the Feedback Questionnaires how
   many people attended each session (assuming each

CHAPTER IV

EVALUATION OF THE VIEWER-DISCUSSION GROUPS
BY FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRES

This chapter discusses a survey that was made of
the viewer-discussion group leaders in the TRUST several
months after the project was over. Matters pertaining to
this survey are presented in the following order:
1) Background of the Survey of Viewer-Discussion Group
Leaders; 2) Survey Procedures; 3) Findings from the Survey
of "Successful" Group Leaders; 4) Findings from the Survey
of "Unsuccessful" Leaders.

Background of the Survey of Viewer-Discussion Group Leaders

The Project TRUST Follow-Up Questionnaire for group
leaders was developed primarily for two interrelated
reasons:

1. The characteristics of the viewer-discussion
    sessions were not known. There was a general
    idea of what a viewer-discussion session should
    be like, based on the directions given at the
    training sessions for group leaders and in the
    printed materials. Moreover, it could be as-
    certained from the Feedback Questionnaires how
    many people attended each session (assuming each

participant completed a questionnaire), certain demographic characteristics of the participants, and some of their feelings about the interactive media/citizen participation process and certain criminal justice issues. Data were lacking, however, with which the intervention (or the independent variable or treatment) could be described.

2. It was not known why some of the groups stayed together for the full complement of four programs while others apparently did not. According to the number of Feedback Questionnaires received, the number of groups meeting declined from 95 meeting the first week to 60 meeting the fourth. It would of course be useful for evaluating the interactive media process and other aspects of the project to know the reason for this attrition.

Hyman and Wright (1971) gave insight into the reasons the evaluator should attempt to describe the program. First of all the word "program" itself may be misleading. Frequently a program is merely a written description of what the program planner intended but what was never completely implemented by the field staff. The difference between the intended program and the actual program is usually a matter of degree; while one rarely finds completely unrealized programs, partially realized programs are common.

Sometimes the singular term "program" is deceptive because the treatment being evaluated is extended in time and/or space. Labeling such extended treatments as a "program" inevitably leads to ambiguity in the conclusions.

These authors advise the evaluator to describe the various local programs that are being carried out, and, depending on their diversity, decide whether the research is an evaluation of a single program, a series of replications, or a series of comparative evaluations.

Two other variables must be considered in describing the program: the staff and the site. Any operating program has a staff and any evaluation should attempt to isolate its contribution. The site contains the staff and the program, and since the ecology of sites can affect the outcomes of programs and it should be conceptualized by the evaluator.

Hyman and Wright summarized the difficulty in conceptualizing the "program" as follows:

> Staff, site, and treatment are three elements of a program. . . . The treatment in most programs is anything but a unitary variable. The treatment is so lengthy, complex, and multiform that it demands analysis, but in its sprawl it often defies our powers of conceptualization (p. 197).

These authors also set limits on the evaluator's responsibility for conceptualizing the "program":

> Conceptualizing a program in terms of staff, site, didactic and communal elements of treatment, and temporal patterns only provides a schema within which the evaluator can introduce further conceptual requirements. In our judgment, he should not push these refinements too far. He must certainly describe a program and its main elements, but sometimes that

is where he should stop. Such description and basic conceptualization is quite different from endless dissection of a complex treatment which [the project's sponsor] regards as a functional unity (p. 197).

Following from the suggestions of these authors, items were included on the Follow-Up Questionnaire that elicited data about certain characteristics of the group leaders (who after all could be considered an extension of the staff since they had responsibility for operationalizing the objectives for the viewer-discussion groups), the site (i.e., the location and other data about the settings of the sessions), and the "treatment" (data on what went on in the sessions).

Variables related to the staff (i.e., the group leaders), sites, and treatment were essentially beyond the control of the project staff. Other variables were under such control or were subject to manipulation by the project staff, such as the films, printed material, training sessions, and other assistance to the groups. Group leaders' reactions to these variables would of course be of interest so items were included that brought out such reactions.

Two kinds of literature were consulted for clues as to the properties of group cohesiveness and how it might be measured--literature on small group research and literature specifically related to listening groups. Reading a few sources in the first category (Cartwright and Zander, 1968; Dunphy, 1972; King, 1962) indicated that this would unlikely be a fruitful line to pursue in any depth. This was true for at least two reasons: 1) it would be

difficult to develop specific questions because of the ambiguity about the variables that would serve as indicators of the concept of "cohesiveness"; 2) the approaches to measurement that were suggested seemed to be intended for studying a group actually in operation, whereas this evaluation necessitated a retrospective approach.

Only two of the reports from other listening group projects that were consulted considered the factors that caused groups to stay together. Hill (1941) stated that a number of reasons could be cited for group failure, all of which could be placed in two main categories for the sake of convenience: 1) those that were external to the group; and 2) those that were inherent to the group itself. Occasionally these two sources of failure were blended. Reasons that were external to the group included the termination of the program, change in broadcast time, or the quality of the program. The reasons inherent to the group that were discussed could be summarized as lack of interest. However, Hill asserted in discussing these reasons, "Some, if not all of the groups mentioned as ailing or failing because of the character of their members were suffering chiefly because those in charge of them were in one way or another incompetent. An able, trained leader can make something of almost any group" (p. 108).

Johnson (1965) in considering recruiting techniques stated that the formal organizations in a community simply provide one possible means of getting viewer-discussion

group leaders but that members might come from anywhere.
With the exception of high school groups, viewer-discussion
groups in his projects rarely consisted entirely of persons
belonging to the same organization. Friendship was empha-
sized as a strong cohesive factor. Johnson concluded that
friendship groups tended to be more persistent than those
based on one association.

Survey Procedures

Two questionnaires were developed for the group
leaders in the TRUST project, one for "successful" groups
and one for "unsuccessful" groups. Successful groups were
those from which at least three Feedback Questionnaires had
been received which meant that the group leader had appar-
ently been successful in keeping the viewer-discussion group
together for the full complement of the ". . . And Justice
For All" television programs. The groups from which three
questionnaires had been received were defined as "success-
ful" also, although there were four programs, because these
groups might have actually met for four times but for some
reason failed to send in one set of the questionnaires. The
records were checked to see if most of the missing question-
naires were related to a given program. For example, ques-
tionnaires missing from the first program might have meant
that the group was not organized until after the first
program--possibly as a result of someone's watching that
program and deciding to form a group. On the other hand,
questionnaires missing from the fourth program might have

meant that the group had disbanded by then. However, the missing sets of questionaires did not cluster around any particular program so as to suggest any rational basis for treating these groups as a separate category. The "unsuccessful groups" were those from which only one or two sets of Feedback Questionnaires had been received. It was possible that these groups, too, had in fact met more than the number of times indicated by the number of sets of questionnaires they had sent in. However, since in a program of this type it could be expected that some groups would not stay together for a variety of reasons, it was assumed that the number of sets of questionnaires sent in and the number of times the group met were related.

There were 65 groups that could be defined as successful. No group leader could be identified for four of these groups but from the number of people in these groups according to the computer printout for the Feedback Questionnaires, it was likely that they were school groups.

Sixty successful group leaders were mailed Follow-Up Questionnaires during the second two weeks in May of 1975. No address could be found in the records for one leader and one questionnaire was returned indicating that the addressee had moved leaving no forwarding address. Therefore, it was assumed that 59 of the 61 identified successful leaders actually received the questionnaire. A reminder letter was sent on June 5. On June 20, telephone calls were made to those who still had not responded,

whose correct telephone numbers were in the records or could be obtained from directory assistance. A total of 40 or 67.7 percent of the 59 group leaders who received the Follow-Up Questionnaire responded in time to be included in the analysis of the data.

The general reasons for non-returns in gathering data by questionnaires no doubt applied in this situation. For example, one respondent wrote on the last page of the instrument "This questionnaire is too long!" In another case, the respondent's secretary sent a note in reply to the reminder letter that he was on vacation and would not return for about a month. Another questionnaire was returned with a Canadian postmark, although it had been mailed to a local address, so perhaps a number of group leaders were away from their usual places of residence at the time the questionnaires arrived.

There were also reasons for non-returns which were related to variables that were peculiar to this program or to this type of program. One respondent, after receiving a reminder letter, telephoned the investigator to say that some of the questions specifically related to what happened in the viewer-discussion group just did not seem applicable to her experience. For the first session no one showed up and just she and her husband sent in questionnaires. Apparently, for the second and third sessions, only two other people came because four questionnaires were received for these sessions. None were received for the

fourth. This respondent was instructed to complete as much of the questionnaire as she could; e.g., the parts that were not specifically related to group discussion. She promised to do so but never sent the questionnaire in. Another respondent wrote on her questionnaire, "I'm sorry you had to send a reminder and then call to get me to get this done. My sincere apologies. I guess maybe it was a case of subconsciously not wanting to fill it out because I feel our group didn't accomplish much."

Findings from Successful Leaders

Following are the questionnaire items, a breakdown of the responses to those items, and comments on selected items.

1. How many times did your group meet to watch and discuss the '. . . And Justice for All' programs?

   once __2__ (5.0%)
   twice __1__ (2.5%)
   three times __4__ (10.0%)
   four times __30__ (75.0%)
   [no response] __3__ (7.5%)

It was necessary to find out how many separate viewer-discussion meetings were held by each group rather than assuming that because four sets of Feedback Questionnaires had been received the group had met four times--or that because fewer than four were received the group did not meet four times. In one instance, a church group watched the four films of ". . . And Justice For All" at one session. Some of the instances of discrepancy between the number of times the group met and the number of

questionnaires sent in could be accounted for by assuming a misunderstanding of the question.

The foregoing findings suggest that there can be a degree of error in determining how many people are participating in such a project if one relies only on the questionaires received and that there should be some other means of ascertaining the number of groups and participants.

2. Did your viewer-discussion group meet at the same place each session?

yes 37   (92.5%)
no   3   (7.5%)

3. Where did your group meet?

in your home 22   (55.0%)
in the home of another group member   3 (7.5%)
other (please specify) 13 (32.5%)
[two responses] 2 (5.0%)

Schools and churches were specified most often as "other" meeting places.

4. Did your group watch the ". . . And Justice For All" programs together?

yes 36   (90.0%)
no   4 (10.0%)

In the four instances where the groups' members did not view the films together, two were school groups where apparently the two daytime showings did not correspond with their class meeting time. In the other instances the TRUST discussions were held at the group's regular meeting time, which apparently did not correspond with the times the programs were televised.

The report on the CHOICES Project considered the question of whether viewer-discussion groups should be

encouraged to watch as a group. Of course, CHOICES differed from TRUST in two ways that were relevant to this question: 1) their programs were an hour long; 2) there were more than a dozen times available to see each film. Having an hour film might necessitate cutting down the discussion time or having a longer meeting time. Even with the numerous times available, the CHOICES evaluation stated that meeting times still were highly limited if they were governed by the television schedule. That report concluded that groups should be presented the option of watching the programs separately. However, it was pointed out that in such cases many participants in the discussion would neither have read the background material nor watched the programs. Moreover, the explanation of the process to prospective group leaders would be complicated by presenting this option; it is simpler to instruct the leaders to select a time and call their groups together to watch and discuss.

5. What time did your group watch the programs?

    Fridays, 8:00 P.M. 12   (30.0%)
    Mondays, 11:00 A.M. 3   (7.5%)
    Fridays, 1:30 P.M. 10   (25.0%)
    Mondays, 8:00 P.M. 12   (30.0%)
    [None of the above] 3 (7.5%)

Of the three responses that were "none of the above," one was the church group mentioned after the first question and two were groups whose members watched the programs separately and came together only for discussion.

6. Was your viewer-discussion session a part of a meeting that was usually held at that time for some other purpose?

Yes __8__ (20.0%) (Please answer question A below).
No __32__ (80.0%) (Go on to question 7).

A. What was the name and/or purpose of the group
   usually meeting at that time?

Of the eight who responded "yes," four were school

situations, two were church meetings, one was a meeting of

a jail volunteer group, and one was a regular discussion

group. It could be suggested that if the programs had been

offered at a wider variety of times they might have corres-

ponded to the regular meeting times of more groups, or if

publicity had gone out sooner groups could have changed

their regular meeting times if they wished.

7. Before participating in the TRUST project, were you
   employed by or a member of an organization which
   deals with criminal justice issues?

   yes __14__ (35.0%) (Please answer question A below).
   no __26__ (65.0%) (Go on to question 8).

   A. Is the organization a
      private, non-profit organization __9__ (22.5)
      governmental agency __1__ (2.5)
      other (please specify) __3__ (7.5)
      [more than one of the above responses] 1 (2.5)

8. How were you recruited to be a viewer-discussion
   group leader for the TRUST project?

   by one of the citizens mobilization personnel on
   the TRUST staff __12__ (30.0%)
   by a member of an organization to which you
   belong __18__ (45.0%)
   other (please specify) __10__ (25.0%)

"Other" means of recruitment included some affilia-

tion with the TRUST staff, TRUST publicity, or contact with

other organizations.

9. Were you the discussion leader for each session?

   yes __34__ (85.0%) (Go on to question 10).
   no __6__ (15.0%) (Please answer question A below)

A. If "no," please explain why.

In on-going discussion groups, responsibility for leadership is sometimes rotated among the members. However, of the six who indicated they were not the leader for all four sessions, only two had planned it that way. One said that different resource people were used, and, in one instance, the group met in four different homes and the respondent led only the discussion which met in her home. In the other instances, the respondents did not lead because of illness or other unexpected incidents.

10. Before the TRUST project, what was your relationship with the people who participated in your viewer-discussion group?

They were your neighbors__12__ (30.0%)
They were your co-workers_____
They were members of an organization to which you belong__12__ (30.0%)
other(please explain)__13__ (32.5%)
[more than one of the above responses] 3 (7.5)

"Other" responses included student-teacher relationships or could be classified as some kind of organizational affiliation.

11. Before the TRUST project, how well acquainted with each other were the people in your viewer-discussion group?

Everyone knew each other__10__ (25.0%)
Most of them knew each other__22__ (55.0%)
Few of them knew each other__8__ (20.0%)
None of them knew each other_____

12. Did you attend one of the training sessions for group leaders sponsored by the TRUST staff?

yes__22__ (55.0%) (Please answer question A).
no__18__ (45.0%) (Go on to question 13).

A. If "yes" how would you rate the training session in terms of how well it prepared you to serve as

a discussion leader for the TRUST project?

excellent   6   (27.2%)
good 11   (50.0%)
fair   4   (18.1%)
poor   1   (4.5%)

13. Before the TRUST project, had you had any formal training for leading a discussion group?

yes 20   (50.0%)
no 19   (47.5%)
[no response] 1 (2.5%)

14. Before the TRUST project, how much experience as a group discussion leader had you had?

no previous experience   8   (20.0%)
little previous experience 6   (15.0%)
some previous experience 14   (35.0%)
quite a bit of previous experience 12   (30.0%)

15. How do you feel that your knowledge about criminal justice issues affected your performance as a discussion leader?

I knew enough about criminal justice
issues to do well as a discussion leader 12   (30.0%)
I would have been a better discussion
leader if I had known more about
criminal justice issues 12   (30.0%)
My knowledge about criminal justice issues
did not affect my performance as a discussion
leader 15   (37.5%)
[no response] 1 (2.5%)

16. How would you rate your knowledge about group discussion techniques at the time you participated in the TRUST project?

I knew enough about discussion techniques
to lead the group effectively 29   (72.5%)
I could have used more training related
to group discussion techniques   9   (22.5%)
[no response] 2 (5.0)

17. In general, how did you try to guide the discussion?

I tried to have as many members as possible
discuss the issues without trying to reach
any conclusions 16   (40.0%)
I tried to get the group to reach conclusions
about the issues as individuals but not
necessarily to present their conclusions to
the group   8   (20.0%)

I encouraged group decision on the issues
but did not tie that decision in with any
commitment to group or individual action __11__ (27.5%)
I encouraged group decisions and group action
upon those decisions __4__ (10.0%)
[more than one response] 1 (2.5%)

Since leadership connotes some goal on the part of the leader, there was some concern as to how the leaders viewed this goal. According to Haiman (1951, p. 79) "talking groups" generally satisfy two kinds of needs—the need to learn from others and the need to act with others. The need to learn from others, to express feelings and ideas to them, and to improve one's understanding of his environment—this need is the motivation for "learning groups." The need for cooperation with others in planning work and decision making which one cannot handle alone provides the motivation for "action groups." Whereas the purpose of the learning group is individual growth, group productivity is the goal of the action group. However, most talking groups are concerned with both learning and action to one extent or another.

Ohliger (1966) found that at least four discussion patterns could be discerned from the groups that he studied. These patterns are the bases for the response options in the foregoing question and seem to lend themselves to the learning versus action dichotomy suggested by Haiman.

18. On the average, how long were your discussion periods?

30 minutes or less __15__ (37.5%)
45 minutes to an hour __20__ (50.0%)
over an hour __5__ (12.5%)

19. On the average, how much of your discussions was related to the items on the Feedback Questionnaires?

    none __1__ (2.5%)
    very little __3__ (7.5%)
    some __22__ (55.0%)
    quite a bit __14__ (35.0%)

20. In general, how do you think most of your group members felt about filling out the Feedback Questionnaires?

    They didn't mind at all __34__ (85.0%)
    They were somewhat unwilling to fill them out __6__ (15.0%)
    They were very unwilling to fill them out _____

21. How much explanation did you have to give about the purposes of the Feedback Questionnaires?

    no explanation __3__ (7.5%)
    a little explanation __34__ (85.0%)
    quite a bit of explanation __3__ (7.5%)

22. In general, how interested do you think most of the members of your group were in finding out how their answers on the Feedback Questionnaires compared with those of participants in other discussion groups?

    not interested at all __6__ (15.0%)
    somewhat interested __29__ (72.5%)
    very interested __5__ (12.5%)

23. Usually there were group discussions about criminal justice problems on television immediately following the ". . . And Justice For All" films. Did your group watch these discussions?

    yes __14__ (35.0%)
    no __26__ (65.0%)

24. How many member of your group do you think read the Participants Handbook for the TRUST project?

    none of them __3__ (7.5%)
    a few of them __24__ (60.0%)
    most of them __11__ (27.5%)
    all of them __1__ (2.5%)
    [don't know] __1__ (2.5%)

25. Were there any "task assignments" carried out by any of your group members?

    yes __11__ (27.5%)
    no __29__ (72.5%)

26. How much did you encourage them to do the "task assignments"?

I did not encourage them at all __18__ (45.0%)
I encouraged them some __19__ (47.5%)
I encouraged them quite a bit __2__ (5.0%)
[no response] 1 (2.5%)

27. Why do you think most of the members of your group participated in the TRUST project?

They were interested in learning more about criminal justice problems __17__ (42.5%)
They were interested in doing something about criminal justice problems __11__ (27.5%)
They were more interested in social contact with the other members of the group than in criminal justice problems __1__ (2.5%)
Other (please specify) __8__ (20.0%)
[more than one of the above] 3 (7.5%)

28. During the TRUST project, did you have any problems for which you had to contact the TRUST staff?

yes __7__ (17.5%) (Please answer questions A and B below)
no __33__ (82.5%) (Go on to question 29).

A. If "yes," what was the nature of the problem?
B. How helpful was the staff in solving the problem?

very helpful __6__ (85.7%)
somewhat helpful __1__ (14.2%)
not helpful at all _____

In one instance the problem for which the staff was contacted was a lack of viewer-discussion participants. In the rest, the assistance needed was additional material (i.e., Feedback Questionnaires and other printed material prepared for the groups).

29. If a similar project were to be offered, would you participate as a discussion leader?

yes __14__ (35.0%)
uncertain __17__ (42.5%)
no __9__ (22.5%)

It should not be inferred from the "no" and "uncertain" responses that these leaders had an unsatisfactory

experience with the TRUST project. There was no follow-up question asking those responding "no" or "uncertain" to explain why. It was considered, but for the sake of brevity this contingency question was omitted. However, some respondents did write marginal comments. One who responded "no" wrote "Because of other community involvement I could not undertake the additional responsibility." The intent of the question was simply to provide a basis for inference about the leaders' satisfaction with their experience in TRUST. However, this question could be interpreted as solicitation to participate in another project. Another who responded "no" indicated that she was moving away. Another "no" respondent stated in relation to Item 33 which asked for suggestions for improvement that everything about the project was well done and in Item 34 which asked for additional comments that she enjoyed participating. One "uncertain" respondent said further participation would depend on the subject of the project.

30. If a similar project were to be offered, how many members of your viewer-discussion group do you think would participate?

all of them __1__ (2.5%)
most of them __20__ (50.0%)
few of them __16__ (40.0%)
none of them __1__ (7.5%)

31. Did you attend the Action Fair Conference?

yes __10__ (25.0%)
no __30__ (75.0%)

32. As a result of the TRUST project, has your group
    or any of its members that you're aware of carried
    out any activity in relation to criminal justice
    problems?

    yes __13__ (32.5%) (Please describe the activity on
                       the last page of this question-
                       naire)
    no __27__ (67.5%)

Eight provided comments on subsequent activities;
however, two described activities engaged in prior to TRUST.
Three leaders and/or some of their members become involved
in the League of Women Voters Courtwatching project. One
described having a local chief of police and youth officer
attend their last viewer-discussion meeting and a lawyer to
attend the session on the courts. She stated "Both meetings
were made more interesting by having outside experts. One
meeting lasted until almost midnight!" A local problem
with some young people who were committing vandalism had
prompted them to make these efforts.

That respondent concluded by saying "I think our
group started out with only a slight interest for the most
part, but as the project got rolling everyone became in-
volved with greater interest and felt it was a good learning
experience as well as an avenue to involvement."

Another leader reported that one of her members set
up a meeting with their local probation officers to give
people an opportunity to learn more about local problems.
One leader became a member of a committee on handgun con-
trol. Two of the leaders, although not reporting subse-
quent activities, emphasized the learning that occurred as

a result of participating in TRUST. One stated "Many mem-
bers were awakened to . . . differences between urban and
suburban problems and the need for local control and
commitment especially for young people in trouble." The
other stated "[We were] not a very action oriented group
in general. [We] found it a consciousness-raising and
provocative experience which may bear fruit in the future.
[We] participated primarily as individuals."

In question 33, the group leaders were asked how
the project could have been improved in relation to the
following elements: group leader training, Feedback
Questionnaires, television programs, and staff assistance.
Related printed material was inadvertently omitted, although
this element and any other suggestions could have been con-
sidered in the "other" category. Of course, not every
leader responded to this question. Some kind of rating
scale on the elements would probably have elicited a
response from each leader but a negative rating would not
have given any idea as to how the particular element could
have been improved, in the respondent's opinion. Therefore,
it was decided to make this an open-ended item. Since many
of these responses serve as good insight-stimulating exam-
ples, and most of them are brief, they will be given ver-
batim.

The highest number of comments (15) was related to
the training sessions. Six of these comments were from per-
sons who did not attend a TRUST training session; three

simply indicated that training was necessary and three comments were related to scheduling, location, and earlier notification of leaders about the training. Of the nine respondents who did attend the TRUST training, five made suggestions related to the content of the training. These suggestions were as follows:

> . . . breaking into small groups for training and then feedback from the instructor.

> . . . a dramatized model of a 'typical' session

> . . . more help on discussion techniques

Two made suggestions related to the broader aspects of organizing and managing a group:

> Deal with how leaders can achieve objectives of their own or their group or organization.

The following quote outlines a number of problems that can occur in a viewer-discussion group that have implications for training.

> I felt that the [group leader] training I had at the Y was good. What I think I needed was more training in how to present the program. I gave everyone [the 'Participants Handbook'] to inform them on the Saturday before the Monday 8 p.m. meeting and then I did not give them the Avenues to Involvement because I thought they would generate some enthusiasm as the program went on. Instead, a few very negative people indicated there was no hope and withdrew all the attention of the group, I guess. I called upon my neighbors who were active in PTA [etc.] because I did not know who would be most likely to join my group. The first and second television programs were just before elections and I didn't want a bi-partisan political problem or overtones either. I felt the people I contacted showed the most community involvement and would . . . most easily . . . recognize the conditions as being in immediate need for corrections.

Of the four remaining comments, three indicated a need for general improvement of the sessions and one suggested a session for leaders midway through the project.

Thirteen comments were offered about the television programs. Six were simply positive comments which offered no suggestions for improvement. Comments from which suggestions for improvement could be inferred were as follows:

. . . maybe a little longer (45 minutes) and fewer of them--more concentrated.

Make clear about T.V. discussion period so [one] can plan for it. [This comment was apparently in reference to the post-program panel discussions which they were told by the TV moderator not to watch.]

. . . more in-depth, practical interviews; less super-star, more average interviewees.

Technically the programs were not too great. The 'supered' names and titles of people in particular were extremely hard to read and that made it difficult for discussion.

Most participants felt that while [printed] material was provocative, the programs weren't.

Last program was too repetitive--showing children clapping over and over, for example.

Ten comments were offered about the Feedback Questionnaires. Several felt that these questionnaires inhibited the discussions. Since at the training sessions and in the printed material it was stated that using the Feedback Questionnaires for discussion was optional, it was checked to see which respondents commenting on the questionnaires had attended the training. The comments preceded by an "X" below were from persons that did attend the TRUST group leader training.

Three commented on the effects of the questionnaire on the discussion:

[They] became inhibiting to discussion and should be filled in only after discussion.

X   Some of the Feedback questions were not either/or
questions and in many instances bogged down the dis-
cussion. With time being limited our group only got
as far as discussion, never group consensus . . ..
[Nothing in the written or oral instructions to group
leaders indicated they were to seek group consensus.]

X   There was some confusion about whether we were
answering for our own community or in terms of the TV
program.

The remaining comments were more related to the

format, content, or quantity of the questionnaires:

X   . . . not so leading [in] choice answers--[should
be] space left for individual input 'opinions.'

X   Please formulate more clearly. The questions with
'degree' answers were especially poor.

Use language that undereducated people can understand.
Questions sometimes very confusiong. [From teacher in
program for truant high school students.]

An area that needs improvement. We felt questionnaires
. . . left something to be desired.

X   . . . more provocative.

. . . more explicit.

. . . one questionnaire at the end would be plenty.

Nine comments were related to staff assistance.

Five were general, positive comments, and offered no sugges-

tions for change. Of the remaining four, two wanted sugges-

tions for action:

X   . . . more specific suggestions for action.

