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CHAPTER ONE

The Research Design

A. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF THE DISSERTATION

In recent years social scientists have been giving increasing attention to the problem of the utilization of knowledge. In the late 1960's the Special Commission on the Social Sciences was formed by the National Science Board to examine the problem of underutilization of scientific knowledge and to make recommendations for increasing the useful application of the social sciences in solving social problems. The Commission concluded that the social sciences have important contributions to make if full advantage is taken of their strengths. Thus, their major recommendations... "are designed to increase and improve the nation's utilization of the strengths of the social sciences." (Special Commission on the Social Sciences, 1969:xii).

In response to the problem of underutilization, a number of studies dealing with aspects of dissemination and utilization have been conducted. These studies have concentrated on the diffusion of innovation in the fields of education, agriculture, medicine, and industry. They have examined conditions promoting the development of innovations, barriers to the diffusion of innovations, phases in the
dissemination process, and strategies for promoting knowledge dissemination and utilization. Many researchers have relied upon communication theory, organizational theory, attitude change research and small group theory in deriving suggestions on strategies a researcher should follow in disseminating knowledge. The study of the dissemination and utilization of knowledge is a developing field; no one theoretical perspective has predominance. While a good deal of empirical research exists on aspects of dissemination and utilization, very little analysis has been conducted on specific utilization events—particularly in the dissemination of social science information. In addition, except for some of the research on consumer behavior, few researchers have examined the problems associated with moving from an understanding of factors that affect dissemination and utilization to a development of strategies or action-oriented plans that could be followed in promoting dissemination and utilization.

BENCHMARK, a program promoting the institutionalization of a social indicator system on the local level, has developed a knowledge dissemination and utilization strategy based on some of the suggestions from the theoretical literature. The overall theory behind this strategy is that adoption is more likely to occur if the provider fosters awareness, interest, trust, and credibility. The importance of promoting these factors has been documented in many empirical studies. This theory assumes that there is a need for a certain innovation. Consequently, non-utilization could be a function of bad theory (that is, the causal process does not work) or bad implementation
(that is, the causal process was not initiated) or the absence of need for a certain product. In this instance, a lot of research supports the validity of the causal process. Consequently, the critical step is how does one initiate the causal process; i.e., Implementation.

BENCHMARK designed four mechanisms to promote these four factors. The primary operating principle behind these mechanisms is that awareness, interest, trust, and credibility can be fostered by group interaction and participation, one-to-one interaction and written reports. Although BENCHMARK's dissemination and utilization strategy encompasses aspects other than these four mechanisms, they are the critical components. Thus, this study outlines and assesses the strategy that was designed to address the utilization of BENCHMARK information. More concretely, the study is designed to evaluate and compare how well four specific utilization mechanisms promoted awareness, interest, trust, and credibility. This evaluation provides baseline data for determining effectiveness. From this, one will be able to make prescriptions about how the knowledge dissemination and utilization strategy could be improved.

Such a study could be an important contribution to the knowledge dissemination and utilization literature. If the problem of underutilization is to be ameliorated, specific action-oriented strategies that researchers could follow in promoting the dissemination and utilization of social science ideas, practices, and information need to be developed, applied, and evaluated.
Rivlin (1970) notes that one problem of the random innovation efforts of the late 60's was that these programs were never sufficiently documented or evaluated. Consequently, any beneficial aspects were lost. An evaluation of a dissemination and utilization strategy not only builds knowledge about techniques that could be used in dealing with the problem of underutilization, but also bridges the gap between an understanding of factors that affect dissemination and utilization, and the development of strategies for promoting dissemination and utilization.

BENCHMARK's dissemination and utilization strategy, although developed for a particular program, could be applied to a variety of dissemination challenges. For example, the State of Ohio and various Ohio cities presently are engaged in developing a system which would facilitate the development and exchange of new approaches and ideas for dealing with urban problems. A critical aspect of this system is developing a dissemination and utilization strategy to facilitate the transfer of scientific and technical information. Many aspects of BENCHMARK's strategy are applicable to this situation. In addition, the cities of Toledo and Cincinnati are developing a BENCHMARK-like Program for their own areas. The cities could also use BENCHMARK's dissemination and utilization strategy.

The next sections examine more closely the literature dealing with knowledge dissemination and utilization, describe the
strategy and mechanisms adopted by BENCHMARK, and specify how the research will be conducted.

B. KNOWLEDGE DISSEMINATION AND UTILIZATION LITERATURE

1. Factors Affecting Dissemination and Utilization

This section provides a brief overview of the literature on the dissemination and utilization of scientific knowledge. First, factors affecting dissemination and utilization are discussed in order to demonstrate the range of views in the literature and to provide a background for the remaining sections of the paper. Second, specific perspectives on dissemination and utilization that have appeared in the literature are examined. These perspectives incorporate many of the factors affecting dissemination and utilization into their schemes. In addition, these perspectives form a foundation for the development of strategies or action-oriented plans for promoting dissemination and utilization. Given the vast number of studies which relate directly or indirectly to dissemination and utilization, this particular exercise does not attempt to outline theoretical antecedents. Havelock (1973) has conducted a comprehensive review of a large number of studies, the results of which have heavily influenced this review. Accordingly, there seems little justification for duplication. Consequently, articles are cited to support a particular point of view, although no attempt is made to cite everything that might apply.

There is a broad range of literature pertinent to knowledge dissemination and utilization. Studies have analyzed the diffusion
of innovations in the fields of education, agriculture, medicine, and industry. They have examined conditions which promote the development of innovations, barriers to the diffusion of innovation, phases in the dissemination process, and strategies for promoting knowledge dissemination and utilization. Many researchers, in examining dissemination and utilization, have relied upon studies done on communication, organizations, attitude change and small groups.

One approach to the literature is to extract primary factors influencing the successful diffusion of innovations. Numerous variables can affect dissemination and utilization. These can be generally classified into the following categories: individual, interpersonal, organization, types of messages and types of media. The next few sections discuss these variables and examine specific perspectives of dissemination and utilization.

A variety of individual variables affect dissemination and utilization. McClelland (1969) argues that the personal motivation of the innovator plays an important role in successful dissemination of innovations. In separate empirical studies he has found that innovators with a high need for achievement are much more likely to successfully promote dissemination and utilization than are those with a low or moderate need for achievement.
Another important variable is the "need" for the innovation that is felt by the potential user. Logically, it makes sense that the more the user perceives he needs a particular product, the more likely he will utilize that product. Coleman (1957), in studying the dissemination and utilization of new drugs by doctors, found high need salience can lead to quick acceptance if the innovation is relevant and effective in fulfilling that need. Katz (1963) supports this view in his study of dissemination and utilization in the fields of medicine and agriculture, and Pelligrin (1966) notes its importance in disseminating information to educators.

Attitudes can be an important facilitator or barrier in dissemination and utilization. Generally if a user has a positive affect towards the influencing agent, utilization is more likely to occur (Hövland and Weiss, 1951). In addition, an individual's inclination to seek new information is related to his feelings about the providers (Beal and Rogers, 1957).

In addition to individual variables, a variety of interpersonal factors affect dissemination and utilization. A major emphasis has been placed on the role that participation of an individual in groups has on the tendency to adopt innovations. Pelligrin (1966) in his review of educational adoption literature notes that change is more likely to be accepted if it is implemented slowly with people involved in discussions about the change. It was also shown that
Involvement in the development of programs is directly related to acceptance. In addition to this research, studies on small groups have shown group cohesiveness to be important in persuading members of the group to accept change (Cartwright, 1959).

Another interpersonal variable is how well a potential adopter is integrated into a social network. Individuals tend to seek advice from, and to influence their peers. Coleman (1957) in a study of doctors and the acceptance of new drugs, found that the larger the network of personal affiliations for an individual doctor, the more likely he would utilize new drugs. Coleman found that doctors who were well integrated into the medical community used the drug earlier.

And finally, studies have shown that change agents with a high degree of credibility and legitimacy are more likely to persuade people to accept an innovation. Havelock cites, among others, the work of Zogona and Harter (1966) who showed that the percentage of people who agreed with information contained in a message on smoking and who perceived it as trustworthy increased as the credibility of the source increased.

Organizational variables also influence dissemination and utilization. Very few studies have directly examined this connection. However, one can speculate that organizational factors may inhibit the flow of information into, through, and out of organizations. For
example, Mosher and Hart (1970) have examined the introduction of a management innovation into the State Department. They found that new ideas encounter a good deal of hostility from other actors in the system who feel the change conflicts with previous operating procedures, or causes shifts in power alignments among and between bureaus. They highlight many of the constraints existing in an organization against innovation and suggest that the style with which change is introduced is critical.

Another possible source of influence is the nature of the "message" being disseminated. Differences in types of messages affect the dissemination and utilization process. Havelock organized his discussion of the "message" by the type of knowledge being disseminated: 1) General-Basic Knowledge; 2) Applied Research and Development Knowledge; and 3) Practice Knowledge. Generally, an important aspect is the specificity of the knowledge being disseminated. Thus, each of these types of knowledge has increasingly more specific situational relevance. The more general the knowledge, the more effort the user must apply to relate it to a specific situation, the less use it will be for individual users.

Another related aspect is the amount of change the user must undergo to accept the message. In industrial situations, this generally refers to production process readjustments. In social systems this refers to the effect of the message on an organization and its conflict with previous operating procedures.
Finally, another source of influence on the dissemination and utilization process is the type of media employed to transfer information about the innovation. There is a large body of literature which is applicable to this discussion. This particular description presents a brief overview of some of the important propositions in the knowledge dissemination and utilization literature. Generally, types of media can be divided into one-way and two-way transmission processes. Types of one-way media are written materials (direct mailings, newsletters, newspapers), lectures and demonstration projects. Written materials can inform effectively a large number of people about an innovation. However, there are limitations. People do not always read the material they receive and certain types of people are more likely than others to rely upon written material for information. Swinehart and McLeod (1960) among others note that mass media readers tend to have a high educational and socio-economic status and to draw heavily from all types of media. Greenberg (1965) found that people with a high interest in a certain innovation sought information from written as well as personal contacts, while those with a low interest level received most of their information solely from personal sources. Glazer (1967), in studying the dissemination of materials in vocational education, found that a particularly effective tactic was to follow written materials with personal conferences and communications. Consequently, while written materials are an effective means of creating awareness, they have limitations which caution against exclusive reliance.
A variety of factors influence the effect of oral presentations. These include the rapport between audience and lecturer, the persuasiveness of the lecturer, and the initial willingness of the audience to receive the message. Hovland (1957), in his studies of factors affecting the impact of lectures, stresses that need arousal must precede factual information. Demonstrations are a particularly effective type of oral presentation. Havelock (9-13) notes that a demonstration performs at least three important functions: 1) it stimulates interest and involvement in the audience; 2) it provides an opportunity for pretrial evaluation by observers; and 3) it reinforces prior adoption for the demonstrator himself. Lippitt (1958) notes that change agents have often persuaded their clients to demonstrate newly adopted innovations to other groups in order to produce greater dedication or internalization of the change.

In summary, one-way transmission processes are an effective way of disseminating information to a large audience, particularly if the message is non-controversial, and may result in further information gathering activities. However, one-way media rarely result in adoption and should be used in concert with other techniques.

Two-way communication is helpful in reinforcing written information, or for complex messages requiring clarification or major behavioral or attitudinal changes. Dyadic exchange is one of the most common and potentially effective of two-way communication processes.
Havelock (9-26) reviews a number of psychological studies supporting the view that dyadic exchange is a most useful communication medium for: 1) learning about new ideas; 2) locating pertinent written sources; 3) getting information about new methods and procedures for research; and 4) eliciting feedback on new ideas.

In addition, Havelock (9-28) reviews a good deal of the literature on small groups. He notes that:

when a potential user has reached the point of considering the relative merits of his own adoption of the change, when he needs to understand it thoroughly, when he needs answers to his specific questions about it, and when he needs supportive feedback on his newly adopted behavior, small group interaction can be highly effective (9-28).

The power of small groups to stabilize and promote attitude change lies in the strength of peer group influence. Lewin (1947) and Peltz (1955) note that group consensus is a powerful motivator for change.

In summary, two-way transmission processes are very useful for promoting the adoption of innovations requiring alterations in attitude or behavior. The involvement of a user in a group stimulates active involvement with the innovation and group norms that are supportive of the innovation create pressure for adoption.
This section has outlined some of the major factors influencing dissemination and utilization. Some of these factors are more easily controlled by the promoter of dissemination and utilization than others. Individual variables discussed were the extent of need, the motivations of the provider, and attitudes towards the provider and product. Generally, more control can be exerted over the promotion of positive attitudes than over motivations or needs, although it is possible to stimulate or identify a need for a certain product. Interpersonal variables discussed were participation, integration in a social network, and credibility of the source. Of these, participation and credibility are more actionable than a user's integration in a social network. Organizational variables are less subject to control by the outside provider, and are more typically constraining rather than actionable factors in the KDU process. Aspects of the message or product also affect dissemination and utilization. Important variables are the degree of specificity and the amount of change the user must undergo in order to adopt. Structuring the message to the needs of a specific user is more actionable than characteristics of the user's situation. And finally, it was shown that the media of dissemination also affects the success of dissemination and utilization. This represents an important variable the promoter of dissemination and utilization could manipulate.
2. Dissemination and Utilization Perspectives

The next few sections present the three major dissemination and utilization perspectives outlined by Havelock that have appeared in the literature. These perspectives incorporate many of the ideas discussed in the previous section, and represent a further step toward the development of strategies for dissemination and utilization.

The Social Interaction (S-I) Perspective focuses upon the individual receiver and the stages he passes through in accepting or rejecting a new product or process. These authors stress the importance of the mechanism used to diffuse an innovation. They maintain that the most effective means of spreading information is through personal contact.

Most of the authors in this group have concentrated their efforts in rural sociology. Rogers (1962) hypothesizes a five-stage process which the individual will sooner or later pass through in deciding to accept or reject an innovation: awareness, interest, evaluation (in terms of decisionmaking), trial, and adoption. Awareness is the initial stage in which the potential adopter is exposed to the innovation and is given some information about it. This phase is important in initiating the individual into later stages. In the "interest" stage, the individual actively seeks information about the innovation. This stage increases the individual's knowledge about the innovation and initiates the development of positive or negative
attitudes towards the new product or practice. Rogers views the third stage, evaluation, as a mental trial by the individual to assess the utility of the innovation for his own situation. If the results of this mental trial are positive, the individual moves to the "trial" stage in which he uses the innovation on a small scale or on a probationary basis to test its utility. Then, if the results of the trial are satisfactory, the innovation is continued or adopted. These are the phases, Rogers suggests, that an individual will pass through in deciding whether or not to use an innovation.

In this formulation two crucial phases are awareness and interest. The receiver reacts "...to the new information, and the nature of his reaction determines whether or not subsequent stages will occur. If his awareness is followed by an expression of interest, he is launched on a series of stages which terminate with the acceptance or rejection of the innovation" (Havelock, 1973:10-29). Havelock presents a number of other authors who take the same basic approach as Rogers, although they differ somewhat in their classification schemes. An illustration of these differences appears in Figure 1.1.

In addition to outlining stages of the diffusion process, each of the authors in the S-I perspective stresses the importance of the way the innovation is transferred. In studying county extension agents, Katz (1961) and Wilkening (1962) have found that written messages operate to inform potential users and that personal contacts
## Figure 1.1
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legitimize the information. They have shown that the county extension agent was not particularly effective until after the farmer had learned about the innovation through other means.

Information sources affect various potential adopters in different ways. Lazarsfeld (1944) hypothesizes a two-step flow of communication in which ideas and information are transmitted through a mass media to opinion leaders who further disseminate the information to less active followers. In addition, the content of this information is mediated by the reference groups of the individual and by the social structure in which these groups are imbedded (Carlson, 1965). Thus, only by considering the social structure of the adopter group, and the interpersonal relationships existing within it, can one understand how an innovation is diffused.

The Research, Development, and Diffusion (R, D, and D) perspective views the process of change as an orderly chain of events. This perspective begins at an earlier point in the process than the S-I perspective. Whereas the S-I theorists concentrated on the potential adopters of the innovation and assumed the existence of an innovation, the R, D, and D authors concentrate on the providers and the development of a successful product for dissemination.
The sequence of activities of the R, D, and D perspective can be summarized as research, development, diffusion, and adoption. One of the major works of this school is a study by Guba and Clark (1966). Research conducted to advance or extend knowledge is the first stage in this rational sequence of events. The second activity, development, has two components: invention and design. Invention is the act of formulating new approaches to problems based upon previous research, experience, or intuition. Design is the act of ordering and systematizing the invented solution into an innovative package that could be disseminated. The next stage is diffusion. This stage can be divided into two parts: dissemination and demonstration. The purpose of dissemination is to create widespread awareness of the innovation among possible adopters. The purpose of demonstration is to allow potential adopters to assess the qualities of the innovation. The final stage of adoption is characterized by three subcategories: trial, installation, and institutionalization. The potential adopter actually tries the innovation in his own specific situation and if this trial is positive, the characteristics of the innovation are adopted to a particular situation; i.e., installation. And finally, the innovation must be institutionalized or made an integral part of the operating system. Guba maintains that this is reflective of the process that occurs even though some parts might be eliminated. More disagreement exists among authors of this perspective concerning the delineation of major stages, but generally Guba's formulation represents the major ideas involved. Figure 1.2 presents Guba and Clark's scheme as compared to other authors in this school.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Field, Year</th>
<th>1. Research</th>
<th>2. Development</th>
<th>3. Diffusion</th>
<th>4. Adoption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins and Clark 1966</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Conduct investigational inquiry</td>
<td>Invent packages and programs</td>
<td>Inform target system</td>
<td>Service and nurture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gather scientific, educational data</td>
<td>Engineer education and training programs</td>
<td>Demonstrate solutions</td>
<td>Install solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Basic Research)</td>
<td>Evaluated</td>
<td>Disseminate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navelock and Benne 1957</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Basic Research</td>
<td>Development and design</td>
<td>Diffusion</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td>Engineering for manufacturing</td>
<td>Diffusion</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Basic Research</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brickell 1964</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Dissemination and labelling</td>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>(Basic Research)</td>
<td>Development or engineering</td>
<td>Evaluation and testing</td>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathers 1966</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Basic Research</td>
<td>Task analysis</td>
<td>Local awareness</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Basic Research)</td>
<td>Design of a design</td>
<td>Local awareness</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen 1964</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Dissimination</td>
<td>richest</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(research, development, invention, discovery, etc.)</td>
<td>Construct and test prototype models</td>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallagher 1964</td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>New cultural element made available</td>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Innovation)</td>
<td>Dissemination is shared</td>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyerson and Katz 1957</td>
<td>Fads</td>
<td>Discovery of potential fads</td>
<td>Local awareness</td>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Adoption)</td>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>Integration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.2: Research, Development, and Diffusion Change Models

The Problem-Solver (P-S) perspective portrays the change process as solving the problems of a specific user. This change process may be initiated either by the provider or user of the services, but in either case, the receiver must desire the services and participate in its outcome. Figures 1.3 and 1.4 portray the process that is hypothesized by those committed to this perspective.

Although a number of people have advocated the problem solving perspective, the model described by Lippitt, Watson, and Westley (1958) is typical of this group.

In the first phase, the development of the need for a change, the client system formulates a problem that needs resolution. After this, the client system builds a change relationship with a probable provider system. Lippitt et al. maintain that the establishment of a positive working relationship between provider and client is one of the most important phases of the change process. In order for diagnosis to occur, the change agent must receive information about the client's problem. After the change agent has a sound understanding of the client's problem, he begins examining possible alternatives for ameliorating the situation. Once a plan of action has been formulated, the change agent implements actual change efforts. Lippitt maintains that this is the most important part of the entire process, and that without adequate feedback mechanisms, the client may prematurely abort the change process. Finally, given the success of the change efforts,
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**PROBLEM-SOLVER CHANGE MODELS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Problem-Solver Change Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. R.</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>1. Define the problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>2. Plan the solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>3. Evaluate the results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Problem-Solver Change Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>Planning phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>Implementation phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.</td>
<td>Evaluation phase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**

- **Planning phase:**
  - 1. Define the problem
  - 2. Plan the solution
  - 3. Evaluate the results

- **Implementation phase:**
  - 4. Define the objectives
  - 5. Plan the implementation
  - 6. Evaluate the results

- **Evaluation phase:**
  - 7. Define the evaluation criteria
  - 8. Plan the evaluation
  - 9. Evaluate the results
the innovation must be stabilized into the system. Lippitt found that the termination of the change agent/client relationship occurred at various points in this relationship, but notes that successful change was more likely to result if the relationship was maintained to the stabilization stage.

Thus, this perspective stresses the importance of producing information to satisfy the needs of users, and of considering the dissemination and utilization of that information with the user system in mind. In addition, this perspective offers insights into the nature of the client/change agent relationship:

What the client system really needs in the long haul is guidance and training in how to do his own problem solving...Hence the change agent should be a non-directive consultant, advising and helping on the process more than on the content encouraging the user to do his own diagnosis, retrieval, and application work for himself. The farthest that the change agent should go in direct helping is to participate as collaborator and co-equal in the P-S process (Havelock, 1973:11-13, 11-14).

Thus, the change agent and client should enter into a collaborative relationship during which the change agent should endeavor to leave his client with more of a capacity to perform problem-solving functions.
An important aspect of that collaborative relationship is the development of trust and credibility. Havelock states:

This type of collaborative interaction will not only make solutions more relevant and effective, but it also builds relationships of trust and mutual perspectives by user and resource persons that the other is truly concerned, will listen and will be able to provide useful information. These trust relationships can over time become channels for the rapid and effective transfer of information (11-14).

In addition, as was discussed in the previous section, the credibility of the change agent plays an important role in his success. Havelock states: "One of the most important variables that determines whether or not a sender will be able to influence a receiver is the extent to which he is perceived as a reliable and believable source of information" (5-16).

Thus, in this section a brief overview has been provided of the factors that could affect the dissemination and utilization process. This review was conducted to provide background information for a discussion of the major dissemination and utilization perspectives that have appeared in the literature. Of these, the Research, Development, and Diffusion is the least useful for design purposes because it only categorizes the process and does not prescribe what should be done to promote dissemination and utilization.
The Social Interaction perspective is more useful because it identifies the major phases the adopter goes through in deciding whether to accept or reject an innovation. This conceptualization shows the need to promote awareness and interest, and a positive evaluation of the innovation. In addition, it emphasizes the importance of the media used to disseminate, and of the social and professional networks of the user in leading to a decision to adopt.

The Problem Solver perspective is also very useful for the design of a dissemination and utilization strategy. This perspective identifies the need for a collaborative relationship between provider and client, and the importance of promoting credibility and trust.

From these three perspectives, BENCHMARK derived suggestions not only as a basis for an overall theory of knowledge dissemination and utilization, but also about how aspects of that overall theory could be promoted. The next few sections provide a brief description of BENCHMARK's dissemination and utilization strategy.
C. BENCHMARK'S DISSEMINATION AND UTILIZATION STRATEGY: A CONCEPTUAL OVERVIEW

BENCHMARK originally arose out of a desire by many people in the Columbus community for an assessment process which could provide information about citizens' needs, aspirations, satisfactions, and conditions. It was felt that there was a good deal of institutional, census, and other kinds of information available in the community, but very little "subjective" information on the community. Thus, the Social Reports were among the first major products to be disseminated and were based, in part, on the data from a survey of Columbus area residents; i.e., the Columbus Area Social Profile (CASP). The resource system was constituted by the professional staff of BENCHMARK and the user system consisted of the major segments of the Columbus community—civic, governmental, and private.

Thus, BENCHMARK developed a strategy to promote the dissemination and utilization of the Social Reports, as well as other products that might be developed. The overall theory behind this strategy is that adoption is more likely to occur if the provider fosters awareness, interest, trust, and credibility. The importance of promoting these factors has been identified by the Social Interactionists (awareness, interest, evaluation, trial, and adoption) and can be divided into a knowledge phase and a persuasion phase. The promotion of awareness and interest fosters knowledge, and the promotion of trust
credibility assists in persuasion. It should be noted that this conceptualization deals primarily with the beginning of the innovation decision process.

An important assumption of this conceptualization is that there exists a need for a certain innovation. In some cases a potential user recognizes the need for a certain innovation and then searches for the solution (need precedes awareness) and in other situations the knowledge of an innovation causes the potential user to recognize a need he may have (awareness and interest stimulate needs). It should also be recognized that the decision to adopt may occur at various points in time. There are distinct differences between early and late adopters due to individual and situational factors (for a discussion of the literature on this, see Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971:175-196; and Havelock, 1973:10-1 to 10-26).

Consequently, from this conceptualization, non-utilization could be a function of bad theory (that is, the causal process does not work) or bad implementation (that is, the causal process was not initiated) or the absence of need for a certain product. It would be very difficult to test this theory because little data exists on needs and utilization rates. However, given the research supporting the importance of these factors, an equally important question is how one promotes awareness, interest, trust, and credibility. In addition, how does one design a certain product so that it is useful (i.e., responds to needs) or helps the user identify his own needs. This
kind of information helps bridge the gap between an understanding of factors that affect dissemination and utilization and the development of strategies promoting dissemination and utilization.

