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ABSTRACT

An interview was used to assess the use of learner evaluation by teachers of informal, non-credit course in parent education in Tucson, Arizona, from January to June, 1980. Thirty-five teachers of parent education were interviewed about their use of formal and/or informal evaluation of learners, the timing of such evaluation, specific procedures for conducting the evaluation, and their needs and concerns regarding evaluation of learners.

Almost all of the parent education teachers used all of the five specified informal evaluation procedures. Less than one-fourth of the teachers used any one of the specified evaluation procedures. Almost half used no formal evaluation of students' learning. Most evaluation was conducted at the end of a class.

An assessment of the evaluation devices provided by the subjects revealed that most of the evaluation in these parent education classes was conducted for the purpose of providing feedback to the teachers, not for the purpose of evaluating the learners. Examination of the needs and concerns in parent education expressed by the teachers revealed that only 1 of 93 responses dealt with evaluation of learners' achievements.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

From the beginning of their lives, what children learn is based on what parents teach. Parents need to recognize this teaching role and accept it as their own. Parents are responsible for enabling their children to have strong and healthy bodies, providing the background for children's positive or negative feelings about themselves, and setting the stage for teaching children about interacting effectively in the world of people. The vocation of parent is perhaps the most important role in society. Although there are no precise answers to many of the questions that arise in the day-to-day interactions with children, parent education programs can provide a place where parents can think these questions through in dialogue with other parents and with direction to ensure consideration of the widest range of alternatives (Pickarts and Fargo, 1971).

Parent education is the accumulation of all types of activities and experiences that provide guidelines for the parent role (Earhart, 1980). Its intention is to provide the participants with a greater knowledge of the principles of child growth and development and to expose them to alternative methods for interaction with their children (Coward and Kerckhoff, 1978).

The fact that there are great numbers of adults seeking information about child rearing is evidenced by the popularity of parent education classes. For example, in California, the parenting courses are part of the
general adult education program of the public schools. In a recent year, 22,275 adults were enrolled in parent education classes in the Los Angeles schools (Verduin et al., 1977). Parent Effectiveness Training (PET), one of the group training programs in parent education, has reportedly trained 250,000 parents in workshops (Gordon, 1975).

In parent education classes, as in all classes, evaluation is needed to provide information about learners for a variety of tasks involving decision making. First, an evaluation can provide information about the skills and abilities already possessed by the learners upon entering the class. Another useful evaluation facet is the in-progress evaluation, which can occur at frequent intervals during the period of instruction. The purpose of this type of evaluation is to provide both learners and instructor with feedback concerning the degree of the learners' understanding of the instruction. In-progress evaluation can also provide a basis for improvement or modification of classes in order to increase instructional effectiveness. Although the terminal evaluation that occurs at the end of a class does not offer an opportunity for modification of instruction with the current class members, it can provide a basis for revision of plans to be used with future learners. The terminal evaluation can also provide data about the behavior of the learners at the end of an instructional activity (Verduin et al., 1977).

In the evaluation of learners in parent education, there is concern for both cognitive and affective learning. Cognitive learning involves the development of intellectual abilities and skills, whereas affective learning involves attainment of attitudes, values, and appreciations (Bloom, 1956). Because the purpose of parent education is to provide participants with
information that can be applied to improve or enrich their relationships with their own children, it is important that these learners be given ample opportunity not only to understand factual information but also to develop the values and appreciations associated with application of this information. Therefore, evaluation undertaken with members of parent education classes should assess class members' achievement in both the cognitive and affective areas.

Does evaluation as practiced in nonformal parent education classes fulfill its purpose in providing information needed for decision making? This was the question of concern in the investigation. Although there was an abundance of information on evaluation and how it should be conducted within the traditional school setting, there was little information about what evaluation of learner achievement was being undertaken in the informal, non-credit parent education setting. Furthermore, there was little information as to whether that evaluation was designed to assess the cognitive and affective aspects of participants' learning.

**Problem Statement**

The purpose of this study was to investigate teachers' use of evaluation of learners in informal, non-credit courses in parent education offered in Tucson, Arizona, from January to June, 1980. Specific questions for which data were collected include:

1. How many teachers of informal, non-credit courses in parent education used formal and/or informal evaluation of learners?

2. When was evaluation of learners carried out in the informal, non-credit courses in parent education?
3. How many teachers of informal, non-credit courses in parent education used specified procedures for formal evaluation of learners?

The specified procedures included objective written tests, objective self-reports of feelings, objective self-reports of actions, essay written tests, oral questioning, product rating, and performance observations and rating.