X   We needed more help in action areas and without that
help the whole thing becomes an intellectual exercise.

The two remaining comments were related to addi-

tional contact with the staff:

. . . possibly a small meeting with a few leaders before
the program. [Since this person indicated she did not
attend the training, perhaps she did not know about it.]

X . . . more active follow-up.

There were nine comments in the "other" category of the item related to the project elements, and seven in response to the question that asked for comments about the viewer-discussion experience not brought out by the foregoing questions (question 34). These categories were combined because each question allowed the respondent to comment on relatively unspecified aspects of their experience.

Five were related to scheduling problems:

People are interested but time is a problem.

It is difficult to maintain a high degree of interest and involvement in a four part program. Too many of our people have jobs requiring travel during the week. Hard to get them together over several weeks.

Timing. November is a very busy time of year and it was hard to find people willing to commit themselves to four meetings just before the frantic Christmas season. I think it might have been more successful in January or February.

We had schedule problems. For group meetings to watch together and discuss we need Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday nights. . . . Some of the discussion group watched the program twice.

Do it all in one week, if possible (2 sessions).

Two commented on the printed material:

. . . materials more suitable for students. I was contacted so late I had little preparation time for myself or group.

. . . good printed material; easy procedures to follow; well run series.

Several gave comments on their role as leader:

I just want to emphasize the fact that I felt very inadequate as a leader because of my knowledge of criminal justice issues.

I think, had it been suggested or urged, I would have
formed a group of people that I knew were interested
and would clearly benefit. [From the leader of a school
group.]

I enjoyed being in a group and sharing the leadership
responsibilities with [another member.] We had quite a
fall off by the last session, I think due to time
conflicts more than anything else.

It was interesting to hear everyone's personal opinion
about crime and just what we can do to help.

Involvement in community affairs gives me a clear pic-
ture of what people feel and how to deal with local
problems.

Beautiful experience.

One commented on the Action Fair Conference:

Attended Action Fair Conference with another group
leader. Found it disappointing. Expected more infor-
mation on the ideas and actions that grew out of other
meetings--not speeches telling why they were there.

It was not clear from the immediately foregoing
quote whether the respondent by "other meetings" was refer-
ring to the separate sessions at the Action Fair Conference
or other viewer-discussion groups. However, it seems clear
that she wanted feedback. This was a concern of another
respondent also who suggested "Have the Feedback Question-
naire and the Action Fair Conference on TV. Have the pro-
gram longer with the second half being a summary of what
some groups had felt and what they decided on."

Another additional comment was:

Can think of no ways to improve. All were profession-
ally done and served the purpose.

35. How concerned do you think you are about community problems?

very concerned __22__ (55.0%)
somewhat concerned __15__ (37.5%)
not concerned at all ____
[no response] 3 (7.5%)

36. How active are you in community affairs?

very active __21__ (52.5%)
somewhat active __15__ (37.5%)
not active at all __2__ (5.0%)
[no response] 2 (5.0%)

37. What is your sex?

female __27__ (67.5%)
male __11__ (27.5%)
[no response] 2 (5.0%)

Of the 11 males who were group leaders, three had viewer-discussion groups composed of their students, five had groups composed of their church or synagogue members and met at the place or worship, one had a group composed of penal institution volunteers which he led. All of the foregoing nine groups had in common the fact that they were based in one association or were drawn from one source. Moreover, five of the nine were part of a meeting that was usually held at the time of the viewer-discussion session for some other purpose.

Only eight of the 40 group leaders answered "yes" to that question. These facts suggested that males who participated as group leaders generally did not go through the process of actually organizing groups. They tended to take advantage of groups that were already organized for some other purpose--chiefly school or religious groups-- and used the regular meeting time of the group for viewer- discussion group purposes.

38. In which age group are you?

```
20 or less _____
21-30    7    (17.5%)
31-40    13   (32.5%)
41-50    13   (32.5%)
51-60    1    (2.5%)
61 and over   4    (10.0%)
[no response]  2  (5.0%)
```

39. What is your racial/ethnic background?

```
Black    2    (5.0%)
Latino _____
White    36   (90.0%)
Other _____  (please specify)
[no response]  2  (5.0%)
```

40. How much formal education have you completed?

```
8th grade or less _____
some high school    1    (2.5%)
high school graduate    1    (2.5%)
some college    5    (12.5%)
college graduate or more    31    (77.5%)
[no response]  2  (5.0%)
```

Findings from the Unsuccessful Leaders

The questionnaire for "unsuccessful" group leaders;
i.e., those groups it was assumed had met fewer than three
times, was a modified version of the one for the "successful"
group leaders. The modification was done for two main
reasons: 1) if those group leaders had had a disappointing
experience with their viewer-discussion groups, they might
have been unwilling to complete the forty-one item question-
naire designed for successful group leaders; 2) some of the
items about what went on in the group might not have seemed
pertinent if, in fact, those groups had met only once or
twice; therefore, some of those items were omitted. The
items related to the leaders' backgrounds and the relation-
ships between the people in the groups were retained because

they might have given insight into why the groups were "unsuccessful." The item that asked them to evaluate various elements of the project was of the same interest for the unsuccessful leaders as for the successful leaders.

There were 35 unsuccessful groups. Group leaders could be identified for 26; however, 25 made up the population for this survey because one leader had two groups. The questionnaires were mailed out in June, 1975; two could not be contacted because there were no addresses for them in the project records and one questionnaire was returned because the address in the records was incorrect. Of the 22 it can be assumed received the questionnaire, 11 (50 percent) responded.

Following are the questionnaire items, a breakdown of the responses, and comments on selected items.

1. How were you recruited to be a viewer-discussion group leader for the TRUST project?

    by one of the citizens mobilization personnel on the TRUST staff __4__ (36.4%)
    by a member of an organization to which you belong __4__ (36.4%)
    other (please specify) __3__ (27.3%)

One reason given as "other" was that the respondent had called COPE and volunteered to be a group leader after hearing about the project on television. The remaining "other" responses involved some kind of organizational affiliation.

2. Before the TRUST project, what was your relationship with the people who participated in your viewer-discussion group?

They were your neighbors __3__ (27.3%)
They were your co-workers ____
They were members of an organization
to which you belong __3__ (27.3%)
other (please explain) __3__ (27.3%)
[some combination of the above] 2 (18.2%)

3. Before the TRUST project, how well acquainted with
    each other were the people in your viewer-discussion
    group?

    Everyone knew each other __4__ (36.4%)
    Most of them knew each other __5__ (45.5%)
    Few of them knew each other __2__ (18.2%)
    None of them knew each other ____

4. Was your viewer-discussion group session a part of
    a meeting that was usually held at that time for
    some other purpose?

    yes __3__ (27.3%) (Please answer question A below)
    no __7__ (63.6%) (Go on to question 5).
    [no response] 1 (9.1%)

    A. What was the name and/or purpose of the group
       usually meeting at that time?

    The three who responded "yes" specified classes.

5. Before participating in the TRUST project, were you
    employed by or a member of an organization which
    deals with criminal justice issues?

    yes __3__ (27.3%) (Please answer question A below).
    no __7__ (63.6%) (Go on to question 6)
    [no response] 1 (9.1%)

    A. Is the organization a

       private, non-profit organization __3__ (27.3%)
       governmental agency ____
       other (please specify) ____

6. Did you attend one of the training sessions for
    group leaders sponsored by the TRUST staff:

    yes __4__ (36.4%) (Please answer question A below).
    no __7__ (63.6%) (Go on to question 7).

    A. If "yes," how would you rate the training session
       in terms of how well it prepared you to serve as
       a discussion leader for the TRUST project?

```
excellent   2   (50.0%)
good   2   (50.0%)
fair _____
poor _____
```

7. Before the TRUST project, had you had any formal
    training for leading a discussion group?

    yes __8__ (72.7%)
    no __3__ (27.3%)

8. Before the TRUST project, how much experience as a
    group discussion leader had you had?

    no previous experience __1__ (9.1%)
    little previous experience __2__ (18.2%)
    some previous experience __2__ (18.2%)
    quite a bit of previous experience __6__ (54.5%)

In relation to training for group leadership the

unsuccessful leaders differed from the successful leaders

more than they did on most other background variables of

concern in both questionnaires. Only 45 percent of the

successful group leaders had not attended a TRUST training

session, only 47.5 percent had had formal training in leading

discussions, and only 30 percent had had "quite a bit of

previous experience."

9. How do you feel your knowledge about criminal jus-
    tice issues affected your performance as a discus-
    sion leader?

    I knew enough about criminal justice issues
    to do well as a discussion leader __4__ (36.4%)
    I would have been a better discussion leader
    if I had known more about criminal justice
    issues __4__ (36.4%)
    My knowledge about criminal justice issues
    did not affect my performance as a discussion
    leader __3__ (27.3%)

10. How would you rate your knowledge about group dis-
    cussion techniques at the time you participated in
    the TRUST project?

    I knew enough about discussion techniques
    to lead to the group effectively __9__ (81.8%)

I could have used more training related
to group discussion techniques __1__ (9.1%)
[no response] 1 (9.1%)

The unsuccessful leaders apparently were more confi-
dent in their knowledge of group discussion techniques than
the successful leaders in that only 72.5 percent of the
latter felt they knew enough about such techniques.

11. Why do you think most of the members of your
    group participated in the TRUST project?

    They were interested in learning more about
    criminal justice problems __6__ (54.5%)
    They were interested in doing something
    about criminal justice problems __2__ (18.2%)
    They were more interested in social contact
    with the other members of the group than in
    criminal justice problems __1__ (9.1%)
    other __1__ (9.1%) (please specify)
    [more than one response] 1 (9.1%)

12. During the TRUST project, did you have any problems
    for which you had to contact the TRUST staff?

    yes __2__ (18.2%) (Please answer questions A and B
                              below)
    no __9__ (81.8%) (Go on to question 13).

    A. If "yes," what was the nature of the problem?
    b. How helpful was the staff in solving the prob-
       lem?

       very helpful _____
       somewhat helpful __1__ (50.0%)
       not helpful at all _____

13. If a similar project were to be offered, would you
    participate as a discussion leader?

    yes __7__ (63.6%)
    uncertain __1__ (9.1%)
    no __3__ (27.3%)

The unsuccessful leaders were more favorable toward
participating again than the successful leaders were; only
35 percent of the latter indicated they would and 42.5 per-
cnet were "uncertain."

14. If another project like TRUST were being planned, how do you think it could be improved in relation to the following items? Comment on as many as you wish.

Six of the respondents commented on training sessions, of whom three had attended the TRUST training sessions. One of those three suggested having a number of training sessions before the films; the investigator inferred that he was recommending more extensive training than was provided. Another of those who had attended the TRUST training recommended more sessions at different times to accommodate more leaders; the third simply commented "good."

Of the three who had not attended the TRUST training, one simply put a check mark beside "training sessions," one commented that all discussion leaders should be trained, while the third said that such training was a good idea for some leaders.

Seven comments were offered on the Feedback Questionnaires. Three simply gave them ratings: i.e., "okay," "very good," "excellent." Two commented on the content; one said they were "too vague," and the other suggested that, in addition to providing bilingual questionnaires, "the issues for disadvantaged citizens should be simplified." One criticized the number of questionnaires; he felt there should have been only one at the beginning and one at the end of the series. One suggested that the questionnaires "certainly could be improved," but did not specify how.

Six commented on the television programs. Three simply wrote "good." Two made critical remarks; one said

that while the programs were interesting, they did too much repeating and the other stated that they were "obvious set-ups . . . one sided" and that "crime is as American as capitalism." One was concerned about the availability of the films: "Continue to make the films available to educational institutions and on television."

Four comments were offered on assistance from the TRUST staff. Three gave ratings: two "excellent" and one "very good." One was concerned about future communication; he suggested "A newsletter and a 'Thank You' letter. More criminal justice information, pamphlets, etc., to inform each other of current issues."

Five respondents offered additional comments. Four of these were compliments on the project, two of which suggested that it should be offered again; e.g., ". . . one viewing is not enough; reinforced learning and training requires more than one session with such valuable material."

One leader offered a comment that gave insight into a possible reason why some questionnaires were not received for each viewer-discussion session that actually was held; i.e., "The mailing cost was a little high. I feel the leaders should have their money refunded or maybe a recognition dinner to let them know how helpful they were for the cause."

15. How many times did your viewer-discussion group meet?

once ___1___ (9.1%)
twice ___1___ (9.1%)
three times ___3___ (27.3%)

four times __5__ (45.5%)
[did not check one of the above but wrote
a comment] 1 (9.1%)

Eight of the so-called "unsuccessful" groups had
met enough times to be classified as "successful" at least
according to their self-reports; three had met three times
and four had met four times according to their responses.
In Item 16, six commented on why their groups had met fewer
than four times. Two had had scheduling difficulties and in
two instances the groups had lost interest. In one case
the leader had had a personal emergency and in one case the
group was a high school class which watched two of the
films on television and two in the classroom so they did
not meet for four separate sessions.

It was assumed that the number of times a given
group was represented by the number of sets of Feedback
Questionnaires sent in for the group. If the writer had
known that this was not the case to the extent that it
proved not to be, two additional items would have been in-
cluded on the questionnaire for "unsuccessful" leaders:
1) how many sets of Feedback Questionnaires did you send
in?; 2) if the number of sets you sent in was fewer than
the number of times your group met, why? Of course the
accuracy of the responses to those items would be question-
able, given the time that had elapsed between the viewer-
discussion activity and the time the survey was carried
out; the time to check on the reasons for missing Feedback
Questionnaires would have been during the viewer-discussion
activity or immediately thereafter.

The additional comments that were called for in Item 17 were combined with those in Item 14.

18. How concerned do you think you are about community problems?

very concerned __7__ (63.6%)
somewhat concerned __4__ (36.4%)
not concerned at all _____

19. How active are you in community affairs?

very active __4__ (36.4%)
somewhat active __5__ (45.5%)
not active at all __2__ (18.2%)

20. What is your sex?

female __4__ (36.4%)
male __6__ (54.5%)
[no response] 1 (9.1%)

21. In which age group are you?

20 or less _____
21-30 __3__ (27.3%)
31-40 __5__ (45.5%)
41-50 _____
51-60 __3__ (27.3%)
61 and over _____

22. What is your racial/ethnic background?

Black __7__ (63.6%)
Latino _____
White __4__ (36.4%)
other _____ (please specify).

23. How much formal education have you completed?

8th grade or less _____
some high school __1__ (9.1%)
high school graduate _____
some college __3__ (27.3%)
college graduate or more _____ (63.6%)

This chapter and the preceding one have considered TRUST in relation to one of its targets; i.e., the ordinary citizen. The next chapter is concerned with another target; i.e., the cooperating organizations.

CHAPTER V

THE EVALUATION OF THE ATTAINMENT OF THE

OBJECTIVES RELATED TO

COOPERATING ORGANIZATIONS

In addition to the ordinary citizen, the TRUST
project had as a target certain organizations, and this
chapter discusses the evaluation of the attainment of the
objectives related to these organizations. Matters per-
taining to that evaluation are presented in the following
order: 1) Background of the Organizational Evaluation;
2) Developing and Implementing the Evaluation Strategy;
3) Findings; 4) Some Concluding Observations.

Background of the Organizational Evaluation

The proposal for funding for the TRUST project was
useful for getting a picture of how organizations were to
be involved in the TRUST project, at least in the early
thinking of those who designed the project. No goals
related to organizations were included among the explicitly
stated short- or long-range goals of the project. Both
kinds of goals were given in relation to the individual
citizen. However, the proposal did state that "an organi-
zational and citizen network is the critical component in

131

an interactive media project" (COPE, Note 4, p. 6). COPE saw as one of the crucial and perhaps unique contributions it could make to an interactive media/citizen participation program was the network of organizations participating in its regular monthly luncheon meetings. This network was described as being "regional in perspective and [including] representation from all major interest groups. . . . 275 corporations, governmental and privately funded agencies have participated" (COPE, Note 4, p. 6).

The proposal specified what the anticipated output from the cooperating organizations would be in the TRUST project. First of all, it was expected that these organizations would assume some of the responsibility for the citizens mobilization component. According to the proposal:

> Proper organization of this key component is perhaps the most time consuming and costly aspect of the overall project.
>
> To be successful, it requires considerable cooperation from the target groups and a great deal of communication and coordination by the Council staff.
>
> Expenses for the overall effort can be lessened in direct proportion to amount of responsibility assumed by volunteers or paid staff from cooperating organizations (COPE, Note 4, p. 12).

Secondly, the proposal emphasized that the responsibility for any follow-up activities would have to be assumed by cooperating organizations:

> It must be stressed that the Council is a neutral forum dealing with five separate areas of concern. Hence, the Council will not be in a position to organize sustained follow-up activities in any one area like criminal justice. Rather, such follow-up activities like conferences, seminars, or perhaps Action Fairs must become the responsibility of a consortium of participating groups (COPE, Note 4, p. 11).

Although no goals related to organizations were among the explicitly stated long- and short-range goals of TRUST, such goals could be inferred from the evaluation portion of the proposal. Among the aspects of the project that the proposal suggested an evaluation might consider were:

> The value of the project to citizens groups particularly concerned with criminal justice. How did they evaluate their own participation? Did the project help them become more visible in the community, advance their agendas, learn from others, gain additional members or volunteers, and so on (COPE, Note 4, p. 15).

It was the desire of the project director that the evaluation attempt to make some assessment of the benefits that cooperating organizations got from participating. Findings from such an assessment would certainly be valuable for judging this particular project but perhaps more valuable for planning similar projects in the future. Since the likelihood of gaining some organizational benefit might be the most important reason many organizations would participate, knowing how to maximize that benefit is essential.

Developing and Implementing the Evaluation Strategy

It was not decided to attempt an evaluation in relation to cooperating organizations until the late spring of 1975; the project had officially ended with the Action Fair Conference in December, 1974. The content of the questionnaire developed for organizational representatives was determined almost solely by the concerns of the project

director. As in the case of the goals which determined the contents of the Feedback Questionnaires for the viewer-discussion groups, the goals for organizations and the anticipated benefits they were to get from participating in TRUST were to a great extent in the mind of the project director. Again, the investigator's task was to translate those conceptions into a research instrument.

The project director saw the potential benefits for organizations of participating in TRUST as being opportunities to: 1) educate or inform their members; 2) publicize or promote their activities; 3) involve their members in some future activity; 4) get more volunteers or members; 5) become more familiar and/or active with other organizations working with criminal justice problems.

Defining the population for this survey was not as simple as it was for the follow-up of the leaders of the viewer-discussion groups. The ways in which organizations were involved in the project included the following:

1. served on the advisory committee for issue identification

2. served on the advisory committee for developing the contents of the ". . . And Justice For All" films

3. appeared in the ". . . And Justice For All" films

4. appeared in a panel on television immediately following the films

5. distributed literature about the Action Fair Conference

6. helped in the general planning for the Action Fair Conference

7. organized and/or participated in a workshop at the Action Fair Conference

8. participated in Involvement Alley at the Action Fair Conference

9. formed a viewer-discussion group

10. was listed in "Avenues to Involvement"

The investigator decided to take the sample for this survey from the following:

1. the advisory group that assisted in the issue identification and content development phase

2. those persons who attended the various planning meetings for the Action Fair Conference

3. the persons who participated in Involvement Alley at the Action Fair Conference

4. viewer-discussion group leaders for whom there was an organizational affiliation listed on the citizens mobilization staff's registration forms. This category was eventually eliminated because an organization was listed for relatively few (the form did not require it), although many of these persons got involved in TRUST primarily through some organizational affiliation.

The sample was drawn from the persons who participated in the activities just described because:

1. there were records available of who had participated in those activities although, in the case of the advisory group, not how many sessions they had attended

2. those activities were the ones in which, in principle, any organization could have participated depending on their being known by COPE at the time the activity was taking place; other activities such as appearing in one of the films or one of the post-program television discussion groups were not available to all organizations

3. those activities required the organizations to expend some of their resources, at least the time of volunteers or staff members; on the other hand, involvement by way of being listed in "Avenues to Involvement" would not have required such expenditure.

Questionnaires were mailed to the representatives of 80 organizations during June, 1975. It could be assumed that only 71 of the representatives probably received the questionnaire. Some questionnaires were returned marked "addressee unknown." Some mail and telephone follow-up efforts resulted in our being informed, in some instances, that the representative no longer worked for the organization. Still, it could only be assumed that the remaining

71 received the questionnaire. Telephone contact was complicated by the fact that some of the representatives were not at the organizational location on a fixed schedule; moreover, the survey was carried out during a time of the year when many people are on vacation.

Thirty-eight (53.5 percent) of the 71 assumed contacts returned the questionnaire in time to be included in the analysis of the data. As in the case of the Follow-Up Questionnaires sent to the viewer-discussion group leaders, there were reasons for non-returns that were peculiar to this situation. The central purpose for the questionnaire was to assess the benefit to organizations that participated in the TRUST project. However, some contacts probably did not perceive of themselves as representing organizations or seeking organizational benefit through their participation and therefore the questionnaire might have seemed inappropriate or irrelevant. In fact, one respondent who filled it out on a pilot basis did send a letter accompanying his questionnaire which included the following:

> My initial reaction to the questionnaire is that it focuses too much on what the TRUST program may have done for me, or my organization, rather than what it may have done for the community at large. I personally see the program in terms of its potential community impact rather than in relation to my organization (Confidential communication, note 15).

One of the representatives who was on the list of those who had participated in Involvement Alley returned the blank questionnaire with a note stating: ". . . We had

virtually no involvement in this project and can therefore not adequately assess its efficacy." It should be kept in mind that the degree of organizational involvement could vary greatly from participating in just one of a series of planning meetings or participating in a number of the activities listed on page 134. Therefore the saliency of the requested information could vary greatly from respondent to respondent. On the other hand, another representative whose organizational participation had included being featured in one of the ". . . And Justice For All" films as an exemplary community crime prevention program as well as Action Fair planning, the advisory committee, and being listed in "Avenues to Involvement" was contacted by phone because he had not returned his questionnaire. He said he was having difficulty in answering some of the questions. In the case of an organization which had been provided such exposure, as well as being involved in the other ways mentioned, it seemed that it would have been easier to assess the benefit than for an organization whose participation had been more limited.

Another representative whose organization is involved in funding criminal justice programs said that she would have to get permission from her supervisor in order to fill out the questionnaire, when she was contacted by a follow-up telephone call. The investigator instructed her to return the questionnaire with a note that she could not fill it out if she did not get permission. The questionnaire was not returned at all.

The covering letter for the questionnaire was on TRUST letterhead and one respondent commented on his questionnaire:

> I generally find in-house evaluations, particularly those I do, to be self-serving without really evaluating. I would be interested in knowing what use you plan to make of this evaluation and whether some outside source was invited to do the evaluation (Confidential communication, Note 15).

It is likely that more organizational representatives than the ones just discussed had similar reactions. Those reactions, in some instances, probably influenced them not to return the questionnaire.

Findings

Organizations' Awareness of Potential Benefit

The first item on the questionnaire was devised because the project director felt that the survey of the organizations should provide certain information to them as well as elicit information from them. A conversation she had had with one representative prior to the decision to do such a survey revealed that the latter felt that TRUST had had potential for benefiting his organization but that the organization had not capitalized on it. This revelation was an important stimulus for doing the survey in general and prompted the project director to want to include something that would inform organizational representative just how the project was intended to benefit them. Just listing the potential benefits in the covering letter or the questionnaire might seem extraneous to the recipient.

Therefore, an item was devised that could go along with the listing of benefits so that it might seem naturally a part of the questionnaire as well as inform the respondent.

Nearly half of the respondents (42.1 percent) indicated that they were aware of all of the ways that the TRUST project was designed to benefit organizations which included the following:

1. by using the '. . . And Justice For All' programs, other television and radio efforts, and printed materials to call general attention to the vital role that private organizations play in reducing crime;
2. by providing organizations with--
   a. a focal point around which you might gather your members and/or potential members in joint exploration of criminal justice problems;
   b. an opportunity for cross-interest group interaction;
   c. information to make you more knowledgeable about criminal justice problems and your possible role in relation to these problems;
   d. further opportunity to promote and publicize your activities;
   e. resource material to assist you in pursuing goals you might deem desirable.

The next highest percentage (34.2 percent) knew "most of them." The responses to this question provided a basis for asserting only that the potential organizational benefits were generally recognized by the representatives. However, for those who chose the response options "most of them" or "few of them" (a combined total of 52.6 percent), it was not known which ones they were unaware of and those might have been the very ones from which their organization could have gained the most.

Extent of Organizational Involvement

As in the case of the first item, the second was intended primarily to give information to the respondents. It was felt that it would be helpful to remind them of the various ways in which there had been representation by their organization in the TRUST project for at least two reasons: 1) some of the activities had taken place more than a year before the time this survey was conducted; 2) if several persons were listed in the project records from one organization, each name was included on the questionnaire as a contact person. In some instances, the person answering the questionnaire might not have been aware of some activity that another member had carried out.

The largest percentage of the organizations (50 percent) had only 1 to 3 members involved in TRUST activities and the next largest proportion (28.9 percent) had had 4 to 6 members involved. These responses suggest that there was little of what one might call "organizational" involvement at least if such involvement were defined by the number of members participating in the various activities.

Kind of Organizational Involvement

The activities related to the planning and implementation of the Action Fair Conference involved the largest percentage of the organizational representatives who returned the questionnaire; 68.4 percent participated in Involvement Alley and 42.1 percent had organized and/or participated in workshops at the Action Fair. Only 21

percent of the respondents had formed viewer-discussion groups although it was anticipated in the planning for the project that organizations would be instrumental in the citizens mobilization phase and would be sources for group leaders. That activity; i.e., "formed a viewer-discussion group" with the exception of the two related to appearing on television was the one in which the fewest organizations participated.

It was useful that the respondents were so heavily represented by those who were involved in the Action Fair Conference because that was the part of the project with which cooperation from other organizations was absolutely indispensable. The other activities could have been carried out without such cooperation although it would have been useful and desirable for various reasons. Also, it was emphasized in the proposal that the responsibility for any follow-up activity would have to be assumed by other organizations.