BENCHMARK designed four specific mechanisms that were focused on the need to create awareness of and interest in BENCHMARK products, and to promote adoption and use in the context of high trust and credibility. This study will evaluate and compare how well these four mechanisms, the BENCHMARK Community Conference (BCC), the Reports Review Committee (RRC), the Community-Originated Studies Program (COS), and the Technical Assistance Program (TA) promoted awareness, interest, trust, and credibility. In addition, it will outline and assess the theory-based dissemination and utilization strategy of BENCHMARK in order to document that strategy and to recommend changes that might improve its operation.

D. DATA COLLECTION STRATEGY

In the spring of 1975, BENCHMARK conducted an evaluation in order to provide information about the effectiveness of its dissemination and utilization strategy. This information was needed for redesigning the dissemination and utilization strategy in preparation for CASP-II. In consultation with my advisor and colleagues, that evaluation was designed in order to meet the present needs of the Program and to fulfill the data requirements of this dissertation.
Most of the data used in this dissertation were collected by a mail questionnaire given to people who had had more than a casual acquaintance with the Program. Specifically, questionnaires were sent to all requestors of Community-Originated Studies who had received their information by the time the questionnaires were sent out (twenty-six people), all members of the Report Review Committees (forty-nine people), all recipients of technical assistance which necessitated more than ten hours of staff time (seventeen people), and all BENCHMARK Community Conference participants who attended more than one meeting, to the best of our knowledge (one hundred and twelve people).

The questionnaires were distributed in the middle of May, 1975; consequently, this evaluation deals with activities of the Program prior to that date. Questionnaires were sent out up to three times, and the first mail out was followed by a personal telephone call. Response rates were acceptable. These rates are as follows: 61% of the BENCHMARK Community Conference participants, 76% of the Report Review Committee participants, 65% of the Technical Assistance users, and 84% of Community-Originated Studies requestors.

In addition to the systematic data collected by the evaluation questionnaire, information will be supplied by this analyst on the basis of his experiences with The BENCHMARK Program as a participant observer/designer. The analyst was associated with
BENCHMARK throughout its duration, and has an intimate knowledge of its development. In addition, he has had numerous conversations with all key staff members, and is aware of their impressions and opinions.

E. INSTRUMENTATION AND DATA ANALYSIS STRATEGY

1. Instrumentation

The actual questionnaires were made up of two major parts. One part had questions that were only germane to a particular mechanism. The second part contained questions which were asked of everyone regardless of which mechanism they had participated in.

In this second part were included multiple indicators of each of the four concepts—awareness, interest, trust, and credibility—plus measures of how much the respondent had disseminated information about the Program. Because of the multi-dimensional nature of each of these concepts, no scaling is attempted, and the analysis will consist of comparing the distribution of responses across mechanisms. One is interested in comparing the substantive nature of the levels of awareness, interest, trust, and credibility; consequently, trying to obtain a single number to represent each of these concepts is inappropriate. Chapter Two examines the actual indicators used.

Awareness can be nominally defined as the degree of knowledge or information an individual has about The BENCHMARK Program; i.e., its products and services. Interest generally refers to active information seeking about BENCHMARK and its products. Credibility refers to
being a reliable and believable source of information. Trust refers to the confidence of the user that the staff person is truly concerned, will listen, and will be able to provide useful information.

2. Data Analysis Strategy

The major focus of this study is to assess the effectiveness of four utilization mechanisms of BENCHMARK. The common objectives of these mechanisms are to promote awareness, interest, trust, and credibility and to activate the user to further disseminate the information. This study is not designed to test a utilization theory, but rather, it is designed to evaluate a KDU strategy and determine the effectiveness of various mechanisms. Given the theory that the promotion of awareness, interest, trust, and credibility fosters adoption, what strategy or action-oriented plan does one follow in order to promote the factors. Thus, BENCHMARK's knowledge dissemination and utilization strategy (i.e., what was done to promote awareness, interest, trust, and credibility) will be evaluated in order to determine the effectiveness of various mechanisms.

In evaluating these mechanisms, hypotheses will be formulated to assist in the data analysis. The hypotheses identify factors which might cause differences in the levels of awareness, interest, trust, and credibility. However, while systematic data exist for the dependent variables (awareness, interest, trust, and credibility), there is not usually systematic data for the independent variables. Thus, this data is estimated for each group of participants (BCC members, RRC
members, COS requestors, and TA requestors). Thus, because the data for the independent variable is estimated for groups and not individuals, one will not be able to test these hypotheses in a rigorous scientific manner, or to determine the relative impact of a variety of factors on the scores of a specific group of people, although one will be able to obtain an estimate as to the validity or invalidity of the hypotheses. This discussion will be elaborated in Chapter Two.

On the basis of these hypotheses, expected scores and relative positions will be formulated for each mechanism on the variety of indicators available. These scores and positions become guides to the data analysis. The outcome of the evaluation will be to pin-point places where the mechanisms could be improved. Recommendations will be made on the basis of evaluation data and on the basis of the researcher's knowledge as a designer/participant observer. Prescriptions will be offered about the mechanisms in particular and the dissemination and utilization strategy in general. The analysis will consist of:

- specification of BENCHMARK's dissemination and utilization strategy;
- specification of factors affecting levels of awareness, interest, trust, and credibility, and the formulation of hypotheses;
- the assignment of expected scores and relative positions for the mechanisms across a variety of indicators;
• a comparison of responses across mechanisms to see differences in levels of awareness, interest, trust, and credibility, and the amount of dissemination activity of the respondent, and a speculation concerning the reasons for those differences;

• an overall assessment of the effectiveness of each mechanism and recommendations concerning improvement of that mechanism; and

• an overall assessment of the effectiveness of the knowledge dissemination and utilization strategy as a whole and recommendations concerning the improvement of that strategy.
CHAPTER TWO

Conceptual Analysis

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the four major dissemination and utilization mechanisms and outlines the proposed data analysis strategy. The description focuses on aspects of the mechanisms which may have influenced levels of awareness, interest, trust, and credibility. Following the description, each of these four concepts are discussed, and indicators measuring aspects of those concepts are examined. Finally, the general scores and relative position for each mechanism on the variety indicators are predicted.

B. BENCHMARK'S DISSEMINATION AND UTILIZATION STRATEGY

The Social Reports were among the first major products to be disseminated and were based, in part, on a survey of Columbus area residents; i.e., the Columbus Area Social Profile (CASP). The dissemination and utilization of the Social Reports was promoted by a strategy which involved potential users in all phases of the research process and which utilized a variety of different kinds of media. Users were involved in the design of the survey questionnaire for CASP, in the design of the strategy for disseminating Social Reports and in the actual writing of the Social Reports. Types of media used were
informal meetings with a variety of community leaders,
speeches to community groups, coverage by the written and electronic
media, a variety of written materials produced by Program staff
(including pamphlets, a newsletter called BenchMarkings; brief des-
criptions of Community-Originated Studies and the Social Report) and
a variety of participation mechanisms. The major focus of this study
is an analysis of the effectiveness of these participation mechanisms.
These mechanisms are the BENCHMARK Community Conference (BCC), the
Report Review Committee (RRC), the Community-Originated Studies
Program (COS), and the Technical Assistance Program (TA).

The BENCHMARK Community Conference (BCC) was created to
guide the development of CASP and to promote interaction between the
professional staff and potential users. The BCC brought together in a
working group a number of potential users of CASP and the BENCHMARK
professional staff to design the first Columbus Area Social Profile.
Through this interaction the staff would be better able to understand
the information needs of the users, and the users would understand
better the steps in designing and implementing the survey.

The BCC was a self-selected, voluntary group of people from
the community who were interested in BENCHMARK, and the development
of CASP. The BCC was a fairly large (attendance varied from fifteen
to forty people per meeting with a total membership of about one
hundred at the time of the first Social Report) continuing organization
which experienced fairly large shifts in membership over time. It was
created in October, 1973, two months after The BENCHMARK Program began. The group generally met once a month, and the primary agenda items for the first seven months were the development of the CASP questionnaire, and administrative questions related to the development of the BCC as a continuing organization. After that, it reviewed general policy questions of the Program (for example, in what order, according to subject, should the Social Reports be released, and how should priorities be established for processing Community-Originated Studies).

Generally, interaction between BCC members and BENCHMARK staff occurred within a large meeting, although there was limited one-to-one interaction outside BCC meetings. Both oral and written transmission processes were used to disseminate information. In addition to oral presentations about major Program activities, all Program products were available at monthly meetings. In addition, all members of the BCC were sent the monthly issues of the Program newsletter, BenchMarkings.

It was hoped that the two-way interaction occurring in BCC meetings would increase the trust in and credibility of the professional staff and produce a survey schedule that would respond to the information needs of potential users. In addition, people who participated in the development of CASP would begin to view the Social Reports as their own and to internalize the information. This interaction should also increase awareness of and interest in BENCHMARK and its range of products. In addition, by becoming knowledgeable
about The BENCHMARK Program, the BCC participants would disseminate information about the Program and about products of the Program within their social networks.

After the CASP data base was completed, it was decided to disseminate information generally through Social Reports written on each major topic area in CASP. A Report Review Committee (RRC) was established for each Social Report to: 1) advise on the development of issues and themes; 2) enable community input to the reporting process itself; 3) provide opportunities for users and potential users to become more aware of the scope of each CASP-I module; 4) increase awareness of the variety of analytical options that can be brought to bear on the CASP-I data base; and 5) provide opportunities for individuals to become more knowledgeable about each report.

Unlike the BCC, people who participate on RRCs were invited by staff members on the basis of a known interest in the particular subject area. However, membership was not closed. All individuals who volunteered for a RRC were invited as were all individuals nominated by others. Sign-up sheets were passed around BCC meetings in order to encourage BCC members to serve on an RRC. The important point, however, is that the writing of a Social Report provided the occasion for involving people in BENCHMARK who may not have shown a strong previous interest.

The RRC was a fairly small (seven to fifteen people) ad hoc group which met approximately three times. An RRC disbanded after the
Social Report was released. The RRC members reviewed and commented on drafts of a Social Report prepared by staff members. The first meeting of the RRC provided a general introduction to the Program, CASP, and the particular subject area being examined. The second and third meetings dealt primarily with the Social Report being produced. Generally, copies of past Social Reports were circulated as examples and sometimes, Social Reports were given to participants. Different staff members conducted various RRCs; consequently, the types of issues covered in these meetings varied. However, due to high internal communication, different Report Review Committees basically had the same major features.

Generally interaction between RRC members and BENCHMARK staff members occurred in a small group, although there was some limited one-to-one interaction outside RRC meetings. Generally, only oral transmission processes were used within a RRC to disseminate general information about the Program. Generally, previous Social Reports and copies of the CASP-1 User's Guide were passed around in RRC meetings; however, only rarely were these materials given to RRC members. RRC members were not added routinely to the mailing list of the Program newsletter.

Thus, the primary purpose of the RRC was to guide the development of the Social Report for each area of concern. In addition, by getting people in the community who were interested in the particular topic area to participate in the RRC, specialized users would be
informed about the information in CASP and about The BENCHMARK Program in general; i.e., promoting interest and awareness. By writing Social Reports with the direct involvement of people with substantive knowledge or interest in a particular area, one hoped to maximize the usefulness of the information contained in the Social Report, to promote internalization of the information and to increase staff and community interaction, promoting trust and credibility. By establishing contact with potential users of the information, through their participation on the RRC, utilization would be encouraged. Finally, it was hoped that on the basis of increased awareness, interest, trust, and credibility, RRC participants would disseminate the information in their social networks.

The Social Reports were broad, relatively short, descriptive papers that disseminated the information available in CASP. It was recognized that this general information might be insufficient to satisfy the information needs of specific users. However, it was hoped that these reports would promote awareness of and interest in the information, and would stimulate specific requests for analysis from various users throughout the community.

Thus, BENCHMARK established the Community-Originated Studies (COS) Program to facilitate processing of individualized requests for information from CASP. Through the COS Program, a staff member was assigned to process each specialized request. Thus, although the COS Program was not a separate entity from BENCHMARK, it was a convenient
label under which BENCHMARK promoted and processed specialized requests for information from CASP.

COS requestors initiated the study which usually concentrated on one particular subject area of CASP (such as Crime) although a few studies covered a number of subject areas. Generally, the production of a COS occurred over a short period of time, involving two meetings between staff and user. During these meetings, and any other telephone contacts, the primary topic was the specific COS being produced.

The COS Program promoted close one-to-one interaction between the staff of BENCHMARK and a specific user. The product of that interaction was a Community-Originated Study tailored for a specific user and which that user helped produce. While the focus of this interaction was the specific COS being produced, some general information about the Program was presented orally to the COS requestor. Written materials were not routinely made available. COS requestors were not routinely added to the mailing list for the Program newsletter.

As with the previous mechanisms, this interaction was expected to promote awareness of and interest in the products and services that BENCHMARK could provide, and to stimulate credibility and trust. In addition, it was hoped the user would disseminate information in his social network.
The previous three mechanisms were all connected to the Columbus Area Social Profile. However, in the original design of The BENCHMARK Program, it was anticipated that the group of analysts brought together for the design and implementation of a Columbus Area Social Profile, could also respond to ad hoc requests for technical assistance from users in the community. In addition to providing a badly needed service, technical assistance contacts could further promote other aspects of BENCHMARK. Within BENCHMARK, all non-CASP related requests for service or information were handled in the Technical Assistance (TA) Program.

All technical assistance requests were initiated by a specific client. As a whole, technical assistance requests ranged from simply providing information to a client over the telephone to actually conducting public opinion surveys. However, this evaluation only concentrated on major technical assistance (which is defined as consuming more than four hours of staff time). Generally these kinds of activities took a longer time to conduct than Community-Originated Studies. Generally two to four meetings were held with TA requestors and these meetings with a client primarily dealt with the particular type of assistance being provided.

In theory, the TA Program was closely related to the COS Program. There was close one-to-one interaction between the staff and user. The product of that collaborative interaction was tailored to the needs of a specific user. While the focus of that interaction was on the specific TA project, some general information about the
Program was presented orally to the TA requestor. Written materials produced by the Program were not routinely made available and TA requestors were not routinely added to the mailing list of the Program.

The occasion for working on a specific product allowed the staff not only to transfer various skills, but also to promote interest in and awareness of BENCHMARK in general. It was hoped that during this interaction the staff person and the Program would gain credibility and trust. This interaction, if productive, should form the basis for future interaction. In addition, it was hoped the user would further disseminate knowledge about BENCHMARK among his colleagues and acquaintances.

In summary, these four mechanisms constituted the major components of BENCHMARK's knowledge dissemination and utilization strategy. They represented a variety of possible access points to and outreach mechanisms of The BENCHMARK Program. The Community-Originated Studies Program and Technical Assistance mechanisms involved primarily one-to-one contact between staff and user. The outcome was a product which the user can directly and primarily use. The BENCHMARK Community Conference and the Report Review Committees represented a large collection of people. Direct contact occurred between community and staff, although this interaction was usually within a larger group. The product of these interactions was geared to a larger audience than the immediate participants. The primary product of the BCC, that is, a questionnaire for CASP-1, gained utility in the reporting of the
survey results. The Social Report produced by the RRC could have been (and hopefully was) directly useful to the participant, although its primary focus was toward a general audience.

The BCC, COS, and Technical Assistance mechanisms generally depended upon self-selection; that is, it was necessary for the participant to show an interest by attending meetings or requesting assistance. Only within the RRC did a good degree of solicitation occur. The RRC member still had to show an interest by attending meetings, but an initial direct contact by a staff member was usually made.

The BCC encompassed all aspects of the Program, and members received most of the written materials. The RRC and the COS focused primarily upon specific subject areas of CASP, and the TA Program dealt with non-CASP related technical assistance. The BCC was designed to be a continuing mechanism while the others had a relatively short duration.

These mechanisms are similar in that each is focused on the need to create awareness of and interest in BENCHMARK products, and to promote adoption and use in the context of high trust and credibility. The next section will examine these concepts more thoroughly and discuss specific indicators for each that were included in the evaluation questionnaire. Then predictions will be made concerning the general scores and relative positions of each mechanism on the variety of indicators.
C. DISSEMINATION AND UTILIZATION CONCEPTS--AWARENESS, INTEREST, TRUST AND CREDIBILITY

This section examines the concepts of awareness, interest, trust, and credibility, and specifies how each will be measured. Hypotheses are formulated concerning factors which might affect differences among mechanisms. These hypotheses are formulated to guide the assignment of expected scores and relative positions, and to facilitate the data analysis. The purpose is to be explicit about assumptions that are usually implicitly made concerning possible relationships.

It was noted in the first chapter that while systematic data exist for the dependent variables (awareness, interest, trust, and credibility), there is not usually systematic data for the independent variables. This information is estimated by the researcher for each major group of participants. Thus, because levels are estimated for groups and not individuals, one cannot rigorously test these hypotheses or determine the relative effect of a combination of factors for a specific group.

For example, in the next section the following hypothesis is formulated:

- The more the content of the meeting emphasizes general information transmission, the higher the level of general awareness.

No systematic data exist concerning exactly what occurred in BCC, RRC, COS, and TA meetings. However, this analyst has an informed impression and knowledge about the content as a participant observer of these
meetings. Thus, on the basis of this participant/observer knowledge, an estimate is made concerning the content of these convenings. However, these are characterizations of the overall content, and there is no way to measure the extent to which an individual participant was exposed to general information. In addition, this is one of three factors that were hypothesized. Because no systematic data exist on these factors, one cannot rigorously determine the relative impact of these three factors on the overall group percentages.

However, the formulation of these hypotheses highlights major factors that could effect differences among scores, and suggests variables that might be manipulated in order to increase effectiveness. Although they cannot be rigorously tested, one will be able to see the extent to which these hypotheses assisted in the prediction of expected scores and relative positions, and thus make some estimation concerning their overall validity (although one will always have to consider that the original estimate of the independent variable may be incorrect).

In addition to facilitating an assessment of the effectiveness of these mechanisms and the making of recommendations for redesigning the mechanisms, the formulation of these hypotheses suggests factors for which data should be collected in future efforts. Thus, the formulation of these hypotheses, although not rigorously tested, becomes an important step in bridging the gap between a theory of dissemination and utilization, and the development of strategies--i.e.,
action-oriented plans that combine purposes and resources—that could be followed in promoting dissemination and utilization.

And finally, one is not analyzing a controlled situation. In many cases, these mechanisms were developed over a period of time. Participants in these mechanisms were subjected to a number of different influences. All of these could affect their responses. Thus, according to strict scientific norms, inferences between what occurred in a specific mechanism and the responses of participants are tenuous. However, the assumption is made that these mechanisms were the major influence and that the mix of certain factors affected the level of response.

2. Awareness

Definition. Awareness is a concept employed by the Social Interactionists and refers to general knowledge about the existence of an innovation. The importance of the awareness stage is to stimulate the potential user into gathering further information about the innovation.

A variety of communication techniques informed people in the community about the existence of BENCHMARK and its activities. Generally these techniques were:

- informal meetings by the Director with community leaders—although meetings of this type continued throughout the course of the Program, most occurred in the initial months of the Program;
• written and electronic media coverage—BENCHMARK received coverage by newspapers, television, and radio. There was an initial blitz coverage when the Program was announced, each Social Report received newspaper and radio coverage, and some of the Social Reports received television coverage;

• written materials produced by BENCHMARK—a variety of written materials were produced by the staff of BENCHMARK. These included pamphlets describing the Program, a Program newsletter, Social Reports, brief descriptions of Community-Originated Studies, lists of the Social Reports and COS's that were written and a CASP-I User's Guide which included a copy of the survey questionnaire, information about the development of the Program, and information about how to use the survey data;

• lectures to community groups—a variety of community groups asked BENCHMARK to provide speakers. These requests continued throughout the course of the Program; and

• participation mechanisms—as previously noted a variety of mechanisms were created to involve users in the entire research process. These were the BCC, RRC, COS, and TA Programs. Each of these mechanisms provided information of some type. The BCC covered all aspects of the Program. The RRC and COS concentrated on specific subject areas in CASP. The TA Program covered non-CASP related requests for assistance and provided information concerning the Program in a tangential way.

Thus, BENCHMARK employed a variety of one-way and two-way transmission processes. This evaluation focuses on the last of these; i.e., the participation mechanisms. This list of communication techniques was presented to demonstrate that these mechanisms were only part of a larger dissemination system.
In many ways the self-selected nature of the BCC, COS, and TA Programs (and to a certain extent, the RRC) demonstrates an initial awareness of the innovation, gained by other means. Participation demonstrates further information gathering activities or interest in the Program. Thus, in the strict sense that Rogers (1971) uses the term, participation itself indicates that awareness has been created. However, in formulating the indicators for this concept, the emphasis was upon measuring the level of knowledge the respondent has concerning BENCHMARK and its activities.

Variables Affecting Level of Awareness. A variety of factors could potentially affect the level of awareness of the participant. From the discussion in the previous chapter dealing with the effect of the type of media, it was shown that types of one-way transmission processes can effectively inform a large audience about the innovation and two-way transmission processes can more effectively stimulate a positive evaluation of that innovation. This discussion focuses on the effect of two-way transmission processes in transferring information about the Program.

Scores are assigned on the basis of three variables: 1) the purpose or content of the convening; 2) the degree of exposure; and 3) the type of exposure. It is expected that the content of the convening has a major impact upon the level of awareness of the respondents. This is a logical deduction from the premise that the
more information an individual receives, the more information he potentially retains.

BCC members were exposed to a variety of information concerning all aspects of the Program. The RRC, COS, and TA mechanisms had more narrowly focused purposes and the content of the convening did not stress general information. This variable should favor RRC members over COS and TA requestors because RRC members were routinely given a brief overview of the Program and this was not routinely given to the latter two groups. COS requestors should have received more general information than TA requestors because the purpose of the COS meeting dealt with the major activity of the Program; i.e., CASP. Thus, general information was more relevant for a COS convening than was relevant for a TA meeting.

The degree of exposure should also affect levels of awareness. This variable refers to the effect of redundancy upon the level of information retained. The more times certain information is repeated or reinforced, the higher the rates of retention. Although this is related to content, it is thought that an approximation of the degree of redundancy is the length of time a person was associated with the Program.

BCC members were continually exposed to information in the meetings and many of these members were associated with the Program for a year before other mechanisms were put into operation. BCC members routinely received the Program newsletter in addition to written
materials available at each of the meetings. Thus, more reinforcement of information occurred for BCC members than for those participants in other mechanisms. RRC members, COS requestors and TA requestors had about the same length of exposure. Few materials were supplied at meetings, and these people did not routinely receive the BENCHMARK newsletter.

Finally, closely related to the previous variable, the type of exposure should affect levels of awareness. Havelock (1973:9-3) states: "It is generally true a combination of media or transmission processes is more effective than any one used singly if the characteristics of the selected media complement one another." Generally, only BCC members were exposed to both oral and written information sources, while RRC, COS, and TA members were exposed to primarily oral sources of information.

Thus, it is expected that BCC members will have the highest levels of awareness because the content of the convening stressed general information transmission, because they were exposed for a relatively long period of time, and because they were exposed to a variety of written and oral transmission processes. RRC members should have slightly higher levels of general information awareness than COS or TA requestors because they routinely received a lecture concerning the general aspects of the Program. And COS requestors should have higher levels of general awareness because they were involved in the major activity of the Program; i.e., CASP, and consequently, more
general information was relevant to that convening than was relevant to TA meetings.

These general principles translate into the following hypotheses:

- The more the content of the meeting emphasizes general information transmission, the higher the level of general awareness;
- The longer the time of contact, the higher the level of awareness; and
- The more varied the type of information transmission processes, the higher the level of awareness.

Indicators of Awareness. In Chapter One there was a brief discussion of the primary data source used in this dissertation. It should be remembered the actual indicators were formulated eight months before this dissertation was outlined in specific terms. Because BENCHMARK needed an evaluation, the evaluation questionnaire was designed to meet the information needs of the Program, and the expected requirements of this study. There were constraints on the amount of time available to design the questionnaire and on the length of the questionnaire. Consequently, there are inevitable gaps between the actual indicators used, and what one ideally would have desired in retrospect. Nonetheless, these indicators do provide broad, general measures of the level of awareness.

Figure 2.1 presents the list of indicators used, the wording of each question, and the response categories that were available.
Figure 2.1
INDICATORS OF AWARENESS

A. Have you ever heard of the Community-Originated Studies (COS) Program?
   1. Yes, and I am familiar with its overall purpose.
   2. Yes, but I'm not too sure what its purpose is.
   3. No.

B. Have you ever heard of the BENCHMARK Community Conference?
   1. Yes, and I'm familiar with its overall purpose.
   2. Yes, but I'm unfamiliar about what its purpose is.
   3. No.

C. Have you ever heard of the Columbus Area Social Profile (CASP-I) conducted by BENCHMARK?
   1. Yes, and I'm familiar with the subject areas it covered.
   2. Yes, but I'm not too familiar with what was contained in it.
   3. No.

D. BENCHMARK provides a variety of services and information. How familiar do you feel you are with the services and information BENCHMARK can provide?
   1. Very familiar
   2. Somewhat familiar
   3. Not very familiar
   4. Not at all familiar

E. Sixteen subject areas or modules were included in the CASP-I survey. Some people are aware of a few of the subject areas while others know what most of the subject areas are. Do you feel you know what most, some, a few, or none of the subject areas are in the survey?
   1. Most (11 to 16 areas)
   2. Some (5 to 10 areas)
   3. A few (1 to 4 areas)
   4. None

F. How familiar do you feel you are with the information from the survey that was dealt with in your Reports Review Committee?
   1. Very familiar
   2. Somewhat familiar
   3. Not very familiar
   4. Not at all familiar
Note that an "X" indicates the mechanism for which certain questions were asked. Fewer awareness questions were asked regarding the TA mechanism because it was not designed to provide information about CASP.