4. How many of the teachers of informal, non-credit courses in parent education used specified procedures for informal evaluation of learners?

The specified procedures included student reaction to course material, quality of student questions, judgment of student problem-solving ability, judgment of student responses to oral questioning, and student perception of achievement of goals.

5. How many of the teachers of informal, non-credit courses in parent education used evaluation procedures designed to assess specified levels of cognitive learning?

The specified levels of cognitive learning were knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation.

6. How many of the teachers of informal, non-credit courses in parent education used evaluation procedures designed to assess specified levels of affective learning?

The specified levels of affective learning were receiving, responding, valuing, organization, and characterization by a value complex.

7. What different kinds of information were items on evaluation devices used in informal, non-credit courses in parent education designed to provide?
8. What did instructors who did and did not use formal evaluation in their classes perceive their needs in the area of evaluation to be?

Assumptions and Limitations

In carrying out the research, the investigator made the following assumptions:

1. The instrument designed to elicit information about the use of evaluation of learners in informal, non-credit courses in parent education was a valid instrument.

2. The instrument designed to assess the evaluation devices that were obtained from the participants was a valid instrument.

3. The participants answered the interview questions accurately.

4. An open and unbiased relationship was established between the interviewer and the participants.

5. The interviewer carried out the interviews consistently.

Several factors in the nature and setting of the study were recognized as placing limitations on the findings. They were:

1. Data were collected for informal, non-credit courses in parent education offered in Tucson, Arizona, from January to June, 1980. These results are not generalizable to other subject areas, geographic locations, or time periods.

2. The 35 participants in the study were self-selected and may not have represented the views and practices of the total population of instructors of informal, non-credit parent education classes in Tucson, Arizona, from January to June, 1980.
Definitions

The following definitions were used in the design and conduct of the study:

**Adult**—a person who is 16 years old or older and no longer enrolled in elementary or secondary school.

**Adult education**—instruction provided for the benefit of adults.

**Affective learning**—that part of learning that includes changes in interests, attitudes, and values and the development of appreciations (Krathwohl et al., 1975).

**Cognitive learning**—that part of learning that includes the recall or recognition of knowledge and the development of intellectual abilities and skills (Bloom, 1956).

**Evaluation of cognitive and affective learning**—the process in which a judgment is made about the extent to which cognitive and affective objectives have been achieved (Cross, 1973).

**Formal evaluation**—a systematic procedure, used consistently with all members of a class, usually including some documentation of evidence for determining the extent to which learner objectives have been achieved. Types of formal evaluation procedures include:

**Objective written test**—a structured instrument in which the learner selects an answer from a limited number of choices.

**Objective self-report of feelings**—an instrument consisting of several statements to which the learners are asked to respond as to their degree of agreement or disagreement.
Objective self-report of past actions—a questionnaire or pretest designed to determine the past behavior or experiences of the learners.

Essay written test—an instrument consisting of questions that require the learners to organize their own answers and express themselves in their own writing style.

Oral questioning—a presentation of problems that requires the learners to organize answers and express themselves in their own words.

Product rating—an exercise that requires the learner to produce something which is then evaluated on the basis of criteria, often through the use of a rating scale.

Performance observation and rating—an exercise in which a learner carries out a particular performance, which is then evaluated on the basis of criteria, often through the use of a rating scale (Wolf, 1979).

Informal evaluation—impressionistic, immediate feedback based on the personal judgments of the instructor, usually not suited to documentation or systematic (Skager, 1978). Types of informal evaluation procedures include:

Student reaction to course material—the instructor's impression of the students' grasp of the material being presented based on facial expression and body language.

Quality of student questions—the instructor's impression of the students' grasp of the material based on the type and quality of questions being asked by the students.
Judgment of student responses to oral questioning—the instructor's impression of the students' grasp of the material based on the quality of their answers to oral question.

Student perception of achievement of goals—the instructor's impression of the students' accomplishments when measured in conjunction with the students' own perceptions of goal achievement.

Informal, non-credit courses for adults—courses offered for the benefit of adults that do not serve as criteria toward the attainment of any kind of a degree.

Learner achievement—the extent to which the learner has reached the objectives.

Parent education—all types of activities and experiences that provide guidelines for the parent role (Earhart, 1980).
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Literature examined that was relevant to evaluation in informal, non-credit courses in parent education will be presented in five sections: (1) purposes of parent education, (2) purposes of evaluation in educational programs, (3) models of evaluation applicable to parent education, (4) types of evaluation procedures useful in parent education classes, and (5) analysis of evaluation of parent education reported in the literature.