Reasons for Participating

Of the five reasons listed for participating in the TRUST project, the one selected most frequently was "wanted to become more familiar and/or active with other organizations working with criminal justice problems"; 65.7 percent selected this reason. The reasons "saw opportunity to publicize and promote your organization's activities" and "wanted to educate or inform your members about criminal justice problems" were almost equally popular, in that they were selected by 47.3 percent and 42.1 percent of the

respondents, respectively. The reason "hoped to get more volunteers or members" was selected by only 31.5 percent. This finding was interesting,in light of the fact that one of the main purposes of the Action Fair Conference was to give organizations an opportunity to gain new members or volunteers. However, one could not conclude that gaining new members or volunteers was relatively unimportant for the cooperating organizations; one might wonder why publicizing and promoting their organization's activities was important if they were not interested in including more people in their organizations. Also, the words "members" and "volunteers" might have obscured the intended meaning of the question, since some organizations might not be interested in gaining "members" or "volunteers" but "clients" or "participants."

Of the 12 answers given as "other" reasons for participating, all but three were similar to the response options given. Six were similar to "wanted to become more familiar and/or active with other organizations working with criminal justice problems" which further indicated that this was the most important reason organizations participated. Examples of reasons that were classified as being the same as the foregoing were ". . . attempt to form a consortium," "felt this was a good opportunity to involve the Chicago police and community groups in a joint positive program."

The three "other" reasons that did not seem to be

related to any of the response options for this item had in common the fact that the respondents had some special expertise or input they wanted to give to the project. Those reasons were stated as follows: "Assist program with our educational/professional experts in CRJ matters," "contribute to development of information/publicity re problems to which TRUST directs attention. . .," "TRUST appeared establishment oriented and some of us who went to the [planning] meetings felt the need for other input."

Extent to which TRUST Helped Organizations Educate or Inform Their Members

The respondents were equally divided between those who felt the TRUST project did help them to educate or inform their members about criminal justice problems and those who felt it did not. Fifteen provided comments of whom 13 answered "yes." Five of these comments were not responsive according to the instructions for the item; i.e., they did not tell how the project helped them in the manner specified. Rather, four gave reasons why the project probably or actually did not help. Two of those respondents stated that they were already very knowledgeable about criminal justice matters, in fact one was involved in a statewide educational program in this field. One felt it was difficult to ascertain the extent to which his organization members had actually participated and another said it had been too near the end of their program year to involve her members in the TRUST project. One simply wrote the word "possibly."

Obviously there were discrepancies in cases where the respondent answered "yes" but gave comments like the ones just discussed. Possibly the desire was to give a socially acceptable response, which in this case would be "yes." "Uncertain" perhaps should have been given as one of the response options; however, it was assumed that the contact persons would have opinions on whether the TRUST project helped in the manner described.

Of the remaining ten who did tell how the project helped them to educate or inform their members, three mentioned use of the TRUST films and/or printed materials; three mentioned specific information or points of view that came from the project; e.g., "I kept referring to all other communities having similar problems. How we should cooperate"; four were more specific in that they mentioned some organizational activity or part of the organization that made use of information provided by TRUST; e.g., "disseminated information to Youth Chairman, Safety Chairman, and block leadership."

Extent to which TRUST Helped Organizations Publicize and Promote Their Activities

Twenty-two respondents (57.8 percent) answered "yes" to the statement: "The TRUST project helped us to promote and publicize our activities." Fifteen (39.4 percent) responded "no" and one did not respond. There were 18 comments of which two were unresponsive in that they repeated the basic statement without adding any details. Seven

indicated which part of the TRUST project helped them in the manner stated; e.g., "Participated in Involvement Alley with literature of our institution." Three mentioned that their organization had been contacted by individuals offering help, wanting to become members, or requesting information. One specified which organizational activity was benefited by the project; i.e., "Made block meetings purposeful on a vital issue."

Five made comments that indicated their organizations were helped only to a minor extent or not at all; e.g., "In a way it did [help us]. Unfortunately, we wished we could have utilized it more (we were weak in this)." "Not enough people came to Involvement Alley. It was a complete waste of time."

Extent to which TRUST Helped Organizations Involve Their Members in Future Activities

Twelve respondents (31.5 percent) answered "yes" to the statement "The TRUST project helped us to involve our members in some future activity." Twenty-five (65.7 percent) replied "no," and one did not respond. There were 12 comments. Four stated in effect that TRUST materials or concepts were being used in some old organizational activity; e.g., "The films have been helpful to us in War on Crime workshops which we have been conducting throughout the state." Four indicated that some new activity had been started or resumed; two of these were attendance at COPE monthly luncheon meetings and another stated "reactivated

efforts to develop community crime prevention after previous discouragement." Two commented on the possibility of some future activity and two felt little or no benefit had been derived.

Extent to which TRUST Helped Organizations Gain New Members or Volunteers

Only four respondents (10.5 percent) answered "yes" to the statement "The TRUST project helped us to get more volunteers or members"; 31 (81.5 percent) answered "no" and 3 (7 percent) did not respond. There were eight comments. In three instances the respondents were really uncertain; e.g., "Possibly. It would be difficult to determine whether or not we obtained any volunteers as a result of the Action Fair Conference." "I'm not sure. We had quite an active group going already." Two respondents' comments indicated that they did not take advantage of the opportunity; one cited the reason as not having time for promotion and the other stated "It had the potential but no results. If we had taken advantage of "a" and "c" sort of things [from questionnaire item 5,] I believe we would have had results."

Of the two who commented on how the project helped them in the manner stated, one indicated that class participants had been gained and one said the benefit had come primarily through Involvement Alley.

The comment of one respondent points to something that should be considered in relation to this particular organizational benefit. This respondent had answered "no"

and commented "Perhaps because we're limited to working
with honorably discharged vets as 'members.'" As it has
already been stated some organizations are not set up to
take on new members or use volunteers or they may not want
to do so. In fact, only 12 percent chose this reason for
participating in the project.

Extent to which TRUST Helped Organizations Become Familiar and/or Active with Other Organizations

Twenty-two (57.5 percent) felt that the TRUST pro-
ject had helped them to become more familiar and/or active
with other organizations working with criminal justice
problems. There were 14 comments. Five specified that they
had achieved this benefit through the Action Fair Conference
or otherwise working with the project; e.g., "Met people
at planning sessions and at Fair." Five felt they had bene-
fited--although two pointed out it was only to a limited
extent--but they did not specify how.

Of the remaining four respondents, two commented on
why they did not benefit in the manner stated; one mentioned
lack of time and the other stated her organization was
already familiar with other groups working with criminal
justice problems. One stated that she had contacted many
of the organizations that were involved in the project and
one apparently felt she or her organization had benefited
by recognizing the similarity in problems from community
to community.

Extent to which TRUST Helped in Ways
Not Specified

Four offered comments on how the project had bene-
fited their organizations in ways not described in the other
five statements in this item. Two of the comments indi-
cated that the respondents had been helped to get addi-
tional resources to further their own goals. A third com-
mented that the project would help her organization plan for
future involvement. The fourth simply stated that he was
sure his staff had benefited although they were initially
reluctant to participate in the project.

Benefit Received in Relation to Effort Expended

Thirteen (34.2 percent) indicated that they got more
benefit from TRUST than the effort they put into it; ten
(26.3 percent) got about the same amount and nine (23.7
percent) got less benefit. Four (10.5 percent) gave no
response and two (7.2 percent) wrote comments only.

How Organizations Could Have Increased
Their Benefits

There were twenty responses to the statement
"Please describe what you think your organization could
have done to increase the benefit it got from the TRUST
project." Nine specified components of the project in
relation to which their organizations could have done
more or handled differently. Their suggestions included
more involvement in the planning, assistance to or forma-
tion of viewer-discussion groups, and attendance at a
greater variety of workshops at the Action Fair Conference.

Three felt their organizations simply should have had more members involved. One respondent's suggestion was a combination of the foregoing two types; i.e., " We should have had more block clubs involved. Should have worked harder at Feedback. I would have liked to film Feedback and reactions." Two felt they would have benefited more if they had known about the project earlier; however, those responses were more appropriate for the next item. Two indicated they could have done more but did not specify what or how; i.e., "More input possibly would have caused more benefit." "Even more direct participation." Three answers were not responsive to the question.

How TRUST Staff Could Have Increased Organizational Benefits

There were 18 comments on what TRUST project staff could have done to increase organizational benefits. Six commented on the planning and implementation of the Action Fair Conference. In relation to planning, one respondent suggested that a survey should have been carried out to determine before hand what each participating organization wanted to accomplish at the Action Fair. Two felt that the planning sessions could have been better organized. As far as the Fair itself was concerned, three respondents respectively made the following suggestions: 1) a different structure for rape workshops; 2) a better location for Involvement Alley; 3) better publicity for the Action Fair and better identification and coordination of workshops and resource people.

Two respondents were concerned with follow-up. One suggested a follow-up of all groups involved and provision of on-going use of resource material. Another suggested: ". . . Better planning for follow-up. People became interested but lacked TRUST support in hooking up to organizations."

There were two suggestions related to each of the following: 1) more effective communication and explanation about the project; 2) earlier notification about the project; 3) improvement in the overall structure and organization. In the third category one respondent felt there could have been more commitment on the part of the staff and one objected to the involvement of government agencies and co-optation.

Two commented that they were uncertain what the staff could have done to effect more organizational benefit. One of those observed that inter-organizational jealousy had impeded the project staff and once it got underway the remaining time was too short.

One respondent suggested the involvement of a particular judge "more personally" in the project and one felt there should have been television coverage on the principal networks.

Likelihood of Future Organizational Participation

To the question "If this type of program were to be repeated, would your organization participate again?" 18 respondents (47.3 percent) answered "yes," six (15.7

percent) answered "no" and 11 (28.9 percent) were "uncertain." Twenty provided comments. Four expressed dissatisfaction with the Action Fair Conference. One respondent who represented an organization concerned with rape complained that there were three other workshops on this same topic. Another stated that one of her staff was not notified of a time change for the workshop in which he was to participate. Two criticized the location of Involvement Alley, one of whom observed that attendance was low at the Fair and few uncommitted lay people were present.

Six respondents felt it was unclear how participating would benefit their organization and five cited the lack of organizational resources. Two gave reasons that involved both these elements.

One respondent wanted to see different topic areas or information covered by the project, but it was unclear whether she was referring to the contents of the films or to the Action Fair workshops. One recommended planning meetings and publicity well in advance of the project.

One respondent who answered "yes" stated: "While I do not believe the programs impacted to the extent that they should have it was worth trying and perhaps future efforts supported by the first will be more successful."

Additional Comments

Eight responded to "Please give any additional comments about your organization's participation in the TRUST project that were not brought out by the foregoing

questions." Four gave reasons for dissatisfaction with participation. Two were dissatisfied for reasons that were extrinsic to the project, one because she did not have a background in criminal justice and one because she represented several organizations and did not focus her efforts. Two were dissatisfied for reasons related to the project: one who had participated on a panel at the Action Fair and had not known what was expected of him until the time for the meeting suggested that the planning for the Action Fair could have been better; the other, whose organization had sponsored an inmate viewer-discussion group in a jail setting, called it "a no purpose intellectual exercise except for PR value."

Two stated the project did not provide enough assistance for action; while both felt the project was beneficial in some respects, one characterized the lack of follow-up as ". . . the most glaring deficiency." Two comments were related to potential benefits that could come from participating in a project like TRUST.

Some Observations on "Evaluation"

In assessing the benefits that accrued to organizations as a result of their participation in the TRUST project, one is not "evaluating" at least according to the conception that some writers have of this process. Among the elements that must be present before evaluation can take place, according to Suchman (1971) is a deliberate intervention which one can assume capable of accomplishing

a desired goal. Riecken required that same element which he designated as being "whatever is done knowingly and purposefully to the participants" (1952, p. 5). Herzog (1959) pointed out that the evaluator must be able to determine by what means the desired change is to be brought about.

The element that each of the foregoing was referring to is labeled in various ways: "treatment," "intervention," "program," "independent variable." In the case of the individual citizen this element was participation in two activities: the viewer-discussion group and the Action Fair Conference. In the case of organizations, the means of bringing about the desired changes; i.e., various organizational "benefits," was not so explicit. The proposal stated that certain organizations were target groups for the TRUST project but it did not spell out what was to be done to or for these organizations.

The findings in this chapter did not provide a basis for unequivocal conclusions about the accomplishment of goals in relation to the cooperating organizations in the TRUST project. These findings were more useful for specifying:

1. what the organizational representatives wanted to get from participating in the project

2. some of the ways organizations were benefited by having representation in various aspects of the project

3. some of the factors that kept more benefit
    from being realized.

The nature of organizational participation in
TRUST and some of the problems related to it are considered
in portions of the next chapter also.

CHAPTER VI

ANALYSIS OF THE MAJOR EVENTS OR PROCESSES
IN THE TRUST PROJECT

The first chapter of this report provided a brief
description of the major events or processes of the TRUST
project. In this chapter another description of TRUST is
given which takes into consideration data from Chapters
III to V, the project records, and related literature.

The purpose of this chapter is three-fold: 1) to
clarify some of the findings in Chapters III to V; 2) to
outline the various problems that occurred in each phase;
3) to give a comprehensive picture of the overall project.
This second description is discussed according to the
following topics: 1) The Initiation of the Project;
2) The Issue Identification and Content Development Phase;
  4) The Training of Viewer-Discussion Group Leaders;
3) The Citizens Mobilization Phase; 5) Selected Viewer-
Discussion Group Processes; 6) The Action Fair Conference.

The Initiation of the Project

According to the evaluation of the CHOICES project,
there were certain conditions that were favorable for
starting an interactive media/citizens participation pro-
ject. First, three kinds of resources were needed:
1) television time; 2) financing; and 3) a means of

recruiting participants--and it did not matter which resource was obtained first.

At the time that COPE began to consider the idea of carrying out an interactive media/citizens participation project, it apparently had in hand two of the resources mentioned. It had a relationship with WTTW through its involvement with the RTA project and WTTW had agreed to donate up to six half-hours of prime time and appropriate follow-up programming. Through the network of organizations involved in its regular Monthly Luncheon Program, it had a potential means for recruiting participants. What remained was to get funding.

COPE approached several funding agencies before meeting with success with the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. The project director was encouraged to seek funds from LEAA by a person who had been active with the Monthly Luncheon Program who felt that the proposed interactive media project met the criteria for an LEAA Citizens Initiative program (Malone, Note 3). It was too late in the year to get funds from the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission (ILEC), the state agency for LEAA, so the only means of getting funds from LEAA was to apply directly to them for unallocated FY 1974 federal funds. Although the major funding (90 percent) for TRUST came from LEAA (the other 10 percent came from grants from the Chicago Community Trust and Commonwealth Edison Company), the proposal for funding had to go through review processes with

the following agencies: Northern Illinois Planning Commission, Chicago-Cook County Criminal Justice Commission, ILEC, Region V of LEAA, and the State Clearinghouse.

The grant period for the TRUST project was July 1 to December 31, 1974. COPE anticipated that it would be able to carry out the project in this relatively short period and with less funds than such projects had cost in other places because of the organizational base available to it (Malone, Note 3). Much work had already been done in relation to the project prior to July 1; in fact, virtually all of the resources of COPE had been devoted exclusively to TRUST during the months of May and June (Malone, Note 16).

Although certain activities related to the project could be carried out without the commitment for funding one very crucial activity had to wait; i.e., citizens mobilization, because the citizens mobilization staff could not be hired until the funds were obtained. Consequently, the citizens mobilization personnel were hired and their work was initiated with less forethought than these two key tasks should have been given.

The CHOICES report also suggested that the sponsoring organization should have certain characteristics in order to have a successful initiation of an interactive media/citizen participation project. It should have a sincere desire for increasing the number of citizens who deal with public issues in an informed manner; it should

have a reputation for competence, or, if a new organization, it should be headed by persons recognized as competent; and it should be known to organizations whose commitment is needed; e.g., civic groups, television companies, funding agencies.

COPE's regular Monthly Luncheon Program and the fact that it wanted to carry out an interactive media/citizen participation project seemed to be evidence that it had the first characteristic. The investigator cannot say to what extent COPE or its leaders were perceived of as being competent. COPE was known to representatives of organizations who were involved in the Monthly Luncheon Program, but whether those persons were in a decision making position with respect to involving their organizations in TRUST, or to what extent COPE was known to the numerous other community organizations whose cooperation would increase the likelihood of success for the project who were not involved in the luncheon program the investigator cannot say. Although it cannot be said to what extent COPE had some of the aforementioned characteristics, it still seems useful because of the exploratory purpose of this research to point out that there are certain identifiable conditions under which an interactive media/citizen participation project can have a relatively successful start.

The Issue Identification and
Content Development Phase

Issue Identification Procedures

Three meetings were held in April, 1974 to demonstrate to lay citizens how to carry out issue identification sessions in their own communities. In these meetings they learned about the "nominal group process"; i.e., the process that was to be used to elicit citizens' concerns about personal safety and the criminal justice system (COPE, Note 17). The process was described as follows:

> [It is] widely used where neutrality is required, for it registers the concerns of each and every group member, and makes it virtually impossible for 'good speakers' to sway the views of others. The priorities of each group are arrived at by [a] numerical weighting system (COPE, Note 18, p. 1).

Eventually some 23 groups of ordinary citizens with a total of about 175 participants convened at various places throughout the metropolitan area for issue identification sessions (COPE, Notes 6 and 18). The concerns of criminal justice "experts" and professionals were determined by two mailed questionnaires. Eighty-eight individuals were included in this sample (COPE, Note 7) and evidently the response rate to the first questionnaire was 46.5 percent (COPE, Note 19). The writer could not determine the response rate to the second questionnaire.

The issue identification committee was to use the data from the issue identification sessions and the experts' questionnaire to develop some objectives and outlines for the television programs (see section on "The Issue

Identification Process" in Chapter I for information on how this committee was formed).

The Making of the Films

According to the project director, COPE decided to produce its own films basically for two reasons: 1) although WTTW had turned over their production staff for the RTA program for one hour on a one-shot basis, it would not have been feasible for them to make their staff available for four separate half-hours; 2) moreover, a talk show emanating from the studio was felt to be the least desirable way to accomplish the objectives for the television programs.

The project director interviewed and reviewed the work of nine producer/directors working in the Chicago area before making her choice. The reasons for her selection were outlined in her response to a query from the funding agency about why she had not used a sealed bid process in selecting the filmmakers:

> In fact, the Council has utilized an informal competitive bidding process in arriving at our final selection. We interviewed and viewed the work of nine top producer-directors working in the Chicago area. Of these, several said they could work within a $75,000 budget for four programs only by utilizing a large percentage of video tape, a severe limitation in terms of flexibility and on-site programming, as well as representing a decided sacrifice in quality. The work of some of these producers, as well as others, was not terribly impressive to us. But even more to the point, several had not done the kind of work that would equip them to generate exciting material with no professional actors, but ordinary police officers, correctional and court personnel, ex-prisoners, and plain folk. Ability to work with people and to establish rapport quickly with a broad spectrum of people had to be considered,

along with excellence in film-making itself. These are
the kinds of items so important to the success of a
project like ours, but which cannot be determined by
a sealed-bid process (Malone, Note 20).

Four reasons were given for the selection that was
finally made. First, the members of the filmmaking team
had worked together for several years. Consequently, they
knew what to expect from each other and could more effec-
tively coordinate their efforts. Otherwise, much time
could be wasted and, given the severe time constraints in
the project, this could not be afforded. The project dir-
ector had been alerted to the importance of the filmmaking
team members' prior working experience with one another by
the report on the CHOICES for '76 project.

Secondly, the filmmakers were backed by an estab-
lished producer with a reputation for close fiscal manage-
ment. This was crucial because of the relatively small
film production budget for the project.

Thirdly, instead of using videotape to reduce costs,
they would be able to do the program entirely on 16 mm
film; this would provide greater flexibility and quality.
Moreover, the film director would be able to do all of the
editing and sound mixing.

Fourthly, the members of the team had had quite a
bit of experience with the kinds of issues that were to be
considered in the TRUST films. One member was an ex-
policeman and had also worked as a photographer-
cinematographer in Viet Nam and many other locations.
Another member had designed and produced a series of

commercials or public service announcements for a drug abuse program, the Boy Scouts, the Chicago Police Department, and a number of similar organizations. A third worked with a walk-in youth counseling service operated by community volunteers.

COPE collaborated with the filmmakers throughout the development of the ". . . And Justice For All" films. The research from the issue identification committee had gone on for about two months before the filmmakers got involved in the project. The input from the issue identification activities considerably shortened the pre-production and research time needed by the filmmakers; consequently film production costs were reduced (Malone, Note 3). The project director had the responsibility for making some of the arrangements necessary for the shooting of the films. Certain ones of the interviews, police protection at some of the filming sites, some of the props; e.g., a police car, a policeman's uniform, a prisoner's uniform, clearance to film in certain places, were examples of the requirements for which the project director was to be responsible (Sikevitz, Note 21).

The rough cuts of the first three films were shown at preview sessions and various changes were made in the films that were based on the reactions of those who attended those sessions. In fact, the project director felt that in some instances these reactions gave her extra leverage in insisting on certain changes that the filmmakers,

from an artistic standpoint, were reluctant to make (Malone, Note 3).

Some Reactions to the Films

The success of a project like TRUST depends to a great extent on the cooperation of other organizations such as community groups, voluntary associations, and governmental agencies. There may of course be differences in viewpoints on the various aspects of the project but the films, in that they are the focal point and carry the message that the project is trying to get across, will likely be the aspect most subject to criticism. The following two incidents are illustrative.

One member of the issue identification committee withdrew the support of his organization after seeing a preview of one of the films because, as he stated:

> The communities most afflicted by crime and those most affected by criminal 'justice' were not represented at COPE meetings and their community leadership was not present.
>
> A process of 'issue identification' was imposed which [emphasized] 'professional' criminological and sociological perspectives and middle-class concerns. The issue identification committee declined its responsibility to obtain breadth and diversity of viewpoints and to overcome or compensate for distrust and reticence in poor communities.
>
> The result of this process is, we feel, an unconstructive definition and presentation of these issues; emphasis on fear rather than an understanding of crime, reinforcement of negative (defensive) and divisive responses rather than ones which build unity across economic and political lines, fostering separatist and isolated projects linked only through existing and middle class agencies (Personal communication, Note 22).

The local criminal justice planning agency did not get to involve a member of their staff until near the end of the issue identification phase. In fact, their representative only participated in the last meeting at which the issue identification committee gave the final approval for the shooting script for the films (Malone, Note 23). Apparently this agency had wanted to have more voice in the decisions about the contents of the films, or at least to know in advance what these contents would be. In a letter to their director, the project director of TRUST stated:

> Due to the fact that much of the detailed content will be generated by interviews with experts in criminal justice precisely what those experts may say cannot be outlined in advance (Malone, Note 23).

In a letter dated October 23, 1974 (two days before the premiere of the first ". . . And Justice For All" film) the project director received a letter from the aforementioned agency which stated:

> I am most concerned about the course that the [TRUST project] has taken. Without fail, all reports I've received on the three film previews have spoken of the consistent failure to present an unbiased, objective view of the criminal justice system. Instead, there has been a focus on the deficiencies in the system, which . . . may well increase the sense of helplessness, fear, and ignorance that it was designed and funded to help alleviate (Confidential correspondence, Note 24).

On the other hand, according to the project director, the responses she received after the broadcast of the first film were encouraging. Various educational institutions, the Chicago Police Academy, and the Central

Educational Network expressed interest in using the films.
Several local experts stated that in their opinions the
films dealt with the issues clearly and provocatively.
One criminal justice professional remarked that the first
film accomplished in thirty minutes for his class what it
usually took him two months to do.

Citizens Mobilization

The importance of the citizens mobilization task
to the success of an interactive media project cannot be
overestimated. Data from the TRUST project, as well as
reports from similar projects support this assertion. The
problems of citizens mobilization in TRUST are discussed
according to the following topics: 1) Background of the
Citizens Mobilization Staff; 2) Orientation of the Citizens
Mobilization Staff; 3) Methods of Recruitment of Viewer-
Discussion Leaders; 4) Management of the Citizens Mobiliza-
tion Staff; 5) Media Support.

Background of the Citizens Mobilization Staff

The task of citizens mobilization; i.e., the re-
cruitment of viewer-discussion group leaders was primarily
the responsibility of COPE's citizens mobilization staff.
A total of six persons eventually worked on the citizens
mobilization staff, however, COPE had anticipated needing
only three persons for recruitment. The original three
were hired in July. One was a white female who had lived
in the Chicago area for two years. She had had experience

as a school teacher and had been active with the League of Women Voters, the Episcopal Archidiocese, and the boards of several voluntary organizations. The other two persons hired were male, one black and one white. The former was active in church work and a variety of community improvement projects and had had work experience with a bank and a newspaper. The latter had been attending the COPE monthly luncheons and was the only citizens mobilization staff person with whom the project director was acquainted before his being hired. This individual was the ex-director of a citizens group opposing the construction of a certain expressway and was active with a number of civic groups on the southwest side of the city. In September three additinal male citizens mobilization personnel were hired--one black, one Latino, and one white.

Orientation of the Citizens Mobilization Staff

The lack of time and perhaps a lack of appreciation for the importance of doing so kept the citizens mobilization staff from being effectively oriented to the TRUST project. The project director felt that more should have been done in getting the citizens mobilization staff "philosophically attuned" to the project (Malone, Note 3). One staff member suggested that perhaps a weekend retreat for the purpose of orientation should have been provided (COPE, Note 25).

The CHOICES report (RPA, 1974) discussed the importance of developing a common conception of the project

among the various staff members. Some of the CHOICES staff viewed their process as a referendum on current political issues. However, others felt the focus should be on broader planning issues more basic than a single project or bill and that the public's fundamental understanding of the inter-relatedness of the issues was more important than a one-shot public opinion survey.

That report advised that it should be recognized there are various views on the role of a CHOICES-type project in the broader democratic process and that all staff members should be aware or each other's viewpoints. However, some common denominators should provide a guiding definition for the project. Otherwise, some staff members might be unenthuasiastic about the project and their feelings might become evident to the public.

The original three citizens mobilization staff persons sat in on at least two of the meetings that were held to discuss the evaluation instrument to be used with the viewer-discussion groups. Their views expressed at these meetings indicated that they had diverse opinions about what the project ought to accomplish. There was one staff member who developed a serious disagreement with what he perceived as the goals of TRUST and his feelings were indeed made evident to the public (see discussion of Cose article, p. 179). Perhaps a period of orientation could have uncovered some of the divergent points of view and provided some way of reconciling them.