Responses to these questions provide subjective measures of awareness. One is restricted in measuring awareness. Perhaps the best method would be a series of open-ended questions given by an interviewer. This would allow an in-depth examination of the substance behind a person's statement. The interviewer would be able to probe in those cases where a respondent does not fully answer the question. Unfortunately, one is limited to a mail questionnaire which eliminates the presence of an interviewer and restricts the use of open-ended questions.

Figure 2.2 provides information about the expected scores for each mechanism and their relative positions. In the assignment of scores one is restricted by the absence of any standards or baselines. For example, there is no standard to determine what are "good" or "bad" levels of awareness.

Consequently, the levels have been stipulated as "high", "medium", and "low". If a mechanism is scored as "high" in a certain category, this means that 60% or more of the respondents show high levels of awareness. If the mechanism is rated "medium", this means that between 40-59% show high levels of awareness; and if the mechanism is rated "low", it means that less than 40% are expected to show
### Indicator | BCC | RRC | COS | TA
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
A. Heard of COS | High \(^a\) | Medium 2 | Low 3 | -
B. Heard of BCC | Medium 1 | Medium 2 | - | -
C. Heard of CASP | - | - | - | -
D. Familiar with services | High 1 | Medium 2 | Medium 3 | Low 4
E. Familiar with CASP subject areas | High 1 | Medium 2 | Medium 3 | -
F. Familiar with Information In RRC | - | - | - | -

\(^a\) In all cases except two (items D and E) the "high" category refers to the first response item. In items D and E, the "high" category refers to the first and second response items.
high levels of awareness. These scores were assigned on the basis of the three hypotheses formulated in the previous section.

Figure 2.2 also shows the expected relative position of each mechanism. Although the assignment of scores is arbitrary because there is no baseline to determine what the percentage of responses might be, one should be able to predict, in relative terms, the rank order of the mechanism. As was mentioned earlier, these predictions are made to provide guidelines for the evaluation of the mechanism.

3. Interest

Definition. Interest is also a concept employed by the Social Interactionists and refers to further information gathering activities by the potential user. The importance of the "interest stage" is to provide the potential user with more information with which to begin evaluating the value of the innovation. Interest is closely related to awareness because the major impact of the awareness stage is to stimulate interest in the potential user.

Because of the self-selected nature of participation in these mechanisms, participation itself demonstrates an information gathering activity by the potential user. Consequently, the focus is on determining levels of interest, or the variety of information gathering activities in which the person has engaged.

Variables Affecting Level of Interest. A wide variety of factors can affect the level of interest or further information
gathering activities of the participant. The objective of this exercise is not to build a detailed theoretical model of how interest is promoted, but rather to identify factors which are associated with differences in the levels of interest among participants.

However, one can speculate conceptually about the process the individual passes through in order to demonstrate further information gathering activities. In order for a person to gather further information, he must be aware of the innovation, he must have some sort of motivation, and he must have the means to gather that information.

For example, in order for a person to read a Social Report, he must be aware that such a thing exists. In addition, he must have the motivation to get a copy of the Social Report and to read it. And finally, he must have the opportunity or means to gather a Social Report and to read it.

There are a wide variety of information gathering activities that could be measures of interest. These could be:

- attendance at meetings;
- asking questions at meetings or making comments;
- requesting written materials produced by the Program;
• making requests for assistance;
• reading materials; and
• talking to staff.

In measuring aspects of "interest", three major categories of activities have been identified:

• measures of reading materials produced by the Program;
• measures of formal requests for information or assistance; and
• measures of the likelihood of future information gathering activities.

These activities have been separated because different variables should affect the level of interest measured in each of these major categories.

Because of the close relationship to awareness, measures of the extent of reading materials produced by BENCHMARK should be affected by some of the same factors affecting awareness. Specifically, these factors are: 1) the type of exposure; 2) the degree of exposure; and 3) the purpose of the convening.

The type of exposure affects levels of interest because it affects the degree to which a person is aware of a certain product and the availability of those products to an individual. The degree of exposure should have a complementary effect with the previous variable, because the longer a person has been associated with the Program, the more likely he is aware of the products and has had an opportunity to collect them.
The purpose of the convening should also affect the levels on these indicators because it affects the motivation of participants to engage in these activities. Different products were more relevant to the purposes of some mechanisms than others. For example, BCC participants helped design the CASP questionnaire. Thus, products from that questionnaire are relevant to their efforts. In other words, they should be motivated to see the outcomes of their efforts. COS requestors sought further information from the CASP data; thus, the Social Reports based on information about that data base are relevant to their requests. RRC members helped write a particular Social Report. However, the information in other Social Reports are only marginally relevant to their situation. Information about CASP was only marginally relevant to TA requests, because by definition, these requests were non-CASP related.

In summary, because the BCC continued for a long period of time, received copies of most written materials, and participated in the design of CASP, these participants should show higher levels of reading Program materials than the participants in other mechanisms. COS requestors should show the next highest level because the purpose of these meetings was clearly relevant to the products produced. RRC members should show higher levels than TA requestors, because the purpose of the former convening was more relevant to the written materials than was the purpose of the TA convening.
Measures of the frequency of formal requests for information or assistance should be affected by: 1) the content of convenings; 2) the degree of exposure; and 3) the level of positive feelings towards the Program and the expectation of receiving useful information. The COS and TA Programs were not asked these questions because, by definition, they have made formal requests for information or assistance.

Because the content of the RRC dealt with producing a report which the members helped design, it could be that many of their own personal information needs were covered in the Social Report. Thus, RRC members should show lower levels of making formal requests. In addition, because making requests for information or assistance rests upon the existence of a need, and because RRC members had been associated with the Program for a much shorter time than BCC members, it could be that not enough time had elapsed for RRC members to have the occasion or need arise for requesting BENCHMARK assistance or information. It is also anticipated that a person's level of positive feelings toward the Program (trust and credibility) affects the rate of making requests. It is expected that the level of need is the primary factor, and that given equal needs, those people with positive feelings would be more likely to formally request further information. The determinants of positive feelings will be discussed in the next section. From that discussion one will see that RRC members are expected to have higher levels of positive feelings than BCC members.
Measures of the likelihood of further information gathering activities in the future should be affected primarily by the degree of positive feelings. As was mentioned in the previous paragraph, given equal needs, the more positive a person is towards the Program, the more likely he is to request information. Once again, the discussion in the next section will demonstrate that COS requestors should have the highest positive affect, followed by the TA, RRC, and BCC mechanisms.

These general principles translate in the following hypotheses:

- The longer the time of contact and the more varied the type of information transmission processes, the higher the level of reading Program materials;

- The more relevant Program materials are to the purpose of the convening, the higher the level of reading Program materials;

- The more the content of the convening stresses the production of materials which fulfill a participant's information needs, the smaller the number of formal requests;

- The longer the time of contact, the greater the number of formal requests;

- The higher the degree of positive feelings, the greater the number of formal requests; and

- The higher the degree of positive feelings, the greater the likelihood that the participant will request information in the future.
**Indicators of Interest.** Figure 2.3 presents a list of the indicators measuring various types of information gathering activities. An "X" indicates those mechanisms for which a certain question was asked.

Figure 2.4 presents the expected scores and relative positions of the mechanisms for each indicator. These scores and positions were assigned based upon the hypotheses presented in the previous section.

4. **Trust and Credibility**

**Definition.** Trust and credibility are examined together because these two concepts are very similar. Unlike the previous two concepts, trust and credibility refer to the development of positive attitudes towards BENCHMARK. The Social Interactionists view the innovation decision process as consisting of two major phases: 1) a knowledge phase, and 2) a persuasion phase. The first two concepts, awareness and interest, relate to the knowledge phase and trust and credibility relate primarily to the persuasion phase; i.e., promoting a positive evaluation of the innovation.

**Trust** refers to positive feelings and confidence in staff. Because a general purpose of all these mechanisms was to develop a product with the active collaboration of potential or actual users, it is important that a positive relationship be developed between staff and users. In addition this active collaboration would promote trust since participants would see the staff in action and have the opportunity to get to know people more personally and on an informal
### Figure 2.3

**INDICATORS OF INTEREST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BCC</th>
<th>RRC</th>
<th>COS</th>
<th>TA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Measures of Reading</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Have you ever read any of the Social Reports produced by BENCHMARK?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No, I have copies of Social Reports, but haven't had a chance to read them.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. No, I haven't read any Social Reports.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Do you have a copy of the User's Guide for the first Columbus Area Social Profile (CASP-I)?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes, I own one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No, I don't own one, but I have access to one.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. No, I don't own one, but I've looked through it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No, but I've heard about the User's Guide.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. No, I didn't know it was available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Measures of Requests and Contact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Have you ever made any requests for assistance or information from the Program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes—If yes, what did you request (please be specific).</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Since your participation on the RRC (COS/TA), have you had any further contact with the BENCHMARK Program?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes—If yes, what was it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Measures of Future Information Gathering</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Would you be interested in participating in selecting the kinds of questions to be included in the next Columbus Area Social Profile?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Maybe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. In the future, if the need arises, how likely do you think it is that you would ask BENCHMARK to provide you with assistance or information?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Somewhat likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Not very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Not at all likely—Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Indicators

#### I. Measures of Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Read Social Report</th>
<th>B. Have User's Guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### II. Measures of Requests and Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Request assistance or Information</th>
<th>B. Since participation; further contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### III. Measures of Future Information Gathering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Participate In CASP-11</th>
<th>B. Would make future request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### MECHANISMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BCC</th>
<th>Score Position</th>
<th>RRC</th>
<th>Score Position</th>
<th>COS</th>
<th>Score Position</th>
<th>TA</th>
<th>Score Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High 1</td>
<td>Medium 3</td>
<td>Medium 2</td>
<td>Low 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In all cases except one (Item B) the 'high' category refers to the first response item. In Item B the 'high' category refers to the first and second response item.*
basis. The staff must demonstrate an active concern for the opinions of users and incorporate their suggestions into the product. The user must have confidence in the abilities of the staff and in their willingness to incorporate user suggestions.

**Credibility** refers to the dependability and reliability of the staff and to the accuracy and responsiveness of the information produced. This concept is closely related to trust. While operationally the distinction between these two concepts is blurred since each impacts on the other, trust relates more to the staff/user relations and feelings, and credibility refers more to the user's assessment of products.

**Variables Affecting Trust and Credibility.** A number of different factors could affect trust and credibility. An individual's feelings of trust could be affected by his perceptions of the actions of the staff, and by the opinions of others with whom that individual has contact. If the actions of the staff are consistent with stated purposes and the user believes in the integrity of those purposes; and, if the process of producing materials reflects competency and objectivity; and if others support the overall process, then the staff/user relations will be characterized by high levels of trust.
On the other hand, credibility will be high if products have utility, if the process of producing materials reflects competency and objective, if other "experts" say they are well done, and if the media takes them seriously.

It is anticipated that these perceptions or judgments by the user will be affected by the type of interaction occurring within the mechanism and by the degree of private benefits received by the user. The first factor refers to the type of interaction between staff and participants. It is expected that the participant will be more likely to develop positive attitudes towards the Program if he has had close interaction with staff members. The more staff/user relationships approximate one-on-one, the higher the levels of trust and credibility. Thus, the COS and TA Programs—where there is essentially one-to-one interaction—should have higher levels of trust and credibility than the RRC and BCC mechanisms. And the RRCs, because they are relatively small groups of people, should show higher levels of trust and credibility than the BCC.

In addition, it is expected that the degree of private benefits received by the user should promote positive attitudes. If an individual received a private benefit that was useful, he should be more inclined to positively evaluate the source of that benefit. COS and TA requestors both received private benefits. This factor should slightly favor TA over COS requestors because the benefit received by the former was relatively larger. This judgment is made because
generally, more time was spent on TA requests than on COS requests. It could be that the amount of time is an inadequate indicator for the size of the private benefit. Consequently, this variable is offered tentatively in order to try to predict differences between the TA and COS mechanisms. The products produced by the RRC and BCC mechanisms were not designed for a specialized user, although an RRC member could influence the content of a Social Report for his own needs, and the product of the BCC meeting (the CASP questionnaire) only gains utility in the reporting of the results.

In summary, the COS and TA programs—where there is essentially one-to-one interaction, and where participants in both received private benefits—should have higher levels of trust and credibility than the RRC and BCC mechanisms. In addition, the TA Program, where a relatively large private benefit was given, should have slightly higher levels of trust and credibility than the COS Program. The RRC, because these are relatively small groups of people and because they received more private benefits, should show higher levels of trust and credibility than the COS Program.

These principles translate into the following hypotheses:

- The smaller the ratio between staff and users, the higher the levels of trust and credibility.
- The greater the actual service provided to a user, the higher the levels of trust and credibility.
Indicators of Trust and Credibility. As noted in the section on awareness, because of the time between the execution of the evaluation questionnaire and the detailed specification of the parameters of this dissertation, gaps appear between the indicators chosen and what one would have desired in retrospect. This feeling is particularly acute with regard to measures of trust and credibility.

Figure 2.5 lists the indicators chosen. Some of the indicators used are only rough approximations of the concepts. For example, under measures of credibility, the first two indicators deal with aspects of credibility (responsiveness and accuracy); however, for the indicator on satisfaction with the information, credibility is only one possible dimension of the attitude. This question is examined because it is important substantively and because it deals generally with an evaluation of the information. It was mentioned previously that trust and credibility generally refer, in the Social-Interactionist perspective, to the promotion of positive evaluations toward the provider and the product. Thus, an examination of the results of this question is warranted.

The measures of trust are also only rough approximations of the concept. However, on the basis of responses to the open-ended part of the satisfaction question, it appears that people were generally satisfied or dissatisfied with the competency and integrity of staff. This generally corresponds with the stipulated definition of trust offered in the previous section. However, for the second
**Figure 2.5**

**INDICATORS OF TRUST AND CREDIBILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RSC</th>
<th>RAC</th>
<th>COS</th>
<th>TA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Measures of Credibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. How responsive do you think BENCHMARK is to requests for services or information?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Very responsive</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Somewhat responsive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Not very responsive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Not at all responsive</td>
<td>Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I don't know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Do you think the information contained in the Social Report is a very accurate, somewhat accurate, somewhat inaccurate, or very inaccurate reflection of public opinion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Very accurate</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Somewhat accurate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Somewhat inaccurate</td>
<td>Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Very inaccurate</td>
<td>Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Undecided/Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. In general, how satisfied were you with the information provided? Were you very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied with the information provided?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Very satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Undecided/Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Measures of Trust</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. In general, how satisfied were you with the performance of the staff with whom you had contact? Were you very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied with the performance of the staff from BENCHMARK?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Very satisfied</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Undecided/Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Generally, how do you feel about the BENCHMARK Program? Do you feel very positive, somewhat positive, somewhat negative, or very negative about the BENCHMARK Program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Very positive</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Somewhat positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Somewhat negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Very negative</td>
<td>Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Undecided/Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Measures of Credibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MECHANISM</th>
<th>BCC</th>
<th>RRC</th>
<th>COS</th>
<th>TA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. How Responsive</td>
<td>Medium&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Accuracy of Information</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Satisfaction with Information</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measures of Trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MECHANISM</th>
<th>BCC</th>
<th>RRC</th>
<th>COS</th>
<th>TA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Satisfaction with Staff</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Feelings about BENCHMARK</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> In all cases except two (items B and E) the "high" category refers to the first response item. In items B and E the "high" category refers to the first and second response items.
question, while these dimensions were a major part of the reasons people gave for their answer, some respondents reacted to other aspects. Figure 2.6 lists the expected scores and relative positions of the various mechanisms for each indicator.

5. Promotional and Referral Activity

Definition. In addition to promoting awareness, interest, trust, and credibility, it was hoped that these mechanisms would also stimulate users to further disseminate information about BENCHMARK and its products within their own social networks. The importance of this activity was noted by the Social Interactionists. Thus, measures of the activity of the individual to further promote information about and refer people to BENCHMARK were included on the evaluation schedule.

Factors Affecting Personal Dissemination Activity. Talking to colleagues about BENCHMARK and referring them to the Program indicates interest and involvement in the activities of the Program. A variety of factors could motivate further promotional or referral activity:

- participant involvement in developing the products resulting in a desire to have others informed about or to use those products;
- participant feelings that the Program is useful to him or could be useful to others; and
- a situation in which the individual is involved, and in which BENCHMARK information could be potentially useful.
These types of motivation suggest the following variables as being important determinants of dissemination activity: 1) the degree of involvement; 2) the degree of positive feelings; and 3) the number of situations in which the individual is involved and which could potentially use BENCHMARK products. The degree of involvement should affect levels of dissemination activity because the individual begins to build an identification with the information. This identification should make the person more likely to use the information and to promote its use among others. The importance of developing this identification was noted by authors of the Problem-Solver perspective. BCC participants had the greatest degree of involvement in BENCHMARK, and RRC, COS, and TA participants all had similar levels of involvement.

It is also expected that the degree of positive feelings will affect promotional or referral activity. Logically, it appears that if a person is positive towards the Program and believes the products are useful, he is more likely to disseminate information about it. It is expected that COS and TA requestors should have higher levels of positive feelings than BCC and and RRC members because the former groups received private benefits, and their interaction with BENCHMARK staff occurred primarily on a one-to-one basis.

In addition, it is expected that those people who encounter more situations in which BENCHMARK information would be relevant should have higher rates of dissemination activity than others. There is no data for determining which of these participants were involved in more
situations that could potentially use BENCHMARK products. Consequently, as a surrogate, one can use the length of time a person has been involved with the Program. Consequently, BCC participants, because they had been involved with the Program for over a year before the other mechanisms got started, should have encountered more situations in which BENCHMARK was relevant than did RRC, COS, or TA participants who were associated with the Program for about the same length of time.

In summary, BCC participants should have the highest levels of promotional or referral activity because they had the greatest degree of involvement and had the longest association with the Program. TA and COS requestors should have higher levels of promotional or referral activity than RRC members because these groups are expected to have higher levels of positive feelings. And finally TA requestors should have slightly higher levels of further promotional or referral activity than COS requestors because the former should have slightly higher levels of positive feelings.

Based upon these factors the following hypotheses can be generated:

- The higher the degree of involvement, the higher the level of promotional or referral activity;

- The higher the degree of positive feeling, the higher the level of promotional or referral activity; and
• The more situations in which the individual is involved that could potentially use BENCHMARK products, the higher the level of promotional or referral activity.

Figure 2.7 shows the expected scores and relative positions of these mechanisms for the measures of promotional or referral activity.
A. How often have you talked to someone (not a member of the BENCHMARK Community Conference or the BENCHMARK staff) about the BENCHMARK Program?

1. Very often - It averages about once or twice a week.
2. Sometimes - It averages about once or twice a month.
3. Rarely - I've talked to people about BENCHMARK, but it's irregular and not very often.
4. Never - I can't remember talking to anyone about BENCHMARK.

B. Have you ever personally referred someone to BENCHMARK, either to obtain some service or information or to attend a BENCHMARK Community Conference (BCC) meeting?

(Check all boxes that apply)

1. Yes, for some service or technical assistance.
2. Yes, for information or report.
3. Yes, to a BCC meeting.
4. No.

C. Have you ever talked about the findings of your Social Reports with someone or mentioned them to someone (other than a member of your RRC or a BENCHMARK staff member)?

1. Yes - I've actually discussed the findings with someone.
2. Yes - I've mentioned them or referred to them in the course of discussions.
3. No - I've never discussed the findings with anyone or mentioned them to anyone.

* "High" category refers to the first and second response item.

b "High" category refers to the first, second, and third response items.
CHAPTER THREE

Data Analysis

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter analyzes the scores for different mechanisms on indicators of awareness, interest, trust, and credibility. In this analysis, the hypothesized scores from the previous chapter provide guideposts for interpreting the results. One is interested not only in the actual level of responses and deviations from the hypothesized score, but also in the substantive and theoretical implications of the data. The overall purpose is to determine the relative effectiveness of these mechanisms and to speculate on factors affecting that effectiveness. From this, one can begin to formulate recommendations concerning how these mechanisms might be more effectively designed.

B. AWARENESS

1. Analysis

The following hypotheses guided the assignment of expected scores and relative positions for indicators of awareness:

- The more the content of the meeting emphasizes general information transmission, the higher the level of general awareness;

- The longer the time of contact, the higher the level of awareness; and
• The more varied the type of information transmission processes, the higher the level of awareness.

Thus, it was expected that the BCC participants should have the highest levels of awareness, followed by the RRC, COS, and TA Programs.

Everyone except COS requestors was asked if he had ever heard of the Community-Originated Studies Program. Figure 3.1 summarizes the results of this question. Generally, the expected scores and relative positions corresponded to the actual. BCC participants and those who participated in a combination of mechanisms had the highest percentage of respondents who were familiar with the overall purpose of the COS Program.

Surprisingly, RRC and TA members showed similar levels of familiarity, although over half of the TA respondents had never heard of the COS Program. The RRC mechanism had a slightly lower percentage of people who were familiar with the purpose of the COS Program than was expected. This low level of familiarity is particularly unfortunate because the RRC was an important opportunity to familiarize a group of potential users with the information in a certain subject area. Through the COS Program people could receive a more detailed analysis of the data, and it appears that many of the RRC members were not aware of the purposes of the COS Program. Thus, RRC members may not have been aware of all the opportunities available to them.
Figure 3.1

AWARENESS OF COS PROGRAM

QUESTION: Have you ever heard of the Community-Originated Studies (COS) Program?

1. Yes, and I'm familiar with its overall purpose.
2. Yes, but I'm not too sure what its purpose is.
3. No.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BCC</th>
<th>RRC</th>
<th>TA</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, Familiar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Score</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>Less than 40%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Score</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Respondents (41) (22) (9) (19)

These are people who attended or participated in more than one mechanism. Most of them (thirteen of nineteen people) attended the BCC and RRC.

People who participated in more than one mechanism are separated from the rest in order to separate multiple effects. Because this group is so small, it is difficult to compare the different combination of mechanisms that occurred. The most common combination was participation in the BCC and RRC, and in all the other combinations, one of the mechanisms was the BCC. Because of the closeness of BCC and combination scores, it is difficult to determine the effect of combined participation. However, one can expect that the more
information about The BENCHMARK Program is reinforced, the higher the level of awareness. This is consistent with all three of the hypotheses that were formulated.

RRC members and COS requestors were also asked if they had ever heard of the BENCHMARK Community Conference. Figure 3.2 summarizes the results of this question.

**Figure 3.2**

**AWARENESS OF BCC**

**QUESTION:** Have you ever heard of the BENCHMARK Community Conference?

1. Yes, and I'm familiar with its overall purpose.
2. Yes, but I'm unfamiliar with what its purpose is.
3. No.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RRC</th>
<th>COS³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, Familiar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Score</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Score</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, Not Familiar</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of Respondents**

(22) (16)

³A combination category was not included in this table, because all the combinations involved participation in the BCC. Thus, all those people were familiar with the BCC.

The expected scores and positions differ from the actual. A much lower percentage of RRC members were familiar with the BCC than was
expected. In assigning expected scores it was thought that the percentages for the RRC and COS mechanism would be fairly close because for both the content of the convening did not stress general information, the period of contact was fairly short, and generally only oral transmission processes were used. However, the RRC was expected to be slightly higher because these participants routinely received introductory material about the Program in the first meeting, and it was not known if this always occurred for COS requestors. These scores could have occurred either because the COS requestors were exposed to this information to a greater extent than was estimated by this researcher (that is, the content of the COS encounters did stress general information more than the content of RRC meetings) or because one-to-one interaction is a more effective situation for transferring oral information than one-to-many. While a determination of whether one or both of these factors are operative cannot be made now, these relationships can be examined further in other indicators.

Substantively, knowledge of the BCC was not crucial for either RRC or COS members. By the time these mechanisms were created, the BCC had completed its primary function; i.e., the development of the questionnaire for CASP-1. Thus, a lack of knowledge about the BCC did not particularly handicap the dissemination process. However, it was thought that knowing that potential users had participated in the design and development of the questionnaires would add to the credibility of the information. This particular question did not adequately cover this dimension. It could be that participants knew that users
had participated in the questionnaire design, but did not associate that participation with the label "BENCHMARK Community Conference".

TA requestors were asked if they had ever heard of and were familiar with the purposes of CASP-I. Seventy-eight percent (78%) were familiar with the purposes of CASP-I. This can be compared to only 33% of TA requestors who were familiar with the COS Program. Thus, TA requestors received and retained information about the major project undertaken by BENCHMARK.

Everyone was asked how familiar he was with the services or information provided by BENCHMARK. The results of this question are displayed in Figure 3.3.

Generally, the actual scores were higher than expected. BCC members generally showed the highest levels of familiarity because they were the only mechanism to have any number of respondents who were very familiar with services. This was expected. RRC members and COS requestors were expected to be fairly close, and they were (because of the small N-size, a change in the response of two people would have almost equalized the percentages). However, COS requestors demonstrated a slightly higher percentage with high degrees of awareness than RRC members. This continues a trend noted earlier.