Purposes of Parent Education

Parent education, in the form of passing information from one generation to the next, probably represent the oldest of all educational disciplines (Thorsrud, 1974). Parenting, one of the most difficult of professions, is often achieved through tradition, instinct, and repetition (Price, 1971). This form of education is not entirely sufficient, however, as parents often find themselves repeating the same mistakes as their parents (Huber and Lynch, 1978). Hence, for approximately two centuries, parents have been seeking parenting information from outside sources.

Parent education has been defined in two ways: (1) the purposeful training in preparation for the responsibilities of parenthood (Coward and Kerckhoff, 1978) and (2) the purposive learning activity of parents who are trying to modify their method of interaction with their
children (Croake and Glover, 1977). The distinctions between these two definitions is that the first involves education prior to the advent of children and the second involves education concurrent with parenthood.

The techniques generally used in parent education are discussion methods. There are two essential elements involved in the discussion method of education. The first element is participation, because in all areas people learn by doing. The second element is personal involvement by the learner. In areas such as parent education, which involves a high affective component, personal involvement seems to be important (Hereford, 1963).

The content of parent education generally consists of topics designed to help parents gain a better understanding of their children. Topics might include child development norms, general personality and functioning, child-rearing techniques, methods of discipline, interpersonal communications, parent-child relations, practice advice, and theoretical approaches (Croake and Glover, 1977).

Three primary aims for a parent discussion group are: (1) to provide supplementary training in child rearing in order to reduce parental confusion, doubt, guilt, and anxiety by increasing the parents' knowledge of child growth and development (Balter, 1976), (2) to help the parents to clarify their own role and that of their children, and (3) to increase the parents' understanding of the complexities of everyday situations in order to help them make better management decisions (Tavormina, 1974). Three additional outcomes are required for effective parent training. Not only must parents acquire the modification skills and changes in their own behavior as outlined above, but they must implement these
changes with their children and, most important, these changes must gen-
eralize and persist in the parents' day-to-day practice (O'Dell, 1974).
Therefore, the evaluation of education in parent-child relations must con-
cern itself first with knowledge and attitude change and ultimately with
behavior change (Hereford, 1963).

Purposes of Evaluation in
Educational Programs

Evaluation is far from a new concept. Webster's (1979, p. 632)
gives the definition of evaluation as, "To determine the worth of; to ap-
praise." Given such a broad focus for this term, it can be said that
evaluation has always been with us and that every individual since the
beginning of time has been, in unique fashion, an evaluator. (Worthen
and Sanders, 1973).

From an educational point of view, evaluation can be defined as
a systematic process for determining the extent to which objectives are
achieved by learners. Two important aspects of this definition are (1)
evaluation implies a systematic process, which necessarily omits the casual,
uncontrolled observation of learners, and (2) evaluation assumes that
educational objectives have been defined at some previous point in time
(Gronlund, 1965).

The above is a typical definition of evaluation conducted in a
formal manner. However, much evaluation is informal, impressionistic,
and immediate. It is often based on the personal judgments of learners,
teacher, and others involved in the learning process. Although the for-
mer definition of evaluation in a systematic manner is more widely accepted,
the role of the informal in evaluation continues to be recognized and respected (Skager, 1978).

Evaluation is both a means and an end. As a means it involves procedures designed to improve the quality of teaching. These procedures include tests, grades, student questionnaires, and carefully planned research studies. Evaluation is also a means to better student learning and can provide evidence of student deficiency and progress toward objectives and goals (Dressel, 1961).

Evaluation of learner progress can and should contribute directly to improved comprehension by the learner in a number of ways. Evaluation procedures help to clarify just what information is to be learned. They provide concrete information about the learner's progress. They help in the recognition of areas in which there is difficulty in learning. And they indicate, for both the learner and the instructor, readiness for future learning activities. In addition, information from evaluation techniques can provide the instructor with information regarding the effectiveness of the course content and the teaching methodology (Gronlund, 1965).

Evaluation can serve both formative and summative functions. Formative evaluation serves as a basis for instructional decisions. Summative evaluation provides evidence of the achievement of participants. Both functions are relevant to evaluation in parent education.

Formative evaluation is concerned with the ongoing improvement of the parenting curriculum. It provides information concerning how closely the actual learning situation corresponds to the ideal situation described in the learning objective. This feedback can be used by teachers and
learners for the enhancement of learning during the education process in parenting classes.

Summative evaluation, although it focuses on the same conditions as does formative evaluation, is conducted for the purpose of drawing conclusions about the learning situation. This form of evaluation is concerned with whether a total effort such as a series of parent education classes has been successful, that is, whether the desired parenting behaviors have been established and maintained over time. Conclusions that are drawn through the use of summative evaluation have an element of finality (Skager, 1978).