The citizens mobilization staff's understanding of the project would of course influence their "sales pitch" in seeking organizational and individual support. One staff member commented that one had to be very specific in spelling out the benefits of participating when one is trying to convince a person to devote four evenings (and possibly various organizing efforts) to a project like TRUST (COPE, Note 25). The staff did not initially have effective approaches for gaining support. Although they improved with practice, the trial-and-error probably cost the project in terms of recruitment.

Methods of Recruitment

At the time the proposal was written, COPE thought that three staff persons would be enough for citizens mobilization. It was anticipated that these three would "sell" the project to community organizations which would have internal coordinators who would be responsible for recruiting viewer-discussion group leaders from within their organizations (Malone, Note 3). The proposal for funding emphasized the contribution expected from community organizations in relation to the organization of viewer-discussion groups. However, this expectation was not met: the responsibility for recruiting ultimately fell on the TRUST staff.

The "top-down" approach to recruiting group leaders was not successful in this project and it was advised against in reports of other interactive media projects

which discuss recruitment methods. For example, the CHOICES report advised against relying on the promises of leaders of large business or civic organizations, churches or unions. Promises of support and whatever direct help might be provided should be sought but the project staff should organize at the local level itself.

The CHOICES staff found that both functional and geographical approaches to recruitment were necessary. The functional approach relied on keeping in touch with organizations such as school systems, colleges, churches, corporations, civic organizations, and unions at the top. The League of Women Voters chapters were to follow up at the local level and stimulate involvement of the unorganized also. It was pointed out that great slippage occurred between the policy set at the top of an organization and the action taken by its local affiliates.

Eventually, when it was evident that the organizations with whom they were working were not very successful in recruiting viewer-discussion leaders, a geographical approach was tried. Staff were sent to different counties to recruit local activists and thereby come closer to the actual recruits. The geographical approach had its drawbacks also. Going into a community necessitated a meeting which would require a lot of organizing in itself. Without working through functional hierarchies, the sponsoring organization would have had to organize and hold together a countywide organization; whereas functional organizations

already had on-going staffs and hierarchies with whom
to work.

The recruiting strategy in Metroplex (Johnson, 1965)
was based on the concept that the interactive media process
was a means through which the various kinds of people who
made up the population of the St. Louis metropolitan area
could take part in the search for ways to enrich contem-
porary life and solutions to problems the area faced. Since
it was realized only a small proportion of the over two
million St. Louis area citizens would be involved in the
interactive media process, it became crucial to have a con-
cept of participation and to develop a strategy that would
operationalize that concept.

Recognition of the major metropolitan populations
was the concept and the strategy was to assign each segment
to appropriate staff members. The Metroplex recruitment
strategy was described as follows:

> The rationale behind the 'segment' approach was that
> different segments would have strong internal ties
> reinforced by emotional loyalties, internal communi-
> cation channels, and identifiable leaders. Sometimes
> the segment would be little more than a label for a
> group of autonomous individuals--women who work for
> example. Some segments--the Catholic community, for
> example--are so large and complex that they have
> numerous semi-autonomous groups within the community.
> The Protestant community too is divided into a large
> number of denominations. . . . All have special cir-
> cumstances that must be understood if the denominations
> are to be effectively involved, first in the process
> of selecting a Metroplex theme and later in actually
> recruiting [viewer-discussion group] organizers. The
> same statement could be made of the AFL-CIO Central
> Labor Council with its membership of large and powerful
> unions. . . .

> Most [citizens mobilization staff members] were assigned
> several segments. The task was to explore and map out
> the population segment; identify its sub-organization,
> its leadership and its communication channels, including
> details about any publications serving the population
> (Johnson, 1965, pp. 16-17).

The citizens mobilization staff members in Metroplex were encouraged to devise their own plans for involving each population segment and various plans were developed. Special events were arranged for groups of various sizes. Short presentations were made to organizations at their regular meetings. Numerous conversations were held with influential individuals in the community to help interpret the project and get insight into their views about various aspects of the program. Whatever the method used, the goal was the same: to get the signature of a St. Louis resident on a viewer-discussion registration card. This card was the signer's moral commitment to organize a viewer-discussion group. Subsequently, the registration cards became the main source for the weekly mailing list and the means of determining whether the viewer group had actually been organized and, if so, how it was getting along.

Management of the Citizens Mobilization Staff

One TRUST citizens mobilization staff member observed that someone was needed to "ride herd" on the staff, that is, to see to it that they were making proper contact and follow-up efforts. His feeling was that the staff had too much freedom (COPE, Note 25).

The citizens mobilization reponsibility required a

lot of self-discipline in regard to contacting and maintaining communication with prospective viewer-discussion group leaders. Effective recordkeeping procedures were not developed until the citizens mobilization staff had been at their task for some time. One member of the group was supposed to function as supervisor for the rest but for various reasons did not carry out this role effectively. Lack of time and varying work schedules of the individual citizens mobilization staff members made staff meetings almost impossible (Malone, Note 3).

Apparently there was some difficulty in smoothly incorporating the three staff members who were hired in September with the original three, at least in the perception of one of the former. The second group was to follow-up on contacts initiated by the first group, as well as make new contacts if possible. The member in question felt that there was a spirit of competition or ownership about the prospective group leaders in that sometimes the person who made the initial contact wanted to hold onto the group leader or at least be given credit for the recruitment in the records (COPE, Note 25).

Most, if not all, of the problems outlined in this discussion of the citizens mobilization component of the TRUST project are related to some aspect of the "management" function. Management responsibilities or functions can be conceptualized in various ways. One writer suggested that there are seven management functions--planning, organizing,

CONTINUED

2 OF 3

staffing, direction, control, innovation, and
representation--which are all part of the manager's job, but
that the importance of each may vary at different times in
different places (Dale, 1973).

Of the seven functions just mentioned, at least two,
directing and control, were especially crucial for the op-
timum functioning of a citizens mobilization staff. As a
part of the directing function, the employee should be pro-
vided with day-to-day directions. It must be insured that
he knows the results expected in each situation, that he is
assisted in improving his skills, and, in certain instances,
told how and when certain tasks are to be performed (Dale,
1973).

The need for direction could be inferred from the
observations of one of the citizens mobilization staff per-
sons in TRUST. She suggested that since each staff person
came to the job with different backgrounds perhaps their
tasks should have been tailored to these backgrounds. For
example, one staff member had been very active with a number
of community organizations on the southwest side of the
city; therefore it was perceived that he came to the project
with a constituency he could call upon for their cooperation
in the recruitment of group leaders. On the other hand,
another staff member was relatively new to the Chicago area
and did not have a constituency. The latter felt it took
her some time to get the knack of gaining entry to groups
and developing them in relation to the goals of the project.

She suggested that perhaps the member with the constituency could have been primarily responsible for making initial cntacts with organizations and she could have been primarily responsible for following up those same contacts (COPE, Note 25).

The good manager makes his subordinates want to do the best possible job, not just enough to get by. Motivation seems especially important where one is relying on employees who are temporary (and possibly part-time), who have no particular loyalty to the sponsoring organization, and who, because of the nature of their task, must be allowed a good measure of autonomy.

In the control function, determination is made of how well jobs have been carried out and what progress is being made toward the goals. The manager has to know what is happening so he can intervene and make changes if the organization is deviating from the path he has set for it.

An incident occurred during the planning of the Action Fair Conference that helps illustrate the sensitive and critical nature of the citizens mobilization role. One of the citizens mobilization personnel, who will be referred to as K, had been terminated for unsatisfactory job performance, a few days prior to the second Action Fair planning meeting. At that meeting, he took the occasion to bring before the planning group his version of the firing incident. An argument ensued involving several members of the planning group and some of the project staff about

whether this staff member had in fact done his job properly and whether the project director had the prerogative to govern her staff. K had been the contact person for some of the members of the planning group in attempting to recruit viewer-discussion group leaders. The scheduled business of this group was completely disrupted and the meeting had to be adjourned. Those interested in pursuing the matter further were invited to meet with the project director and K after the adjournment.

The outcome of the post-adjournment session was that K was rehired. However, he continued to be critical of the project to various persons who might have been helpful in promoting it and in general did not do his job any better than before he was fired. He had demonstrated by the incident at the planning meeting that he had a "constituency" whose support of the project he could influence and this lessened the project director's ability to apply any sanctions against him (Personal observation, Note 26).

K was one of the three original members of the citizens mobilization staff and had primary responsibility for getting representation from the black community. It is likely that his actions cut down the representation from that group that there might have been if he had been loyal to the project and had conscientiously recruited.

Media Support

The TRUST project received attention in both the print and broadcast media. It was the investigator's

opinion that the most essential purpose of media support should be to stimulate citizen participation. Since the pricipal mechanism for citizen participation in the TRUST project was the viewer-discussion group, this discussion of media support is presented in relation to the timing of the viewer-discussion group activity; i.e., before, during, and after the broadcast of the ". . . And Justice For All" programs, and the investigator's observations are related to the promotion of this activity. The concluding portion of the discussion is concerned with some observations of TRUST's director of community relations.

Pre-Broadcast Media Support

On October 7, 1974, Willard Wirtz, formerly Secretary of Labor and a member of COPE's National Advisory Board, appeared on a local morning television talk show to promote the TRUST project. This appearance was cited as the introduction of TRUST to the community (COPE, Note 27). Mr. Wirtz also held a press conference that day on behalf of the project.

The first article on the project in a major Chicago daily newspaper appeared on October 3, 1974. Information on the broadcast time of the ". . . And Justice For All" programs, their contents, the interactive media concept, and the Action Fair Conference was provided. However, in the investigator's opinion, the article did not give the impression that the task of organizing the viewer-discussion groups was still underway or that anyone could organize or

participate in a group. This article stated:

> In addition to the viewing public, 500 special volunteer groups of 10 persons each will watch the programs together and discuss what solutions are needed and how they should be applied (McClain, 1974, p. 3).

After giving the names of some groups endorsing the program and stating that there were 100 other such groups, the article continued:

> The 5,000 persons who will participate in the viewers' groups come from these organizations thru the canvassing of three citizen mobilization groups [sic] of the council which scoured the metropolitan area for participants. . . . [emphasis added].

The week before the premiere of the films, brief articles also appeared in the other two Chicago major daily newspapers. Of the interactive media/citizen participation aspect, one of those articles simply stated:

> The goal of Project TRUST is to involve citizens directly in the solution of community problems (Chicago Daily News, 10/19/74, p. 40).

The other was a little more informative:

> [COPE] will organize 5,000 persons in small discussion groups to watch four 30-minute television specials that deal with the problems of crime control, the courts and prisons.
>
> Afterward the 5,000 will be assembled at a special conference to try to find ways in which they can do something about the problems (Chicago Sun-Times, 10/23/74, p. 48).

Between October 17 and 25, 1974, the week before the premiere of the first program, the project also received publicity in at least five suburban papers and a weekly distributed free in the Chicago area. Three of these articles gave, in addition to information on the interactive media/citizen participation process, telephone numbers that

those wishing to become involved or desiring further information could call.

During the Broadcast Period

The project director was interviewed on radio programs November 12 and 16, 1974, and on one of the television channels that broadcast the ". . . And Justice For All" programs on November 20, 1974 (COPE, Note 27). All of the Chicago television stations made public service announcements about the project, according to COPE's director of community relations.

TRUST received further attention in a major Chicago daily newspaper during this period. One article was cited as having "brought major visibility to the project and created interest in our program from a major network" (COPE, Note 27). This article, by the television critic of the Chicago Sun-Times, deplored the fact that:

> A Chicago citizens group that would like to use television as one arm of a multi media project can't squeeze onto the airwaves. Not on the downtown network affiliates anyway, or on "Chicagos own" independent giant WGN. Project TRUST must be content with carrying out its crime-prevention and court-reform experiment on our city's small-audience UHF outlets . . . and the public-TV station (Powers, 1974, p. 38).

Post-Broadcast Media Support

Another point of view on TRUST from that expressed in the foregoing quote appeared in the same paper on November 30, 1974. This article was by Ellis Cose, a columnist in the editorial section of the paper. After giving background information on TRUST, Cose stated the following:

[K] . . . who will be out of a job when the project
ends, thinks the theory [i.e., that the interactive
media process can be a catalyst for citizens wishing to
improve the criminal justice system] is nonsense. In
his eyes it is a classic study in what happens when
'white folks from the suburbs' come into the city to
deal with a criminal justice system that primarily
imprisons blacks.

He is also unhappy that the project did not take a more
activist role in fighting for systems change and be-
lieves that if any more money is forthcoming, it should
go to a black group interested in effecting change.

After giving the views of the project director and

the director of community relations for TRUST on the matters

in question and their hopes for the project, Cose concluded

the article as follows:

(_____), an intern co-ordinator for the Illinois
Center for Community Systems of Justice, is skeptical.
'So you contact all of these people who were doing
things any way. For What?' she asks.

The answers to both her and [K's] questions lie at the
end of the action fair; where the larger question appar-
ently concerns the function of predominantly white
liberal groups in the black community.

The Editorial Director of WMAQ, Channel 5, a major

network television affiliate, was present at the Action

Fiar Conference to get "man on the street" comments on the

criminal justice system from the Fair participants. Those

comments were presented on a program called "Speak Out"

for five days following the Fair.

Observations of the Director of
Community Relations

COPE's director of community relations was inter-

viewed for her observations about the support of the media

in the TRUST project (Blustain, Note 28). According to her,

the Chicago network affiliates were unwilling to broadcast the ". . . And Justice For All" programs because the networks are required to donate only so much public service time and they were unwilling to give two hours to any one organization. Also, their lack of control over the quality and content of the programs and possible legal ramifications influenced the network affiliates' decision. On the other hand, the TRUST project was the first occasion that three stations broadcast the same program in the Chicago area and two of the stations even followed each program with a half-hour panel discussion related to the topic area of the project.

The television writers of two of Chicago's major daily newspapers were said to be most uncooperative in providing any coverage of the project. In the interviewee's opinion, this was because they felt a community agency like COPE did not have a product that was exciting enough for them to cover. However, getting a critique of the films was of least importance to COPE, according to the interviewee; the desired emphasis would have been on the program of citizen initiatives and education of viewer-discussion groups.

The director of community relations stated that if an interactive media project were carried out in the future more efforts would be made to reach the black and Latino communities. The major black daily newspaper was approached about promoting the project but it did not. The interviewee felt their lack of cooperation was because they were

supporting another group with a program on the criminal justice system and wanted to give that group the most visibility.

The interviewee thought it was of particular significance that the TRUST project brought visibility to 26 other organizations concerned with criminal justice matters through the ". . . And Justice For All" films and the post-program discussion panels. Also she felt that COPE had been instrumental in showing some of these other groups how to get broadcast time for their own programs. In fact, she stated COPE has constant calls from people about whom to contact at the television channels for public service time.

The Training of Viewer-Discussion Group Leaders

TRUST Group Leader Training

From notes made during the discussion of viewer-discussion group leader training, the investigator recalls that there was a difference of opinion on what should be the content of such training. The investigator felt that the training should emphasize techniques for leading a group discussion effectively. Others, influenced by advice that was given by a consultant from the Second Mile project felt little consideration needed to be given to methods for effective group discussion leadership, since each person has his or her own style of leading a discussion. The relative lack of emphasis on actual "training" for group

leadership was because of the necessity to cover a lot of information in a short period of time as well as the perceived lack of importance of such training on the part of the decision makers.

Four training sessions were held on October 10, 11, and 15, 1974; each followed essentially the same format. The project director gave remarks about the background and purposes of TRUST. Staff members were introduced and the purpose for each item in the packet of materials that the prospective leaders had been given was explained. Those items were as follows:

1. a viewer-discussion group leader's manual which included a schedule of the television programs, a list of activities that were to be carried out in each session, and some suggestions for leading a group discussion

2. a viewer-discussion group participant's handbook which contained background and supplemental material on each ". . . And Justice For All" television program, a broadcast schedule, a brief suggested reading list, and a glossary of terms used; also included were "Learning from the People Who Know" suggestions; i.e., suggestions for "task assignments" which were intended to give the participants direct contact with various elements of the criminal justice system (see page 28 for examples of task assignments in the Second Mile project).

3. "Avenues to Involvement," a directory of nearly 100 community organizations which have criminal justice projects; it was intended that the viewer-discussion group participants would use this directory to become active with organizations that interested them and to facilitate the carrying out of the task assignments

4. A Call for Citizens Action, a publication which describes various citizen initiative projects across the country and discusses the Federal government's concern for the development of such activities; it was intended that this publication would motivate and reinforce the development of similar projects in the Chicago area.

5. Multiple copies of the four Feedback Questionnaires

6. "About the Questionnaire," a single page document that provided the group leaders suggestions on the administration and further use of the Feedback Questionnaires

7. Recordkeeping forms for keeping attendance information.

Following the discussion of how the aforementioned items were to be used, a brief prsentation was given on the use of the questionnaires and a few pointers on leading a discussion were considered. Questions from the participants were entertained and the meeting was adjourned.

Participants were then to meet with the citizens mobilization staff person to whom they had been assigned and pick up the supply of material for their groups.

Comments on Training from the Authorities

The role of the group leaders and the importance of their training is stressed in most accounts of interactive media projects that the investigator consulted. Provision of training can vary in time allotted and scope of content. The Metroplex project used a variety of formats for training leaders which included weekend residential institutes at a secluded location away from the city, clinics addressed to discussing problems identified by members of viewer-discussion groups, training sessions or short institutes held on the sponsoring university's campus, and small group meetings of viewer-discussion group leaders and project staff and persons trained in discussion and evaluation when a particular activity had ended. On the other hand, in the CHOICES project, the viewer-discussion group leaders were simply given a four-page guide. It was stated, "Given the other demands of the project, we had to simply turn the hosts loose to do the best they could" (RPA, Note 10, p. 66).

The TRUST viewer-discussion group leaders' observations on training are considered in Chapter IV of this report. One authority on interactive media projects (Waniewicz, 1972) suggested that such training should cover at least four principal areas: 1) problems related to the

topic covered by the project; 2) pedagogic techniques;
3) feedback techniques; 4) logistics problems. The first
two are pertinent to this discussion; the other two will
be considered in the next section of this chapter.

In regard to subject matter knowledge, it was sug-
gested that the leaders need not have a profound knowledge
but that they should be sufficiently initiated into the
purpose of the project and into the topic area to have a
general orientation to the range of problems the broadcast
will cover. The pedagogic techniques considered should
cover the art of leading a discussion, of dealing with dis-
putes, and of drawing conclusions at the end of the discus-
sion. Also, specific information should be provided on how
to use the accompanying printed material effectively. (See last
comment on p.116 for an example of difficulty in using the
material effectively, among other things.) The training
should also impart a clear understanding of the purpose of
each component of the project in the accomplishing of the
expected educational objectives (perhaps the group leaders
did not promote the carrying out of task assignments
because they did not fully understand the purpose for such
activities).

A TRUST-type interactive media project needs yet
another type of input to the training of viewer-discussion
group leaders. TRUST was classified as an "education to
action" program by its major funding agency, the Law
Enforcement Assistance Administration. The purpose of

such programs is "To enlighten citizens as to the nature and scope of criminal justice problems at both the national and local levels and the specific ways they can become involved in: 1) improving the quality of criminal justice and 2) implementing programs designed to protect themselves against crime on both an individual and community-wide basis" (LEAA, Note 5). The action objectives implied in the foregoing quote suggested another area of training for viewer-discussion group leaders in an interactive media/ citizen participation program. Also some of the group leaders suggested this content area in their comments on the Follow-Up Questionnaire (see p.118 under "Staff Assistance").

In a discussion of "Organizing, Implementing and Managing Citizens Efforts to Reduce Crime" in A Call for Citizen Action (one of the resource materials for the viewer-discussion groups), it was pointed out that in their desire to do something about the crime problem, citizens do not give sufficient attention to such matters as how to organize, determine the problem areas, establish priorities, get funding, obtain assistance from other citizens and cooperation of public officials, and sustain the crime prevention program once it is started. It was suggested that the foregoing considerations do not embody an "all purpose prescription for success [but] they give guidelines that can be modified for the unique conditions of each locality" (National Advisory Commission, 1974, p. 14).

Information that would help the viewer-discussion groups implement action objectives should be included in the group leader training, and in some way be part of the viewer-discussion group session. It was envisioned that some of the Action Fair Conference workshops would cover such matters but there was no guarantee that participants would come to such an event (only 25 percent of the successful group leaders reported that they attended the Fair). Perhaps there would have been more motivation to attend the Action Fair Conference if matters pertaining to action had been considered by the viewer-discussion groups.

The foregoing discussion of the importance of group leader training and the content of such training should not obscure the fact that it is difficult to get prospective leaders to the training. In TRUST only 55 percent of the successful leaders and 36 percent of the unsuccessful leaders attended the training. Johnson's experiences over a three-year period led him to conclude that it would be impossible to provide adequate training to all viewer-discussion group leaders. There was difficulty in getting them to attend training sessions in large numbers and some leaders would organize a group at the last minute. Therefore, the Metroplex staff devised a plan that would lessen the dependence of the group on the organizer or leader. Aspects of this plan are covered in the discussion of feedback in the next section.

Selected Viewer-Discussion Group Processes

The data in Chapters III and IV provided a picture of the activity of the viewer-discussion groups and some of the outcomes of that activity. However, there were two processes essential to the functioning of these groups that needed to be considered in this chapter: 1) because they represented two elements for which careful planning is needed; 2) problems related to them were alluded to but not fully discussed in the previous chapters. These processes are: 1) the logistics of handling the paperwork; and 2) feedback/follow-up.

The Logistics of Handling the Paperwork

Following is a chronological presentation of how the paperwork related to the viewer-discussion groups was to be handled:

1. The group leaders were to be given packets of materials at the training sessions.

2. Certain clerical responsibilities were to be carried out by the leaders at each viewer-discussion session, which were:

    a) marking questionnaires--the leader was to put the group identification number of each Feedback Questionnaire;

    b) recording attendance--after the first session a Group Roster Report was to be completed and a form was also provided for recording session-by-session attendance;

c) mailing data--the Feedback Questionnaires were to be mailed to the COPE office after each session; the Group Roster Report was to be returned after the first session and the Group Attendance Report after the fourth; pre-addressed, stamped envelopes were in the packets of group leader materials.

3. At the COPE office certain activities were to take place:

a) recording of data received--the group numbers and number of questionnaires received were recorded for each packet of materials received from the group leaders;

b) following-up of group leaders--the citizens mobilization staff was to check with each group leader by phone. Large newsprint sheets were placed on the walls divided into squares, one for each viewer-discussion group. For each group was recorded such information as whether the group had met, sent in the Feedback Questionnaires, and carried out any task assignments.

3. passing on of Feedback Questionnaires for processing--the Feedback Questionnaires were to be picked up by representatives from the Survey Research Laboratory for data processing.

Some of the problems that occurred in relation to the foregoing procedure were as follows:

1. All of the persons that eventually served as viewer-discussion group leaders did not attend a training session and this fact led to at least three difficulties. First, after the training sessions the citizens mobilization staff delivered packets of materials to various individuals and organizational representatives. In some cases, the person receiving the material eventually became a leader, in other cases the material was passed onto someone else. Some "untrained" leaders no doubt did not receive the material in time to go over it thoroughly and uncover any questions they might have, or might not have realized the importance of doing so (see p. 119, first comment on printed material).

    Second, certain instructions were emphasized at the training sessions. No one was to be coerced into filling out the Feedback Questionnaires and these questionnaires were to be used for discussion only if, and to the extent that, the group wished. Also, no one was to be required to sign any attendance sheets if he did not wish to; this guideline was not included in the printed instructions. It was

pointed out at the training sessions that the project staff wanted names only for mailing list purposes and for seeing how much turnover occurred in the groups. However, if anyone felt uneasy about having his name in the attendance records an arbitrarily assigned number could be used so at least the number of people in attendance could be determined even if the names for all of them were not recorded.

Third, some leaders who received their materials after the training sessions might not have received the supplementary postage. (See comment on page 128, fourth paragraph.)

2. A sufficient supply of the Group Roster Sheet was not available so that one could be included in each packet of group leader materials. The information required on this form was sent in on plain paper in some instances and in many instances not sent in at all.

3. When more Group Roster Sheets were printed, the second batch differed slightly from the first. One batch did not require the group identification number and did not have instructions printed on it as to when it was supposed to be mailed in; i.e., after the first session. Of course, the group identification number did not matter, since, in principle, there were other

ways of verifying which group leader had which number. However, in light of the following problem, it would have been useful to have the instructions just mentioned printed on the form.

4. The instructions for when the attendance forms were to be sent in were somewhat unclear. On the Group Leaders Information Sheet, the list of tasks that were to be done for each session included "Send in Group Roster Report." The Group Roster Report was really to be mailed in after the first session and the Group Attendance Report after the fourth session. Having the instructions for when each form was to be mailed in printed on the forms might have cleared up any confusion that could have occurred.

5. No clear instructions were given at the training sessions or in the written instructions on how to keep the group attendance. It was obvious from the Group Attendance Report Form that the names of the viewer-discussion participants were to be provided and a check for each week they attended. However, it was not clear whether the form should be filled out one week at a time or all at the end of the fourth week; a leader attempting to do the latter might have some difficulty if he had a sizeable group and/ or there was turnover from week to week.

The investigator does not mean in discussing the ambiguity in or lack of explicit instructions for the attendance forms that problems related to recording and reporting attendance were insurmountable. It should have been fairly simple for a group leader to work out a system for taking attendance and to figure out when the forms were to be sent in (providing of course he had the forms). The purpose of describing these particular problems and the others discussed in this section was to throw light on some of the comments made by the group leaders and to provide a basis for any recommendations that will be made in relation to record-keeping.

Feedback/Follow-Up

According to the project director, it was an error not to include money in the budget for follow-up or follow-through activities (Malone, Note 3). In this discussion both "feedback" and "follow-through" are considered. Both types of activities are related to communication between the viewer-discussion groups and the project staff, although feedback may be thought of as communication while the overall viewer-discussion activity is taking place (in TRUST, this would be the four-week period of the broadcasts of the ". . . And Justice For All" programs) and follow-up or follow-through might be thought of as taking place after the overall viewer-discussion activity is over.