The surprising results in Figure 3.3 were the responses of the TA requestors. TA requestors showed a much higher degree of awareness than was expected. It appears that this mechanism was more
Figure 3.3
FAMILIARITY WITH BENCHMARK SERVICES
AND INFORMATION

QUESTION: BENCHMARK Provides a variety of services and information. How familiar do you feel you are with the services and information BENCHMARK can provide?

1. Very familiar
2. Somewhat familiar
3. Not very familiar
4. Not at all familiar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BCC</th>
<th>RRC</th>
<th>COS</th>
<th>TA</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very familiar</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat familiar</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very familiar</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all familiar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected Position
Actual Position
Expected Score
Actual Score\(^a\)
Number of Respondents (42) (22) (17) (9) (20)

\(^a\)The actual scores were obtained by adding the percentages for the first two response categories.
effective than anticipated in promoting a general awareness of The BENCHMARK Program. A detailed analysis is handicapped because of the small number of indicators of awareness available for TA requestors.

Those people who participated in a combination of mechanisms showed the highest percentage saying that they were very familiar. This continues a trend of high awareness found in previous indicators. However, in this indicator the percentage of responses for people attending a combination were much higher than for BCC members. This supports the notion that participation in more than one mechanism had a positive affect on the level of awareness.

Although these percentages generally indicated high levels of familiarity, the small percentage of responses in the "very familiar" category was unexpected. This distribution could be because respondents avoided extreme categories, or because most respondents believed they were unaware of some aspects of The BENCHMARK Program. This question required subjective evaluation by the respondents; consequently, it is difficult to determine if they are actually unaware of a number of aspects of the Program. However, this question does seem to suggest that more effort should be employed in the mechanisms to familiarize participants with all aspects of The BENCHMARK Program.

Everyone except TA requestors was asked how familiar he was with CASP-I subject areas. These results are displayed in Figure 3.4.
Figure 3.4

KNOWLEDGE OF CASP-1 SUBJECT AREAS

QUESTION: Sixteen subject areas or modules were included in the CASP-1 survey. Some people are aware of a few of the subject areas, while others know what most of the subject areas are. Do you feel you know what most, some, a few, or none of the subject areas are in the survey?

1. Most (11 to 16 areas)
2. Some (5 to 10 areas)
3. A few (1 to 4 areas)
4. None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BCC</th>
<th>RRC</th>
<th>COS</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected Position 1 2 3 -
Actual Position 1 2 3 -
Expected Score 60%+ 40-59% 40-59% -
Actual Scorea 75% 69% 58% 95%

Number of Respondents (41) (22) (17) (20)

aThe actual scores were obtained by adding the percentages for the first two response categories.

The actual scores generally correspond with, although are somewhat higher than, the expected. BCC members had the highest levels of awareness. RRC and COS members had similar levels. While RRC members had a higher percentage when the two response categories are combined, COS members had a higher percentage of people saying they knew what
most of the CASP-1 subject areas were. As was true with previous indicators, those people participating in a combination of mechanisms had the highest levels of awareness. Substantively this is an important question because CASP was the major activity of the Program, and a high familiarity with the kind of information contained in that data base made these people potentially valuable disseminators.

RRC members were asked how familiar they were with the information contained in their Social Report. The expected high level of awareness occurred. Fifty-five percent (55%) said they were very familiar and 41% said they were somewhat familiar. While one might expect a higher percentage who said "very familiar", it should be noted that in a previous question like this, very few people chose the extreme category. Thus, when the categories are combined, one sees that 96% said they were very or somewhat familiar with the Information contained in their Social Report.

2. **Summary**

The self-selected nature of participation in the BCC, COS, and TA Programs (and to a certain extent, the RRC) demonstrates an initial awareness of the innovation gained by other means. Thus, in the strict sense that Rogers (1971) uses the term, awareness has been created. Consequently, in formulating Indicators for this concept, the emphasis was upon measuring the level of knowledge the respondent has concerning BENCHMARK and its activities.
Although there were exceptions, these mechanisms created a fairly high level of awareness. Figure 3.5 summarizes the scores of the different mechanisms for the awareness indicators. The percentages refer to people with high levels of awareness. While some fairly low scores occurred on indicators concerning an awareness of the BCC and COS, it should be noted that only 23% of the RRC members said they had never heard of the COS Program, and that only 32% of the RRC members and 19% of the COS requestors said that they had never heard of the BCC. Thus, these mechanisms were successful in stimulating a fairly high level of knowledge, albeit at differential rates.

A variety of hypotheses were formulated in order to assist in the assessment of these mechanisms. These hypotheses were:

- The more the content of the meeting emphasizes general information transmission, the higher the level of awareness;
- The longer the time of contact, the higher the level of awareness; and
- The more varied the type of information transmission processes, the higher the level of awareness.

While these hypotheses were not tested directly because systematic data did not exist for each, they were helpful in formulating fairly accurate predictions of the actual scores and relative positions of these mechanisms for the various indicators. Seven of twelve predictions of relative positions were accurate, and another three predictions were only
## Figure 3.5
### SUMMARY OF AWARENESS INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMBINATION</th>
<th>Awareness of COS</th>
<th>Awareness of BCC</th>
<th>Awareness of CASP-I</th>
<th>Familiarity With BENCHMARK Services</th>
<th>Knowledge of CASP-I Subject Areas</th>
<th>Familiarity With Information in RFC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Score (N-size)</td>
<td>79% (19)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100% (20)</td>
<td>95% (20)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCC Expected Position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Score</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Score</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N-size)</td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCC Expected Position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Score</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Score</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N-size)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COS Expected Position</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Position</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Score</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Score</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N-size)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA Expected Position</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Position</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Score</td>
<td>Less than 40%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Less than 40%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Score</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N-size)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent who say "Yes, and I am familiar with the overall purpose".

*Percent who say "very familiar" or "somewhat familiar".

*Percent who say "most" or "some".
off one place. Eight of twelve predictions of scores were accurate, three predictions were less than the actual scores, and one prediction was greater. Thus, these hypotheses were helpful in estimating the actual results.

However, there were some unexpected results. COS requestors had a higher percentage of people with high degrees of awareness than RRC members. It was suggested that this could be due either because this observer underestimated the amount of general information transmission occurring in COS meetings or because one-to-one interaction is more effective for transferring oral information than one-to-many. Because TA requestors showed a surprising percentage of people with a fairly high level of awareness and because these meetings did not stress general information transmission, the latter situation seems plausible. Thus, the following hypothesis is suggested:

- If primary reliance is placed on oral transmission process, there will be a higher degree of awareness if the interaction is one-to-one rather than one-to-many.

In analyzing the results, people who had participated in more than one mechanism were separated from the rest in order to separate multiple effects. Because this group is so small, it was difficult to compare different combinations of mechanisms. Generally, however, regardless of the type of combination, very little variation occurred in the responses. In addition, although the BCC was always one of the mechanisms, the scores of those people who attended a combination of mechanisms were consistently higher than for those people who only
attended the BCC. Thus, it appears that participation in more than
one mechanism had a positive affect on the level of awareness. This
is consistent with the second (length of contact) and third (variety
of information transmission processes) hypotheses. In addition, it
suggests another hypothesis which is slightly different:

- The more reinforcement that occurs concerning
  information about BENCHMARK, the higher the
  level of awareness.

C. INTEREST

1. Analysis

The following hypotheses guided the assignment of expected
scores and relative positions for indicators of interest:

- The longer the time of contact and the more
  varied the type of information transmission
  processes, the higher the level of reading
  Program materials;

- The more relevant Program materials are to
  the purpose of the convening, the higher the
  level of reading Program materials;

- The more the content of the convening stresses
  the production of materials which fulfill a
  participant's information needs, the smaller
  the number of formal requests;

- The longer the time of contact, the greater
  the number of formal requests;

- The higher the degree of positive feelings,
  the greater the number of formal requests; and

- The higher the degree of positive feelings,
  the greater the likelihood that the participant
  will request information in the future.
In the previous chapter, it was mentioned that these hypotheses have different relevance to types of interest indicators: 1) measures of reading materials produced by the Program; 2) measures of formal requests for information or assistance; and 3) measures of the likelihood of future information gathering activities.

Everyone was asked if he had ever read any of the BENCHMARK Social Reports. These results are displayed in Figure 3.6.

**Figure 3.6**

**READERSHIP OF SOCIAL REPORTS**

**QUESTION:** Have you ever read any of the Social Reports produced by BENCHMARK?

1. Yes
2. No, I have copies of Social Reports but haven't had a chance to read them.
3. No, I haven't read any Social Reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>BCC</th>
<th>RRC</th>
<th>COS</th>
<th>TA</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected Position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Score</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>Less than 40%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Score</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, but have copies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Number of Respondents | (41) | (22) | (17) | (9) | (19) |

*RRC members were asked if they had read any Social Reports other than the one produced by their RRC.*
The surprising results are the large number of TA requestors who had read Social Reports. This is consistent with the high level of awareness for TA requestors that was noted in the previous section. Perhaps this high level of reading Social Reports was due to the motivations of the people who requested technical assistance rather than the structural characteristics of the TA mechanism. Generally, technical assistance requests involved some aspect of survey research, albeit unrelated to CASP. It could be that because these people were interested in survey research, they sought information concerning what could be done with surveys and how the results were reported. It could also be that because the TA contacts examined in this evaluation were generally fairly long term, intensive efforts, these contacts stimulated interest in other aspects of The BENCHMARK Program.

Although the scores of COS requestors were within the expected range, they had the lowest percentages of any mechanism. Originally, it was felt that the Social Reports would stimulate requests for specialized studies. This still could be occurring if the COS requestor heard that BENCHMARK had information available in a certain subject area from the media coverage of a Social Report, or if an acquaintance read the Social Report and told the COS requestor about it. In addition, some Community-Originated Studies were requested before a Social Report was written for that area of concern. However, it was thought that the COS requestor would at least be interested in reading the Social Report covering the area of concern pertinent to his request. Forty-one percent (41%) said they did not even have copies of Social Reports.
BCC and RRC members had scores similar to the expected. The percentage of RRC members who had read Social Reports is particularly high considering they were asked if they had read any Social Reports other than the one produced by their RRC. And finally, all of those people who attended a combination of mechanisms had read a Social Report. This continues a trend noted in the previous section on awareness.

Everyone except TA requestors was asked if he had a copy of the CASP-1 User's Guide. The User's Guide provided an overview of all the material contained in CASP-1. These results are displayed in Figure 3.7.

The expected results are similar to the actual. COS requestors show a higher percentage than was expected. This is an encouraging result because the User's Guide contained information that would have been valuable to COS requestors. While the results are positive overall, it should be noted that 27% of the RRC members did not know the User's Guide was available. While this is not a large percentage, it is much greater than the scores of the other mechanisms. This reflects a lack of awareness concerning the CASP-1 User's Guide.

BCC and RRC members were asked if they had ever made any requests for assistance or information from the Program, other than a COS or TA request. These results are displayed in Figure 3.8.
**Figure 3.7**

**OWNERSHIP OF CASP-1 USER'S GUIDE**

**QUESTION:** Do you have a copy of the User’s Guide for the first Columbus Area Social Profile (CASP-1)?

1. Yes, I own one.
2. No, I don't own one, but have access to one.
3. No, I don't own one, but I've looked through it.
4. No, but I've heard about the User's Guide.
5. No, I didn't know it was available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BCC</th>
<th>RRC</th>
<th>COS</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, but access</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, but looked at</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, but heard of</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, did not know</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expected Position**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Actual Position**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Expected Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>60%+</th>
<th>40-59</th>
<th>40-59%</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Actual Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>69%</th>
<th>48%</th>
<th>76%</th>
<th>90%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Number of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(41)</th>
<th>(22)</th>
<th>(17)</th>
<th>(19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*a*The actual scores were obtained by adding the percentages for the first two response categories.
Figure 3.8
REQUESTS FOR ASSISTANCE OR INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION: Have you ever made any requests for assistance or information from the Program?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BCC</th>
<th>RRC</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Score</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Score</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, the direction of the responses are consistent with the hypotheses that were formulated, although the responses for RRC members are lower than expected. This could have occurred either because many RRC members had not been associated with the Program for a very long time or because their information needs were fulfilled within the RRC; consequently, they had no need to request further information or assistance. However, this indicates a rather low level of further information gathering by RRC members. In addition, people who participated in more than one mechanism have a lower percentage of people who made formal requests than BCC members. This is one of the few instances so far in which this group has scored less than BCC members.
Everyone except BCC members was asked if he had had any further contact with BENCHMARK after his participation. Looking at Figure 3.9, one sees that the actual scores are consistently lower than was expected.

**Figure 3.9**

**SINCE PARTICIPATION FURTHER CONTACT**

**QUESTION:** Since your participation on the RRC (COS/TA), have you had any further contact with The BENCHMARK Program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RRC</th>
<th>COS</th>
<th>TA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (tie)</td>
<td>2 (tie)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Position</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Position</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This could have occurred because all of these mechanisms provided some sort of information to the participants, which may have fulfilled their present information needs, or because not enough time had elapsed to determine if these mechanisms were successful in establishing a longer term relationship between BENCHMARK and these participants. Thus, perhaps a better standard would be the amount of contact that occurred a year after the initial RRC, COS, or TA meetings.
Thus, a series of questions were asked to measure the likelihood of future interaction. Everyone except TA requestors were asked if they would be interested in participating in selecting the kinds of questions to be included in the next CASP. These results are displayed in Figure 3.10.

Figure 3.10
PARTICIPATION IN CASP-II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION: Would you be interested in participating in selecting the kinds of questions to be included in the next Columbus Area Social Profile?</th>
<th>BCC</th>
<th>RRC</th>
<th>COS</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Position</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual Position</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>60%+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Score</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual Score</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results, as expected, were quite high. Given the small N-size, the percentages are fairly close across mechanisms. Note that while RRC members showed fairly low levels of interest on some of the previous
indicators, they had the highest percentage of members wanting to participate in the design of CASP-II.

In addition, everyone was asked how likely he thought it was that he would seek assistance or information from BENCHMARK in the future. These results are displayed in Figure 3.11.

**Figure 3.11**  
**LIKELIHOOD OF FUTURE REQUESTS**

**QUESTION:** In the future, if the need arises, how likely do you think it is that you would ask BENCHMARK to provide you with assistance or information?

1. Very likely  
2. Somewhat likely  
3. Not very likely  
4. Not at all likely  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>BCC</th>
<th>RRC</th>
<th>COS</th>
<th>TA</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Likely</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Position</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Score</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Score</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Somewhat Likely</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, the actual scores were similar to the expected. COS requestors showed the highest percentages for all mechanisms. This
was expected, because it was thought that actually having received specialized information in the past would make one more likely to request it in the future. In other words, they should have more positive feelings towards the Program. Although TA requestors showed lower levels than COS requestors, three out of four say that it was very likely or somewhat likely that they would make future requests if the need arose. RRC members had the lowest percentages saying that they would be "very likely" to request information in the future, although 86% said it was very or somewhat likely. This continues a general trend found in some of the previous indicators. However, these last two indicators demonstrate that even though participants in most mechanisms showed fairly low levels of formal requests or contact after their initial participation, there was a willingness to seek further contact with the Program in the future.

2. Summary

"Interest" is defined as further information gathering activities by the potential user. Interest is closely related to awareness because the major impact of the awareness stage is to stimulate interest in the potential user. Because of the self-selected nature of these mechanisms, participation by the potential user demonstrates an information gathering activity. Consequently, the focus was on determining levels of interest, or the variety of information gathering activities in which the person has engaged.
Figure 3.12 presents a summary of the indicators of interest. Although the results are mixed, there were generally high levels of further information gathering activities. For the indicators available, there was a fairly high readership of Program materials. Although 50% of RRC members and 47% of COS requestors said they had actually read Social Reports, about 60% of both mechanisms had copies. For RRC members, this involved reading or obtaining a Social Report other than the one produced by their RRC. While participants were not asked if they had read the CASP-l User's Guide, fairly high percentages of people owned or had access to one. Although there were rather low levels of requests to or contact with The BENCHMARK Program, there were fairly high levels of interest in having future contact. Thus, these mechanisms were generally successful in stimulating fairly high levels of further information gathering activities by the participants.

A variety of hypotheses were formulated in order to assist in the assessment of these mechanisms. These hypotheses were:

- The longer the time of contact and the more varied the type of information transmission processes, the higher the level of reading Program materials;

- The more relevant Program materials are to the purpose of the convening, the higher the level of reading Program materials;

- The more the content of the convening stresses the production of materials which fulfill a participant's information needs, the smaller the number of formal requests;

- The longer the time of contact, the greater the number of formal requests;
### Figure 3.12

**SUMMARY OF INDICATORS OF INTEREST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Read Social Report</th>
<th>Have User's Guide</th>
<th>Request Assistance or Information</th>
<th>Since Participation</th>
<th>Further Contact</th>
<th>Participation in CASP-11</th>
<th>Likelihood of Future Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BCC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 (tie)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Score</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Score</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N-size)</td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Position</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Position</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (tie)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Score</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Score</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N-size)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Position</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (tie)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Score</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Score</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N-size)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Position</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (tie)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Score</td>
<td>Less than 40%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Score</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N-size)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combination</strong></td>
<td>Actual Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Score</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N-size)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent of people who have read Social Reports.

*Percent of people who own a User's Guide or have access to one.

*Percent of people who have made formal requests (other than COS or TA).

*Percent of people who made further contact after formal participation.

*Percent of people who would be interested in participating in CASP-11.

*Percent of people who would be very likely to request information or assistance from BENCHMARK in the future.
The higher the degree of positive feelings, the greater the number of formal requests; and

The higher the degree of positive feelings, the greater the likelihood that the participant will request information in the future.

While, as was true with the indicators of awareness, it was not possible to directly test these hypotheses, they were helpful in formulating fairly accurate predictions of the actual scores and relative positions of these mechanisms for the various indicators. The predictions of positions were not as accurate as for the awareness indicators. Of the nineteen predictions on relative positions, eight predictions were accurate (including two of the ties) and eight were off one place. Of the nineteen predictions of scores, eleven predictions were accurate. Thus, these hypotheses were helpful in estimating the actual results.

Of the mechanisms, the BCC members generally showed the highest levels of interest. As was discussed previously, interest can be generally conceived as the impact of awareness. That is, hopefully, the content of the original awareness message motivates the individual to seek further information. Thus, there should be a general association between measures of awareness and measures of interest. This appears to be the case. However, not only is knowledge important, but also the way that information is presented and received is important. BCC members received a good deal of information; that is, they were aware. Materials such as Social Reports and User's Guides were made available; that is, they had the means. And, they also read those materials, and made requests; that is, they were motivated. These are interesting findings because the BCC had the largest ratio of staff
to participants; and it demonstrates that a high level of awareness and interest can be stimulated in that kind of situation. This suggests another hypothesis:

- The higher the degree of awareness, the higher the degree of interest.

RRC and COS members had lower levels of gathering further information. While there was a fairly low level of contact after their participation, this general trend was predicted by the second general hypothesis. Perhaps the more important finding was that there was a high degree of willingness for future interaction with The BENCHMARK Program. However, even though our measures of interest are less than complete, they are consistent with the general hypothesis formulated in the previous paragraph. These two mechanisms did have lower degrees of awareness than the BCC.

TA requestors showed a higher degree of interest than was expected, particularly on the indicator dealing with reading Social Reports. Unfortunately, many of the indicators were not presented to TA requestors, and this hampers the analysis. It was suggested that the researcher underestimated the degree of motivation of TA requestors. It could be that they had more of a need to read Social Reports than was expected.
And finally, those people who participated in a combination of mechanisms showed high levels of further information gathering activities. This is consistent with the high level of awareness found in the previous section on awareness. These results were expected because participation in more than one mechanism demonstrates a high level of interest in BENCHMARK.

D. TRUST AND CREDIBILITY

1. Analysis

Trust refers to positive feelings and confidence in the staff. Credibility refers to the dependability of the staff and the accuracy of the information produced. These concepts are closely related. Trust relates more to the staff, and credibility refers more to products.

In the previous chapter, it was hypothesized that if the actions of the staff are consistent with stated purposes and the user believes in the integrity of those purposes; and, if the process of producing materials reflects competency and objectivity; and if others support the overall process, then the user should have high levels of trust and credibility. Since these are judgments made by the potential user, it was thought that these judgments would be affected by the degree of contact with staff (that is, type of interaction) and by the degree of private benefits received by the user. Thus, the following hypotheses guide the assignment of expected scores and relative positions for indicators of trust and credibility:
• The smaller the ratio between staff and users, the higher the levels of trust and credibility; and

• The greater the actual service provided to a user, the higher the levels of trust and credibility.

Thus, the COS and TA Programs, where there was essentially one-to-one interaction, should have had higher levels of trust and credibility than the RRC and BCC mechanisms. The RRC, because these were relatively small groups of people, should have had higher levels of trust and credibility than the BCC. And, the TA Program, where a relatively large private benefit was given, should have had slightly higher levels of trust and credibility than the COS Program.

Everyone was asked how responsive he felt BENCHMARK was to requests for services or information. These results are displayed in Figure 3.13.

Note that for all mechanisms, there was a high percentage of people who thought BENCHMARK was very responsive. In addition, there was very little variation among the various mechanisms. Thus, all the mechanisms were successful in promoting the belief that BENCHMARK was responsive to requests for services or information.
Figure 3.13
RESPONSIVENESS OF BENCHMARK

QUESTION: How responsive do you think BENCHMARK is to requests for services or information?

1. Very responsive
2. Somewhat responsive
3. Not very responsive
4. Not at all responsive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BCC</th>
<th>RRC</th>
<th>COS</th>
<th>TA</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Responsive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Position</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Position</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Score</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Score</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Responsive</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Very Responsive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not At All Responsive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RRC members were asked how accurate a reflection of public opinion were the Social Reports. These results are displayed in Figure 3.14.
Figure 3.14
ACCURACY OF SOCIAL REPORTS

**QUESTION:** Do you think the information contained in the Social Report is a very accurate, somewhat accurate, somewhat inaccurate, or very inaccurate reflection of public opinion?

1. Very accurate
2. Somewhat accurate
3. Somewhat inaccurate
4. Very inaccurate
5. Undecided/Neutral

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RRC</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Accurate</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Accurate</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Inaccurate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Inaccurate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided/Neutral</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Respondents (22) (14)

Eighty-two percent (82%) of the members felt the reports were either very accurate (23%) or somewhat accurate (59%). Although a large majority believed the information was accurate, only 23% believed it was very accurate. The Social Reports were based on interviews with 2401 people in the Columbus metropolitan area. This results in about a +2% sampling error; consequently, with regard to sampling error, the results should have been very accurate. The relatively small percentage believing the results are "very accurate" could be due either to a mistrust of surveys in general or to a mistrust of the validity of the indicators. However, it appears that more effort should have been exerted to persuade RRC members that the results were very accurate.
Although the combined scores of RRC members and those people who attended a combination of mechanisms are fairly close, the latter group had a much higher percentage of people who believed the Social Reports were very accurate. Thus, the effect of attending a combination of mechanisms was to increase confidence in the credibility of the data.

COS and TA requestors were asked how satisfied they were with the information provided by BENCHMARK. These results are displayed in Figure 3.15.

**Figure 3.15**

**SATISFACTION WITH INFORMATION PROVIDED**

**QUESTION:** In general, how satisfied were you with the information provided? Were you *very satisfied*, *somewhat satisfied*, *somewhat dissatisfied*, or *very dissatisfied* with the information provided?

1. Very satisfied
2. Somewhat satisfied
3. Somewhat dissatisfied
4. Very dissatisfied
5. Undecided/Neutral

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COS</th>
<th>TA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Satisfied</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Score</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>60%+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Score</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Somewhat Satisfied</strong></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Somewhat Dissatisfied</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Dissatisfied</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Respondents</strong></td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A much lower percentage of COS requestors were "very satisfied" with the information provided than was expected. When asked why, most requestors mentioned things that were beyond the analyst's ability to control and were not necessarily related to credibility. For example, a number of COS requestors were interested in examining the responses of residents in a small area of Columbus, and small N-sizes hampered effective analysis. Another example were cases in which a COS requestor wanted information for which CASP-I did not have indicators. Note that while only 35% were very satisfied, 94% were either very or somewhat satisfied. Thus, even though they were not able to get all the information they requested, COS requestors were generally satisfied with the information provided.

TA requestors showed a high percentage of people who were very satisfied. This was expected. The TA contact was a much more open-ended situation in that the development of products in response to requests was not constrained by a finite data set. The only real constraint was the amount of time available to staff members and the level of competence vis-a-vis the request.

The scores of people who attended a combination of mechanisms are not presented because of small N-sizes. In this question, COS requestors and TA requestors were asked to evaluate a product that was designed for their own situation. Thus, it is not appropriate to combine COS requestors who participated in more than one mechanism with TA requestors who participated in more than one mechanism. They were
evaluating different things. Generally, however, attending a combination of mechanisms did not affect the evaluation of the products; that is, the scores for people who attended a combination of mechanisms including the COS Program were similar to those people who only requested a COS, and the scores for people who attended a combination of mechanisms including the TA Program were similar to those people who only requested TA.

Everyone was asked how satisfied he was with the performance of the staff from BENCHMARK. These results are displayed in Figure 3.16.

Conceptually, this is a difficult question to interpret. Although it does not solely measure trust and credibility, these considerations played a role in the formulation of an overall attitude. When asked why they were satisfied (or dissatisfied), respondents generally made comments about the competence, intelligence, substantive knowledge, leadership and dedication of the BENCHMARK staff. Thus, one has reason to believe that this question does measure trust and credibility.
QUESTION: In general, how satisfied were you with the performance of the staff with whom you had contact? Were you very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied with the performance of the staff from BENCHMARK?