Models of Evaluation Applicable to Parent Education

Two models of evaluation were identified as having relevance for nonformal parent education classes. These models were the Stufflebeam et al. (1971) CIPP (context, input, process, product) model and the Bennett (1977) Model for Evaluation in the Cooperative Extension Program.¹

CIPP Model

The CIPP model of Stufflebeam et al. (1971), which is widely recognized in the field of evaluation, is applicable to the field of parent education. It involves four types of evaluation: context, input, process, and product.

¹Cooperative Extension education involves non-credit, individual, group, and mass instruction, which is directed toward problem solving. It is usually conducted in a nonformal manner. Cooperative Extension programs are an outreach of land-grant universities and colleges and are usually mutually funded and directed by local, state, and national sources (Bennett, 1977).
Context evaluation is the most basic type of evaluation. The purpose of context evaluation is to provide a rationale for determining the learning objectives. Some of the functions of context evaluation include defining the appropriate environment, describing the desired and actual conditions relative to the environment, identifying unmet needs and unused opportunities, and diagnosing the problems that may be preventing the needs from being met and the opportunities from being used. The purpose of these functions is to provide a basis for developing objectives that, upon achievement, will result in program improvement. Two examples of context evaluation are determining the existing knowledge, attitudes, and skills of learners as they enter classes and determining the learners' perceptions of their needs as parents of young children.

The second type of evaluation that can be used in parent education is input evaluation. The purpose of this type of evaluation is to provide information about how resources can be utilized in order to achieve project objectives. Alternative designs are usually assessed in terms of their resource, time, and budget requirements, their potential procedural barriers, the cost of overcoming these barriers, the relevance of the designs to objectives, and the overall potential of the design to meet the objectives of the project. Examples of input evaluation are analysis of the pool of potential teachers for parent education, analysis of the pool of resource persons who are available for parent education classes, and examination of potential locations and times for class meetings.

The definition of process evaluation is parallel to that of formative evaluation. This type of evaluation is used after a designed course of action has been implemented. Process evaluation is needed in order to
provide periodic feedback to those responsible for the implementation of the plans. Process evaluation involves three main objectives. The first objective is to detect any defects in the procedural design or its implementation. The second objective is to provide information for decision making during the implementation of the program, and the third objective is to maintain a record of the procedure as it is taking place. Examples of process evaluation are reactions of class members to the worth of class sessions, attendance at class meetings, and amount of participation by class members during group discussion.

The fourth type of evaluation in the CIPP model, product evaluation, relates to summative evaluation. The purpose of this type of evaluation is to measure and interpret attainments at the end of a project cycle as well as periodically during the project term. Product evaluation provides information for decisions to continue, terminate, modify, or re-focus an activity and for relating the activity to other phases of the change process. Like summative evaluation, product evaluation is terminal, regardless of when it is conducted (Stufflebeam et al., 1971). Examples of product evaluation are assessment of knowledge about child development gained by class members and a record of changes in parenting practices.

**Bennett Model for Evaluation in Cooperative Extension Programs**

Bennett's (1977) model for analyzing impacts of Cooperative Extension programs is the second evaluation model that was found to have relevance for nonformal parent education classes. This is a model designed for use in an informal learning situation and provides for evaluation at each of the seven stages characteristic of most Cooperative Extension education
The Bennett model assumes that a general direction or ultimate objective has been defined for a program, at least tentatively. Then at each of the stages, sub-objectives are established and used as a basis for evaluating progress toward the end objectives.

At the first, or input, level, potential resources are identified and allocated to programs on the basis of their contribution to the achievement of objectives. For example, factors of cost, time, and potential outreach would be evaluated in deciding whether to use a program of parenting education already in existence or to pay teachers to design a new program.

At the second, or activities, level, the types and numbers of activities that can be conducted with available inputs are evaluated for their potential in achieving program objectives. Evaluation of the probability of achieving objectives of parent education through mass media, large group meetings with a dynamic speaker, or a series of small discussion sessions with a trained leader is an example of evaluation at this level. After the decision about activities has been made and carried out, the worth of activities in achieving objectives is examined.

At level three, people involvement, expectations that certain types and numbers of people, groups, or committees will participate in the activity are stated. For example, an objective in parent education might be to have 15 parents in attendance at each of eight class sessions with an attrition rate of only 20 percent. Another example might relate to the type of participation of class members in discussion. Evidence at this level can suggest the extent to which benefits are being received by the
participants, but this evidence does not necessarily represent progress toward ultimate program objectives, as high participation may occur for some reason unrelated to the expected benefits of the program.