The Views of Waniewicz on Feedback

Waniewicz (1972) discussed various devices which can be used for feedback in interactive media projects. However, it should be pointed out that he was addressing himself to readers in countries where the use of radio and television for adult education is still in its introductory phases and he seemed concerned with open-ended interactive media projects; i.e., those that are not set up at the outset for a limited number of broadcasts like TRUST. Nevertheless, his suggestions were useful in a consideration of feedback or follow-through activities in TRUST.

Waniewicz discussed four categories of feedback devices--periodical reports, visits to reception centers, headquarters consultation, correspondence contacts--which potentially have applicability for a TRUST-type interactive media project. He emphasized that these categories of devices are not interchangeable. The diagnostic capabilities of each are specific and limited in scope, and, for maximum effectiveness, they should be used in combination.

Ideally a report should be sent in from each group after each meeting. The data in these reports should touch on such matters as: 1) attendance; and 2) some of the questions asked during the meeting and propositions and decisions formulated by the group. Data concerning the amount of interest evoked by the broadcast would be useful but might be difficult to elicit if the group leader (or whoever fills out the report) does not know which kinds of behavior are of interest to the project staff.

The viewer-discussion group participants' impressions and attitudes are not likely to be reflected fully by written communication to the project staff. Visits to groups and discussions with group leaders and members are crucial since many reactions and effects can be better observed than documented. It was suggested that one of the main tasks of the citizens mobilization personnel should be to view each of the broadcasts in one of the viewer-discussion groups and submit a report which is similar to the ones designed for group leaders only providing for more descriptive answers.

Conferences and consultative meetings involving representatives of governmental departments, local authorities, organizations participating in the project, project staff, group leaders, and the television producers could be used for feedback. Such meetings could be useful for discussing a wide variety of matters related to the overall functioning of the project.

It is possible that a project which calls attention to a community problem will solicit a number of letters, queries, and requests directly related to the subject matter of the project. The project's sponsor should make the appropriate disposal of these documents. Questions which are of common interest could be answered on the air. Replies to other kinds of inquiry could be handled by letter or through newsletters or other publications. Matters which cannot competently be handled by the project staff should

be referred to the appropriate authority or agency; however, the project staff should assume responsibility for sending out the answers in time because the reputation of the entire project could be undermined by failure to deal adequately with such questions and requests.

Johnson's Experiences with Feedback in Metroplex

In an effort to make the success of their viewer-discussion groups less dependent on the skills of the group leader, the staff of the Metroplex project used certain measures which are of interest in a consideration of feedback devices. It was felt that reliance on the skills of the group leader should be lessened because it was impossible to provide sufficient training for all viewer-discussion group leaders for various reasons. Therefore, a plan was developed for increasing the sense of interrelatedness among the groups participating in the project.

One way of fostering a sense of interrelatedness was by emphasizing in all of the newsletters sent to the groups the importance of participating in the second part of the broadcast (see p. 23 for a description of Metroplex viewer-discussion sessions) by phoning in questions and listening to the various comments and questions sent in by other groups throughout the metropolitan area. Questions were suggested at the end of the first part of the television presentation for the viewer-discussion groups to consider. The groups were encouraged to submit a question which, by

group consensus, was felt to be the most important or perplexing one for the group.

Another way of making the interdependence of the viewer-discussion groups felt was through the use of the opinion ballot. Alternative choices on several significant issues were presented on the ballots with space for the viewer to indicate his preference. The viewer-discussion group leaders received the ballots by mail and distributed them to group members; they were returned to project headquarters by mail and tabulated. The findings were then distributed to the viewer-discussion groups, organizations and agencies most interested in these reactions, and the area newspapers, television and radio stations.

Feedback in TRUST

Several of the feedback devices just discussed were used in the TRUST project. The principal means of getting feedback from the viewer-discussion groups was the Feedback Questionnaires. However, the effectiveness of those instruments for feedback purposes was limited for one important reason: the data processing arrangements were such that no findings from the Feedback Questionnaire data were available until the time of the Action Fair Conference, two weeks after the last broadcast of the fourth ". . . And Justice For All" program. It should be kept in mind that 72.5 percent of the "successful" group leaders responded that their members were "somewhat interested" in getting feedback on how their answers compared with those of the members

of other groups, as contrasted with being "very interested" or "not interested at all." However, these responses reflect only the group leaders' perceptions of their members interest in the Feedback Questionnaire data and may not be an accurate assessment.

Group leaders were supposed to turn in reports that required attendance data. Only 44 percent of the total number of group leaders sent in the group roster report that was due after the first meeting and 50.1 percent of the total number of leaders sent in the overall attendance reports at the end of the fourth session. The relatively low return on the attendance records could be attributed to two reasons: 1) some of the leaders apparently did not have the regulation forms for these reports in their materials; 2) the instructions for mailing in the attendance reports were unclear. At any rate, these forms required only attendance data and did not elicit any information on the activity or concerns of the groups as suggested by Waniewicz.

Newsletters about the TRUST project were sent out to COPE's regular mailing list in the months of August, Setpember, and October. A fourth was sent out sometime after the Action Fair Conference. The timing of the dissemination of these newsletters was not such that they could influence the activity of the viewer-discussion groups in the ways that Waniewicz and Johnson described.

Only 30 percent of both the "successful" and

"unsuccessful" group leaders reported that they were re-cruited by the citizens mobilization staff. Forty-five percent of the successful leaders and 60 percent of the unsuc-cessful leaders had not attended any of the TRUST training sessions for group leaders. It was conceivable that the viewer-discussion group leaders could have contacted the project staff about any concerns that developed during the activity of the groups. However, since a goodly number probably had had no contact with TRUST project personnel, they might not have realized or appreciated the latter's potentiality for assistance.

The elements of the TRUST project that the group leaders were asked to comment on the Follow-Up Questionaire did not include feedback or follow-up so one can only con-jecture how important these variables were to them. How-ever, from the comments on the "other" elements (Item 33, Follow-Up Questionnaire for successful leaders) or the general comments (Item 34, Follow-Up Questionnaire for successful leaders) a concern for leader/project staff com-munication could be inferred. For examples, see comments on staff assistance (p 118) and the last comments in the "other" category (p. 120).

Regardless of the inferences drawn from the group leaders' comments, effective feedback devices are essential to the successful functioning of viewer-discussion groups. They can help the project staff diagnose and assist in the solution of various problems that may come up in the groups.

Moreover, they can foster a sense of interrelatedness among the groups which can help combat the feeling of impotence that some groups might feel about their ability to do anything about the problems they are considering.

The short time between the ". . . And Justice For All" programs complicated the problem of feedback in TRUST. Information was obtained from the groups by way of questionnaires and group leader reports, but it was impossible to get findings from these instruments back to the groups by the data handling procedures that were used.

The Action Fair Conference

The Action Fair Conference was the culminating event of the TRUST project. It was clarified during the early planning for the evaluation that this event was an essential part of the "program" or experimental variable; i.e., the process that was designed to bring about the desired goal or change. The purpose of the Fair was two-fold: 1) to bring together citizens, professionals, and experts so that they might further explore what was learned through the interactive media experience and link up in any way they saw fit; 2) to give relevant organizations an opportunity to make available materials on their programs and recruit volunteers or new members. This discussion of the Action Fair Conference is in five parts: 1) The Planning for the Action Fair Conference; 2) The Implementation of the Action Fair; 3) Problems Related to the Planning for the Action Fair; 4) Problems Realted to the Implementation of the

Action Fair; 5) A Partial Evaluation of the Action
Fair.

The first of five meetings that were held for the
purpose of planning for the Action Fair took place on
September 20, 1974. All of the organizations that were
listed in "Avenues to Involvement" were invited, in addition
to representatives of some governmental agencies and others
whom the project staff felt should be involved in the plan-
ning. The mailing list for the first Action Fair planning
meeting had a total of 159 names and from the sign-in atten-
dance sheets for the meetings it was determined that an
average of 25 persons participated in each of the planning
meetings.

At the first meeting the role of the Council in
implementing the Action Fair was clarified and some prelim-
inary consideration was given to the overall goals and for-
mat for that event. It was pointed out that the Council
would act as a coordinator or catalyst but that the planning
and implementation would have to come from the various
groups represented at the meeting. It was agreed upon that
the Fair should reflect the diverse interests and needs of
the individuals and groups that would be participating. A
decision was made that there would be two basic components
to the Fair: 1) small workshops dealing with a variety of
issues, rather than large assemblies or speaker-audience
situations; 2) some means by which the various interest
groups could distribute their material and sign up new

members or volunteers if they wished (which was eventually named "Involvement Alley"). A number of issues that might be considered at the Fair were proposed and some participants volunteered to begin planning workshops around those issues.

During the second and third meetings a tentative format for the Fair was presented by one of the members of the planning group. This person (who will be referred to as B) was a representative of a community organization with whose work the project director was acquainted and favorably impressed. Also this organization was featured in the fourth ". . . And Justice For All" film.

The format suggested by B was shaped by her view that, although the Fair msut allow for maximum flexibility because of the diverse interests, points of view, and motivations of the participants, it should have a cohesive framework with a clear beginning, middle, and end.

Until the fourth meeting, the Fair was tentatively scheduled to begin on a Friday evening and last all day the following Saturday. According to B's plans, Friday night's activities would include a review of how the event came to be, a preview of the overall Fair, and a "celebration"; i.e., entertainment-type activities such as music and skits. Saturday's activities would basically consist of workshops, feedback, and celebration.

It was proposed that workshops be of three types: 1) key issues workshops; 2) action workshops; 3) all-day

workshops. The key issues workshops would deal with general broad problem areas and representatives from various organizations would be invited to discuss what their organizations were doing in relation to the problems. The action workshops were to be aimed at those already committed to working on specific problems and their emphasis would be on devising tactics for dealing with those problems. Each action workshop was to be given the task of drawing up five strategies for attacking the problem it would be considering. The third type of workshop was to be led by members of B's organization, and its emphasis was to be on problem solving and cooperative efforts. It was to last all day and it was hoped that organizations would designate representatives to participate in this particular session.

At this stage in the planning, each workshop was to have a reporter who would be responsible for taking notes and reporting to the general session when the participants reconvened as a whole body. It was also being considered that the workshop reports be typed, duplicated, and distributed to the participants before the Fair adjourned. The invitation that went out to the next planning meeting included a note requesting volunteer typists, mimeo machine operators, registrars, typewriters, and reproducing equipment because TRUST did not have the personnel nor other resources to handle that particular undertaking without considerable help.

A list of 66 possible workshop topics had been

generated by the planning group. That list was also in-
cluded with the invitation to the fourth meeting with a
request that the group attempt to organize those topics in
some way and add others if they wished.

By the time of the fourth meeting, it had been de-
cided that the Action Fair would take place entirely on
Saturday because the site selected for it would not be
available on Friday evening. In the remaining two meetings
the planning group broke into small subgroups to work out
plans for specific workshops (COPE, Note 29).

The Implementation of the Action Fair

The Action Fair Conference took place on December 7,
1974 at the Chicago campus of Northwestern University. It
followed the basic format that had been agreed upon by the
planning committee; i.e., celebration-workshops-report
out-celebration, and the substantive portion did consist of
the two types of activities; i.e., workshops and "Involve-
ment Alley."

The opening session included group singing led by
a community organization and a panel composed of representa-
tives of governmental and private agencies in the criminal
justice system. There were 25 workshops listed on the
"Schedule of Workshops," six listed for all day (i.e.,
11-12:45 and 2-4:00), ten were listed for the 11-12:45 per-
iod only and nine were listed for the 2-4:00 period only.
This schedule, if it were actually adhered to, meant that
there were 16 workshops going on in the morning session and

15 in the afternoon session. Representatives of 41 organizations participated in Involvement Alley. There was a report back session after the afternoon workshops and dinner and a celebration rounded out the day's activities.

<div align="center">
Problems Related to the Planning for
the Action Fair Conference
</div>

On the Project TRUST Follow-Up Questionnaire sent to organizational representatives, discussed in Chapter V, six of the 21 responses to the question "What could the TRUST project have done to increase the benefit your organization got from participation . . .?" were explicitly related to the Action Fair Conference. In the case of some of the other comments, it was not clear whether the overall TRUST project was of concern or just the Action Fair Conference. One respondent suggested that the planning should have included a survey to determine beforehand what each participating organization wanted to accomplish at the Fair; two felt that the planning sessions could have been better organized. Several comments in response to the item: "If this type of program were to be repeated, would your organization participate?" possibly implied criticisms of the planning. Six respondents felt it was unclear how participating would benefit their organizations. An additional respondent recommended planning meetings and publicity well in advance of the project, but it was unclear in this instance whether the entire project or the Action Fair was meant.

The investigator is not suggesting that the aforementioned comments represent the consensus of the persons who participated in the planning sessions for the Action Fair Conference. The questionnaire items that elicited these responses were not specifically aimed at the respondents' feelings about the planning meetings; those items were open-ended and some respondents commented on other aspects of the project while others did not respond to those items at all. Moreover, the survey was taken about seven months after the planning phase for the Action Fair and the effects of memory have to be considered.

Whether or not the aforementioned comments represented a consensus, there are problems inherent in involving citizens in the planning process. First of all, the time period needed for planning will likely have to be extended. Time is needed to make various kinds of preparations for the planning sessions themselves and the sessions have to be scheduled for the convenience of those who are to participate.

Secondly, including as few people as possible permits decisions to be made more quickly. Note the number of topics generated by the planning group mentioned on page 205. That group, in turn, was expected to narrow the list down in some way--a time consuming task when carried out by 25 people.

Thirdly, the expectations of the people involved are aroused by participating in the planning process.

There were diverse points of view on what the outcomes of
the Fair should be among the people participating in the
planning; of course not all of these outcomes were realized
or capable of being realized, for various reasons. For
example, COPE did not have the resources for making avail-
able the workshop reports (see page 204); nor apparently did
the organizations contribute the means for carrying out this
task, as requested, because this particular plan did not
materialize at the Fair.

Problems Related to the Implementation the Action Fair

The site of the Action Fair was a variable that
seriously affected its success. The activities of the Fair
took place in three different buildings. The registration
and opening ceremonies which were scheduled for 9:00-10:50
were in one building (which will be referred to as Building
A). The morning and afternoon workshops were in the second
building (Building B). Lunch, for those who had purchased
lunch tickets, was in a third building (Building C). The
problem of having to move from building to building was
made worse by the fact that the weather was cold and incle-
ment.

Involvement Alley was located in Building A during
the registration-opening ceremonies session and had to be
relocated in Building B after 9:45. Several Involvement
Alley participants commented on the organizational represen-
tatives questionnaire (discussed in Chapter V) that
Involvement Alley was in an out-of-the-way place.

The major problem in getting a location for the Action Fair was cost, according to the project director (Malone, Note 3). The location had to be somewhere where the rental of the facilities would not necessitate a sizeable registration fee. The Action Fair Conference registration fee was $3.00 and lunch was $2.00, although the announcements stated one could bring his own lunch, and dinner was $4.00. This cost eliminated any of the major hotels.

The location also had to accommodate numerous small groups and this fact immediately suggested a school setting. The downtown campus of Northwestern University was chosen because of its location and, because it is a private university, it was felt that there would be fewer political implications to consider than if the Fair were held at a publicly supported institution.

Another factor that influenced the success of the Action Fair was the communication between the project staff and the resource people for the workshops. The Council made arrangements for each workshop to have a moderator who was to be generally responsible for regulating the activities of the workshop. Their task, as outlined on the Moderator's Instruction Sheet which was given them the day of the Fair, was three-fold: 1) to get a list of participants' names and the organizations they represented; 2) to complete the Moderator's Control Sheet which required the specification of the workshop topic, a brief summary of what happened, and a description of any future action that was proposed as

a result of the workshop activity; 3) to regulate the work-shop discussion. Also, a few pointers were given on the Moderator's Control Sheet for handling conflict that might develop because of the sensitive nature of the general topic.

From some of the remarks on the Follow-Up Question-naire for organizational representatives, and the investiga-tor's personal observation, certain indications of poor communication can be pointed out. One respondent commented on the questionnaire that he was a member of a panel and did not know what was expected of him until the time of the meeting. The investigator attended a workshop that was to have nine "featured discussants" according to the workshop schedule which listed it as an "all day" workshop. During the time the investigator observed this workshop (which was for a 20-minute period about one-half hour after it had started), there was only one discussant present and the moderator. The investigator does not know whether this workshop continued after lunch and, if so, whether any of the other scheduled discussants showed up.

Both the location of the Action Fair and the communi-cation to the moderators impeded the data gathering that was attempted at this event. A questionnaire was included in the packet of materials that was given to each partici-pant (Appendix G). It was intended that the participants would complete this questionnaire at the end of the after-noon workshop session--ideally at the wrap-up session. It was mentioned during the opening remarks that there was

an evaluation form in the packet of materials, but that was
only one piece of information among several that had to be
put across in that opening session. It was impossible for
the investigator to get around to all of the workshop ses-
sions before they started to request that the moderators
remind the participants about the questionnaire. A number
of participants left after the morning workshops were over.
After lunch the investigator was stationed by the exit to
catch people as they were leaving during the afternoon work-
shops. A few questionnaires were obtained this way al-
though some people were reluctant to take the time to com-
plete the questionnaire after they had decided to go home.
Also, there was nowhere in the area of the exit to sit down
and fill out a questionnaire anyway.

Most of the few questionnaires that were obtained
were filled out at the report-out session. However, only a
small percentage of the participants attended this session,
because some participants left after each natural break in
the day's activities; i.e., after the morning workshops,
after lunch, after the afternoon workshops; moreover they
were trickling out throughout the day. A few questionnaires
were also obtained from the people who stayed for dinner and
the closing celebrations.

A Partial Evaluation of the Action Fair

Determining Participation Figures for the Fair

Seventy-seven usable questionnaires were returned by
the participants at the Action Fair Conference. The

investigator attempted to document the attendance at the Fair in order to determine what percentage the 77 respondents represented. However, this task was complicated by the fact that the participants could be classified into two groups: 1) those having special roles at the Fair; i.e., workshop moderators and resource people, and 2) the self-selected. Only the responses of the latter were of interest in relation to the evaluation questionnaire.

The names of those who registered for the Action Fair and those who were listed on the program as moderators and/or resource persons for the workshops were cross-checked. There were 258 persons listed as having registered and 121 persons listed as moderators and/or resource persons of whom 53 had registered. Therefore, the attendance of 205 apparently self-selected participants can be documented. The investigator does not know whether there were self-selected participants who did not register and, if so, how many.

Findings

Although it is uncertain to what extent the Action Fair evaluation questionnaire repondents were representative of the self-selected participants at this event, the findings from these questionnaires were useful for at least two reasons: 2) some criteria for judging this event could be inferred from the items; 2) some of the immediate impressions of a group of participants were conveyed rather than those which were influenced by time and other variables.

Those data discussed here are from the items re-lated to the respondents' motivation for coming or the stimuli that got them to the Fair and those related to their evaluation of their experiences.

Over twice as many respondents (61.0 percent) had not participated in a viewer-discussion group as those who had (25.9 percent). Ten repondents (12.9 percent) did not answer the question about viewer-discussion group participation. If they did not know about the interactive media component of the TRUST project they probably did not understand the term "viewer-discussion group."

Most did not learn about the Action Fair Conference through the means that would have reached the masses of people; i.e., newspaper, radio and television publicity. To the question "How did you hear about the Action Fair Conference? Please circle as many answers as apply" the responses were as follows:

    a. . . . received an invitation (36.3%)
    b. . . . heard an announcement on radio or TV (15.5%)
    c. . . . friend or acquaintance told me (37.6%)
    d. People from TRUST called me (27.2%)
    e. Other (28.5%):

        Worked with a participating organization (14.2%)
        Heard through some organization other than COPE (11.6%)
        From participating in a viewer-discussion group (5.1%) (Note that 25.9% of the respondents indicated they had participated in a viewer-discussion group.)
        Assigned by supervisor to attend (2.5%)
        COPE monthly luncheon meetings (2.5%)
        From school or teacher (2.5%)
        In a bar (1.2%)
        Called COPE on another matter and was informed about the Action Fair (1.2%).

Organizational affiliation was an important motivation for attending the Fair. Following are the responses to the item "The _most_ _important_ reason I came to the Action Fair Conference was (circle only one answer)":

a. I want to take action on a specific problem (2.5%)
b. I work for an agency or organization that is involved in these issues (16.8%)
c. I was invited to take part in a panel discussion (1.2%)
d. A friend of acquaintance asked me to come (0)
e. I belong to an organization concerned about these issues (20.7%)
f. I have a general concern about crime (18.1%)
g. I want to do something about crime (1.2%)
h. I want to learn more . . . (14.2%)
i. other (2.5%):

    was invited to moderate a panel (1.2%)
    has possible faculty position which includes teaching community organization (1.2%)

gave more than one answer (19.4%)
gave no answer (3.8%)

Nearly half (46.7 percent) felt that the Action Fair helped them to accomplish their objectives for coming; 36.3 percent were uncertain; 9.0 percent responded "no" and 7.7 percent did not answer.

The most valuable thing about the conference for 41.5 percent of the respondents was participating in the workshops. Other response options chosen were "meeting people" (22.0 percent); "getting printed material-- 'Involvement Alley'" (10.3 percent); "Other" answers written in were: "Listening to people" (1.2 percent); "some action seems to be in the wings" (1.2 percent); "getting information on the issues and the feeling that we may possibly be able to solve some of our problems" (1.2

percent); "getting out" (1.2 percent). Ten (12.9 percent)
of the respondents gave more than one answer and 7.7 per-
cent gave no answer.

Fifty-one (66.2 percent) persons responded to the
item "How do you think the Conference could have been im-
proved?" The numbers over the responses indicate the num-
ber of times the respective responses were given.

(13)
better publicity or better attendance
(Responses related to these two variables were grouped
together because the purpose of publicity is to get
people to attend.)

(8)
workshops superficial and/or not action oriented
hold all activities in the same building
did not have time to attend all workshops of interest

(6)
miscellaneous negative comments about the opening panel
better organization in general

(3)
resource people not knowledgeable

(2)
more time needed for audience participation
more publicity for Involvement Alley
begin on time
too little citizen involvement/too much representation
by organizations ,

(1)
a later meeting to determine if any progress has been
made
mail workshop material in advance so questions can
be formulated
more relevant discussion topics
group leader could have directed discussion better
make sure panelists show up
representation by people who work in the criminal
justice system; e.g. public defenders, states attorneys
people at the registration desk could have been more
helpful in giving out information about changes
have registration at both buildings to accommodate late-
comers
guarantee that reports-back will be made by someone

else if moderator is not available
(This comment was in reference to the report-out session.)
better attention to microphones
not having the Conference at all
do not charge
give correct room numbers.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND
RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of the research discussed in this report was to evaluate the TRUST project, an interactive media/ citizens participation project. This project was evaluated in three ways: 1) a measurement of the extent to which the objectives related to viewer-discussion group participants were met; 2) a measurement of the extent to which objectives related to cooperating organizations were met; and 3) an analysis of the major events or processes that were a part of the project; i.e., a) the initiation of the project; b) the issue identification phase; c) citizens mobilization; d) group leader training; 3) selected processes related to the viewer-discussion groups; and f) the Action Fair Conference.

The discussion of the TRUST evaluation in this chapter is presented according to the following topics: 1) Summary of the Findings for Viewer-Discussion Groups; 2) Summary of the Survey of Cooperating Organizations; 3) Summary of the Problems Related to the Major Events or Processes; 4) Recommendations; and 5) Some Concluding Observations.

217

Summary of Findings for Viewer-
Discussion Groups

The outcomes for the viewer-discussion participants were examined by means of two sets of instruments: 1) Feedback Questionnaires, which were completed by the group members during the viewer group sessions; 2) Follow-Up Questionnaires which were completed by group leaders several months after the completion of the project.

Findings from the Feedback Questionnaires

For purposes of analyzing the data from the Feedback Questionnaires, the participatns were divided into "select" participants and "non-select" participants. Select participants were those from groups that met certain criteria that a "typical" group should conform to based on assumptions of the project staff and reports of other projects.

There were sixteen select groups whose participation figures for the four sessions were 121, 115, 115 and 124. There were 37 non-select groups (i.e., groups which had sent in four sets of questionnaires but who did not meet the other criteria for a typical group.) Their participation figures for the four sessions were 459, 413, 437, and 371. These figures do not account for all of the viewer-discussion participants in TRUST. A total of 102 groups sent in at least one set of questionnaires. See Appendix A for total participation data.

Selected Characteristics of Viewer-
Discussion Participants

Sex

The select groups were predominantly females in
comparison to the non-select groups. There was an average
of 74.8 percent females in the select groups for the four
programs and an average of 57.1 percent for the non-select
groups.

Age

An average of 34.9 percent of the non-select parti-
cipants were in the "20 or less" age category while only an
average of 1.25 percent of the select participants were in
this category. This category accounted for the largest
proportion of the non-select participants, which fact,
along with other evidence suggested that they were students
participating in a school setting. The largest proportion
of the select participants were in the 30-39 age category.

Race

Racial minorities were underrepresented in the sel-
ect group . Blacks made up an average of 18.7 percent of
the non-select participants but only 2.6 percent of the
select participants. Whites were an average of 96.1 percent
in the select group and 78.2 percent of the non-select
group . There was only one Latino in the select group
for an average of .8 percent. In the non-select group ,
Latinos ranged between 5-7 for an average of 1.4 percent
for the four programs.

Education

Both select and non-select groups had the highest proportion of their participants in the educational categories representing the highest levels of formal schooling. The select group had an average of 74.5 percent who were "college graduate or more" whereas 32.2 percent of the non-select participants were in this category. The largest percentage (33.6 percent) of the non-select participants were in the "some college" category which accounted for an average of 19.5 percent of the select participants.

Reasons for Participating

The largest percentage of both types of participants indicated that their most important reason for participating in the viewer-discussion group was "I want to learn more about criminal justice problems." Nearly a third of each type chose this reason. The second highest percentage of the select participants (13.2 percent) chose "as a favor to a friend" while only 4.1 percent of the non-select participants chose this reason.

Relations to the Community

Two items dealt with the participants' relationship to the community. Almost equal percentages of both types of participants were "very concerned about community problems" (47.9 percent select participants and 46 percent non-select participants) and "somewhat concerned" (51.2 percent select participants and 50.1 percent non-select participants).