1. Very satisfied
2. Somewhat satisfied
3. Somewhat dissatisfied
4. Very dissatisfied
5. Undecided/Neutral

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BCC</th>
<th>RRC</th>
<th>COS</th>
<th>TA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Satisfied</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Position</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Position</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Score</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>60%+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Score</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Somewhat Satisfied</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Somewhat Dissatisfied</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Dissatisfied</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undecided/Neutral</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Respondents (42) (22) (17) (9)

Looking at Figure 3.16, one sees that the predicted scores and relative positions are similar to the actual. In addition, there is more variation in the scores across mechanisms than appeared in some of the previous indicators. The direction of the scores is consistent with
the hypothesis that the type of interaction affects levels of trust, although the COS requestors show a slightly higher percentage than TA requestors. Generally, however, these are high levels of satisfaction.

This question is similar to the last one, in that participants evaluated the performance of the staff within a certain situation. Thus, people who attended a combination of mechanisms were asked this question several times in reference to different mechanisms. Thus, it is inappropriate to group all of these responses into a single "combination" category. While very small N-sizes hamper the analysis, the following example illustrates the general relationship that appeared. A person has attended the BCC and RRC. His responses to the performance of staff within the context of the BCC were higher than the responses of people who only attended the BCC, but lower than his responses to the performance of the staff within the context of the RRC. His responses to the performance of the staff within the context of the RRC were similar to the responses of people who only attended the RRC. Thus, the effect of attending a combination of mechanisms appeared to be to raise the percentage of people who were "very satisfied" with the performance of staff in the mechanism that showed the lowest overall percentage, but not to affect the general high level of positive responses encountered in the other mechanisms.

Everyone was asked how positive he felt about The BENCHMARK Program in general. These results are displayed in Figure 3.17.
Figure 3.17

FEELINGS ABOUT THE BENCHMARK PROGRAM

QUESTION: Generally, how do you feel about The BENCHMARK Program? Do you feel very positive, somewhat positive, somewhat negative, or very negative about The BENCHMARK Program?

1. Very positive
2. Somewhat positive
3. Somewhat negative
4. Very negative
5. Undecided/Neutral

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BCC</th>
<th>RRC</th>
<th>COS</th>
<th>TA</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Positive</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Positive</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Negative</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Negative</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided/Neutral</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected Position</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Position</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Score</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Score a</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Number of Respondents | (42) | (22) | (17) | (9) | (18) |

aThe actual scores were obtained by combining the percentages for the first two response categories.

Generally, the expected positions are similar to the actual. Overall, a large percentage of people were positive about BENCHMARK. While the percentage of people who were "very positive" was about the same across mechanisms, when the first two response categories were combined, a good deal of variation appeared. While these results are generally
consistent with the first hypothesis that was formulated, they are not consistent with the second. COS requestors had a higher percentage of people who felt positive than did TA requestors.

2. Summary

Figure 3.18 presents a summary of the measures of trust and credibility. Generally, all these mechanisms promoted fairly high levels of trust and credibility. This helps establish a rather firm base of support for future activities.

A variety of hypotheses were formulated in order to assist in the assessment of these mechanisms. These hypotheses were:

- The smaller the ratio between staff and users, the higher the levels of trust and credibility; and
- The greater the actual service provided to a user, the higher the levels of trust and credibility.

Generally, these hypotheses allowed one to make fairly accurate predictions. Of the fourteen predictions on relative positions, six were accurate and six were off one place. Of the fourteen predictions of scores, twelve were accurate.

The first hypothesis was almost always consistent with the actual scores. The only exception was the question dealing with the responsiveness of BENCHMARK, and in this question there was very little variation in scores across mechanisms.
**Figure 3.18**
SUMMARY OF MEASURES OF TRUST AND CREDIBILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Responsiveness&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; of BENCHMARK</th>
<th>Accuracy of Information&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Satisfaction&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; With Information</th>
<th>Satisfaction&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; With Staff</th>
<th>Feelings About&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt; BENCHMARK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RCC</strong></td>
<td>Expected Position</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual Position</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Score</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual Score</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N-size)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>(42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RRC</strong></td>
<td>Expected Position</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual Position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Score</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>70%+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual Score</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N-size)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>COS</strong></td>
<td>Expected Position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual Position</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Score</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>60%+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual Score</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N-size)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TA</strong></td>
<td>Expected Position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual Position</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Score</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>60%+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual Score</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N-size)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Combination</strong></td>
<td>Actual Score</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N-size)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Percent who say "very responsive".
<sup>b</sup>Percent who say "very" or "somewhat accurate".
<sup>c</sup>Percent who say "very satisfied".
<sup>d</sup>Percent who say "very" or "somewhat positive".
The second hypothesis was not generally consistent with the actual scores. This hypothesis was formulated to provide a rationale for possible differences in scores between COS and TA requestors. The only indicator that was consistent with this hypothesis was the one dealing with satisfaction with the information provided. In this instance, it was speculated that the difference may have occurred not as a function of the size of the private benefit, but because of the nature of requests. COS requests were constrained by a finite dataset, whereas TA requests were constrained only by staff competence and by the amount of staff time available. Thus, perhaps for this analysis the important dimension is not the size of the private benefit, but that private benefits were received.

Participation in a combination of mechanisms generally had little effect on the actual scores. The previous two concepts dealt with the relative effectiveness of these mechanisms in producing awareness or interest; i.e., knowledge and information gathering activities. It was found that attending a combination of mechanisms increased the level of awareness and interest. This section deals with attitudes, and one would not expect the same sort of relationship to occur. One might expect that the effect of attending a combination of mechanisms (plus attending over a fairly long period of time) would be to increase the stability of these attitudes. However, there are no measures of stability. On the question dealing with the accuracy of the Social Reports, those people who attended a combination of mechanisms were much more likely to feel the reports were very
accurate compared to those people who only attended an RRC. Unfortunately, everyone was not asked this question.

In the question dealing with satisfaction with staff performance, the effect of a combination of mechanisms appeared to be to raise the percentage of people who were "very satisfied" with the performance of staff in the mechanism that showed the lowest overall percentage, but not to affect the general high level of positive responses encountered in the other mechanisms. Thus, because of small N-sizes and a limited number of indicators, it is difficult to ascertain a consistent pattern.

E. **PROMOTIONAL AND REFERRAL ACTIVITY**

1. **Analysis**

The following hypotheses guided the assignment of expected scores and relative positions for measures of promotional or referral activity.

- The higher the degree of involvement, the higher the level of promotional or referral activity;

- The higher the degree of positive feelings, the higher the level of promotional or referral activity; and

- The more situations in which the individual is involved that could potentially use BENCHMARK products, the higher the level of promotional or referral activity.

Thus, it was expected that BCC members should have had the highest levels of dissemination activity because they had been fairly intimately involved in the activities of the Program for a fairly long
period of time. Although RRC members, COS requestors, and TA requestors were involved for about the same length of time, it was expected that COS and TA requestors should have had higher levels of dissemination activity than RRC members because the former had higher levels of positive feelings and because they received private benefits. TA requestors should have had slightly higher rates than COS requestors because their interaction generally occurred over a longer period of time.

Everyone was asked how often he had talked to someone about The BENCHMARK Program. These results are displayed in Figure 3.19.

Generally, the expected positions and scores are similar to the actual. Of the mechanisms, BCC members showed the highest levels of discussing BENCHMARK. However, while BCC members had the highest percentage saying they had talked to someone "very often", they also had the highest percentage who say they had never talked to anyone about BENCHMARK. The RRC, COS, and TA mechanisms showed about the same level of responses. For all the mechanisms, very few people said they had never talked about BENCHMARK. Generally, these results are consistent with the hypotheses that were formulated.

People who had participated in more than one mechanism had the highest level of talking about the Program. This is consistent with the hypotheses that were formulated, and with results found in the previous sections on awareness and interest.
QUESTION: How often have you talked to someone (not a member of the BENCHMARK Community Conference or the BENCHMARK staff) about The BENCHMARK Program?

1. Very often—It averages about once or twice a week.
2. Sometimes—It averages about once or twice a month.
3. Rarely—I've talked to people about BENCHMARK, but it is irregular and not very often.
4. Never—I can't remember talking to anyone about BENCHMARK.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BCC</th>
<th>RRC</th>
<th>COS</th>
<th>TA</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BCC</th>
<th>RRC</th>
<th>COS</th>
<th>TA</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected Position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Score</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Score(^a)</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Respondents (42)  (22)  (17)  (9)  (18)

\(^a\)Actual score obtained by adding the first two response categories.
Everyone was asked if he has ever referred anyone to the BENCHMARK Program. These results are displayed in Figure 3.20.

**Figure 3.20**

**REFERRED SOMEONE TO BENCHMARK**

**QUESTION:** Have you ever personally referred anyone to BENCHMARK, either to obtain some service or information, or to attend a BENCHMARK Community Conference (BCC) meeting? (Check all)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>BCC</th>
<th>RRC</th>
<th>COS</th>
<th>TA</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, Service</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, Information</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, BCC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, Combination(^a)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected Position</td>
<td>1  4  3  2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Position</td>
<td>2  4  3  1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected Score</td>
<td>60%+ 40-59% 40-59% 40-59%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Score(^b)</td>
<td>79% 41% 47% 89%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Respondents | (42) | (22) | (17) | (9) | (18) |

\(^a\)Refers to people who checked more than one of the first three responses.

\(^b\)Actual score obtained by adding the first four response categories.

Generally, the expected results are similar to the actual. A much higher percentage of TA requestors referred people than was anticipated.
This could have occurred either because these people were involved in a number of situations for which BENCHMARK services and information were relevant or because they were motivated to refer others. Consistent with previous indicators, people who participated in more than one mechanism have the highest rate of referring others to the Program.

RRC members were asked if they had ever talked about the findings of the Social Report with someone. These results are displayed in Figure 3.21.

**Figure 3.21**
**DISCUSSED SOCIAL REPORTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION: Have you ever talked about the findings of your Social Report with someone or mentioned them to someone (other than a member of your RRC or a BENCHMARK staff member)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes--I've actually discussed the findings with someone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Yes--I've mentioned them or referred to them in the course of discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. No--I've never discussed the findings with anyone or mentioned them to anyone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RRC</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, actually discussed</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, mentioned</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Respondents: (21) (14)
Forty-three percent (43%) said they had actually discussed the findings, and an additional 33% said they had mentioned the findings during the course of discussions. Thus, it appears that a high percentage of RRC members at least talked about the information contained in the Social Report. In addition, those people who attended a combination of mechanisms showed a very high percentage of people who had actually discussed the findings of the Social Report with someone. This was expected because attending a combination of mechanisms reflected a high degree of involvement with the Program.

2. Summary

The authors in the Social Interaction perspective have noted the importance of opinion leaders and social networks in facilitating the dissemination and utilization of innovations. Thus, the focus of this section is determining the extent of further information promotional or referral activity by participants in these various mechanisms.

Figure 3.22 presents a summary of the indicators of information dissemination activity. Although only a few indicators were available, differences appeared among mechanisms. BCC participants and those who participated in a combination of mechanisms had the highest levels of further promotional or referral activities. TA participants had a high percentage of people who referred others to the Program, and a moderate percentage of talking to others, although only 11% say they have never talked to anyone about BENCHMARK. RRC and COS participants had moderate levels of activity. Although only
Figure 3.22
SUMMARY OF MEASURES OF INFORMATION
DISSEMINATION ACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BCC</th>
<th>RRC</th>
<th>COS</th>
<th>TA</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Frequency talk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about BENCHMARK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Score</td>
<td>60%+</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td>40-59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Score</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N-size)</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **B. Referred someone** |     |     |     |    |             |
| to BENCHMARK           |     |     |     |    |             |
| Expected Position      | 1   | 4   | 3   | 2  |             |
| Actual Position        | 2   | 4   | 3   | 1  |             |
| Expected Score         | 60%+ | 40-59% | 40-59% | 40-59% |             |
| Actual Score           | 79%  | 41%  | 47%  | 89% | 100%        |
| (N-size)               | (42) | (22) | (17) | (9) | (18)        |

| **C. Discuss Social Reports** |     |     |     |    |             |
|                               |     |     |     |    |             |
| Actual Score                 | -   | 43% | -   | -  | 71%         |
| (N-size)                      | -   | (21) | -   | -  | (14)        |

\( ^a \)Percent who have talked to someone very often or sometimes.

\( ^b \)Percent who have referred someone to BENCHMARK.

\( ^c \)Percent who have actually discussed the findings of the Social Reports with someone.
a very small percent said they had never talked to anyone (9% and 6%, respectively) slightly over half of the participants in both mechanisms said they had never referred anyone to the Program for assistance or information. Although no standards exist concerning the amount of further promotional or referral activity that should have been influenced by these two mechanisms, when compared to the other mechanisms, the RRC and COS were much less effective.

A variety of hypotheses were formulated in order to assist in the assessment of these mechanisms. These hypotheses were:

- The higher the degree of involvement, the higher the level of promotional or referral activity;
- The higher the degree of positive feeling, the higher the level of promotional or referral activity; and
- The more situations in which the individual is involved that could potentially use BENCHMARK products, the higher the level of promotional or referral activity.

Generally, these hypotheses were helpful in formulating fairly accurate predictions of the actual scores and relative positions of these mechanisms for the various indicators. Of the eight predictions on relative positions, six were accurate and two were off one place. Of the eight predictions on scores, six were within the expected range. Thus, these hypotheses were helpful in estimating the actual results.
It appears that the first and last hypotheses were the most helpful. The BCC mechanism which intimately involved participants with the Program for a fairly long period of time was successful in promoting high levels of activity. TA requestors showed a very high percentage of people who referred others to the Program. This could be because they were involved in a number of situations for which BENCHMARK services or information were relevant or because their involvement motivated these people to refer others. If the latter situation were correct, COS requestors should have had lower rates of promotional or referral activity. This did not occur. It could be, however, that not enough time had elapsed for a large percentage of COS requestors to engage in such activity. Thus, more data is needed to examine this situation more thoroughly.

Although the hypothesis dealing with the relationship between positive feelings and dissemination activity was generally helpful in predicting the direction of differences among the RRC, COS, and TA mechanisms, high positive feelings alone do not seem to result in high promotional or referral activity. Although a cross tabulation would be necessary to determine the extent of this relationship, it should be noted that the BCC had the lowest level of general positive feelings toward BENCHMARK, but had some of the highest levels of dissemination.
CHAPTER FOUR

Summary of Findings for Participation Mechanisms
With Conclusions and Recommendations

A. INTRODUCTION

This chapter integrates information from previous chapters to provide an overall assessment of the relative effectiveness of each mechanism, and to suggest changes which might improve effectiveness. This assessment and recommendations are based upon the results of the evaluation questionnaires, and upon this analyst's experiences as a designer/participant observer. Each mechanism is examined separately, and recommendations concerning that mechanism are presented.

B. THE BENCHMARK COMMUNITY CONFERENCE

1. Assessment

The BENCHMARK Community Conference (BCC) was created to guide the development of CASP and the overall efforts of The BENCHMARK Program, and to promote interaction between the professional staff and potential users. Through this interaction the staff would be better able to understand the information needs of users, and the users would understand better the steps involved in designing and implementing the survey. The BCC was a continuing organization that could act as an input mechanism for all phases of The BENCHMARK Program. It was
hoped this two-way interaction would increase the trust in and credibility of the professional staff and produce a survey schedule that would collect information that responded to the information needs of potential users. This interaction should also increase awareness of and interest in BENCHMARK and its range of products. In addition, by becoming knowledgeable about the BENCHMARK Program, the BCC participants would facilitate the dissemination of information about the Program and about products of the Program within their own social networks.

Generally, the BCC was successful in guiding the development of CASP-I. This is a subjective judgment based upon my experiences. Because the BCC was a new setting, it took a long time for the conference to produce a questionnaire. This process was hampered because it brought together a large group of diverse interests in the community, and because most of the staff had limited experience in convening such a group. Nonetheless, the BCC did allow the staff to consult with a number of potential users about possible questions, and it did serve to increase the credibility of the questionnaire. In the original months of the Program there was a good deal of staff concern that BENCHMARK not be viewed as "just another academic exercise", but rather as a community research effort that collected information useful to a variety of decisionmakers and other participants in community affairs. Involving users in the design of CASP helped to overcome an academic image.
However, problems occurred because the BCC was designed to be a continuing organization. After the design of CASP, the BCC did not have a clear definition of tasks and attendance declined. This occurred despite staff efforts midway through the field work of CASP-I to encourage the BCC to give attention to its future functions. This ambiguity arose because the BCC was suppose to provide guidance not only for the design of CASP, but also for The BENCHMARK Program as a whole. The latter function was never defined, and, in the opinions of some of the participants, this function included overall policy management and Program management. This created tension between some BCC participants who felt that the staff was not sensitive to the desires of the BCC, and BENCHMARK staff who felt the BCC was infringing upon nonresearch related aspects of the Program such as staffing and budget decisions. The combination of functions in the BCC—i.e., to provide guidance to CASP and to The BENCHMARK Program as a whole—was a major design flaw which created problems tangential to the promotion of dissemination and utilization. In addition, few people were recruited into the BCC after the survey was out of the field. Analysis is difficult because attendance records were not kept for most of the BCC meetings. However, respondents in the evaluation questionnaire were asked to specify when they attended their first BCC meeting. Sixty percent (60%) say they attended their first meeting either sometime between October and December, 1973 (49%) or between January and June, 1974 (11%). (The CASP survey went into the field in May, 1974.)
While the BCC was primarily designed as an input mechanism, it promoted high levels of awareness and interest. The previous chapter demonstrated that, of all the mechanism, the BCC generally promoted the highest levels of awareness and interest. It was speculated that this occurred because the convenings emphasized general information about The BENCHMARK Program, because BCC participants were associated with the Program for a fairly long period of time, and because a variety of written and oral transmission processes were used in the meetings. In addition, general information in the meeting was discussed rather than merely being presented as a lecture. Indeed the BCC participated in shaping The BENCHMARK Program. Thus, two-way communication occurred, which is effective in stimulating attention and interest.

In addition, people generally came to BCC meetings seeking information. Respondents to the evaluation questionnaire were asked a series of open-ended questions about why they first came to a BCC meeting, and about what benefits they received from participation. Open-ended questions on mail questionnaires provide limited information. It is easy to leave the space blank and there is no interviewer to probe if the respondent does not fully answer the question. However, about 80% of the respondents provided some sort of answer to the question of why they first attended. Forty-seven percent (47%) said they came because of CASP, and they wanted to learn more about the Columbus community; 33% came because they wanted to learn more about The
BENCHMARK Program; and 21% said they came as a representative of a certain organization.

BCC participants were also asked what benefits they received from their participation. Sixty percent (60%) of the respondents answered this question. Of those who answered, 44% said a benefit they received from participation was more information and knowledge about the Columbus community, 29% mentioned meeting new people, and 21% said a benefit was learning about The BENCHMARK Program.

From these two questions one sees that a primary function of the BCC was to disseminate information about The BENCHMARK Program and about the Columbus community. This is different from the original conception of the BCC which stressed its role as an input mechanism. This does not mean that the BCC did not provide guidance to the Program, especially in the design of CASP-I. It does indicate that when people were given an open-ended format in which to discuss the BCC, they cited aspects dealing with the transfer of information. This further helps explain why BCC members showed high levels of awareness and interest.

In addition, about 26% of the BCC members participated in other BENCHMARK mechanisms. While this is not a large percentage, all the people who participated in a combination of mechanisms were BCC members.
While BCC participants had high levels of awareness and interest, they had the lowest levels of trust and credibility, or positive attitudes. This was particularly true regarding satisfaction with staff and overall feelings about BENCHMARK. It was speculated in the previous chapter that this could be because the interaction occurred in a large group or because BCC members did not receive substantial private benefits. In addition, it may have occurred because of tensions arising from an ambiguous purpose after CASP-I was finished. This might also have been affected by the timing of the execution of the evaluation which occurred while the BCC was struggling to establish its future agenda. Nonetheless, it is unfortunate that given the amount of staff time devoted to the BCC, this interaction did not result in a higher level of positive feelings.

And finally, BCC members were fairly active in promoting BENCHMARK within their social networks and in referring others to the Program. It was speculated that this occurred because of the high interest and involvement of members; and because most had been associated with the Program for a relatively long period of time.

In summary, the BCC mechanism was generally successful. Positive aspects included the promotion of: 1) high levels of awareness and interest; 2) positive attitudes, albeit lower than desired; 3) interaction between staff and potential users resulting in the questionnaire design of CASP-I; 4) promotional and referral activity by the participants; and 5) involvement—and often leadership by—the
BCC participants in other mechanisms of The BENCHMARK Program. Negative aspects include: 1) the amount of staff time devoted to the mechanisms; 2) the length of time needed to design the questionnaire; 3) the low level of informal, one-to-one interaction between staff and community leadership; 4) the relatively low levels of trust and credibility; and 5) the problems that occurred because the BCC was viewed as a continuing mechanism, which resulted in an ambiguous situation following the completion of CASP-1.

Overall, it appears that the BCC was successful in stimulating awareness, interest, trust, and credibility. The mechanism actively involved users in the Program, promoted awareness of major aspects of the Program, stimulated further information gathering activities, and generally stimulated positive evaluations in terms of trust and credibility, although not as well as some of the other mechanisms. However, there were gaps in the effectiveness of this mechanism, particularly with regard to stimulating participation in Report Review Committees, and to creating problems, tangential to the research process, because of an ambiguous function. Unfortunately, no utilization measures were available.

2. Recommendations

The preceding assessment suggests changes that could be made to improve the effectiveness of the BCC.
1. **The BCC should be an ad hoc group of people convened in order to design the survey questionnaire.** Viewing the BCC as an ad hoc group of people with a specific purpose should overcome some of the difficulties encountered. Specifically, it should not only reduce the amount of continuous staff time that is needed to maintain an organization, but also decrease the tension caused by ambiguous purposes.

2. **More effort should be expended to reduce the time between designing the questionnaire and reporting the results, and to encourage participation of BCC members in Report Review Committees.** Undoubtedly, the original CASP design period was hampered because BENCHMARK was a new program. There were many problems and questions which had to be considered that were tangential to the actual design of CASP. Viewing the BCC as an ad hoc group should facilitate this process because many of the organizational questions will be eliminated. However, it is very important to reduce the time period between design and reports in order that timely information is presented and that interest is maintained. In addition, shortening this time period should facilitate the participation of BCC members in Report Review Committees. Such continued participation is important because it further stimulates awareness and interest, and because it increases involvement and identification with the results. The objective is to overcome some of the loss of effectiveness (specifically in terms of awareness and interest) in the BCC because it has a more limited focus and time span, by encouraging continued participation in other mechanisms. A major finding of the
previous chapter is that participation in a combination of mechanisms has a positive effect on levels of awareness, interest, trust, and credibility.

3. **More effort should be expended to increase one-to-one interaction and the extent of personal follow-ups after the conclusion of the BCC.** Although one-to-one interaction occurred between staff and BCC members, particularly by the Director of BENCHMARK, more effort should be expended by other members of the staff. It is anticipated that specifying and narrowing the purpose of the BCC should help increase trust and credibility because fewer misunderstandings should result concerning staff responsibilities. In addition, more conscious pursuit of one-to-one interaction should also improve the level of positive feelings.

4. **More effort should be expended to utilize a variety of information transmission processes.** It was previously mentioned that of all the mechanisms, the BCC was the only one which used a mix of oral and written transmission processes. However, this mix becomes even more important if the scope of the BCC is reduced. Fewer general aspects of The BENCHMARK Program will be discussed in meetings, because the focus will be exclusively on CASP. Consequently, the amount of redundancy of information will be reduced. Thus, more emphasis will have to be placed on providing short, written descriptions of BENCHMARK activities at meetings, and including this information in
the newsletter sent to BCC participants. In addition, a conscious effort should be made to discuss this information with participants in one-to-one interaction outside the BCC meeting.

C. THE REPORT REVIEW COMMITTEE

1. Assessment

A Report Review Committee (RRC) was established for each Social Report to: 1) advise on the development of issues and themes; 2) enable community input to the reporting process itself; 3) provide opportunities for users and potential users to become more aware of the scope of each CASP-1 module; 4) increase awareness of the variety of analytical options that can be brought to bear on the CASP-1 database; and 5) provide opportunities for individuals to become more knowledgeable about each report.

Thus, the primary purpose of the RRC was to guide the development of the Social Report for each area of concern. In addition, by getting people in the community who were interested in the particular topic area to participate in the RRC, specialized users would be informed about the information in CASP, and about The BENCHMARK Program in general; i.e., promoting awareness and interest. By writing Social Reports with the direct involvement of people who had substantive knowledge or interest in a particular area, one hoped to maximize the usefulness of the information contained in the Social Report, to promote internalization of the information and to increase staff and
community interaction, promoting trust and credibility. By establishing contact with potential users of the information, through their participation on the RRC, actual utilization of the information would be encouraged. Finally, it was hoped that on the basis of increased awareness, interest, trust, and credibility, RRC participants would further promote information about the Program in their own social networks and refer others to the Program.