On the second item, the two groups' responses were not as similar; 22 percent of the select participants were "very active" in their communities but only 14.2 percent of the non-select participants. About equal percentages were "somewhat active" (59 percent select participants and 55.6 non-select participants). The non-select participants had a higher percentage (29.6 percent) who were "not active at all" than did the select participants (16.5 percent). The presumed high proportion of students in the non-select groups could account for differences in relation to this variable.

Political Views

A slightly larger percentage of the non-select participants (5.9 percent) rated themselves as "very conservative" and "somewhat conservative" (34.9 percent) than did the select participants (4.1 percent and 33.1 percent, respectively). Moreover, the select group had a larger percentage (14.9 percent) rating their views as "very liberal" than the non-select group (11.8 percent). These findings were puzzling because of the relatively younger status of the non-select group. The largest percentage of both groups of participants rated their political views as "somewhat liberal," with 42.1 percent for the select group and 45.3 percent of the non-select group.

Contact with the Criminal
Justice System

More of the select participants (16.6 percent) had

had contact with the criminal justice system as jurors than the non-select group (10.1 percent). A slightly larger proportion of the non-select participants (22.4 percent) had been witness-complainants than the select participants (18.9 percent). Moreover, 8 percent of the non-select participants but only 2.7 percent of the select participants had been defendants, which could be accounted for by the higher proportions of youth and racial minorities in the non-select group.

Findings from the Feedback Evaluation Data

Pretest

On the pretest the non-select participants responded similarly to the select participants. The statement which the highest percentages of both groups were in agreement with was "I should work personally for improvements in the criminal justice system." The statement that the second highest percentages of both groups were in agreement with was "I feel free to make my feelings about the criminal justice system known to public officials." The item that the smallest percentage of both types of participants were in agreement with was "I feel my views about the criminal justice system will make a difference to public officials," which was exceeded only slightly by "I know what I can do to help improve the criminal justice system."

In general, the questionnaire items related to the participants' perceptions about their knowledge of the

dynamics of the criminal justice system were agreed with by fewer respondents than items related to their feelings about involvement with the criminal justice system or citizen participation. Also, apparently the respondents felt more certain about their obligation to work for change and about how to go about taking certain actions to bring about improvement than what the changes ought to be.

Posttest

In comparing pretest and posttest scores, only the responses from the select group were considered. The total number of non-select participants varied so greatly from program 1 to program 4 that discussing their scores in terms of percentages would be misleading. The individual select groups were not stable either; the records showed that they generally varied in the numbers attending each week and only 57.3 percent of the select participants indicated on the fourth Feedback Questionnaire that they had attended the first session (as compared to 64.4 percent of the non-select participants).

In general, the greatest change came in relation to feelings of being informed in relation to things covered specifically in the television programs. Other areas where an increase in information was intended but which had to be accomplished by some means other than, or in addition to, the television programs showed less than the average amount of change.

The degree of personal commitment to act and the

participants' knowledge about what they could do to help improve the criminal justice system were relatively un-affected. However, the select participants must have found the viewer-discussion experience rewarding because the statement "In the future, I would like to particiate in another t.v. discussion group like this one on another topic" had a higher percentage of respondents in agreement with it on the posttest than any other item and showed the second largest percentage increase.

Evaluation of Other Elements

On the fourth Feedback Questionnaire, participants were asked to evaluate various aspects of the viewer-discussion experience. The findings from both the select and the non-select participants were considered, as with the pretest findings. Since these were post-program measures only, there was not the difficulty in interpreting them for the non-select groups as there was with the posttest scores because of the drop in participation from the first to the fourth program.

In relation to how well the television programs helped the participants understand the problems of the criminal justice system, the non-select group rated the programs more favorably than the select participants. Although the largest proportion of both types of participants rated the programs as helping "moderately well," more of the select participants rated the programs as helping "poorly," and more of the non-select participants rated the programs as helping "very well."

The data in regard to how well the discussions helped the participants understand criminal justice problems were more ambiguous, but it appeared that the non-select participants were not as favorable. Here again, the largest percentage of both types of participants rated the discussions as helping "moderately well." However, in comparing various inputs to the viewer-discussion experience with each other in terms of their helpfulness in the understanding of criminal justice problems, over half of the non-select participants chose the television programs to 35.5 percent of the select participants. More than twice the percentage (46.8 percent) of select participants chose the discussions as non-select participants (21.8 percent).

The largest percentage (29.8 percent) of the select participants indicated that they liked the fourth program best and the largest percentage of the non-select participants chose the first program. The responses to this item were of doubtful value in that it was not known how many of the respondents saw all of the programs and, since all four were on the same general topic, it might have been difficult to recall them as discrete units.

Findings from the Follow-Up Survey

Group leaders were classified as either "successful" or "unsuccessful" for this survey. Leaders from whom at least three sets of Feedback Questionnaires had been received were classifed as "successful" and those from whom fewer than three sets had been received were classified as

"unsuccessful." It was assumed that the number of sets of
questionnaires received from a group generally represented
the number of times it had met. Both types of leaders were
surveyed by a mailed questionnaire; the questionnaires for
the unsuccessful leaders was a shortened version of the one
for successful leaders.

Findings from Successful Leaders

In nine instances the number of times that group met
according to the leaders' responses to the Follow-Up
Questionnaire and the number of sets of questionnaires
received at the project office did not correspond.
Most of the groups did watch the television programs to-
gether in the home of the group leader. The two evening
times were more popular than the two day times that were
available.

Only eight of the groups indicated that their
viewer-discussions session was part of a meeting that was
usually held at that time for some other purpose. However,
five of these eight were males (of a total of 11 males in
the sample) which suggested that males who participate as
group leaders generally do not go through the process of
organizing a group but take advantage of groups that are
already organized for some other purpose--chiefly school
or religious groups. In 75 percent of the groups, most or
all of the participants knew each other prior to the
viewer-discussion experience, and, in over half of the
groups, the participants were either neighbors or members
of an organization.

Most of the group leaders had had no prior affilia-
tion with the criminal justice system either by way of
employment or membership in an organization concerned with
criminal justice issues. Only 30 percent reported being
recruited by the TRUST citizens mobilization staff. Nearly
half of the leaders had not attended one of the TRUST group
leader training sessions, nor had they had any previous
formal training in relation to group discussion techniques.
However, they were relatively experienced in relation to
prior group leadership experience.

Most of the leaders felt they knew enough about
group discussion techniques to lead their groups effectively
and most felt they either knew enough about criminal jus-
tice issues or that such knowledge was irrelevant to their
performance. Few contacted TRUST for help after the viewer-
discussion event got underway and the assistance needed in
most of these instances was for additional materials.

Very few of the leaders tried to motivate group
action through the discussion and most felt that their group
members wanted to learn something about criminal justice
problems rather than to do something about such problems.
Three-fourths of the leaders did not attend the Action Fair
Conference and over two-third reported that neither they
nor any of their members of which they were aware had
carried out any activity related to the criminal justice
system subsequent to the viewer-discussion activity.

The discussion sessions for half of the groups

lasted 45 minutes to an hour. In over a third, the sessions were 30 minutes or less. The Feedback Questionnaires influenced the discussion agenda in that 90 percent of the group leaders responded that "some" or "quite a bit" of their discussions was related to the Feedback Questionnaires. However, those instruments were not as intrusive as had been anticipated by the project staff, in that 85 percent of the leaders indicated that their members did not mind filling out the questionnaires at all and that they had to provide little explanation about them. In the perceptions of the group leaders, there was moderate interest in most groups in getting feedback about how their responses on the questionnaires compared with those of participants in other groups.

In most of the groups, only a few members read the "Participants Handbook," in the perceptions of the leaders. Apparently the notion of doing "task assignments" did not appeal very much and nearly half of the leaders did not encourage the performance of task assignments at all.

The largest proportion of the respondents were "uncertain" if they would participate again if a similar project were to be offered. Half of the leaders felt that "most" of their members would participate in a future project, but 40 percent felt that "few" of their participants would.

The group leaders were asked how the project could have been improved in relation to the following elements:

group leader training, Feedback Questionnaires, television programs, and staff assistance. Of course not every leader responded to this question. The highest number of comments (15) was related to the training sessions. Thirteen commented on the television programs; ten on the Feedback Questionnaires and nine on staff assistance. Nine made comments on "other" aspects and nine on anything not brought out by the other items in the questionnaire. Those that actually did deal with variables not previously considered were concerned with scheduling problems for the viewer-discussion sessions, the printed material, their roles as group leaders, and the Action Fair Conference.

The successful respondents were predominantly white, female, college graduates, and between the ages of 31-50.

Findings from the Unsuccessful Group Leaders

The unsuccessful leaders were similar to the successful on all of the items on which both types of leaders were questioned except the following:

1. With the unsuccessful leaders, there were more instances where the number of times the group met was not represented by the number of sets of Feedback Questionnaires received from the group. In fact, eight of the eleven so-called "unsuccessful" leaders had met enough times (i.e., at least three) to be classified as "successful." However, these eight were "successful" only according to their self-reports,

and not according to the number of question-
naires received from them.

2. A larger proportion of the unsuccessful leaders
    were males, blacks, and in the 31-40 age cate-
    gory.

3. A larger proportion of the unsuccessful leaders
    held viewer-discussion sessions at times that
    were usually used for some other meeting.

4. More of the unsuccessful leaders had not at-
    tended the TRUST training sessions. However,
    more of these leaders indicated that they had
    had formal training in leading discussions and
    quite a bit of previous experience in leading
    discussions. Also, more of these leaders indi-
    cated they knew enough about group discussions
    to lead their groups effectively.

5. More of the unsuccessful leaders were favorable
    toward participating again if a similar project
    were offered.

Summary of the Survey of Cooperating Organizations

A mailed questionnaire was sent to representatives
of organizations that had cooperated with the TRUST project
in various ways. Although at least nine ways of cooperating
could be specified, the sample was drawn from organizations
that had participated in three of these ways (although they
could have also participated in one or more of the other
six.)

Findings

Nearly half of the respondents indicated that during the planning and implementation of TRUST they were aware of all six of the ways the project was designed to benefit organizations and about a third knew most of them.

There was little of what one might call "organizational" involvement if such involvement were defined by the number of organization members participating in TRUST activities. The largest percentage (50 percent) had only 1-3 members involved and the next largest percentage (28.7 percent) had 4-6 members involved.

The activities related to the planning and implementation of the Action Fair Conference involved the largest percentage of respondents. Few had formed viewer-discussion groups; in fact this activity, with the exception of the ones related to appearing on television, was the one in which fewest organizations had participated.

The most frequently chosen reason for participating in the TRUST project was "Wanted to get more familiar and/ or active with organizations working with criminal justice problems." Two other reasons were chosen by the second highest percentages of the participants: "Saw opportunity to publicize and promote your organization's activities" and "Wanted to educate or inform your members about criminal justice problems." A reason given as "other" that was not implied by the response options to this item was that the respondents wanted to provide some special input or expertise to the project.

Organizations benefited from participating in TRUST
in all of the five ways listed on the questionnaire, at
least in the opinion of the respondents. The largest per-
centages of affirmative responses (58 percent) were given
to two statements: "The TRUST Project helped us to promote
and publicize our activites" and "The TRUST Project helped
us to become more familiar and/or active with other organi-
zations working with criminal justice problems." These two
benefits also corresponded to the reasons for participating
selected by the highest and second highest percentages of
respondents.

The benefit receiving affirmative responses from the
smallest percentage of participants (10.5 percent) was "The
TRUST Project helped us to get more volunteers or members."
However, only 31.5 percent of the respondents selected this
statement as a reason for participating. These findings
are interesting in light of the fact that assisting organi-
zations to gain new members or volunteers was one of the
most important reasons for the Action Fair Conference.

In the opinion of the representatives, there were
certain things that could have been done by the organiza-
tions themselves and by the project staff to increase the
benefit the former got from being involved in TRUST. The
organizations could have done more in relation to the fol-
lowing:

      a. involvement in the planning

      b. involvement of more organizational members

c. assistance to and formation of viewer-
discussion groups

d. attendance at a greater variety of workshops
at the Action Fair Conference

The staff could have carried out the following
aspects of the project more effectively:

a. publicity and communication about the project

b. organization of the Action Fair Conference
planning sessions

c. communication to resource people at the Fair

d. coordination of certain workshops

e. the location of Involvement Alley

f. follow-up or assistance for action.

Summary of the Problems Related to the
Major Events or Processes

The Initiation of the Project

Certain conditions under which an interactive media/
citizens participation project could have a successful start
were discussed. Those conditions were the availability of
three kinds of resources; i.e., television time, financing,
and a means of recruiting participants. Moreover, the
sponsoring organization should have certain characteristics:
a reputation for competence, a sincere concern for increas-
ing the number of citizens who deal with public issues in
an informed manner and recognition by organizations whose
cooperation is needed.

COPE did start out with a commitment for television

time and a potential means of recruiting participants. Although certain activities related to the project were carried out before funding was received, a critical one which had to wait was citizens mobilization because the citizens mobilization staff could not be hired until then.

As far as the necessary characteristics for a sponsoring organization are concerned, COPE obviously had the second named above but the extent to which they had the other two is a matter for conjecture.

The Issue Identification Phase

Two major activities made up this phase: 1) the identification of the criminal justice-related concerns of lay citizens and criminal justice professionals and experts; 2) the making of the ". . . And Justice For All" films.

Two incidents were cited as illustrative of the kinds of problems that can occur with this aspect of a TRUST-type project especially one focusing on a sensitive topic like criminal justice. One member of the issue identification committee withdrew the support of his organization because he was critical of the composition of the committee and of its definition and presentation of criminal justice issues in the films. A representative of one of the funding agencies apparently wanted to have more input into the decisions about the contents of the films and was subsequently critical because the films "failed to present an unbiased objective view of the criminal justice system."

Citizens Mobilization

Citizens mobilization, the recruitment of group leaders for the viewer-discussion groups, was the responsibility of the citizens mobilization staff. The cooperation of the media was discussed in relation to this phase of the project also because such cooperation ultimately had citizens mobilization as an important, if not the most important, purpose also.

The orientation and management of the citizens mobilization staff was a problem area in TRUST. An orientation process was lacking that would have helped the staff thoroughly understand the interactive media/citizens participation process and become philosophically attuned to the overall goals of the project.

The daily work of the staff apparently lacked supervision that, on the one hand, provided direction, and, on the other hand, assured accountability.

The overall strategy for recruiting group leaders proved not to be effective. It was intended to enlist the cooperation of heads of organizations who, in turn, would have an internal coordinator who would be responsible for involving other members; however, most of the responsibility for direct recruiting ultimately fell on the citizens mobilization staff.

The participants in the TRUST project were not representative of a cross-section of the adult population of the Chicago metropolitan area. They were disproportionately

white, in the educational categories representing the highest levels of formal schooling. Moreover, a disproportion were from the suburbs, especially the north suburbs.

There was cooperation from both print and broadcast media before, during and after the viewer-discussion activity. Two observations could be offered for the purpose of evaluation: 1) the major Chicago daily newspapers, as compared with the suburban papers, were not informative about the interactive media concept and/or did not give the impression that anyone could participate in a viewer-discussion group; 2) the publicity did not appear sufficiently in advance of the broadcasts to get more people involved in viewer groups.

Group Leader Training

On the Follow-Up Questionnaire for successful group leaders, more suggestions were offered in relation to leader training than the other elements on which they were asked to comment; it received the second highest number of comments from the unsuccessful leaders. Responses related to the content suggested more training on how to lead a discussion and how to organize and manage a group. Other comments pointed to a need for improvement in scheduling, location, and notification of participants.

Since TRUST was an education to action program, it was suggested by the investigator that the training should give some consideration to how to develop a strategy for a community crime prevention effort. Also from some of the

leaders' comments could be inferred a desire for assistance in relation to action objectives.

Selected Viewer-Discussion Group Processes

Findings in relation to the two questionnaires used to study the viewer-discussion groups which were discussed in Chapter III and IV suggested that two processes needed to be given fuller consideration in Chapter VI. Those processes were the logistics of handling the paperwork and feedback/follow-up.

The handling of paperwork was complicated by three factors: 1) many of the persons who eventually served as group leaders did not attend the group leader training; 2) a sufficient supply of one of the forms was not available; 3) some of the instructions for some of the paperwork were unclear.

The principal problems in relation to feedback in TRUST was that the data processing arrangements were such that no data from the Feedback Questionnaires were available until after the viewer-discussion activity was over. Newsletters which could have served the purpose of feedback were used in TRUST but their dissemination did not coincide with the viewer-discussion activity.

Follow-up was discussed along with feedback because both have to do with communication between the project staff and the viewer-discussion participants, although they take place at different times and have different purposes. Some of the comments on the Follow-Up Questionnaire for

organizational representatives criticized the project because it did not provide for follow-up. However, the proposal for funding had emphasized that criminal justice was only one of five areas with which COPE's regular program was concerned. For this reason and also because of lack of staff resources, COPE did not plan to carry out any sustained follow-up efforts. It was intended that the Action Fair Conference would provide opportunity for citizens and organizations to join forces in whatever ways they saw fit and that therefore this event would signify the point at which COPE would "turn over the reins" to the cooperating organizations.

The Action Fair Conference

Representatives of cooperating organizations made suggestions for improving the project related both to the planning and implementation of the Action Fair Conference. Those suggestions included improvement in: 1) the organization of the planning sessions; 2) communication with the resource people at the Action Fair Conference; 3) coordination of the workshops; 4) the location of Involvement Alley; 5) publicity and communication.

A questionnaire was distributed to the participants at the Action Fair Conference but for various reasons there was a low return on this instrument. However, some of the data from it were instructive. Attendance was cited more times than any other variable as the one that would have improved the Conference. The variables that received the second highest

number of comments were the location of the event and the
workshops. In relation to the latter the complaints were
that: 1) participants could not attend all workshops of
interest; 2) the workshops were superficial and/or not
action-oriented.

It appeared that there was little correlation be-
tween participation in a viewer-discussion group and atten-
dance at the Action Fair Conference. Three-fourths of the
successful group leaders reported that they did not attend
the Fair. Over twice as many of the respondents to the
questionnaire distributed at the Fair indicated that they
had not participated in a viewer-discussion group as those
who had. Also, the responses to this questionnaire sug-
gested that many of the Fair participants were already
involved in organizations concerned with criminal justice
problems; in other words, the "uncommitted" were under-
represented.

Recommendations

The following recommendations seemed warranted
based on the findings of this research.

Initiation of the Project

1. The project staff needs to do an input evalua-
   tion early in the planning for the project.
   The management of the project should be guided
   by some explicit design that is based on a
   determination of the resources available and

necessary and of the best use of the resources in terms of costs and benefits in accomplishing the project goals. PERT or a systems analysis framework might be useful for doing such an evaluation.

2. There should be enough time for planning and other advance preparations to give the sponsoring organization time to carry out its various responsibilities effectively and , what is almost equally important, to give organizations whose cooperation is desired sufficient lead time to work the project into their programs.

3. Some kind of "chain of effects" illustration should be developed so that it is clear to all working with the project how all of the activities to be carried out are related to each other. Such an illustration would be useful for orienting new employees about the project (as well as clarifying the thinking of the project director) and in turn for helping them to communicate about the project to others.

Also, a "chain of effects" illustration might help point out where some activity might be needed that had not been anticipated. For example, the changes that were to come about for the ordinary citizen were to be accomplished by the viewer-discussion activity and the Action

Fair Conference; however, there did not appear
to be much carryover between these two activi-
ties. Being cognizant of the interrelationship
of the two might have alerted the staff to where
special strategies needed to be devised and
implemented.

Issue Identification

4. The issue identification process and the films
   must be acceptable to individuals, groups, and
   organizations with diverse points of view;
   therefore, the project staff should insure, as
   much as possible, that these two aspects of the
   project cannot justifiably be criticized for
   being biased.

Citizens Mobilization

5. The citizens mobilization personnel should be
   carefully screened. For the most part, they are
   the only representatives of the project with
   whom many of the leaders will come in contact
   and their role is very sensitive and crucial.

6. An explicit recruiting strategy needs to be
   developed. Several strategies were discussed
   in this report and one or some combination of
   these would have been applicable to TRUST.

7. Prospective group leaders should be informed
   that friendship is a good basis for selecting

242

group members. The reason for participating given by the second highest number of select participants was "as a favor to a friend."

8. The importance of the viewer-discussion group activity should be stressed to those who are helping to plan the Action Fair Conference and they should also be urged to form groups if possible. Very few of the respondents in the organization representatives survey indicated that they had formed viewer-discussion groups and it had been anticipated by the project director that organizations would be an important source of group leaders.

9. Careful records should be kept of group leaders' names, addresses, telephone numbers, and group identification numbers.

Group Leader Training

10. The viewer-discussion group leaders are an extension of the staff and their training should be carefully planned taking into consideration the findings in this report. Instruction should relate to at least the following areas: group discussion skills; the subject matter of the project; organizing and managing a group; the importance of and the procedure for handling the paperwork properly; organizing and managing a community crime prevention effort or other specific suggestions for action.

Moreover, the group leaders should be given a set of the various materials they will be using in advance of the training session, so that the various questions and problems they might have with the material can be dealt with at the session. Finally, it would probably be helpful to the leaders to see at least one of the films or perhaps excerpts from all of them at the training session.

11. Consideration should be given to the fact that many of the persons that will eventually serve as group leaders will not attend the training. Any tasks which the group leaders will have to carry out should be planned for with this fact in mind.

12. A carefully worked-out discussion outline should be provided for the leaders to use if they wish. Most of the leaders used the Feedback Questionnaires as a discussion agenda to one extent or another even though such use was optional. However, even some of those who attended the group leader training apparently did not use these questionnaires effectively for this purpose.

13. Since most of the "unsuccessful" leaders were males, encourage prospective male group leaders (or possibly all group leaders should be presented this option) to get someone else to

serve as a secretary for the group to handle
responsibilities related to the paperwork.

14. Since in the TRUST project males tended to use
groups that were already organized, such as
classes and church groups, for viewer-
discussion purposes, encourage prospective male
group leaders (and all other group leaders if
it is thought advisable) to use pre-formed
groups for viewer-discussion purposes.

Viewer-Discussion Groups

15. Some means should be devised of ascertaining
how many people are participating in viewer-
discussion groups other than relying on the num-
ber of questionnaires received.

16. Communication with the viewer-discussion groups
during the viewer-discussion activity would
probably greatly enhance the project. Such
communication could be used to foster a sense
of interrelatedness among the viewer groups and
could lessen the dependence on the group leader.

Two of the stations made a half-hour avail-
able after each ". . . And Justice For All"
broadcast. This time was used for panel dis-
cussions which the viewer groups were instructed
not to watch; it could have been used for con-
sidering questions sent in or phoned in by the
groups and for passing on information about the
activities in various groups.

17. The statement "I know what I can do to help improve the criminal justice system" had next to the lowest amount of change on the posttest for the select participants. Perhaps more information on opportunities for personal involvement should have been provided in the printed material and the films. Although one of the purposes of the Action Fair Conference was to provide opportunities for citizens and organizations to join forces in any way they saw fit, there is no guarantee that the viewer-discussion participants will attend the Action Fair Conference so perhaps some of its objectives might have to be incorporated in the viewer-discussion activity in some way.

18. Have a permit-type or "postage paid by addressee" arrangement for mailing back the questionnaires. It is probable that the reason a number of sets of questionnaires were not received was related to difficulties with the postage.

19. The viewer-discussion groups should be contacted by phone after each session to get information on such variables as the number of people who attended, length of session, the nature of the discussion, whether the questionnaires and recordkeeping forms have been returned, and whether any assistance is needed from the project staff.

Cooperating Organizations

20. Some means should be devised of communicating
    to organizations how the project is intended to
    benefit them and for giving suggestions on how
    to use TRUST to further their own goals.

21. Since the most important reason for organiza-
    tional participation was "Wanted to become more
    familiar and/or active with other organizations
    working with criminal justice problems," the
    possibility of forming a consortium could be
    explored during the planning sessions for the
    Action Fair. Also, a session could be provided
    at the Fair for such an exploration and organi-
    zations could be encouraged in advance to send
    representatives to this session.

Action Fair Conference Planning
and Implementation

22. Consideration should be given to the costs as
    well as the benefits of trying to involve a
    number of outsiders in planning. An average of
    25 people participated in the planning for the
    Action Fair; many more were invited to partici-
    pate. Involving these persons helped legitimate
    the Fair and ensure their cooperation. How-
    ever, time was taken up in planning that per-
    haps should have been used for providing a
    longer lead time for publicity, better coordina-
    tion of the workshop offerings, and more

precise communication to the moderators and resource people.

23. Perhaps an effort should be made to identify the criminal justice voluntary organizations that do want more members or volunteers. One of the main purposes of the Action Fair Conference was to enable organizations to recruit new members or volunteers but only 31.5 percent gave this as a reason for participating.

24. There might have been some benefit in having the Action Fair Conference later than it was held; then the time between the end of the viewer-discussion activity and the Action Fair could have been used to disseminate a newsletter about viewer-discussion group activity, thank the group leaders for their cooperation , and in some way enlist the leaders' assistance in getting their members to come. On the other hand, the project director of TRUST had sound reasons for holding the Fair when she did, which were discussed in ChapterIII and both her reasons and this recommendation should be considered in setting the date for the Fair.

25. Have some kind of post-Action Fair communication which summarizes this event sent to Action Fair participants and those who were otherwise involved in the project.

26. Some type of post-Action Fair follow-up activity
    for viewer-discussion participants and coopera-
    ting organizations should be carried out by the
    project sponsor and provided for in the project
    budget.

Evaluation

27. Decide whether the data from the viewer-
    discussion groups will be used primarily for
    "initiatory" or "pragmatic" purposes. If the
    purpose of the data is initiatory, it will be
    used for discussion and problem solving sessions
    involving the viewer-discussion participants.
    If the purpose is pragmatic, the data will be
    used to influence decision makers. Each purpose
    has different implications for the degree of
    control required in the data gathering process
    and for the process of disseminating the find-
    ings which have to be considered (see Hornstein,
    et al., 1971).

28. Questionnaires should be coded according to the
    individual respondent as well as according to
    the group. Since there will be turnover in
    groups, any findings related to group changes
    will be inconclusive and perhaps misleading.