Generally, the RRC mechanism successfully guided the development of each Social Report. Conway (1976) has extensively examined the general operation of the Report Review Committee and the nature of each of the individual Report Review Committees that were convened around the different modules in CASP. He notes that most staff members felt the RRC members actively participated in the development of the reports and offered many helpful suggestions concerning what information should be highlighted, what information contradicted "common knowledge" in a particular subject area, and what parts of the Social Report were difficult to read or understand. In addition, it was generally felt that the perceived credibility of the reports was increased because potential users participated in the writing of Social Reports.

However, there were differences among the various Report Review Committees that were established. An important variable was the mix of people who served on the committee. Generally, the staff tried to ensure that a broad range of views were represented. Thus, for example, in the RRC on child care, there were representatives from
day care centers (public and private), from Franklin County Children Services, from the City of Columbus, from Community Coordinated Child Care, from The Ohio State University and from the Columbus Metropolitan Area Community Action Organization (CMACAO).

However, in a couple of instances, this mix of people and the political circumstances outside the RRC created tension. For example, the capital improvements RRC had people from the City of Columbus, from Columbus City Council, from the League of Women Voters, from the Development Committee for Greater Columbus and from CMACAO. Although a variety of neighborhood civic association leaders were invited, none were able to attend. At the time the Social Report was being written the City Council was considering the Administration's Capital Improvements Program. The person who coordinated the development of that Program was a member of the RRC. Because he felt the information contained in that Social Report threatened some of the Administration's proposals, he tried to discredit much of the information. A salient political issue at that time was the low amount of money for capital improvements the City was putting into the Central City. The Social Report showed that people in the Central City were much more likely to negatively evaluate the condition of neighborhood streets, street lights, storm sewers, and parks than people in other sections of Columbus. Thus, in each RRC meeting the City representative raised such issues as: 1) the respondents did not know what they were talking about; 2) planners know more about what the people want than the people do; and 3) nothing new appeared in the findings. The staff
analyst was put into a defensive position. While the analyst answered these concerns every time they were raised, he did not want to create a belief among other members of the RRC that every time they raised a question, they would be met with an argument from the staff analyst. Nonetheless, this created a combative atmosphere in the RRC which dampened the willingness of the other members of the RRC to participate in the discussions. In retrospect this situation might have been improved if the analyst had been able to secure the participation of some neighborhood leaders who would have counter balanced the perspective of the City representative.

This example highlights several important aspects of the RRC: 1) the nature of the meeting is affected by the mix of the participants; and 2) the political context may have an important effect upon the operation of the RRC and this needs to be considered before the convening.

The RRC mechanism did provide an opportunity for new people to become acquainted with and involved in The BENCHMARK Program. The RRC was the only mechanism in which a good deal of invitation occurred. The writing of a Social Report provided the occasion for involving people in BENCHMARK who may not have shown a strong previous interest. Of those people who returned questionnaires, 33% said they had never had contact with The BENCHMARK Program before they served on a Report Review Committee. In addition, of those who said they had had contact, many of them had had only informal contact, such as talking to a staff
member about the information available. Although one would have
desired more participation in the RRC from BCC members, the RRC was
successful in allowing The BENCHMARK Program to broaden its range
of contacts.

It does appear that generally, the Social Reports contained
useful information. Although no systematic data exists concerning the
perceived usefulness of the Social Reports to all people who read them,
RRC members were asked to rate the usefulness of the Social Report pro­
duced by their RRC. RRC members are in a unique position to judge the
usefulness of the information. They are close enough to be aware of
the questions that were asked, yet have enough detachment from the
information to maintain objectivity. RRC members could have some bias
towards the information because they helped write the Social Report.
This bias affects the objective assessment of the usefulness of the
data. However, one of the purposes of the RRC was to promote identif­
ication with the information produced. Thus, while one may get a biased
view of the usefulness of the Social Reports, it is important to examine
the degree to which RRC members feel the reports are useful.

Each respondent was presented with a list of seven possible
uses of the CASP-I data, and was asked to judge how useful the inform­
ation was that was dealt with in their RRC, either by itself or in
combination with other kinds of data. These results are displayed in
Figure 4.1. Generally, there are high levels of perceived usefulness.
**Figure 4.1**

**UTILITY OF INFORMATION**

**QUESTION:** BENCHMARK is very concerned about how the information in the survey could be used. The following is a list of possible uses for the information. How useful would you judge the information is that was dealt with in your RRC, either by itself or in combination with other kinds of data, for each of the following topics?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Information</th>
<th>Very Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Not Very Useful</th>
<th>Not At All Useful</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Promoting discussion about the subject area.</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Providing supporting evidence for present knowledge.</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(35)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Help in assessing the needs of citizens.</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Help in making decisions about service delivery.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Help in analyzing the combined overall effectiveness of existing programs in that subject area.</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Help in examining the opinions of citizens.</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Help in making budgetary decisions.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>(35)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Missing cases due to people who did not answer the question.
There was only one category for which a majority did not feel the Social Reports were very or somewhat useful; however, it was an important category. About 60% of the respondents felt the Social Reports were not very or not at all useful for making budgetary decisions. However, overall, RRC members feel that the information dealt with in their Social Report could be used for a variety of purposes. These are important results because they indicate that the RRC mechanism promoted a positive evaluation of the usefulness of the Social Reports. In addition, they are consistent with the high levels of trust and credibility found in the previous chapter. Belief that the information is potentially useful is an important step towards actually using the information from CASP-I.

RRC participants were asked if they have ever used the information contained in the Social Reports produced by their RRC. Forty-two percent (42%) say they have used the information, and an additional 44% say they have not used it yet, but they might in the future. Thus, 86% of the RRC members say they have used the information or they might use it in the future. This seems to be a large amount of use, given that Social Reports were intended to be broad and descriptive, and were not directed towards the specific needs of a user. In addition, not a lot of time had elapsed between the issuance of most Social Reports and the conduction of this evaluation. Thus, the RRC not only was successful in promoting positive evaluations about the potential usefulness of the Social Reports, but also in promoting their use.
If a person answered that they have used the information, they were asked "how". Because most of the answers were brief, it is difficult to determine, in some cases, specifically how the information was used. However, generally, the respondents said they used the information to promote discussion about a certain topic, to provide supporting evidence for a specific course of action, to help in assessing the needs of citizens in a certain subject area, and to help in making decisions about service delivery. Thus, the information in the Social Reports was used for a variety of purposes.

It was noted previously that the RRC promoted lower levels of general awareness than the BCC. It was mentioned that this was particularly true concerning knowledge of the COS Program. This was unfortunate because the COS Program provided a more detailed analysis of the data, and it appears that many of the RRC members were not aware of the purposes of the COS Program. Thus, RRC members were not aware of all the opportunities available to them. This is reflected in the small amount of COS requests which were initiated by RRC members. Of the 49 different RRC members, only four had requested Community-Originated Studies by the time the evaluation was conducted. It was speculated that this unfamiliarity might be due to the relatively short period of exposure to BENCHMARK and to the sole reliance upon oral transmission processes.

However, although RRC members had lower degrees of general awareness, the mechanism was successful in familiarizing a small group
of potential users with the information contained within a particular subject area. In addition, the previous analysis demonstrated that many of the members used the information in the Social Report. This might explain, somewhat, the small number of COS requests from RRC members; i.e., their information needs were satisfied by the Social Reports.

RRC members also had relatively low scores on most indicators of interest. The exception was a high percentage of members interested in participating in the design of the next Columbus Area Social Profile. However, RRC members had a low level of formal requests for assistance and information, and of contact with The BENCHMARK Program after participation on an RRC. It was speculated that this could be due to the short time span between participation on an RRC and the conduction of the evaluation. In addition, it could also be because the participant's information needs were met in the RRC. However, the results of these questions highlight the need for more follow-up by staff members after the conclusion of an RRC.

And finally, the RRC members had fairly low levels of promotional or referral activity. This was particularly true concerning the level of talking about The BENCHMARK Program, and the referral of other people to BENCHMARK for services or information. This low level of activity could have occurred because RRC members had a short period of active involvement and because not a lot of time had elapsed between the conclusion of most Report Review Committees, and the
conduction of this evaluation. Further promotional or referral activities might be stimulated if more effort was made to follow-up the participation of an RRC member after the conclusion of the Social Report.

In summary, the RRC mechanism accomplished many things. Positive aspects included: 1) facilitating the production of the Social Reports, and promoting interaction between community and staff; 2) increasing the perceived credibility of the Social Reports; 3) providing a way for new people to get involved with the activities of BENCHMARK; 4) promoting a positive evaluation of the usefulness of the information contained in the Social Report; 5) promoting high levels of positive attitudes in terms of trust and credibility; 6) promoting the actual use of the information contained in Social Reports; 7) increasing awareness among potential users concerning the information contained in the Social Reports; and 8) promoting interest among members in participating in the design of CASP-II. Negative aspects include: 1) the low level of COS requests initiated by RRC members; 3) the low levels of general awareness of other major aspects of The BENCHMARK Program; 3) the low level of formal requests for Information or of contact with The BENCHMARK Program; and 4) the low level of further information dissemination activity by RRC members. Overall, it appears that the RRC mechanism was successful in stimulating those factors which theoretical studies have emphasized are important; i.e.; awareness, interest, trust, and credibility. There
was actual utilization of the information by RRC members. However, there were gaps in the effectiveness of this mechanism, particularly with regard to stimulating COS requests, and maintaining contact with BENCHMARK.

2. **Recommendations**

   The preceding assessment suggests changes that could be made to improve the effectiveness of the RRC.

   1. **A variety of information transmission processes should be used in RRC meetings.** It was mentioned previously that only oral transmission processes were used in RRC meetings. Specifically, this involved a lecture in the first meeting regarding The BENCHMARK Program in general. This should be supplemented with short, written descriptions of major Program activities. All materials produced by BENCHMARK should be available at meetings. The RRC represents a small group of elites who are interested in the particular subject area. This group of people could be a very important transmitter of information about BENCHMARK, and every effort should be made to facilitate that dissemination activity.

   2. **The Community-Originated Studies Program should be discussed in the first and last meetings of an RRC.** More effort needs to be expended to familiarize RRC members with opportunities available for receiving additional analysis of the information contained in a Social Report. The COS Program should be stressed in the last meeting, and the RRC members should be familiarized with the kind of further
analysts that might be performed with the data. They should also be encouraged to refer others to the Program if there are any questions or requests, and to refer staff to others in the community who might have an interest in the topic they worked on.

3. **More effort should be expended to keep the RRC members informed about the activities of the Program after the conclusion of an RRC.** After the conclusion of an RRC, members were sent a letter thanking them for their participation. However, no systematic effort was made to maintain contact with RRC members. Thus, it is recommended that RRC members be routinely added to the mailing list of the monthly newsletter of the Program, and that they be kept informed about any Community-Originated Studies produced in the subject area dealt with in their RRC. In addition, RRC members should be encouraged to participate in future Program activities.

D. **THE COMMUNITY-ORIGINATED STUDIES PROGRAM**

1. **Assessment**

The Community-Originated Studies (COS) Program facilitated processing of individualized requests from CASP. The Social Reports were broad, relatively short, descriptive papers. It was recognized that the general reports might be insufficient to satisfy the information needs of specific users. However, it was hoped that these reports would promote awareness of and interest in the information, and would stimulate more specific requests for analysis from various users throughout the community.
The COS Program promoted close interaction between the staff of BENCHMARK and a specific user. The product of that interaction is a Community-Originated Study which is tailored for a specific user, and which that user has helped develop. As with previous mechanisms, it was thought that this interaction would not only further promote awareness of and interest in the products and services BENCHMARK could provide, but also stimulate the development of credibility and trust. In addition, it was hoped the user would disseminate information within his own social network.

The COS Program did facilitate the processing of specialized information requests. There was a set of routine procedures which allowed a fairly fast return of the results to users.

In addition, the COS Program involved new people with The BENCHMARK Program. COS requestors were asked if they had had any contact with The BENCHMARK Program before they made their requests. Forty-one percent (41%) state that they had not had previous contact. The type of involvement of those with previous contact was generally attendance at a BCC meeting, or membership on an RRC or informal discussions with members of the BENCHMARK staff. Although it is not known how people heard about The BENCHMARK Program and the availability of Community-Originated Studies, the fairly large group of people without prior activity who requested a COS, seems to suggest the influence of
mass media coverage of the Social Reports, or the promotional activities of community people who had been involved with The BENCHMARK Program.

COS requestors had moderate levels of awareness of general aspects of The BENCHMARK Program. This does not appear to be a major problem. The lowest level of responses was on the indicator dealing with knowledge of the purposes of the BCC. It was speculated that this could be because only oral transmission processes were used, and because of the relatively short period of contact between the COS requestor and The BENCHMARK Program.

It was noted in the previous chapter that overall, the COS requestors showed relatively high rates of further information gathering activities. The lowest levels of responses occurred on the indicators dealing with readership of Social Reports and the degree of contact with the Program after the delivery of the COS. However, a large percentage of COS requestors either owned a User's Guide or had access to one, were interested in participating in the design of CASP-II, and were very likely to request further information from BENCHMARK in the future if the need arose.

In addition, it was noted that COS requestors showed the highest levels of positive feelings towards The BENCHMARK Program, in general, and the highest levels of satisfaction concerning the performance of BENCHMARK staff. Thus, this mechanism successfully promoted high levels of trust and credibility.
However, COS requestors had relatively low rates of promotional or referral activity. There was not a good deal of variation across mechanisms on these indicators, and it was speculated that these rates could have occurred because of a lower level of involvement by COS requestors than BCC members (who had the highest rates of further dissemination activity).

The COS Program attempted to adapt the information from CASP to the needs of specific users. Consequently, one would expect high rates of use of the information by COS requestors. The degree of use depends, partly, upon the reasons an individual requested the information. COS requestors were asked if, at the time they made their request, they anticipated the information might be useful in a project that was already underway, or if they felt it would be useful to have for future reference. Almost everyone (94%) requested the information because they wanted it for immediate use and more than half (58%) thought it would also be useful for future reference.

In addition, COS requestors were asked if they used the information provided by BENCHMARK. All COS requestors said they were able to use the information. Generally, most people said the information was used for planning, either for inclusion in a report or for a needs assessment, or for learning about citizen perceptions on a certain topic. Thus, the COS Program was very successful in providing information that was actually used by a client.
In summary, it appears that the COS Program was very effective. Positive aspects included: 1) the effective processing of requests for specialized information; 2) the involvement of new people in The BENCHMARK Program; 3) the promotion of awareness of the information within a certain subject area; 4) the promotion of relatively high levels of interest; 5) the promotion of high levels of trust and credibility, or positive attitudes about the Program; and 6) the promotion of very high rates of utilization. Negative aspects included: 1) relatively low levels of general information awareness; 2) relatively low levels of contact with the Program after the receipt of the COS and low readership of Social Reports; and 3) relatively low rates of promotional or referral activity. Thus, overall, it appears that the COS Program was successful in stimulating awareness, interest, trust, and credibility, and in promoting the actual utilization of the information.

2. Recommendations

Because of the overall success of this mechanism, only a few changes are suggested in order to improve its effectiveness.

1. A variety of information transmission processes should be used in the COS Program. Generally, oral transmission processes were utilized in COS meetings. Although some staff members did try to provide COS requestors with other written materials produced by BENCHMARK,
this procedure was not routinized. It is particularly important that COS requestors be given routinely copies of Social Reports. This group could be potentially very valuable in disseminating information about the Program, and it's important to facilitate that dissemination activity.

2. More effort should be expended to keep COS requestors informed about the activities of the Program after they have received their information. Not enough effort was made to keep in contact with the COS requestor after the information was delivered. A personal phone call should be made several weeks after the conclusion of a COS to determine any problems with the data. In addition, COS requestors should be added routinely to the newsletter mailing list. Because COS contacts were relatively short, it is important to stimulate further involvement. COS requestors used the information from the CASP database, and it is important to stimulate further dissemination activity. Consequently, every effort should be made to maintain contact with these people and to keep them informed about Program activities.
E. THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

1. Assessment

The previous three mechanisms were all connected in some way to the Columbus Area Social Profile. However, in the original design of BENCHMARK, it was anticipated that the group of analysts brought together for the design and implementation of CASP could also respond to ad hoc requests for technical assistance from users in the community. In addition to providing a badly needed service, technical assistance contacts could further promote other aspects of BENCHMARK. Thus, all non-CASP related requests for service or information are handled in the Technical Assistance (TA) Program. The occasion for working on a specific product allows the staff not only to transfer various skills, but also to promote interest in and awareness of BENCHMARK in general. It was hoped that during this interaction the staff person and the Program will gain credibility and trust. This interaction, if productive, should form the basis for future interaction. In addition, it is hoped the user will further disseminate knowledge about BENCHMARK among his colleagues and acquaintances.

Although systematic data are scarce, it does appear that the TA Program provided useful information and services. In the previous chapter it was noted that everyone was either very satisfied (88%) or somewhat satisfied (12%) with the information provided. These are very high levels of satisfaction. Although, no question was asked concerning
utilization, it is generally felt by this observer that all the information was actually used by the clients. This is supported by the number of letters sent to the Program by TA requestors after the conclusion of the technical assistance thanking the Program for its help, and mentioning that the service or information was useful. This is consistent with the high utilization rates found in the COS mechanism, and supports the high utilization potential of these one-to-one problem solving mechanisms.

While the major focus of the TA mechanism was not on CASP, TA requestors showed a surprisingly high level of awareness and interest in the other aspects of BENCHMARK. While only a small percentage had heard of and knew the purpose of the COS Program, a high percentage knew the purpose of CASP, and were very or somewhat familiar with the services or information BENCHMARK could provide. Thus, it appears that a good deal of information was exchanged in TA meetings concerning other aspects of The BENCHMARK Program. Analysis is hampered because only a few indicators were available.

In addition, it appears that TA requestors had fairly high levels of interest. About 80% have read Social Reports (the highest percentage of all the mechanisms) and about 60% would be very likely to request information from BENCHMARK in the future if the need arose. While only about one-third of the TA requestors had had contact with BENCHMARK after the conclusion of the services, this was the highest
percentage of all the mechanisms. TA requestors also had very high levels of trust and credibility. This is consistent with the scores of the COS mechanism which is conceptually similar to the TA mechanism.

TA requestors also had fairly high rates of further information dissemination activity. The TA requestors showed the second highest percentage of people talking about the Program about once or twice a month (although there was not a lot of variation across mechanisms), and the highest percentage (89%) of referring other people to the Program for service or information.

In addition, the TA mechanism was successful in involving new people in The BENCHMARK Program. Fifty-eight percent (58%) of the TA requestors said they had had no previous contact with the Program. As with the COS Program, these results seem to demonstrate the importance of social networks and of mass media coverage.

One of the few negative aspects of the TA Program is the amount of staff time that was needed, and consequently, the limited number of TA requests that could be processed. The evaluation questionnaire was only sent to people for whom major technical assistance was provided. However, a good deal of short term technical assistance was provided. This generally involved a few phone calls with a particular client to provide information or services. Many of these requests involved referring a client to another information source in the community, reviewing a questionnaire, presenting workshops concerning the use of survey research to various community groups, and helping
certain social service providers conduct a needs assessment. It would have been interesting to have examined these short term contacts to determine the levels of awareness, interest, trust, and credibility that were promoted.

In summary, the TA mechanism was very successful, not only in providing useful information to clients, but also in promoting awareness, interest, trust, and credibility. Positive aspects included: 1) involving new people in The BENCHMARK Program; 2) providing useful information to clients that generally was used; 3) promoting awareness of and interest in the products and services of BENCHMARK; 4) promoting high levels of positive evaluations of the Program in terms of trust and credibility; and 5) promoting high levels of further information gathering activities. Negative aspects included: 1) the amount of staff time devoted to technical assistance users; and 2) the small number of major TA requestors the Program was able to process.

2. Recommendations

Because of the overall success of this mechanism, only a few changes are suggested in order to improve its effectiveness. In many respects, these recommendations are similar to those offered about the COS Program because these two mechanisms are very close conceptually.
1. A variety of information dissemination processes should be used in TA meetings. This is a recommendation that was made previously for other mechanisms. Every person who has more than a casual acquaintance with the Program becomes a potential disseminator of information. It was shown that generally TA requestors show fairly high rates of dissemination activity, and it is important to increase the information base of the participants. The more they know, the more knowledge they can transfer to others.

2. More effort should be expended to keep TA requestors involved in and informed about the activities of the Program. This recommendation is similar to the first. TA requestors should be routinely added to the mailing list of the BENCHMARK newsletter. Because of the amount of time invested in TA requestors, it is wise to try to maximize the value of these people in promoting the activities of the Program. This can be done by trying to maintain contact with TA requestors after the delivery of services or information.
A. INTRODUCTION

The preceding chapter assessed each specific mechanism in BENCHMARK's dissemination and utilization strategy and offered recommendations for improving the effectiveness of those mechanisms. This chapter assesses the overall effects of the mix of mechanisms which collectively comprise the major aspects of BENCHMARK's dissemination and utilization strategy, and makes recommendations concerning relative emphasis and different techniques which might improve the overall effectiveness of the strategy. In addition, post-BENCHMARK experiences in the cities of Cincinnati and Toledo are presented in order to examine how well some of the ideas developed within BENCHMARK could be exported to different contexts. Finally, general statements are presented concerning the applicability of the dissemination and utilization theory employed in The BENCHMARK Program and concerning future research agendas.

B. THE BENCHMARK PROGRAM: AN OVERALL ASSESSMENT

This section assesses the overall effectiveness of the dissemination and utilization strategy developed by BENCHMARK and
offers recommendations to improve its overall effectiveness.

Figure 5.1 illustrates the relationship among major processes, major products, and major structures in the Program. As was mentioned previously, the major activity of the Program was the development and implementation of the Columbus Area Social Profile (CASP). The major products were Social Reports and Community-Originated Studies based upon the CASP data. As Figure 5.1 indicates, potential users were involved in all phases of the research process. This involvement helped the staff to produce information which was useful and was responsive to needs in the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>BCC</th>
<th>RRC</th>
<th>COS</th>
<th>TA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailored</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Product: CASP Questionnaire
Completed Survey
Social Reports
Community-Originated Studies, Technical Assistance

There was a mixture of group participation (BCC, RRC) and one-to-one interaction (COS, TA). This was generally a sound strategy, because it allowed a number of potential users to become exposed to information during the design, development, and general
reporting stages, and then concentrated on one-to-one interaction during the specific reporting stage.

Most of the mechanisms had voluntary self-selected membership. This was basically a sound strategy because time and resources were spent on people who were already basically aware and interested. Other types of media (print, electronic, talks, demonstrations) should be employed to create an awareness of the opportunities. When a Program is in the initial phases, it is also important to seek the advice and personally stimulate the involvement of users. Once a core number of potential users has been involved with various phases, this activity becomes less important. However, it is anticipated that some forms of invitation should always be employed. In addition, past participants of the Program should always be notified of upcoming opportunities for participation.

The RRC, COS, and TA Programs were intermittent mechanisms which provided a relatively short period of intense contact; whereas, the BCC was a continuing mechanism. Although the BCC mechanism was continuous, there were large fluctuations in its membership. Thus, functionally speaking, it was more like an intermittent mechanism—an unexpected consequence of membership participation patterns. In the previous chapter it was mentioned that this facet of the BCC created problems during the later stages of The BENCHMARK Program after the completion of CASP. A continuing mechanism is an unnecessary drain on staff time and resources, and creates problems
which are tangential to the overall objectives of the Program. Instead, mechanisms should be stressed which have a clear purpose and which provide a short period of intensive contact. This allows close contact with the client and enhances the establishment of working relationships.

In addition, better communication should be maintained with participants after the conclusion of a mechanism. It was mentioned previously that everyone who participated in any mechanism of BENCHMARK should receive the Program newsletter. This newsletter should provide information designed to increase the awareness and interest of the recipients towards The BENCHMARK Program. Awareness and interest can also be stimulated by improving the mix of information transmission processes used within a mechanism. More short, descriptive summaries should be written concerning the major components and activities of the Program, how the information produced by the Program could be used, and how the information has been used. In addition, a more conscious effort should be made to maintain personal contact with past participants. All these efforts could serve to maintain a person's interest in the Program after the conclusion of his active participation.

More effort should be exerted to encourage repeat involvement of a participant and to encourage continuity between mechanisms. Thus, people who are involved in the design and development phases (i.e., the BCC) of CASP should be encouraged, to a greater degree,
to participate in the general reporting of the results (i.e., the RRC). And people who participate in the general reporting phase should receive more encouragement to request Community-Originated Studies. The promotion of this continuity would be facilitated if the time period between the major phases of the research process was reduced. Continuity and repeat participation increase the involvement of the individual with The BENCHMARK Program. In addition, previous chapters noted that participation in a combination of mechanisms had a strong positive effect on levels of awareness, interest, and promotional or referral activity.

In reviewing the mechanisms involved in each stage of the research process, it appears that the COS Program should have received more emphasis. The COS Program seemed to have many positive effects, given the relatively small amount of time that was required to process the requests, and the relatively large number of people that were accommodated. There were relatively high levels of awareness, interest, trust, and credibility among COS requestors, and very high rates of utilization. Defects in the mechanism could be overcome by relying upon a variety of information transmission processes, and by using better follow-up procedures. As Community-Originated Studies are processed, short descriptive summaries should be written and sent to people who are on the BENCHMARK mailing list. Emphasizing the different ways the information has been used by others might cause non-COS requestors to see ways they could use the data, and consequently, stimulate more COS requests.
The major products of BENCHMARK (i.e., the Social Reports and Community-Originated Studies) were assessed in the previous chapter. While information does not exist concerning the opinions of all people who read Social Reports, it was shown the RRC members felt the Social Report could be used in a number of ways, and that a number of people had been able to utilize information.

The Social Reports were broad descriptive papers on a particular subject area in CASP. Sixteen Social Reports were released dealing with such topics as recreation, social services, child care, crime (police and courts), transportation, employment, capital improvements, education, health, food, and political involvement. Most of the reports only used CASP data, although in some cases, institutional or census data were included. The strategy behind the issuance of the Social Reports was to disseminate the information available in CASP and to combine CASP data with other information sources in the writing of Community-Originated Studies. However, although this integration of information sources did occur in a few instances, most of the requests for Community-Originated Studies centered exclusively on information contained in the CASP data base. Thus, the integration of CASP information with other types of data never occurred to the extent visualized in the early stages of the Program—an unfortunate result, especially since those reports which did integrate data from a variety of sources were very positively received.
While one can only speculate as to the effect this lack of integration had on the utilization potential of CASP data, it appears that it limited the effectiveness of CASP data. Because the integration never occurred, CASP information did not fully penetrate decisionmaking routines. Decisionmakers are accustomed to relying upon certain types of information in assessing situations, and it was unclear to them how CASP fit into these assessments. Survey research can be another important information source for a wide variety of policymakers. However, there are limitations upon its use as a sole information source. Thus, it is recommended that future efforts combine survey data with other relevant information that is available.

For example, questions in the Capital Improvements module provided information concerning citizen evaluations of the condition of streets, the adequacy of street lights, the effectiveness of storm sewers, and the adequacy of park facilities within their neighborhood. This was information not previously available to decisionmakers. In addition, the need for that kind of information had been cited publicly by a variety of policymakers. Distinct differences in citizen perceptions of these facilities occurred among different parts of town. However, this information was not used to any great extent by policymakers in evaluating the upcoming distributions of capital improvements.
A variety of factors can account for this lack of utilization—the most important being that the information was disseminated at a time when the administration had already assembled the proposed capital improvements budget and consequently was threatened by any information contrary to its recommendations. It appears, however, that utilization might have been increased if CASP data had been combined with sources of information then being used. Thus, the report should have compared citizen evaluations with information dealing with the location of street lights, the age of sanitary sewers (and the location of joint sanitary and storm sewers), the location of parks, and the Highway Department's assessment of streets. This might have demonstrated to decisionmakers how CASP data could complement existing data sources. Moreover, this kind of presentation would have made it more difficult to ignore the capital improvements Social Report in the Capital Improvement decision process.

As previous chapters demonstrated, Community-Originated Studies achieved a high degree of utilization. This was a very successful aspect of The BENCHMARK Program and succeeded in allowing individuals in the community to request further analysis of the CASP data tailored to their own specific information needs. The success of this Program in providing useful information warrants its continued emphasis in future endeavors.

The preceding sections have examined the overall dissemination and utilization strategy of BENCHMARK, and have recommended
changes that might be made to improve the overall effectiveness. While generally, the strategy followed by BENCHMARK achieved a number of positive aspects, it should be noted that the Program disbanded after two years of operation, and the execution of one Columbus Area Social Profile.

The primary sponsor of The BENCHMARK Program was the Academy for Contemporary Problems (ACP). The ACP was a joint endeavor supported by the Battelle Memorial Institute and The Ohio State University. Tensions developed early between the ACP staff and the staff of BENCHMARK. This problem was exacerbated because the policy and program management capabilities of The BENCHMARK Program were better developed than those of the Academy, which had no program planning capability, weak financial management, and largely inexperienced middle management. One of the origins of that conflict concerned BENCHMARK's access to the potential client structure in Columbus.

The client structure in the community can be generally classified into Public Leadership, Civic Leadership, and Business Leadership. Public users were primarily the local city and county government in Columbus—though there is evidence of substantial use by State agencies as well (Conway, 1976). Civic users consisted of neighborhood groups (e.g., the Model Neighborhood Assembly, Northland Community Conference), and quasi-governmental bodies (e.g., Community Coordinated Child Care, Mid-Ohio Regional Planning
Council, CMACAO). The Business sector consisted of business and financial leaders in the community.

In the initial discussions with the ACP before BENCHMARK was officially announced, a debate occurred over the type of community clients whose participation should be sought. The ACP wanted to stress the involvement of the Business leadership structure, and the leadership of BENCHMARK wished to stress the Civic sector. The ACP strategy was an old power structure coalition idea to get money. BENCHMARK wanted to promote credibility and trust—especially among those least likely to give it. It was thought the ACP approach would mean the loss of that credibility. The Public Leadership received less emphasis from both sides. The views of the BENCHMARK staff prevailed in this initial disagreement. However, in the later stages of the Program—when the staff attempted to attain more participation of the Business Leadership—the ACP assumed the role of gatekeeper, mediating these contacts and attempting to block direct access. This severely undermined efforts to secure community-based financial support for the Program.

The survival of BENCHMARK past its initial 2-1/2 year funding depended upon finding additional money within the Columbus community. A variety of political factors beyond the Program's control affected that process of securing additional funds. The status of the Academy changed from a joint venture of Battelle Memorial Institute and The Ohio State University to a non-profit
Institute sponsored by the seven major Public Interest Groups. While the Academy was trying to determine what its overall focus would be, the leadership froze all proposals for future funding which were being prepared by BENCHMARK and other ACP programs. This made it impossible to secure external funding for the Program's future.

Another important factor in the failure to secure additional funding was the inability of The BENCHMARK Program to secure a strong constituency among the financial leadership in the city. This was due to a lack of foresight by BENCHMARK and to the gatekeeping role assumed by the Academy.

In retrospect, it appears that a different type of strategy concerning the client structure should have been developed. The type of information developed by BENCHMARK (diagnostic social profiles of citizens' needs, aspirations, and opinions) could have been useful to all sectors of the client structure. BENCHMARK should have pursued a more balanced approach, seeking open and direct contact with each sector. If any sector should have been emphasized, it should have been the Public Leadership. If local governmental leaders were using a certain type of information in making decisions, it would make that information more important to Civic and Business sector leadership. The emphasis on the Civic structure represents a major design flaw in the Program, and had a dysfunctional influence on its effectiveness. In addition, the gatekeeping activities of
the sponsor accentuated this flaw, and made corrective action in
the later stages of the Program impossible.

Aggravating the development of these relationships is the
fact that often times the type of person who would be effective in
assisting the Program to locate additional funding was not usually
the kind of person who utilized the information. Thus, while the
Program had a good deal of support among middle management in
various large organizations (and top decisionmakers in smaller
organizations and community groups), this support did not filter up
to the top community and financial leaders in the city. In fact,
these top leaders were not adequately aware of the degree and impact
of BENCHMARK activities. Thus, the lack of a strong constituency
among top community and financial leaders made it difficult to
secure additional funding, even given the problems caused by a
change in the status of the sponsor.

C. POST-BENCHMARK EXPERIENCES

In the first chapter it was mentioned that the Cities of
Toledo and Cincinnati were attempting to institute BENCHMARK-like
programs. While both cities are in the initial design stages, these
two experiences allow some provisional estimates of how well some of
the ideas developed within BENCHMARK can be exported to different
settings.
The efforts in both cities were initiated by the Public sector—in sharp contrast to the Columbus experience. Each city has a strong city manager and each has recently adopted a program budgeting process. Toledo is interested in conducting a Toledo Area Social Profile (TASP) in order to obtain citizen evaluations of local government services and measures of citizen needs and priorities. This information will then be used to evaluate progress towards relevant objectives in the program budgets and to obtain citizen views concerning emerging issues in the city. Cincinnati is interested in conducting a social profile which will be used for assessing city services, for prioritizing spending across geographic neighborhoods, and for setting program objectives. At this writing, Cincinnati is still in the initial design stages and Toledo is preparing to conduct the survey. Consequently, the following comments focus on the situation in Toledo because it is further along in the process; however, many of these comments also reflect the situation in Cincinnati.

Former BENCHMARK staff have provided assistance to Toledo in designing the overall questionnaire and in collecting user input into this design process. Because of the strong support of the City Manager, staff members obtained easy access to all department heads and received a good deal of cooperation from these top policy-makers in determining prime information needs.
The involvement and support of department heads and top policymakers is crucial if the information is to be used. Many past studies have documented the capacity of a bureaucracy to block initiatives from a chief executive. Thus, it is important that these people participate in the design of the questionnaire and believe in the credibility of the process and of the information.

In addition to examining the information needs of city officials, Toledo had hoped to use neighborhood priority boards as a mechanism for involving other people in the community in the design of the questionnaire. The neighborhood priority boards are presently being developed in Toledo to increase the amount of citizen participation in local government. Because the priority boards are viewed as a continuing mechanism in Toledo, assisting in the design of TASP would only be one of the many functions performed by these boards. However, the neighborhood priority boards have not yet been convened, and the City was interested in obtaining information that could be used in the next budgetary review process. Thus, the priority boards were not able to participate in the design process of the first Toledo Area Social Profile.

In order to assist in the development of positive attitudes towards the usefulness of survey research, workshops were presented which concentrated on the ways survey research could be used in urban policymaking. These workshops were attended by all department heads and their immediate subordinates. The purpose
was to familiarize these people with: 1) how the survey research process operates and why one can obtain accurate information; 2) how survey research might be used in urban policymaking; and 3) how survey research has been used in urban policymaking. On the basis of pre- and post-workshop evaluations, it appears that participants became aware of uses of survey research which they had not appreciated before and that participants developed positive attitudes towards the credibility of survey research and of the staff.

In addition, because Toledo has a program budget, information from TASP can be used to measure progress towards objectives. Thus, the decisionmaking process will be able to integrate information from TASP, with other institutional indicators in order to evaluate city departments. Reports written will combine information from TASP with other kinds of relevant data.

It is too early to determine how well some of the ideas developed within BENCHMARK will operate in Toledo and Cincinnati. Former BENCHMARK staff participating in these projects have followed the same general philosophy of The BENCHMARK Program, but have not tried to force certain kinds of structures on the particular city. Thus, in Toledo, while a BCC was not set up to design the questionnaire, both group and one-to-one interaction were used to involve users in the design process and to build awareness of and interest in the kind of information evolving from the TASP data base. In addition, because these staff handled the actual design of specific indicators, it was necessary not only to promote the credibility
of survey research, but also to generate trust and confidence in their abilities as researchers. There was direct access to clients and an attempt will be made to combine TASP data with other relevant information sources. At the moment, both the efforts in Cincinnati and Toledo have generated a high degree of enthusiasm, and have the potential for a high degree of utilization.

D. IMPLICATIONS FOR DISSEMINATION AND UTILIZATION THEORY

While a test of the overall theory behind BENCHMARK's dissemination and utilization strategy was not possible, it appears that the results of this evaluation demonstrated that this theory produced a strategy which resulted in a number of positive aspects. In particular, although precise and comprehensive utilization data are sparse, very high rates of utilization appear to have been achieved in the COS and TA mechanisms, and fairly high rates of utilization were achieved by the Report Review Committees—a totally unexpected result.

The COS and TA Programs were conceptually very close to the Problem-Solver Perspective discussed in Chapter One. The outcomes of these two mechanisms demonstrated the benefits in terms of utilization for conducting research in a demand-generated, clinical environment. The one-to-one interaction occurring in these mechanisms allowed the staff to transfer general information about the Program, to establish relationships characterized by high levels of trust and credibility, and to provide information and services which were
utilized by the clients. Given the general success of these mechanisms, the objectives of other mechanisms should be to establish contacts and relationships which stimulate people to come to a clinic with specific problems needing resolution.

Generally, BENCHMARK adopted a "marketing" model of utilization in designing the BCC and the RRC mechanisms. While these two structures had a number of important purposes, the ultimate goal of each mechanism was to promote utilization by the participants. Both the BCC and RRC produced products (CASP questionnaire and Social Reports) that were designed for a general audience. Awareness, interest, trust, and credibility were promoted in order that a relationship would be developed between the resource-staff and the user-participant, thereby leading to increased utilization of the information by the user-participants. The importance of this kind of marketing strategy has been noted in much of the theoretical literature on knowledge dissemination and utilization.

It was expected that the BCC and RRC would create a core group of clients who would use the information. The purpose of the COS Program was to adapt or tailor the information in CASP to the specific needs of a specific user. The TA Program was very similar in that it concentrated on developing a tailored product for a specific client. Thus, while a person could certainly make use of information without needing to request a COS (or technical
assistance), it is reasonable to assume that many of the COS and TA requestors would be former BCC and RRC members.

However, this study has shown that a fairly large number of COS and TA requestors came to the Program without prior contact. This demonstrates the importance of mass media coverage and informal social networks in disseminating information. While, unfortunately, no systematic data exist concerning how COS and TA requestors heard about the Program, it is this researcher's opinion, based upon working with many of these clients, that referrals played a very important role. This process is consistent with the two-step flow of information conceptualized by some of the adherents to the Social Interactionist Perspective--what might be called the "education" model of utilization.

Thus, while these results do not negate the value of the general marketing strategy because few measures exist on the degree of utilization that occurred outside of the COS and TA mechanisms, it does suggest that the two-step flow process is important in disseminating and promoting the utilization of innovations. Given these results, it becomes even more important that any client or potential client be viewed as a potential disseminator of information and a source of future clients. Thus, future efforts should probably consider strategies that take a more balanced approach toward the use of educational and marketing utilization strategies.
While the BENCHMARK Program provided many valuable insights to the problems associated with developing a strategy for the dissemination and utilization of social science information and techniques during its thirty months, many questions remain concerning the long term effect of the Program and its major mechanisms. Specifically these questions deal with the stability of relationships that were established and the types of information and assistance that were provided. The major product of the Program; i.e., the Social Reports, were diagnostic tools that provided perceptual data which had not been previously available to decision-makers. In many respects, existing decisionmaking procedures and processes were compatible with the data, which is often not the case in efforts like this. However, it also appears that decisionmakers did not know how and where to use the data in making decisions. It would have been useful to observe if and how the continuation of periodic Columbus Area Social Profiles would have affected these decisionmaking procedures. In addition, since the previous evaluation seemed to demonstrate the potential of participation in a combination of mechanisms, opportunities to observe the combined effect of reiterative participation in BENCHMARK mechanisms would have been instructive, as would observations of the degree and level of involvement in CASP-II.

The evaluation of prototypes and case studies offers important information concerning the study of dissemination and utilization. It allows theories to be adapted to "real world"
environments and in that exposure it allows one to examine the problems involved with moving from an understanding of factors affecting dissemination and utilization to a development of strategies or action-oriented plans that can be used to guide the dissemination and utilization of social innovations.
REFERENCES

1. These questionnaires are reproduced in Appendices C, D, E, and F.

2. For further information about selection procedures, see Appendix A.

3. For more information concerning the acceptability of response rates, see Appendix A.

4. This is usually defined as the first response category, although this varies across indicators. See the bottom of Figures 2.2, 2.4, 2.6, and 2.7.

5. The Report Review Committees were much more cautious in their approach to balanced reporting and the nature of evidence than most social scientists would expect. This is important because it was felt by some that the RRC would subvert scientific norms of caution. This did not occur, and was never really a problem. For a further discussion, see Conway (1976).
APPENDIX A
Evaluation Documentation

A. INTRODUCTION

This section describes the purposes of the evaluation, constraints encountered in its design and implementation, aspects of the questionnaire construction, the speed of response, and response rates.

B. SURVEY DESIGN AND PURPOSES

In March, 1975, BENCHMARK decided information was needed concerning the effectiveness of major dissemination mechanisms. This information was necessary for funding proposals and for redesigning those mechanisms in preparation for CASP-II. It was decided that the focus of that evaluation should be the institutional innovations developed by the Program; i.e., the BENCHMARK Community Conference, the Report Review Committee, the Community-Originated Studies Program, and the Technical Assistance Program. The substantive focus would be the relative effectiveness of those mechanisms in promoting awareness, interest, trust, and credibility. In consultation with my advisor and colleagues, that evaluation was designed to meet the needs of the Program and to fulfill the data requirements of this dissertation.
C. QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN

The survey questionnaire was designed over a period of a month. The questionnaire went through three drafts which allowed my advisor and BENCHMARK colleagues the opportunity to comment upon the type of information that would be elicited and the type of indicators used. This review process was extremely helpful in producing a final schedule.

It was decided to use a mail questionnaire not only because of monetary constraints, but also to encourage frank comments which might have been constrained by a personal or telephone interview. However, this decision limited the length of the questionnaire and the types of questions that could be used.

The questionnaire was divided into two parts. The first part contained questions which were relevant to a particular mechanism. Thus, four different Part I sections were constructed, one for each mechanism. The second part of the questionnaire contained indicators germane to a variety of mechanisms. This part was essentially the same for each mechanism, although there were some differences. For example, one question in the second part dealt with an awareness of the Community-Originated Studies Program. Obviously, if a respondent had requested a Community-Originated Study, it can be assumed he was aware of the Program. Consequently, this question was not appropriate and was not included in the second part sent to COS requestors. In addition, since the TA Program was not directed toward CASP, many of
the specific questions dealing with CASP were not included in the second part sent to TA requestors.

Some people attended more than one mechanism. In this instance, the respondent received a Part I section for each of the mechanisms he had attended and a general Part II section. For example, if an individual attended the BCC and RRC mechanisms, he received the Part I section pertinent to the BCC and to the RRC, and a general Part II section.

D. MAILING LISTS

The evaluation concentrated upon the four dissemination and utilization mechanisms that were included in the Program. Since the number of people who had participated in these various mechanisms was relatively small, a universe sample was feasible. Complete lists were available for people who had attended a Report Review Committee, who had requested a Community-Originated Study, and who had requested technical assistance. These lists contained people who had participated in these mechanisms up to the time of the evaluation. Questionnaires were sent to all people who had participated on RRC's (forty-nine people), to all people who had requested Community-Originated Studies (twenty-six people), and to all people who had received major technical assistance (seventeen people), (defined as non-CASP related assistance which consumed more than four hours of staff time).
Complete lists were not available for BCC members. In November, 1973, a list was drawn up of people who had attended the initial meetings of the BCC. Attendance records were not consistently maintained until the Fall of 1974. These two sources were scrutinized to identify people who had attended at least two BCC meetings. This list was then reviewed by staff members and the Community Coordinators of BCC to determine if anyone had inadvertently been omitted. Through this process a list was developed of BCC members who had attended more than one meeting and all received copies of the questionnaire (one hundred and twelve people).

E. RESPONSE RATES

Questionnaires were sent out up to three times and were accompanied by a cover letter. The first mailout was followed a week and a half later by a personal telephone call. The questionnaires were confidential. Respondents were asked to sign their name at the end of the cover letter and return the questionnaire. All respondents followed this procedure which allowed a record to be maintained of those who had not returned questionnaires. When a schedule was received, the cover letter was separated from the questionnaire in order to ensure the anonymity of the responses.

Figure A.1 shows the rate at which questionnaires were returned. Eighty-eight percent (88%) of the respondents returned questionnaires within six weeks of the first mailout. This rate of return differed somewhat from rates identified by Erdos (1971:262)
Figure A.1
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because it was generally stable for the first six weeks. In a study of the speed of response for over fifty surveys, Erdos found that on the average 72% of the total returns were received within the first week.

The response rates were acceptable. These rates are as follows: 61% of the BENCHMARK Community Conference participants, 76% of the Report Review Committee participants, 65% of the Technical Assistance users, and 84% of the Community-Originated Studies requestors. Of the seventy-four mail surveys with more than two pages analyzed by Erdos (1971:257), the median response was 54%, and only 30% of the survey had response rates greater than 60%. Thus, the response rates for this evaluation are acceptable.
APPENDIX B

Cover Letter
The BENCHMARK Program is conducting a mid-term evaluation. As you may know, BENCHMARK is an experiment designed primarily:

- to produce information about the Columbus area that can be used to assess citizen needs with regard to some of the problems facing a growing metropolitan community;
- to provide assistance to various groups in using that information.

Because it is our desire to engage in activities that are useful and responsive to the research needs of a variety of groups, we are very concerned about the opinions of people who have come in contact with the program. Enclosed is a short questionnaire we are asking you to complete. Your opinions will help us evaluate the program and to make those changes that would improve the quality and effectiveness of the BENCHMARK Program. Please fill out the questionnaire as soon as possible and return it to us in the enclosed envelope. We do ask that you sign your name at the end of this cover letter. This enables us to determine who has not returned copies so that we can send a reminder. We will remove this sheet when we receive your completed questionnaire in order to maintain the confidentiality of your responses. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jonathon L. Benson
Director of Evaluation

JLB/v1

enclosure: questionnaire

Please sign your name after completing this questionnaire and return it to us.

(Your signature)
APPENDIX C

BENCHMARK Community Conference Questionnaire
We'd like to ask you a few questions in order to get your opinions about various aspects of the BENCHMARK Community Conference (formerly called the Columbus Community Conference) and about the BENCHMARK Program in general.

1:01 First, we would like your opinion of the newsletter, Benchmarking. Do you feel the newsletter is usually very informative, somewhat informative or not very informative about the activities of the program?

☐ 1. Very informative
☐ 2. Somewhat informative
☐ 3. Not very informative
☐ 4. Don't know - Don't read it that often
☐ 5. Don't know - Haven't seen it

1:02 When did you attend your first BENCHMARK Community Conference (BCC) meeting?

☐ 1. October, 1973 to December, 1973
☐ 2. January, 1974 to June, 1974
☐ 3. July, 1974 to December, 1975
☐ 4. After January, 1975

1:02A People participate in the BENCHMARK Community Conference for a variety of reasons. Why did you first come to meetings of the BENCHMARK Community Conference?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

1:03 Since your first meeting, how often have you attended meetings of the BENCHMARK Community Conference?

☐ 1. Very often - I attend most of the meetings
☐ 2. Sometimes - I attend more meetings than I miss
☐ 3. Rarely - I don't attend very often
☐ 4. Not at all - I haven't attended any meetings since my first few meetings

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

1:03A What benefits do you feel you've gotten from participation in the BCC?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

1:03B Do you have any suggestion about what might be done to improve the BCC?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
1:04 How satisfied are you with the performance of the professional staff of BENCHMARK? Are you very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied with the performance of the staff from BENCHMARK?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Very satisfied</td>
<td>why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Undecided/Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1:05 How satisfied are you with the performance of the community coordinators that were elected by the BCC?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Very satisfied</td>
<td>why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Undecided/Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1:06 Generally, how do you feel about your experiences with the BENCHMARK Community Conference? Do you feel very positive, somewhat positive, somewhat negative, or very negative about your experiences in the BCC?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Very positive</td>
<td>why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Somewhat positive</td>
<td>why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Somewhat negative</td>
<td>why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Very negative</td>
<td>why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Undecided/Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How we'd like to ask you a few questions about some of the other aspects of the Benchmark Program.

1134 Have you ever heard of the Community Originated Studies (COS) Program?
   □ 1. Yes, and I am familiar with its overall purpose
   □ 2. Yes, but I'm not too sure what its purpose is
   □ 3. No

1136 Do you have a copy of the User's Guide for the first Columbus Area Social Profile (CASP I)?
   □ 1. Yes, I own one
   □ 2. No, I don't own one, but I have access to one
   □ 3. No, I don't own one, but I've looked through it
   □ 4. No, but I've heard about the User's Guide
   □ 5. No, I didn't know it was available

1137 Sixteen subject areas or modules were included in the CASP I survey. Some people are aware of a few of
the subject areas, while others know what most of the subject areas are. Do you feel you know what most,
some, a few or none of the subject areas are in the survey?
   □ 1. Most (11 to 16 areas)
   □ 2. Some (5 to 10 areas)
   □ 3. A few (1 to 4 areas)
   □ 4. None

1138 With which subject areas included in the survey are you most familiar?

1139 Have you ever read any of the Social Reports produced by Benchmark?
   □ 1. Yes - If yes, which one(s)?
   □ 2. No, I have copies of Social Reports, but haven't had a chance to read them
   □ 3. No, I haven't read any Social Reports

1140 Would you be interested in participating in selecting the kinds of questions to be included in the next
Columbus Area Social Profile?
   □ 1. Yes
   □ 2. Maybe
   □ 3. No

1141 Benchmark provides a variety of services and information. How familiar do you feel you are with the
services and information Benchmark can provide?
   □ 1. Very familiar
   □ 2. Somewhat familiar
   □ 3. Not very familiar
   □ 4. Not at all familiar
With which services, products or activities of the program are you most familiar? Please be specific.

Have you ever hesitated to make a request to the Program for information or assistance?

CHECK ALL BOXES THAT APPLY

☐ 1. Yes, because I didn't know who to contact
☐ 2. Yes, because I didn't know if you had the information
☐ 3. Yes, because I didn't know if you provide that kind of assistance
☐ 4. Yes, because I didn't know if I could get it in time
☐ 5. Yes, because I thought it would cost too much
☐ 6. Yes, because I thought I could get the information or assistance elsewhere
☐ 7. Yes, because I had trouble getting information or assistance from BENCHMARK before
☐ 8. Yes, but for some other reason (specify)
☐ 9. No, I never had a need to contact the Program
☐ 10. No

Do you still feel this way?

1:53 Have you ever made any requests for assistance or information from the program?