29. There should be better communication to the
    workshop moderators at the Action Fair
    Conference about the ways they are to cooperate

with the evaluation such as getting the reports
of their workshop activity into the project
staff, encouraging participants to stay for the
report-out session, and encouraging those who
cannot stay to complete their evaluation ques-
tionnaires before leaving.

30. Any follow-up survey of organizational repre-
sentatives should be carried out as soon after
the end of the project as possible since there
can be a relatively high degree of employee
or volunteer turnover in the types of organiza-
tions that were involved in TRUST. Also follow-
up can be complicated because people are not at
their places of employment or voluntary work
at fixed hours.

31. Avoid trying to find out whether group leaders
or organizational representatives were satis-
fied with their experience with the project
by asking questions related to future partici-
pation. Such questions might be interpreted as
an actual solicitation to participate in
another project, and the respondent could be
unwilling for reasons unrelated to satisfac-
tion with the previous experience.

32. The covering letter for follow-up questionnaires
to group leaders should clearly explain the
purpose for the evaluation (i.e., that they are

not being judged--the project is). Otherwise, they might feel defensive if they feel their groups did not accomplish very much (see page 104).

33. For evaluating organization benefit, it might be useful to develop several questionnaires, each related to different ones of the activities listed on page 2 of the Follow-Up Questionnaire for organizational representatives. The degree of organization involvement in TRUST could vary from participation in one of a series of planning meetings to participation in nine or so other ways.

34. In constructing the questionaire for organizational representatives and interpreting the findings the evaluator should bear in mind at least two other things: 1) some individuals, although perhaps they were contacted to participate because of their affiliation with some organization, were acting as individuals and did not attempt to involve their organizations; 2) interorganizational rivalry has to be considered, on the one hand, and the organizational respondent's possible loyalty to COPE on the other.

Some Concluding Observations

This research should be of value to those wishing to make use of the interactive media process for the purpose of citizens participation in general and for the purpose of bringing about improvement in the criminal justice system in particular. However, before this process can be used effectively for those purposes research needs to be done in relation to the following:

1. an identification of the activities necessary to change the subsequent behavior of the viewer-discussion participants. For example, would the carrying out of task assignments or having outside resource persons meet with the groups really make any difference, or can the contents of the television programs be used more effectively in some way to motivate future action

2. an exploration of the procedures that will get the less well-educated to participate

3. an exploration of some mechanisms that will provide on-going opportunities for the various voluntary organizations, community groups, and governmental agencies concerned with criminal justice to interact, since the desire for such interaction was the most important reason organizations participated in TRUST

4. the development of a procedure for measuring the attainment of action objectives since the

acquisition of certain feelings and/or information does not necessarily lead to action.

5. Finally, the term "citizen participation" was used in this report but the varieties of points of view on the definitions, purposes, and processes related to this term were not examined. Before the full potentiality of the interactive media process as a mechanism for citizen participation can be realized it seems that such an examination would need to be made.

Table 4

Distribution of TRUST Viewer-Discussion Participants by Sex

Sex	Program I	Program II	Program III	Program IV
Female	616 (53.6%)	455 (56.5%)	382 (55.7%)	334 (58.9%)
Male	614 (45.9%)	338 (41.9%)	296 (43.1%)	230 (40.6%)
No Response	7 (0.5%)	13 (1.6%)	8 (1.2%)	3 (0.5%)

Table 5

Distribution of TRUST Viewer-Discussion Participants by Age

Age Category	Program I	Program II	Program III	Program IV
20 or less	628 (46.9%)	250 (21.0%)	204 (29.7%)	163 (28.7%)
21-29	216 (16.1%)	159 (19.7%)	131 (19.1%)	99 (17.5%)
30-39	212 (15.8%)	153 (19.0%)	156 (22.7%)	131 (23.1%)
40-49	139 (10.4%)	119 (14.8%)	98 (14.3%)	75 (13.2%)
50-59	80 (6.0%)	70 (8.7%)	51 (7.4%)	58 (10.2%)
60 & over	58 (4.3%)	41 (5.1%)	38 (5.5%)	39 (6.9%)
No answer	5 (0.4%)	14 (1.7%)	8 (1.2%)	2 (0.4%)

Table 6

Distribution of TRUST Viewer-Discussion Participants
by Racial/Ethnic Background

Racial Category	Program I	Program II	Program III	Program IV
Black	327 (24.4%)	129 (16.0%)	101 (14.7%)	90 (15.9%)
Latino	46 (3.4%)	19 (2.4%)	19 (2.8%)	8 (1.4%)
White	935 (69.9%)	638 (79.2%)	552 (80.5%)	460 (81.1%)
Other	17 (1.3%)	3 (0.4%)	8 (1.2%)	4 (0.7%)
No answer	13 (1.0%)	17 (2.1%)	6 (0.9%)	5 (0.9%)

Table 7

Distribution of TRUST Viewer-Discussion
Participants by Education

Highest Level of Formal Education Completed	Program I	Program II	Program III	Program IV
8th grade or less	73 (5.5%)	55 (6.8%)	50 (7.3%)	48 (8.5%)
some high school	311 (23.2%)	58 (7.2%)	60 (8.7%)	39 (6.9%)
high school graduate	207 (15.5%)	97 (12.0%)	83 (12.1%)	58 (10.2%)
some college	438 (32.7%)	340 (42.2%)	246 (35.9%)	186 (32.8%)
college graduate or more	296 (22.1%)	236 (29.3%)	240 (35%)	236 (41.6%)
no answer	13 (1.0%)	20 (2.5%)	7 (1.0%)	0 (0.00%)

Table 8

Distribution of TRUST Viewer-Discussion Participants by Residence Area

Zip Code Area	Program I	Program II	Program III	Program IV
North City	65 (4.9%)	54 (6.7%)	68 (9.9%)	55 (9.7%)
Northwest City	19 (1.4%)	9 (1.1%)	11 (1.6%)	10 (1.8%)
South City	12 (0.9%)	12 (1.5%)	2 (0.3%)	0 (0%)
Southwest City	60 (4.5%)	62 (7.7%)	52 (7.6%)	34 (6.0%)
Black South City	231 (17.3%)	120 (14.9%)	102 (14.9%)	100 (17.6%)
Black West City	70 (5.2%)	23 (2.9%)	19 (2.8%)	7 (1.2%)
West Suburbs	200 (14.9%)	90 (11.2%)	92 (13.4%)	79 (13.9%)
North Suburbs	473 (35.4%)	273 (33.9%)	296 (43.1%)	236 (41.6%)
South Suburbs	164 (12.3%)	119 (14.8%)	22 (3.2%)	27 (4.8%)
Don't Know	1 (0.1%)	2 (0.2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
No Answer	43 (3.2%)	42 (5.2%)	22 (3.2%)	19 (3.4%)

APPENDIX B

Project T.R.U.S.T.

FIRST VIEWER DISCUSSION GROUP MEETING -- FEEDBACK QUESTIONNAIRE

Note # 1: This questionnaire has two parts. The first part, consisting of
questions 1 - 21, should be filled out <u>before</u> the TV program. The
remaining questions should be filled out after the program.

Note # 2: By the "Criminal Justice System" we mean those agencies for
enforcing the criminal laws and punishing or rehabilitating
offenders, that is, police, courts, corrections.

**FOR EACH NUMBERED QUESTION, PLEASE CIRCLE ONLY ONE ANSWER CODE UNLESS OTHERWISE
INSTRUCTED.**

1. What is the most important reason you are participating in this
discussion group? Please read the complete list, then circle
only one answer.

> I want to learn more about criminal
> justice problems 01
>
> I want a chance to express my feelings
> about criminal justice problems 02
>
> I like to meet new people or neighbors . . . 03
>
> I have a general concern about crime 04   6,7
>
> I want to do something about crime in
> my community 05
>
> As a favor to a friend 06
>
> Because I am a member of a group working
> to solve criminal justice problems 07
>
> I want to do something to improve the
> criminal justice system 08
>
> The chance to be involved in an activity
> with my friends 09
>
> Other (please specify) _____
>
> _____ 10

-2-

For questions 2 - 11, please circle <u>only one answer code for each item.</u> The answer codes are the numbers printed to the right of each item to indicate if you strongly agree, agree, are uncertain about, disagree or strongly disagree with that item.

		STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNCERTAIN	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	
2.	I know how the criminal justice system works	1	2	3	4	5	8
3.	I know why the criminal justice system does not seem to work as it should . . .	1	2	3	4	5	9
4.	I know what changes need to be made in the criminal justice system	1	2	3	4	5	10
5.	I know what I can do to help improve the criminal justice system	1	2	3	4	5	11
6.	I should work personally for improvements in the criminal justice system	1	2	3	4	5	12
7.	In the future, I would like to participate in another TV-discussion group like this one, on another topic	1	2	3	4	5	13
8.	I know how to get in contact with other people interested in improving the criminal justice system . .	1	2	3	4	5	14
9.	I know how to get information about the criminal justice system	1	2	3	4	5	15
10.	I feel free to make my feelings about the criminal justice system known to public officials	1	2	3	4	5	16
11.	I feel my views about the criminal justice system will make a difference to public officials	1	2	3	4	5	17

12. How concerned do you think you are about community problems?

Very concerned 1   18

Somewhat concerned 2

Not concerned at all 3

13. How active are you in community affairs?

Very active 1   19

Somewhat active 2

Not active at all 3

14. What is your sex?   Female 1   20

Male 2

15. In which age group are you?

20 or less 1   21

21 - 29 2

30 - 39 3

40 - 49 4

50 - 59 5

60 and over 6

16. What is your racial/ethnic background?

Black 1   22

Latino 2

White 3

Other (please specify)

_____ . . 4

-4-

17. How much formal education have you completed?

                             8th grade or less 1   23

                             Some high school 2

                             High school graduate 3

                             Some college 4

                             College graduate or more . . 5

18. What is your zip code?

                        ___ ___ ___ ___ ___   24-28

19. Excluding traffic offenses, have you ever come in contact with the criminal justice system as a . . .

(Please circle one answer code for each lettered row.)

                                  YES NO

                   a. Juror?   1   2   29

                   b. Witness / Complainant? 1   2   30

                   c. Defendant? 1   2   31

20. Excluding traffic offenses, have any of your relatives or close friends ever been a juror, witness, complainant or defendant?

                              Yes 1   32

                              No 2

21. In general, how would you rate your political views?

                              Very conservative 1   33

                              Somewhat conservative 2

                              Somewhat liberal 3

                              Very liberal 4

STOP HERE.

Please complete the remaining questions after the television program.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

-5-

A.   The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals
     has selected five crimes for special crime reduction efforts. These five
     crimes were selected for two main reasons:

         *Their costs to the citizen in fear, psychological damage,
          and mistrust (in addition to economic losses) and

         *The rate of these crimes can be assessed and controlled.

     From the following list of ten crimes, circle the _five_ you think the
     National Advisory Commission has selected for special crime reduction
     efforts.

         1. murder-homicide   6. kidnapping

         2. embezzlement   7. robbery

         3. forcible rape   8. prostitution

         4. fraud   9. burglary (breaking and entering)

         5. assault (with a   10. drug abuse
             deadly weapon or
             intent to kill)

B.   Among the five top priority crimes, the National Advisory Commission
     feels that the greatest reduction can occur in two of them. Which
     two would you select?

     1. _____   2. _____

                     [See last page for answers.]

22A From the list of ten crimes above, list in order of priority the
     three crimes you think the police in your community should concentrate
     on. Please list them _by number_, for example, "drug abuse" is No. 10.

                         Highest priority . . . . ____   34,35

                         Second priority . . . . ____   36,37

                         Third priority . . . . . ____   38,39

22B In the same way, please list in order of priority the
     three crimes you think should be given special efforts on
     the _national_ level.

                         Highest priority . . . . ____

                         Second priority . . . . ____

                         Third priority . . . . . ____

Some people feel that the laws ought to be changed so that certain acts
that are now considered criminal would be a matter of private morality
or handled by some social agency, rather than the criminal justice system.
Such reform, it is suggested, would allow the criminal justice system to
concentrate on crimes involving violence and stealing.

                         GO ON TO NEXT PAGE

-6-

Please indicate how you feel about these matters by responding
to the following statements:

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNCERTAIN	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	
23. Gambling should not be treated as a crime	1	2	3	4	5	40
24. The possession and use of marijuana should not be treated as a crime . . .	1	2	3	4	5	41
25. The use of hard drugs should not be treated as a crime	1	2	3	4	5	42
26. Prostitution should not be treated as a crime . . .	1	2	3	4	5	43

27. From the list below, please circle the code numbers for the 2 or 3
criminal justice problems or topics that interest you the most. The
code numbers are to the right of the items. Please read the complete
list before circling your answers.

Organizing neighborhood activities to reduce crime . 01
Improving our jails and prisons 02
Probation, parole and furlough programs 03
Job opportunities and training for ex-offenders . . 04
Protecting the rights of the accused 05
White collar crime 06
Legalizing victimless crimes like gambling,
  prostitution 07
Better police-community relations 08
Legal aid for the poor 09
Juvenile delinquency 10
Careers / Jobs in criminal justice 11
Gun control laws 12
Merit selection of judges 13
Community programs for adult offenders 14
Community programs for juvenile offenders 15
Reform of the court system 16

Other (please specify) _____

44,45

46,47

48,49

_____ . . 17

-7-

ANSWERS TO THE QUESTION PERTAINING TO THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE STANDARDS AND GOALS QUESTION ON PAGE 5.

QUESTION A.   Homicide, rape, assault, robbery and burglary.

QUESTION B.   Robbery and burglary.

REASONS CITED FOR THESE ANSWERS

1.   Robbery and burglary are committed for material gain. Society and the criminal justice system can direct many delinquent youth and ex-offenders to legal means of economic gain so that the attraction of the "easy money" of hold-ups and break-ins will be less important.

2.   Usually burglary and robbery are committed by persons who are strangers to the victims.

3.   Burglary and robbery take place in environments that can be changed to reduce criminal opportunity. Relatively easy deterent strategies are available: for example, police patrols, street lighting, citizen crime prevention activities, speedy and effective court dispositions.

Homicide, assault, and forcible rape are less easily controlled for the following reasons:

1.   Many of these crimes are committed by acquaintances and are not affected by ordinary deterent strategies. (Note the murder situation in the T.V. programs.)

2.   Victims of assault and homicide frequently provoke criminal attacks by their own speech and actions. (Note murder situation in T.V. programs.)

3.   A change in values is needed to reduce these crimes -- more respect for others and a willingness to settle disputes by means other than violence.

Project T.R.U.S.T.

FOURTH DISCUSSION GROUP MEETING -- FEEDBACK QUESTIONNAIRE

Note: Please fill out the first part of this questionnaire (items 1 through 8) at the end of the TV program.

Then please fill out the remainder of the questions after the discussion. The discussion should stop 15 minutes earlier than usual in order to do that.

(FOR EACH NUMBERED QUESTION, PLEASE CIRCLE ONLY ONE ANSWER CODE UNLESS OTHERWISE INSTRUCTED.)

1.   I believe the major reason many employers are reluctant to hire ex-offenders is . . .

   The other employees would resent it 1   6

   Ex-offenders don't have the necessary job skills. . . 2

   Ex-offenders probably don't have the proper
   work habits and attitudes 3

   Fear that the ex-offender would commit another crime. 4

In your neighborhood, how effective do you think the following groups are in dealing with the problems of crime? Are they very effective, somewhat effective, or not at all effective? Please circle one answer code for each numbered row.

	VERY EFFECTIVE	SOMEWHAT EFFECTIVE	NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE	
2. The police?	1	2	3	7
3. The schools?	1	2	3	8
4. Community groups?. . .	1	2	3	9

At present, the Criminal Justice System has the major responsibility for the rehabilitation of ex-offenders. But some people say that ordinary citizens should take more responsibility by oranizing volunteer programs like halfway houses, counseling programs, and helping ex-offenders get jobs. How much of that kind of responsibility do you think people in your community or neighborhood should take? Please circle only one answer code for each numbered row.

	MORE RESPONSIBILITY	ABOUT THE SAME	LESS RESPONSIBILITY	
5. Establishment of halfway houses for ex-offenders convicted of crimes like theft	1	2	2	10
6. Halfway houses for ex-drug addicts. .	1	2	3	11
7. Help ex-offenders get jobs	1	2	3	12
8. Counseling programs for ex-offenders and their families.	1	2	3	13

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS AFTER THE DISCUSSION.

Please circle one answer code to the right of each statement below to indicate whether you strongly agree, agree, are uncertain about, disagree or strongly disagree with that statement.

		STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	UNCERTAIN	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	
9.	I know how the criminal justice system works	1	2	3	4	5	14
10.	I know why the criminal justice system does not seem to work as it should . .	1	2	3	4	5	15
11.	I know what changes need to be made in the criminal justice system	1	2	3	4	5	16
12.	I know what I can do to help improve the criminal justice system	1	2	3	4	5	17
13.	I should work personally for improvements in the criminal justice system . . .	1	2	3	4	5	18
14.	In the future, I would like to participate in another TV-discussion group like this one, on another topic .	1	2	3	4	5	19
15.	I know how to get in contact with other people interested in improving the criminal justice system .	1	2	3	4	5	20
16.	I know how to get information about the criminal justice system	1	2	3	4	5	21
17.	I feel free to make my feelings about the criminal justice system known to public officials	1	2	3	4	5	22
18.	I feel my views about the criminal justice system will make a difference to public officials	1	2	3	4	5	23

-3-

19. What is your sex?

Female 1   24

Male 2

20. In which age group are you?

20 or less 1   25

21 - 29 2

30 - 39 3

40 - 49 4

50 - 59 5

60 and over 6

21. What is your racial/ethnic background?

Black 1   26

Latino 2

White 3

Other (Please specify)

_____ 4

22. How much formal education have you completed?

8th grade or less 1   27

Some high school 2

High School graduate . . 3

Some college 4

College graduate or more 5

23. What is your zip code?

____ ____ ____ ____ ____   28-32

24. Excluding traffic offenses, have you ever come in contact with the criminal justice system as a . . .

(Please circle one answer code for each lettered row).   YES NO

a) Juror? 1 2   33

b) Witness/Complainant . . 1 2   34

c) Defendant? 1 2   35

-4-

25. Excluding traffic offenses, have any of your relatives or
     friends ever been a juror, witness, complainant or defendant?

                                        Yes 1   36

                                        No 2

SATISFACTION WITH PARTICIPATION

26. How well do you think the four T.V. programs helped you to better
     understand the problems of the Criminal justice system?

                                        Very well . . . 1   37

                                        Moderately well . 2

                                        Poorly 3

27. How well do you think the discussions have helped you to better
     understand the problems of the criminal justice system?

                                        Very well . . . 1   38

                                        Moderately well . 2

                                        Poorly 3

28. From my experiences in the viewer discussion groups, I think I
     learned the most from.....

     (Please circle only one answer number.)

                                 The T. V. Program 1   39

                                 The discussions 2

                                 The Background materials 3

                                 The "Learning by Experience"
                                            Activities . . . 4

                                 The Resource Booklet, "Avenues
                                            to Involvement . . . 5

29. Please indicate which one of the four T.V. programs you liked best.

          First,   "And Justice for All". 1   40

          Second,   "Fear, Crime and Prevention" 2

          Third,   "Justice and the Criminal Courts". 3

          Last,   "The Role of the Community". 4

30.   Did you participate in the first viewer/discussion group?

Yes 1   41

No 2

PROJECT TRUST FOLLOW-UP

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE ANSWER FOR EACH QUESTION UNLESS OTHERWISE
INSTRUCTED.

1. How many times did your group meet to watch and discuss the "...And Justice
for All" programs?

once _____

twice _____
three times _____
four times _____

2. Did your viewer-discussion group meet at the same place each session?

yes _____

no _____

3. Where did your group meet?

In your home _____

In the home of another group member _____

other (Please specify.) _____

4. Did your group watch the "... And Justice for All" programs together?

yes _____

no _____

5. What time did your group watch the programs?

Fridays, 8:00 P.M. _____

Mondays, 11:00 A.M. _____

Fridays, 1:30 P.M. _____

Mondays, 8:00 P.M. _____

6. Was your viewer-discussion session a part of a meeting that was usually held at that time
for some other purpose?

yes _____ (Please answer question A below.)

no _____ (Go on to question 7.)

A. What was the name and/or purpose of the group usually meeting
at that time? _____
_____

PROJECT TRUST FOLLOW-UP   2.

7. Before participating in the TRUST Project, were you employed by or a member of
an organization which deals with criminal justice issues?

yes _____ (Please answer question A below.)

no _____ (Go on to question 8.)

A. Is the organization a

private, non-profit organization _____

governmental agency _____

other (Please specify.) _____

8. How were you recruited to be a viewer-discussion group leader for the TRUST
Project?

by one of the citizens mobilization personnel on the TRUST staff _____

by a member of an organization to which you belong _____

other (Please specify.) _____

9. Were you the discussion leader for each session?

yes _____ (Go on to question 10.)

no _____ (Please answer question A below.)

A. If "no," please explain why. _____
_____

10. Before the TRUST Project, what was your relationship with the people who parti-
cipated in your viewer-discussion group?

They were your neighbors. _____

They were your co-workers. _____

They were members of an organization to which you belong. _____

other (Please explain.) _____

11. Before the TRUST Project, how well acquainted with each other were the people
in your viewer-discussion group?

Everyone knew each other. _____

Most of them knew each other. _____

Few of them knew each other. _____
None of them knew each other _____

12. Did you attend one of the training sessions for group leaders sponsored by the
TRUST staff?

yes _____ (Please answer question A.)

no _____ (Go on to question 13.)

a. If "yes," how would you rate the training session in terms of how
well it prepared you to serve as a discussion leader for the TRUST
Project?

excellent _____

good _____

fair _____

poor _____

13. Before the TRUST Project, had you had any formal training for leading a discussion group?

yes _____

no _____

14. Before the TRUST Project, how much experience as a group discussion leader
had you had?

no previous experience _____

little previous experience _____

some previous experience _____

quite a bit of previous experience _____

15. How do you feel that your knowledge about criminal justice issues affected your
performance as a discussion leader?

I knew enough about criminal justice issues to do well as a discussion leader. _____

I would have been a better discussion leader if I had known more about criminal
justice issues. _____

My knowledge about criminal justice issues did not affect my performance as a
discussion leader. _____

16. How would you rate your knowledge about group discussion techniques at the time
you participated in the TRUST Project?

I knew enough about discussion techniques to lead the group effectively. _____

I could have used more training related to group discussion techniques. _____

17. In general, how did you try to guide the discussion?

I tried to have as many members as possible discuss the issues without trying
to reach any conclusions. _____

I tried to get the group to reach conclusions about the issues as individuals but
not necessarily to present their conclusions to the group. _____

I encouraged group decision on the issues but did not tie that decision in with
any commitment to group or individual action. _____

I encouraged group decisions and group action upon those decisions. _____

18. On the average, how long were your discussion periods?

30 minutes or less _____

45 minutes to an hour _____

over and hour _____

19. On the average, how much of your discussions was related to the items on the
Feedback Questionnaires?

none _____

very little _____

some _____

quite a bit _____

20. In general, how do you think most of your group members felt about filling out
the Feedback Questionnaires?

They didn't mind at all. _____

They were somewhat unwilling to fill them out. _____

They were very unwilling to fill them out. _____

21. How much explanation did you have to give about the purposes of the Feedback
Questionnaires?

no explanation _____

a little explanation _____

quite a bit of explanation _____

22. In general, how interested do you think most of the members of your group were
in finding out how their answers on the Feedback Questionnaires compared with
those of participants in other discussion groups?

not interested at all _____

somewhat interested _____

very interested _____

23. Usually there were group discussions about criminal justice problems on televi-
sion immediately following the "...And Justice for All" films. Did your group
watch these discussions?

yes _____

no _____

APPENDIX D (continued)

'4. How many members of your group do you think read the Participants Handbook
    for the TRUST Project?
    none of them _____
    a few of them _____
    most of them _____
    all of them _____

'5. Were there any "task assignments" carried out by any of your group members?
    yes _____
    no _____

'6. How much did you encourage them to do the "task assignments"?
    I did not encourage them at all. _____
    I encouraged them some. _____
    I encouraged them quite a bit. _____

!7. Why do you think most of the members of your group participated in the TRUST
    Project?
    They were interested in learning more about criminal justice problems. _____
    They were interested in doing something about criminal justice problems. _____
    They were more interested in social contact with the other members of the
    group than in criminal justice problems. _____
    other (Please specify.) _____
    _____

?8. During the TRUST Project, did you have any problems for which you had to contact
    the TRUST staff?
    yes _____ (Please answer questions A and B below.)
    no _____ (Go on to question 29.)

        A. If "yes," what was the nature of the problem? _____
        _____

        B. How helpful was the staff in solving the problem?
           very helpful _____
           somewhat helpful _____
           not helpful at all _____

29. If a similar project were to be offered, would you participate as a discussion
    leader?

---

    yes _____
    uncertain _____
    no _____

30. If a similar project were to be offered, how many members of your viewer-
    discussion group do you think would participate?
    all of them _____
    most of them _____
    few of them _____
    none of them _____

31. Did you attend the Action Fair Conference?
    yes _____
    no _____

32. As a result of the TRUST Project, has your group or any of its members that
    you're aware of carried out any activity in relation to criminal justice pro-
    blems?
    yes _____ (Please describe the activity on the last page of this questionnaire.)
    no _____

33. If another project like TRUST were being planned, how do you think it could
    be improved in relation to the following items. Comment on as many as you
    wish.
    training sessions for group leaders _____
    _____
    Feedback Questionnaires _____
    _____
    television programs _____
    _____
    assistance from the TRUST staff _____
    _____
    other _____
    _____

34. Please add any comments you have on your experience as a group discussion leader in the TRUST Project that were not brought out in the foregoing questions.

_____

_____

_____

35. How concerned do you think you are about community problems?

very concerned _____

somewhat concerned _____

not concerned at all _____

36. How active are you in community affairs?

very active _____

somewhat active _____

not active at all _____

37. What is your sex?

female _____

male _____

38. In which age group are you?

20 or less _____

21 - 30 _____

31 - 40 _____

41 - 50 _____

51 - 60 _____

61 and over _____

39. What is your racial/ethnic background?

Black _____

Latino _____

White _____

other _____ (Please specify.) _____

40. How much formal education have you completed?

8th grade or less _____

some high school _____

high school graduate _____

some college _____

college graduate or more _____

41. What is your zip code? _____

42. your name (optional) _____

Describe group or individual activities here (see question 32).