☐ 1. Yes — If yes, what did you request (please be specific)

☐ 2. No

1:54 How responsive do you think BENCHMARK is to requests for services or information?

☐ 1. Very responsive
☐ 2. Somewhat responsive
☐ 3. Not very responsive
☐ 4. Not at all responsive
☐ 9. I don't know

1:55 In the future, if the need arises, how likely do you think it is that you would ask BENCHMARK to provide you with assistance or information?

☐ 1. Very likely
☐ 2. Somewhat likely
☐ 3. Not very likely
☐ 4. Not at all likely
1:56 How often have you talked to someone (not a member of the BENCHMARK Community Conference or the BENCHMARK staff) about the BENCHMARK Program?

☐ 1. Very often – It averages about once or twice a week
☐ 2. Sometimes – It averages about once or twice a month
☐ 3. Rarely – I've talked to people about BENCHMARK, but it's irregular and not very often
☐ 4. Never – I can't remember talking to anyone about BENCHMARK

1:57 Have you ever personally referred anyone to BENCHMARK, either to obtain some service or information or to attend a BENCHMARK Community Conference (BCC) meeting?

**CHECK ALL BOXES THAT APPLY**

☐ 1. Yes, for some service or technical assistance
☐ 2. Yes, for information or report
☐ 3. Yes, to a BCC meeting
☐ 4. No

1:58 Excluding your feelings about the BCC, how do you feel about the rest of the BENCHMARK Program? Do you feel very positive, somewhat positive, somewhat negative, or very negative about the rest of the BENCHMARK Program?

☐ 1. Very positive
☐ 2. Somewhat positive
☐ 3. Somewhat negative
☐ 4. Very negative
☐ 5. Undecided/Neutral

1:58A Below is space for you to write any further comments, suggestions or criticisms about any aspect of the BENCHMARK Community Conference, or of the BENCHMARK Program in general.
APPENDIX D

Report Review Committee Questionnaire
We'd like to ask you a few questions in order to get your opinion about various aspects of the Reports Review Committee (RRC) and about the BENCHMARK Program in general.

1:16 First of all, before you served on the Reports Review Committee, had you had any previous contact with the BENCHMARK Program?

☐ 1. Yes - If yes, what was it?

☐ 2. No

1:17 How familiar do you feel you are with the Information from the survey that was dealt with in your Reports Review Committee?

☐ 1. Very familiar

☐ 2. Somewhat familiar

☐ 3. Not very familiar

☐ 4. Not at all familiar

BENCHMARK is very concerned about how the information in the survey could be used. The following is a list of possible uses for the information. How useful would you judge the Information is that was dealt with in your RRC, either by itself or in combination with other kinds of data, for each of the following topics?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Very Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Not Very Useful</th>
<th>Not at All Useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:19 a) Promoting discussion about the subject area</td>
<td>1. ☐</td>
<td>2. ☐</td>
<td>3. ☐</td>
<td>4. ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:20 b) Providing supporting evidence for present knowledge</td>
<td>1. ☐</td>
<td>2. ☐</td>
<td>3. ☐</td>
<td>4. ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:21 c) Help in assessing the needs of citizens</td>
<td>1. ☐</td>
<td>2. ☐</td>
<td>3. ☐</td>
<td>4. ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:22 d) Help in making decisions about service delivery</td>
<td>1. ☐</td>
<td>2. ☐</td>
<td>3. ☐</td>
<td>4. ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:23 e) Help in analyzing the combined overall effectiveness of existing programs in that subject area</td>
<td>1. ☐</td>
<td>2. ☐</td>
<td>3. ☐</td>
<td>4. ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:24 f) Help in examining the opinions of citizens</td>
<td>1. ☐</td>
<td>2. ☐</td>
<td>3. ☐</td>
<td>4. ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:25 g) Help in making budgetary decisions</td>
<td>1. ☐</td>
<td>2. ☐</td>
<td>3. ☐</td>
<td>4. ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can you think of any other uses for the information?
1:26 Have you ever used the information in the Social Report(s) produced by your Reports Review Committee?
   □ 1. Yes - If yes, how?
   □ 2. No, but I might use it in the future
   □ 3. No, and I don't anticipate that I will

1:27 Have you ever talked about the findings of your Social Report with someone or mentioned them to someone (other than a member of your RAC or a BENCHMARK staff member)?
   **CHECK ALL BOXES THAT APPLY**
   □ 1. Yes - I've actually discussed the findings with someone
   □ 2. Yes - I've mentioned them or referred to them in the course of discussions
   □ 3. No - I've never discussed the findings with anyone or mentioned them to anyone

1:28 What other kinds of survey questions would have provided more useful information?

1:29 Do you think the information contained in the Social Report is a very accurate, somewhat accurate, somewhat inaccurate or very inaccurate reflection of public opinion?
   □ 1. Very accurate
   □ 2. Somewhat accurate
   □ 3. Somewhat inaccurate
   □ 4. Very inaccurate
   □ 5. Undecided/Neutral

1:30 Did you meet anyone new on your RAC?
   □ 1. Yes, and I'm glad I had the opportunity to meet them
   □ 2. Yes
   □ 3. No

1:31 In general, what is your opinion about the performance of the staff from BENCHMARK that participated in your RAC? Were you very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the BENCHMARK staff?
   □ 1. Very satisfied
   □ 2. Somewhat satisfied
   □ 3. Somewhat dissatisfied
   □ 4. Very dissatisfied
   □ 5. Undecided/Neutral
1:34 Have you ever heard of the Community Originated Studies (COS) Program in BENCHMARK?
☐ 1. Yes, and I'm familiar with its overall purpose
☐ 2. Yes, but I'm not too sure what its purpose is
☐ 3. No

1:35 Have you ever heard of the BENCHMARK Community Conference?
☐ 1. Yes, and I'm familiar with its purpose
☐ 2. Yes, but I'm unfamiliar about what its purpose is
☐ 3. No

1:36 Do you have a copy of the User's Guide for the first Columbus Area Social Profile (CASP 1)?
☐ 1. Yes, I own one
☐ 2. No, I don't own one, but I have access to one
☐ 3. No, I don't own one, but I've looked through it
☐ 4. No, but I've heard about the User's Guide
☐ 5. No, I didn't know it was available

1:37 Sixteen subject areas or modules were included in the CASP 1 survey. Some people are aware of a few of the subject areas, while others know what most of the subject areas are. Do you feel you know what most, some, a few or none of the subject areas are in the survey?
☐ 1. Most (11 to 16 areas)
☐ 2. Some (5 to 10 areas)
☐ 3. A few (1 to 4 areas)
☐ 4. None

1:38 With which subject areas included in the survey are you most familiar?

1:39 Have you ever read any of the Social Reports, other than the one(s) produced by your ROCT?
☐ 1. Yes - If yes, which one(s)?
☐ 2. No, I have copies of Social Reports, but haven't had a chance to read them
☐ 3. No, I haven't read any Social Reports

1:40 Would you be interested in participating in selecting the kinds of questions to be included in the next Columbus Area Social Profile?
☐ 1. Yes
☐ 2. Maybe
☐ 3. No
1:41 BENCHMARK provides a variety of services and information. How familiar do you feel you are with the services and information BENCHMARK can provide?

☐ 1. Very familiar
☐ 2. Somewhat familiar
☐ 3. Not very familiar
☐ 4. Not at all familiar

1:42 With which services, products or activities of the program are you most familiar? Please be specific.

________________________________________________________________________

Have you ever hesitated to make a request to the Program for information or assistance?

☐ 1. Yes, because I didn't know who to contact
☐ 2. Yes, because I didn't know if you had the information
☐ 3. Yes, because I didn't know if you provide that kind of assistance
☐ 4. Yes, because I didn't know if I could get it in time
☐ 5. Yes, because I thought it would cost too much
☐ 6. Yes, because I thought I could get the information or assistance elsewhere
☐ 7. Yes, because I had trouble getting information or assistance from BENCHMARK before
☐ 8. Yes, but for some other reason (specify) ______________________________________________________________________
☐ 9. No, I never had a need to contact the Program
☐ 10. No

1:53 Have you ever made any requests for assistance or information from the program?

☐ 1. Yes - If yes, what did you request (please be specific)

________________________________________________________________________

☐ 2. No

1:54 How responsive do you think BENCHMARK is to requests for services or information?

☐ 1. Very responsive
☐ 2. Somewhat responsive
☐ 3. Not very responsive — Why?
☐ 4. Not at all responsive — Why?
☐ 5. I don't know
1155 In the future, if the need arises, how likely do you think it is that you would ask BENCHMARK to provide assistance or information for you?

☐ 1. Very likely
☐ 2. Somewhat likely
☐ 3. Not very likely Why?
☐ 4. Not at all likely

1156 How often have you talked to someone (not a member of the BENCHMARK Community Conference or the BENCHMARK staff) about the BENCHMARK Program?

☐ 1. Very often - It averages about once or twice a week
☐ 2. Sometimes - It averages about once or twice a month
☐ 3. Rarely - I've talked to people about BENCHMARK, but it's irregular and not very often
☐ 4. Never - I can't remember talking to anyone about BENCHMARK

1157 Have you ever personally referred anyone to BENCHMARK, either to obtain some service or information or to attend a BENCHMARK Community Conference (BCC) meeting?

☐ 1. Yes, for some service or technical assistance
☐ 2. Yes, for information or report
☐ 3. Yes, to a BCC meeting
☐ 4. No

1158 Generally, how do you feel about the BENCHMARK Program? Do you feel very positive, somewhat positive, somewhat negative or very negative about the BENCHMARK Program?

☐ 1. Very positive Why?
☐ 2. Somewhat positive
☐ 3. Somewhat negative Why?
☐ 4. Very negative
☐ 5. Undecided/Neutral

1159 Since your participation on the RRC, have you had any further contact with the BENCHMARK Program?

☐ 1. Yes - If yes, what was it?
☐ 2. No

1159A Below is space for you to write any further comments, suggestions or criticisms about any aspect of the Reports Review Committee process or of the BENCHMARK Program in general.
APPENDIX E

Community-Originated Studies Questionnaire
We'd like to ask you a few questions in order to get your opinion about various aspects of the Community Originated Studies (COS) Program of BENCHMARK, and about the BENCHMARK Program in general.

1:07 Before you requested survey information, had you had any previous contact with the BENCHMARK Program?

☐ 1. Yes - If yes, what was it?

☐ 2. No - If no, how did you hear about the program?

1:07A For what purpose did you request this information?

1:08 Do you think you could have acquired similar information elsewhere?

☐ 1. Yes - If yes, where, and why did you come to us?

☐ 2. No

1:09 At the time you made your request, did you anticipate that the information might be useful to you in a project that you already had underway or did you feel it would be useful to have for future reference?

☐ 1. Useful for future reference

☐ 2. Useful now

☐ 3. Both

1:10 Were you actually able to use the information?

☐ 1. Yes - If yes, how?

☐ 2. No - If no, why not?

1:11 Was there anything that you wanted that BENCHMARK was not able to provide?

☐ 1. Yes - If yes, what was it?

☐ 2. No
1.12 In general, how satisfied were you with the performance of the staff with whom you have had contact? Were you very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the performance of the staff from BENCHMARK?

☐ 1. Very satisfied — Why? .................................................................
☐ 2. Somewhat satisfied — Why? ...........................................................
☐ 3. Somewhat dissatisfied — Why? .........................................................
☐ 4. Very dissatisfied — Why? ..............................................................
☐ 5. Undecided/Neutral

1.13 In general, how satisfied were you with the information provided? Were you very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the information provided?

☐ 1. Very satisfied — Why? .................................................................
☐ 2. Somewhat satisfied — Why? ...........................................................
☐ 3. Somewhat dissatisfied — Why? .........................................................
☐ 4. Very dissatisfied — Why? ..............................................................
☐ 5. Undecided/Neutral

1.14 We have been charging a $5.00 fee for requests within the Community Originated Studies Program. Which of the following statements best describes your feelings about the cost of a COS?

☐ 1. I thought that the $5.00 fee was too much money.
☐ 2. I was able to pay the $5.00, but could not pay much more.
☐ 3. I was able to pay the $5.00 fee, and could cover some of the direct costs of producing the COS.

(How much?)

1.15

☐ 1. $0 - 10
☐ 2. $11 - 20
☐ 3. $21 - 30
☐ 4. $31 - 40
☐ 5. $41 - 50
☐ 6. $50 - 100
Now, I'd like to ask you a few questions about the BENCHMARK Program in general.

1:35 Have you ever heard of the BENCHMARK Community Conference (BCC)?
   - 1. Yes, and I'm familiar with its purpose
   - 2. Yes, but I'm unfamiliar about what its purpose is
   - 3. No

1:36 Do you have a copy of the User's Guide for the first Columbus Area Social Profile (CASP I)?
   - 1. Yes, I own one
   - 2. No, I don't own one, but I have access to one
   - 3. No, I don't own one, but I've looked through it
   - 4. No, but I've heard about the User's Guide
   - 5. No, I didn't know it was available

1:37 Sixteen subject areas or modules were included in the CASP I survey. Some people are aware of a few of the subject areas, while others know what most of the subject areas are. Do you feel you know what most, some, a few or none of the subject areas are in the survey?
   - 1. Most (11 to 16 areas)
   - 2. Some (5 to 10 areas)
   - 3. A few (1 to 4 areas)
   - 4. None

1:38 With which subject areas included in the survey are you most familiar?

1:39 Have you ever read any of the Social Reports produced by BENCHMARK?
   - 1. Yes - If yes, which one(s)?
   - 2. No, I have copies of Social Reports, but haven't had a chance to read them
   - 3. No, I haven't read any Social Reports

1:40 Would you be interested in participating in selecting the kinds of questions to be included in the next Columbus Area Social Profile?
   - 1. Yes
   - 2. Maybe
   - 3. No

1:41 BENCHMARK provides a variety of services and information. How familiar do you feel you are with the services and information BENCHMARK can provide?
   - 1. Very familiar
   - 2. Somewhat familiar
   - 3. Not very familiar
   - 4. Not at all familiar
1:42 With which services, products or activities of the program are you most familiar? Please be specific.


Have you ever hesitated to make a request to the Program for information or assistance?

CHECK ALL BOXES THAT APPLY

☐ 1. Yes, because I didn't know who to contact
☐ 2. Yes, because I didn't know if you had the information
☐ 3. Yes, because I didn't know if you provide that kind of assistance
☐ 4. Yes, because I didn't know if I could get it in time
☐ 5. Yes, because I thought it would cost too much
☐ 6. Yes, because I thought I could get the information or assistance elsewhere
☐ 7. Yes, because I had trouble getting information or assistance from BENCHMARK before
☐ 8. Yes, but for some other reason (specify)
☐ 9. No, I never had a need to contact the Program
☐ 10. No

Do you still feel this way?

1:54 How responsive do you think BENCHMARK is to requests for services or information?

☐ 1. Very responsive
☐ 2. Somewhat responsive
☐ 3. Not very responsive — why?
☐ 4. Not at all responsive — why?
☐ 9. I don't know

1:55 In the future, if the need arises, how likely do you think it is that you would ask BENCHMARK to provide assistance or information for you?

☐ 1. Very likely
☐ 2. Somewhat likely
☐ 3. Not very likely
☐ 4. Not at all likely
1:56 How often have you talked to someone (not a member of the BENCHMARK Community Conference or the BENCHMARK staff) about the BENCHMARK Program?

- [ ] 1. Very often — It averages about once or twice a week
- [ ] 2. Sometimes — It averages about once or twice a month
- [ ] 3. Rarely — I've talked to people about BENCHMARK, but it's irregular and not very often
- [ ] 4. Never — I can't remember talking to anyone about BENCHMARK

1:57 Have you ever personally referred anyone to BENCHMARK, either to obtain some service or information or to attend a BENCHMARK Community Conference (BCC) meeting?

CHECK ALL BOXES THAT APPLY

- [ ] 1. Yes, for some service or technical assistance
- [ ] 2. Yes, for information or report
- [ ] 3. Yes, to a BCC meeting
- [ ] 4. No

1:58 Generally, how do you feel about the BENCHMARK Program? Do you feel very positive, somewhat positive, somewhat negative or very negative about the BENCHMARK Program?

- [ ] 1. Very positive
- [ ] 2. Somewhat positive
- [ ] 3. Somewhat negative
- [ ] 4. Very negative
- [ ] 5. Undecided/Neutral

1:59 Since you made your request for information, have you had any further contact with the BENCHMARK Program?

- [ ] 1. Yes — If yes, what was it?
- [ ] 2. No

1:59A Below is space for you to write any further comments, suggestions or criticisms about any aspect of the Community Originated Studies Program or the BENCHMARK Program in general.
We'd like to ask you a few questions in order to get your opinions about various aspects of the service or information provided for you and about The BENCHMARK Program in general.

1.60 Before you requested assistance, had you had any previous contact with The BENCHMARK Program?
   - Yes - If yes, what was it?
   - No - If no, how did you hear about the program?

1.60A For what purpose did you request assistance from BENCHMARK?

1.61 Do you think you could have acquired similar assistance elsewhere?
   - Yes - If yes, where, and why did you come to us?
   - No

1.62 Was there anything that you wanted that BENCHMARK was not able to provide?
   - Yes - If yes, what was it?
   - No

1.63 In general, what was your opinion of the performance of the staff from BENCHMARK with whom you had contact? Were you very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the staff from BENCHMARK?
   - Very satisfied
   - Somewhat satisfied
   - Somewhat dissatisfied
   - Very dissatisfied
   - Undecided/Neutral

1.64 In general, how satisfied were you with the assistance provided. Were you very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the assistance provided?
   - Very satisfied
   - Somewhat satisfied
   - Somewhat dissatisfied
   - Very dissatisfied
   - Undecided/Neutral
How we'd like to ask you a few questions about some of the other aspects of the BENCHMARK Program:

1:33 Have you ever heard of the Columbus Area Social Profile (CASP I) conducted by BENCHMARK?
☐ 1. Yes, and I'm familiar with the subject areas it covered
☐ 2. Yes, but I'm not too familiar with what was contained on it
☐ 3. No

1:34 Have you ever heard of the Community Originated Studies (COS) Program?
☐ 1. Yes, and I am familiar with its overall purpose
☐ 2. Yes, but I'm not too sure what its purpose is
☐ 3. No

1:39 Have you ever read any of the Social Reports produced by BENCHMARK?
☐ 1. Yes - If yes, which one(s)? ____________________________
☐ 2. No, I have copies of Social Reports, but haven't had a chance to read them
☐ 3. No, I haven't read any Social Reports

1:41 BENCHMARK provides a variety of services and information. How familiar do you feel you are with the services and information BENCHMARK can provide?
☐ 1. Very familiar
☐ 2. Somewhat familiar
☐ 3. Not very familiar
☐ 4. Not at all familiar

1:42 With which services, products or activities of the program are you most familiar? Please be specific.

Have you ever hesitated to make a request to the Program for information or assistance?

☐ 1. Yes, because I didn't know who to contact
☐ 2. Yes, because I didn't know if you had the information
☐ 3. Yes, because I didn't know if you provide that kind of assistance
☐ 4. Yes, because I didn't know if I could get it in time
☐ 5. Yes, because I thought it would cost too much
☐ 6. Yes, because I thought I could get the information or assistance elsewhere
☐ 7. Yes, because I had trouble getting information or assistance from BENCHMARK before
☐ 8. Yes, but for some other reason (specify) ____________________________
☐ 9. No, I never had a need to contact the Program
☐ 10. No
1:54 How responsive do you think BENCHMARK is to requests for services or information?

☐ 1. Very responsive
☐ 2. Somewhat responsive
☐ 3. Not very responsive— Why?
☐ 4. Not at all responsive
☐ 9. I don't know

1:55 In the future, if the need arises, how likely do you think it is that you would ask BENCHMARK to provide assistance or information for you?

☐ 1. Very likely
☐ 2. Somewhat likely
☐ 3. Not very likely— Why?
☐ 4. Not at all likely

1:56 How often have you talked to someone (not a member of the BENCHMARK Community Conference or the BENCHMARK staff) about the BENCHMARK Program?

☐ 1. Very often - It averages about once or twice a week
☐ 2. Sometimes - It averages about once or twice a month
☐ 3. Rarely - I’ve talked to people about BENCHMARK, but it’s irregular and not very often
☐ 4. Never - I can’t remember talking to anyone about BENCHMARK

1:57 Have you ever personally referred anyone to BENCHMARK, either to obtain some service or information or to attend a BENCHMARK Community Conference (BCC) meeting?

CHECK ALL BOXES THAT APPLY

☐ 1. Yes, for some service or technical assistance
☐ 2. Yes, for information or report
☐ 3. Yes, to a BCC meeting
☐ 4. No

1:58 Generally, how do you feel about the BENCHMARK Program? Do you feel very positive, somewhat positive, somewhat negative or very negative about the BENCHMARK Program?

☐ 1. Very positive— Why?
☐ 2. Somewhat positive— Why?
☐ 3. Somewhat negative— Why?
☐ 4. Very negative— Why?
☐ 5. Undecided/Neutral

1:59 Since you received services from BENCHMARK, have you had any further contact with the Program?

☐ 1. Yes - If yes, what was it?
☐ 2. No

1:59A Below is space for you to write any further comments, suggestions or criticisms about any aspect of the BENCHMARK Program.
APPENDIX G

List of Hypotheses

Figure G.1 presents a list of the hypotheses that were formulated to aid in the assessment of the mechanisms, and indicates whether the hypotheses were or were not generally consistent with the findings. In addition, hypotheses that were formulated after the findings were analyzed are presented at the end of the table.
## Figure G.1
### Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Generally Consistent With Findings</th>
<th>Not Generally Consistent With Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awareness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The more the content of the meeting emphasizes general information transmission, the higher the level of awareness.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The longer the time of contact, the higher the level of awareness.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The more varied the type of information transmission processes, the higher the level of awareness.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The longer the time of contact and the more varied the type of information transmission processes, the higher the level of reading Program materials.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The more relevant Program materials are to the purpose of the convening, the higher the level of reading Program materials.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The more the content of the convening stresses the production of materials which fulfill a participant's information needs, the smaller the number of formal requests.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The longer the time of contact, the greater the number of formal requests.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The higher the degree of positive feelings, the greater the number of formal requests.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The higher the degree of positive feelings, the greater the likelihood that the participant will request information in the future.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trust and Credibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The smaller the ratio between staff and users, the higher the levels of trust and credibility.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The greater the actual service provided to a user, the higher the levels of trust and credibility.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotional or Referral Activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The higher the degree of involvement, the higher the level of promotional or referral activity.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The higher the degree of positive feelings, the higher the level of promotional or referral activity.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The more situations in which the individual is involved that could potentially use BENCHMARK products, the higher the level of promotional or referral activities.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Hypotheses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. If primary reliance is placed on oral transmission processes, there will be a higher degree of awareness if the interaction is one-to-one rather than one-to-any.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The more reinforcement that occurs concerning information about BENCHMARK, the higher the level of awareness.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The higher the degree of awareness, the higher the degree of interest.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BENCHMARK COMMUNITY CONFERENCE (BCC). One of the four dissemination and utilization mechanisms in The BENCHMARK Program created to guide the development of a survey-based assessment of the needs and aspirations of Columbus area citizens. The purpose of the BCC was to bring together in a working group a number of potential users of this assessment and the professional staff of BENCHMARK in order to design the first Columbus Area Social Profile.

THE BENCHMARK PROGRAM. A program, sponsored by the Academy for Contemporary Problems and The Ohio State University Mershon Center, for promoting the institutionalization of a social indicator system on the local level.

BENCHMARKINGS. The monthly newsletter of The BENCHMARK Program which was sent to members of the BENCHMARK Community Conference and other interested people in the Columbus community. This newsletter contained information concerning the activities and products of BENCHMARK.

COLUMBUS AREA SOCIAL PROFILE (CASP). The survey-based assessment of Columbus area residents' opinions, needs, aspirations, satisfactions and conditions, covering a broad array of concerns. The purpose of CASP was to provide perceptual data which could supplement other information sources available in the community.

CASP-1 USER'S GUIDE. A booklet produced by The BENCHMARK Program to provide an overview of the information contained in the CASP-1 data base, which could be given to potential users of the information. This guide contained information on The BENCHMARK Program in general, on the process used to design CASP, on the variety of uses of survey data, and on the types of questions that were asked.

COMMUNITY-ORIGINATED STUDIES PROGRAM (COS PROGRAM). One of the four dissemination and utilization mechanisms of The BENCHMARK Program created to facilitate processing of individualized requests for information from CASP. Through the COS Program anyone in the community could request a further analysis of CASP information that was tailored to the client's own specialized information needs.
REPORT REVIEW COMMITTEE (RRC). One of the four dissemination and utilization mechanisms of The BENCHMARK Program created to guide the development of a report describing the information contained in a particular subject area of CASP. The purpose of these meetings was to bring together people in the Columbus community who were interested in a particular subject, to review and comment on drafts of the Social Report prepared by staff members of BENCHMARK.

SOCIAL REPORTS. Broad descriptive reports written on each particular subject area in CASP. The purpose of the Social Reports was to disseminate in a general way the results to the questions contained in CASP.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (TA PROGRAM). One of the four dissemination and utilization mechanisms of The BENCHMARK Program created to facilitate the processing of non-CASP related requests for assistance or information. In the process of handling a particular client's request, the staff was given the opportunity not only of providing a badly needed service but also of promoting information about The BENCHMARK Program in general.
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