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

Return to: Jane Karie Browne
Northwestern University
School of Education
2003 Sheridan Road
Evanston, Illinois 60201

PROJECT TRUST FOLLOW-UP

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE ANSWER FOR EACH QUESTION UNLESS OTHERWISE
            INSTRUCTED.

1. How were you recruited to be a viewer-discussion group leader for the TRUST
   project?

   by one of the citizens mobilization personnel on the TRUST staff _____
   by a member of an organization to which you belong _____
   other (Please specify.) _____

2. Before the TRUST Project, what was your relationship with the people who par-
   ticipated in your viewer-discussion group?

   They were your neighbors. _____
   They were your co-workers. _____
   They were members of an organization to which you belong. _____
   other (Please explain.) _____

3. Before the TRUST Project, how well acquainted with each other were the people
   in your viewer-discussion group?

   Everyone knew each other. _____
   Most of them knew each other. _____
   Few of them knew each other. _____
   None of them knew each other. _____

4. Was your viewer-discussion group session a part of a meeting that was usually
   held at that time for some other purpose?

   yes _____ (Please answer question A below.)
   no _____ (Go on to question 5.)

        A. What was the name and/or purpose of the group usually meeting
           at that time?

           _____

           _____

5. Before participating in the TRUST Project, were you employed by or a member of
   an organization which deals with criminal justice issues?

   yes _____ (Please answer question A below.)
   no _____ (Go on to question 6.)

        A. Is the organization a

           private, non-profit organization _____
           governmental agency _____
           other (Please specify.) _____

6. Did you attend one of the training sessions for group leaders sponsored by the
   TRUST staff?

   yes _____ Please answer question A below.)
   no _____ (Go on to question 7.)

                A. If "yes," how would you rate the training session in terms of
                   how well it prepared you to serve as a discussion leader for
                   the TRUST Project?

                   excellent _____
                   good _____
                   fair _____
                   poor _____

7. Before the TRUST Project, had you had any formal training for leading a discus-
   sion group?

   yes _____
   no _____

8. Before the TRUST Project, how much experience as a group discussion leader had
   you had?

   no previous experience _____
   little previous experience _____
   some previous experience _____
   quite a bit of previous experience _____

9. How do you feel that your knowledge about criminal justice issues affected your
   performance as a discussion leader?

   I knew enough about criminal justice issues to do well as a discussion leader. _____

   I would have been a better discussion leader if I had known more about criminal
   justice issues _____

   My knowledge about criminal justice issues did not affect my performance as a
   discussion leader. _____

10. How would you rate your knowledge about group discussion techniques at the time
    you participated in the TRUST Project?

    I knew enough about discussion techniques to lead the group effectively. _____
    I could have used more training related to group discussion techniques. _____

11 Why do you think most of the members of your group participated in the TRUST
   Project?

   They were interested in learning more about criminal justice problems. _____
   They were interested in doing something about criminal justice problems. _____

PROJECT TRUST FOLLOW-UP

They were more interested in social contact with the other members of the group than in criminal justice problems. _____

other _____ (Please specify.)_____

_____

12. During the TRUST Project, did you have any problems for which you had to contact the TRUST staff?

yes _____ (Please answer questions A and B below.)

no _____ (Go on to question 13.)

    A. If "yes," what was the nature of the problem? _____

_____

    B. How helpful was the staff in solving the problem?

      very helpful _____

      somewhat helpful _____

      not helpful at all _____

13. If a similar project were to be offered, would you participate as a discussion leader?

yes _____

uncertain _____

no _____

14. If another project like TRUST were being planned, how do you think it could be improved in relation to the following items? Comment on as many as you wish.

training sessions for group leaders _____

_____

Feedback Questionnaires _____

_____

television programs _____

_____

assistance from the TRUST staff _____

_____

other _____

_____

(over)

PROJECT TRUST FOLLOW-UP

15. How many times did your viewer-discussion group meet?

once _____
twice _____
three times _____
four times _____

16. If your group did not meet for all four sessions, please briefly explain why.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

17. Please add any comments you have on your experience as a group discussion leader in the TRUST Project that were not brought out in the foregoing questions.

_____

_____

_____

18. How concerned do you think you are about community problems?
very concerned _____
somewhat concerned _____
not concerned at all _____

19. How active are you in community affairs?

very active _____
somewhat active _____
not active at all _____

20. What is your sex?
female _____
male _____

21. In which age group are you?
20 or less _____
21 - 30 _____
31 - 40 _____
41 - 50 _____
51 - 60 _____
61 and over _____

22. What is your racial/ethnic background?
Black _____
Latino _____
White _____
other _____ (Please specify.)_____

23. How much formal education have you completed?
8th grade or less _____
some high school _____
high school graduate _____
some college _____
college graduate or more _____

24. What is your zip code? _____

25. Your name (optional)

_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

RETURN TO: Jane Marie Browne
Northwestern University
School of Education
2003 Sheridan Road
Evanston, Illinois 60201

273

PROJECT TRUST FOLLOW-UP

Name of organization: _____

Name of contact person: _____

One of the stated purposes of the TRUST Project was to: "strengthen support for cooperating organizations and their programs." The project was designed to do this in various ways:

· 1. by using the "...And Justice for All" programs, other television and radio efforts, and printed materials to call general attention to the vital role that private groups play in reducing crime;

2. by providing organizations with --

· a. a focal point around which you might gather your members and/or potential members in joint exploration of criminal justice problems;

b. an opportunity for cross-interest group interaction;

c. information to make you more knowledgeable about criminal justice problems and your possible role in relation to these problems;

d. a further opportunity to promote and publicize your activities;

e. resource material to assist you in pursuing goals you might deem desirable.

I. Of the above stated ways that the TRUST Project was designed to benefit organizations, how many were you and/or your organization aware of during the planning and implementation of the project? Please check one of the following.

· a. all of them _____

b. most of them _____

c. few of them _____

d. none of them _____

PROJECT TRUST FOLLOW-UP

II. Our records indicate that you (and/or another representative from your organization) participated in the TRUST Project in the ways checked (✓) below. Please put an X in the blank for, or describe, any additional activity in which you had organizational participation.

a. helped on the advisory committee for issue identification _____

b. helped on the advisory committee for developing the contents of the "... And Justice for All" films _____

c. appeared in the "...And Justice for All" films _____

d. appeared in a panel on television immediately following the " ... And Justice for All" films _____

e. distributed literature about the Action Fair Conference _____

f. helped in the general planning for the Action Fair Conference _____

g. organized and/or participated in a workshop at the Action Fair Conference _____

h. participated in Involvement Alley at the Action Fair Conference _____

i. formed a viewer-discussion group _____

j. was listed in Avenues to Involvement _____

k. other (Please describe.) *_____

_____

_____

III. What was the total number of your organization members involved in the activities checked above? Please check one of the following.

1 - 3 _____

4 - 6 _____

7 - 9 _____

10 or more _____

I don't know. _____

* Use back of last page for any answer requiring more space.

3

PROJECT TRUST FOLLOW-UP

IV.   Would you indicate the reasons that your organization participated

in the TRUST Project. Please check as many as apply.

a. wanted to educate or inform your members about criminal justice prlblems _____
b. saw opportunity to publicize and promote your organization's activities _____
c. wanted to involve your members in some future activity _____
d. hoped to get more volunteers or members _____
e. wanted to become more familiar and/or active with other organizations

  'working with criminal justice problems _____

f. other (Please describe.) _____

_____

_____

   V. Please respond to each of the following statements by circling either

"yes" or "no." If your answer is "yes," briefly explain on the "Comment"

lines how the TRUST Project helped your organization in relation to the

activity described.

a. The TRUST Project helped us to educate or inform our members about criminal

    justice problems. yes   no

Comment: _____

_____

b. The TRUST Project helped us to promote and publicize our activities. yes   no

Comment: _____

_____

c. The TRUST Project helped us to involve our members in some future activity. .

    yes   no

Comment: _____

_____

PROJECT TRUST FOLLOW-UP

d. The TRUST Project helped us to get more volunteers or members. yes   no

Comment: _____

_____

e. The TRUST Project helped us to become more familiar and/or active with

other organizations working with criminal justice problems. yes   no

Comment: _____

_____

f. The TRUST Project helped our organization in the following way(s) not

covered in statements a through e in item V. _____

_____

_____

VI. Which of the following statements is true about your organization's parti-

cipation in the TRUST Project? Please check only one of them.

a. Our organization got more benefit from the TRUST Project than the effort

we put into it. _____

b. Our organization got about the same amount of benefit from the TRUST Project

as the effort we put into it. _____

c. Our organization got less benefit from the TRUST Project than the effort we

put into it. _____

VII. Please describe what you think your organization could have done to

increase the benefit it got from the TRUST Project. _____

_____

_____

VIII. Please describe what you think the TRUST Project staff could have done

to increase the benefit your organization got from participating in this project.

_____

PROJECT TRUST FOLLOW-UP

IX. If this type of program were to be repeated, would your organization participate in it. Please check one of the following responses.

yes _____

uncertain _____

no _____

    If your answer is "no" or "uncertain," please state briefly why.

_____

_____

_____

_____

X. Please give any additional comments about your organization's participation in the TRUST Project that were not brought out by the foregoing questions.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Name: _____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

RETURN TO: Jane Marie Browne
               Northwestern University
               School of Education
               2003 Sheridan Road
               Evanston, Illinois 60201

APPENDIX F (continued)

T.R.U.S.T. 53 W. Jackson, Rm. 235, Chicago 60604

A program To Reshape Urban Systems Together

ACTION FAIR CONFERENCE FEEDBACK QUESTIONNAIRE -- DEC. 7, 1974

YOUR RESPONSE as an Action Fair Conference participant will help us to
evaluate the Conference and plan future events. PLEASE COMPLETE THE
QUESTIONNAIRE AND TURN IN TO REGISTRATION DESK BEFORE LEAVING. Thank you!

1. Which of the four TV programs in the series "...And Justice For All"
    did you see? Please circle "yes" or "no" for each program you saw.

    a. Program I, "Crime, Criminals & The System"   Yes   No

    b. Program II, "Fear, Crime and Prevention"   Yes   No

    c. Program III, "Justice & The Criminal Courts"   Yes   No

    d. Program IV, "The Role of the Community"   Yes   No

2. Did you participate in a viewing-discussion group? Yes   No

3. If you participated in a viewing discussion group, how many sessions
    did you attend? Please circle the letter in front of your answer.

            a. once

            b. twice

            c. three times

            d. all four sessions

4. How did you hear about the Action Fair Conference? Please circle
    as many as apply.

    a. I received an invitation in the mail.

    b. I heard an announcement on radio or TV, or saw
        it in a newspaper.

    c. A friend or acquaintance told me about it.

    e. People from T.R.U.S.T. called me on the phone.

    f. Other: _____.

PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.

5. The most important reason I came to the Action Fair Conference
    was (circle only one answer):

    a. I want to take action on a specific problem, which is:

        _____.

    b. I work for an agency or organization that is involved
        in these issues.

    c. I was invited to take part in a panel discussion.

    d. A friend or acquaintance asked me to come.

    e. I belong to an organization concerned about these issues.

    f. I have a general concern about crime and/or the criminal
        justice system.

    g. I want to do something about crime in my own community.

    h. I want to learn more about criminal justice problems
        and solutions.

    i. Other:_____.

6. Did the Action Fair Conference help you accomplish your objectives
    for coming? Circle only one answer.

    a. Yes   b. Uncertain   c. No

7. The most valuable thing about the Conference for me was (circle one):

    a. Getting printed material -- "Involvement Alley"

    b. Participating in the workshops

    c. Meeting people

    d. Other: _____.

8. At the Action Fair Conference I took part in the following
    workshops (please list):

    a. _____

    b. _____

    c. _____

PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.

3

9. As a result of my participation in the Action Fair Conference, I plan to:

_____

_____

_____

10. How do you think the Conference could have been improved? _____

_____

_____

_____

11. How concerned do you think you are about community problems in general?

    a. Very concerned.   b. Somewhat concerned.   c. Not concerned at all.

12. How active are you in community affairs?

    a. Very active.   b. Somewhat active.   c. Not active at all.

13. Are you presently working with a group involved in criminal justice problems?

    a. Yes   b. No

    If yes, is it a private non-profit organization or a government agency?

    a. Private non-profit organization   b. government agency

14. What is your sex?

    a. Male   b. Female

            PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.

4

15. In which age group are you?

    a. 20 or less

    b. 21 - 29

    c. 30 - 39

    d. 40 - 49

    e. 50 - 59

    f. 60 and over

16. What is your racial / ethnic background?

    a. Black

    b. Latino

    c. White

    d. Other (please specify): _____

17. How much formal education have you completed?

    a. 8th grade or less.

    b. Some high school.

    c. High school graduate.

    d. Some college.

    e. College graduate or more.

18. In general, how would you rate your political views?

    a. Very conservative

    b. Somewhat conservative

    c. Somewhat liberal

    d. Very liberal

19. What is your zip code? ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

STOP HERE.   THANK YOU FOR ATTENDING THE ACTION FAIR CONFERENCE, AND FOR YOUR COOPERATION IN FILLING OUT THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Kellman, Shelly. Untitled paper prepared for Professor John McKnight, Northwestern University, 1972.

2. COPE. Untitled information sheet (Who We Are).

3. Malone, Janet. Personal communication, May 5, 1975, and November 19, 1975.

4. COPE. People to People Project: Interactive Media Model for Citizen Participation Topic Focus The Criminal Justice System (the TRUST project proposal for funding)

5. Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) Office of National Priority Programs Citizen Initiative Program. Background Statement.

6. COPE. TRUST Project Progress Report for Quarter Ended September 30, 1974.

7. COPE. List of Experts Receiving Criminal Justice Questionnaire.

8. COPE. Report of Meeting of Issue Identification/ Content Development Committee Criminal Justice Project, May 6, 1974.

9. 1970 Project Understanding, A Community Education Project on Human Survival. Milwaukee, 1970.

10. Regional Plan Association (RPA). Listening to the Metropolis, An Evalation of the New York Region's CHOICES for '76 Mass Media Town Meetings and Handbook on Public Participation in Regional Planning. New York: Regional Plan Association, 1974.

11. Seattle University Institute of Urban Affairs. Final Summary Report of Criminal Justice Public Awareness Project. Seattle, n.d.

12. Adams, Stuart. Evaluation Research in Corrections, A Practical Guide. Washington, D.C.: The American University Law Institute, 1974. Copy is marked "draft."

13. COPE. Tape of July 31, 1974 meeting on the evaluation process for TRUST.

14. COPE. Tape of August 29, 1974 meeting on the evaluation process.

15. Confidential correspondence to investigator from questionaire respondent.

16. Malone, Janet. November 1, 1974 letter to Mary McClymont.

17. COPE. Training/Issue Identification Sessions (invitation to the three training sessions).

18. COPE. What the Layman Tells Us About Criminal Justice and Law Enforcement. June, 1974.

19. COPE. Memo to Criminal Justice Professionals. June 25, 1974.

20. Malone, Janet. June 18, 1974 letter to Mary McClymont.

21. Sikevitz, Gail. June 19, 1974 letter to Janet Malone.

22. Personal communication. Original letter from the organizational representative to Janet Malone. Copy of letter sent to investigator along with blank Follow-Up Questionnaire for organizational representatives to explain why respondent would not cooperate with the survey discussed in Chapter V.

23. Malone, Janet. Confidential correspondence.

24. Confidential correspondence to Janet Malone, October 23, 1974.

25. COPE. Tape of December 16, 1974 meeting of citizens mobilization staff and project director of TRUST.

26. The account of this incident was based on the investigator's personal observation.

27. COPE. Synopsis of TRUST's Role in the Media, 1974-75.

28. Blustain, Iris. Personal communication, November 19, 1974.

29. COPE. Minutes of the Action Fair Conference Planning Meetings: Invitation to the October 2, 1974 meeting; Report of Project TRUST Action Fair Planning Meeting, October 10, 1974; Invitation to November 6, 1974 meeting.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Aleshire, Robert A. "Planning and Citizen Participation Costs, Benefits, and Approaches," _Urban Affairs Quarterly_ 5 (June 1970): 369-393.

Anderson, Scarvia B., Ball, Samuel, Murphy, Richard. _Encyclopedia of Educational Evaluation_. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974).

Berdie, Douglas, and Anderson, John F. _Questionnaires: Design and Use_. (Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, 1974).

Bogardus, Emory S. _Democracy by Discussion_. (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Public Affairs, 1942).

Brooks, Michael P. "The Community Action Program as a Setting for Applied Research," _Journal of Social Issues_ 21 (January 1965): 29-40.

Burch, Glen. _Accent on Learning Analytical History of the Fund for Adult Education Experimental Discussion Project 1951-1959_. (n.p.: The Fund for Adult Education, 1960).

Burke, Edmund M. "Citizen Participation Strategies," _American Institute of Planners Journal_ 24 (September 1968): 287-294.

Cahn, Edgar, and Cahn, Jean Camper. "Maximum Feasible Participation. A General Overview." In _Citizen Participation: Effecting Community Change_. Ed. Edgar S. Cahn and Barry A. Passett. (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971).

Cartwright, Dorwin. "Analysis of Qualitative Material." In _Research Methods in the Behavioral Sciences_. Ed. Leon F. Festinger and Daniel Katz. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966).

_____, and Zander, Alvin. _Group Dynamics Research and Theory_, 3rd ed. (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1968).

Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Marshalling
    Citizen Power Against Crime. (Washington, D.C.:
    Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1970).

Cose, Ellis. "Whom Can You Trust." The Chicago Sun-Times,
    November 30, 1974, p. 28.

Dale, Ernest. Management: Theory and Practice, 3rd ed.
    (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1965, 1969,
    1973).

Dunphy, Dexter C. The Primary Group: A Handbook for
    Analysis and Feild Research. (New York: Appleton-
    Century-Crofts, 1972).

Everly, Jack C. "The Evaluation of Continuing Education
    Via T.V." In Mass Media and Adult Education. Ed. John
    A. Niemi. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational
    Technology Publications, 1971).

Freeman, Howard E. and Sherwood, Clarence C. Social
    Research and Social Policy. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.:
    Prentice-Hall, 1970).

Good, Carter V. and Scates, Douglas E. Methods of Research
    Educational, Psychological, Sociological. (New York:
    Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954).

Haiman, Franklyn S. Group Leadership and Democratic Action.
    (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1951).

Henaut, Dorothy Todd. "The Media: Powerful Catalyst for
    Community Change." In Mass Media and Adult Education.
    Ed. John A. Niemi. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.:
    Educational Technology Publications, 1971).

Herzog, Elizabeth. Some Guide Lines for Evaluative
    Research. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of
    Health, Education, and Welfare, Social Security
    Administration Children's Bureau, 1959).

Hill, Frank Ernest, and Williams, W.E. Radio's Listening
    Groups: The United States and Great Britain. (New
    York: Columbia University Press, 1941).

Hornstein, Harvey A., Bunker, Barbara Benedict, Burke, W.
    Warren, Gindes, Marion, and Lewicki, Roy J. "Data Based
    Strategies of Social Intervention." In Social
    Intervention, A Behavioral Science Approach. Ed.
    Harvey A. Hornstein, et al. (New York: The Free
    Press, 1971).

Hyman, Herbert H., Wright, Charles R., and Hopkins,
Terence. Applications of Methods of Evaluation, Four
Studies in Encampment for Citizenship. (Berkeley:
University of California Press, 1962).

_____, and Wright, Charles R. "Evaluating Social
Action Programs." In Readings in Evaluation Research.
Ed. Francis A. Caro. (New York: Russell Sage
Foundation, 1971).

International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vol. 5.
"Evaluation Research," by Charles R. Wright.

Johnson, Eugene I. The Community Education Project: A
Four-Year Report. (San Bernardino: San Bernardino
Valley College, 1957).

_____. Metroplex Assembly, An Experiment in Community
Education. (Boston: Center for the Study of Liberal
Education for Adults, 1965).

Katz, Daniel. "Field Studies." In Research Methods in the
Behavioral Sciences. Ed. Leon F. Festinger and Daniel
Katz. (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1966).

King, Charles E. The Sociology of Small Groups, A Handbook
of Theory and Experiment. (New York: Pageant Press,
1962).

Marx, Gary T., and Archer, Dane. "Citizen Involvement in
the Law Enforcement Process: The Case of Community
Crime Patrols." American Behavioral Scientist 15
(September-October 1971): 52-72.

McClain, Leanita. "Television Series to Air Urban Ills and
Seek Answers." Chicago Tribune, Metro-North Edition.
October 3, 1974, section 6A, page 3.

Mass Media/Adult Education (the newsletter of the Mass
Media Section of the Adult Education Association) 5,
April 1968, p. 5.

_____. 6, May 1968, pp. 9-10.

_____. 7, June 1968, pp. 1-2.

_____. 13, December 1968, p. 7.

_____. 15, February 1969, pp. 1-2.

_____. 21, August-September 1969, p. 2.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards
and Goals. A Call for Citizen Action: Crime Prevention
and the Citizen. (Washington, D.C.: Government
Printing Office, 1974).

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

Ohliger, John F. "The Listening Group in Adult Education."
Ed.D. dissertation, University of California, Los
Angeles, 1966.

_____. "The Power Plants of Democracy." In Mass Media
and Adult Education. Ed. John A. Niemi.
(Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Technology
Publications, 1971).

Powers, Ron. "One Crime Show the Giants Avoid." Chicago
Sun-Times, October 26, 1974, p. 38.

Reicken, Henry. The Volunteer Work Camp: A Psychological
Evaluation. (Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Press, Inc.,
1952).

Salem, Greta Waldinger. "Citizen Participation Opportuni-
ties and Incentives." Ph.D. dissertation, University
of Maryland, 1974.

Segal, Andrew. "Talk Back to Your TV." Reader Chicago's
Free Weekly, October 18, 1974, p. 1.

Selltiz, Claire, Jahoda, Marie, Deutsch, Morton, and Cook,
Stuart. Research Methods in Social Relations. (New
York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1951 and 1959, rev.
one-volume edition).

Schulberg, Herbert C. and Baker, Frank. "Program Evaluation
Models and Implementation of Research Findings."
In Readings in Evaluation Research. Ed. Francis A.
Caro. (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1971).

Schwartz, Phil. "TV Audiences Get Rare Change to Talk
Back." The Star, October 20, 1974, p. 15.

Smith, H.W. Strategies of Social Research, The Methodolo-
gical Imagination. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-
Hall, Inc., 1975).

Steele, Sara. Contemporary Approaches to Program Evaluation
and Their Implications for Evaluating Programs for
Disadvantaged Adults. (Syracuse: ERIC Clearinghouse
on Adult Education, 1973).

Stein, Leonard S. "Review of Metroplex Assembly: An Experiment in Community Education." Adult Leadership 14 (February 1966): 277-278.

Suchman, Edward A. Evaluative Research Principles and Practice in Social Action Programs. (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967).

_____. "Action for What? A Critique of Evaluative Research." In The Organization, Management, and Tactics of Social Research. Ed. Richard O'Toole. (Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Company, Inc., 1971).

Sudman, Seymour, and Bradburn, Norman. Response Effects in Surveys, A Review and Synthesis. (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1974).

Thompson, Charles W.N., and Rath, Gustave J. "The Administrative Experiment: A Special Case of Field Testing or Evaluation." (mimeographed) Published in Human Factors 16 (June 1974): 238-252.

"3-Station TV Series Shows Work of Build With Youth." The Herald ,October 23, 1974,p.4.

"TV Series on Citizen Crime Fight." Chicago Daily News, October 19, 1974, p. 40.

"TV To Be Used as Anti-Crime Weapon Here." Chicago Sun-Times, October 23, 1974, p. 48.

Waniewicz, Ignacy. Broadcasting for Adult Education, A Guidebook to World-Wide Experience. (Paris: UNESCO, 1972).

Weigel, John. "Talk to the Television." The Reporter, October 23, 1974, p. 8.

Weiss, Carol. Evaluation Research Methods for Assessing Program Effectiveness. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972).

Weiss, Robert, and Rein, Martin. "The Evaluation of Broad Aim Programs: A Cautionary Case and a Moral." In Readings in Evaluation Research. Ed. Francis G. Caro. (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1971).

Wood, Patricia A. "Resident Participation in the Mass Media." In Citizen Participation Effecting Community Change. Ed. Edgar S. Cahn and Barry A. Passett. (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971).

VITA

Name: Jane Marie Browne

Date of Birth: December 17, 1939

Place of Birth: Knoxville, Tennessee

Educational Background: B. A., 1961, Knoxville College,
major - English, minor - French;

M. A., 1972, The University of Chicago, field of adult education;

Ph.D., 1976, Northwestern University, field of educational
administration

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. A Call for Citizen Action: Crime Prevention and the Citizen. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1974).

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

Ohliger, John F. "The Listening Group in Adult Education." Ed.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1966.

_____. "The Power Plants of Democracy." In Mass Media and Adult Education. Ed. John A. Niemi. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Technology Publications, 1971).

Powers, Ron. "One Crime Show the Giants Avoid." Chicago Sun-Times, October 26, 1974, p. 38.

Reicken, Henry. The Volunteer Work Camp: A Psychological Evaluation. (Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Press, Inc., 1952).

Salem, Greta Waldinger. "Citizen Participation Opportunities and Incentives." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland, 1974.

Segal, Andrew. "Talk Back to Your TV." Reader Chicago's Free Weekly, October 18, 1974, p. 1.

Selltiz, Claire, Jahoda, Marie, Deutsch, Morton, and Cook, Stuart. Research Methods in Social Relations. (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1951 and 1959, rev. one-volume edition).

Schulberg, Herbert C. and Baker, Frank. "Program Evaluation Models and Implementation of Research Findings." In Readings in Evaluation Research. Ed. Francis A. Caro. (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1971).

Schwartz, Phil. "TV Audiences Get Rare Change to Talk Back." The Star, October 20, 1974, p. 15.

Smith, H.W. Strategies of Social Research, The Methodological Imagination. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975).

Steele, Sara. Contemporary Approaches to Program Evaluation and Their Implications for Evaluating Programs for Disadvantaged Adults. (Syracuse: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult Education, 1973).

END