The next level, reactions, may provide a somewhat better confirmation of whether the activities are as helpful as intended, because the criteria at this level are concerned with the reaction of participants to the given activities. Responses to such questions as "What did you learn in this class?" and "Was the group leader helpful in answering your questions?" provide evidence for evaluation at the reactions level.

The fifth, or KASA change, level serves to evaluate changes in the knowledge, attitudes, skills, and aspirations that result from the participants' engagement in the program activities. Evaluation of change in attitude of participants about the importance of parent education is an example at this level. Evaluation of the alternatives a parent expresses concerning ways of disciplining their children is another.

The sixth, or practice change, level refers to individual or collective application of acquired knowledge, attitudes, skills, and aspirations. This level requires that the participants experience certain changes in their individual practices, technology, or social structure. Collecting evidence of a parent's use of reflective listening 6 months after instruction is an example of evaluation of practice change.

The final level, end results, represents the ultimate aim of a program. At this level, the benefits and consequences resulting from practice change are realized. If the ultimate objective of the program has been reached, end results will involve the prevention, checking, reduction, or solution of overall problems. Decrease in child abuse in a 5-year
period or increase in support services for high-risk parents in a similar time period represents examples of end result evaluation.

Types of Evaluation Procedures Useful in Parent Education Classes

In Evaluation in Education, Wolf (1979) has provided a useful discussion of evaluation procedures, which includes a list of the commonly used evaluation procedures. Evaluation has been defined as the process of determining the extent to which educational objectives are achieved. Evaluation is a continuous and comprehensive process that uses a variety of information-gathering procedures. When selecting these evaluation procedures, there are three general principles to follow. First, the evaluation procedure should be appropriate to produce the desired information. Second, if there is a choice of several appropriate evaluation procedures, the one that is most efficient and practical is the one that should be chosen, and, finally, if possible, it is desirable that multiple measures be used. This practice of using multiple measures increases the validity of the resulting data. Wolf lists the following commonly used evaluation procedures. These procedures were chosen for consideration in this study because they appear to have potential for implementing the principles for selection of evaluation procedures.

The first evaluation procedure is the objective written test. On this type of test, the learner operates within a highly structured situation. The learner selects the answer from a limited set of choices supplied by the test constructor. These responses are typically evaluated according to a predetermined set of correct answers. Objective tests can provide evidence of learners' grasp of information in parent education.
Another evaluation procedure, the objective self-report of feelings, typically consists of several fictional statements to which the learner is asked to indicate the degree of endorsement. For each item, the learner is usually furnished with a set of response options such as "I strongly agree" and "I disagree." This procedure can give evidence of the learner's attitudes.

Objective self-reports of past actions are often used to gather information about the learners that may help to interpret results of learner performance in a particular course. The method generally used to collect this type of information is that of a questionnaire. Evidence of learners' practices as parents can be secured with this procedure.

Another procedure, the essay written test, usually consists of only a few questions. In this test form, learners must organize their thoughts, using their own words and writing style to produce an answer. This procedure is particularly useful if the objective involves proficiencies such as making comparisons, describing, or giving examples. Evidence of learners' understanding of concepts and attitudes can be secured from analyses of essay responses.

Oral questioning is similar to essay questioning in that it also requires producing an answer in one's own words. In oral questioning, it is possible for the evaluator to ask follow-up questions that may allow for further clarification of the answer at the time of the examination. One disadvantage of this procedure is that there is no permanent record of the answers unless a tape recorder or similar device is used.

Another procedure, products, scored and rated, involves the completion of a product by the learner, then the subsequent scoring and
rating by the instructor on the basis of some predetermined set of criteria. For example, the learners might be asked to create a toy that would contribute to a child's intellectual development at a given stage and would also adhere to the principles of toy safety.

The last procedure examined was performance, observed and rated, which involves the learner in a particular kind of performance to be observed and rated by the instructor. Such performances might include role playing the use of reflective listening or maintaining discipline in a real-life situation.

Taken as a whole these evaluation procedures can be used to provide evidence of a learner's accomplishment of objectives. In other words, most of these procedures tend to be used at the process and product levels of Stufflebeam's CIPP model and at the KASA change, practice change, or end results levels of the Bennett model.

As has been indicated, there is a relationship between these evaluation procedures and the types of educational objectives they are intended to evaluate. Classifications of educational objectives such as those by Bloom (1956) and Krathwohl et al. (1964) permit systematic evaluation of different types of learner achievement. In these classification systems, the categories are the kinds of behavior that are the desired outcomes of educational programs.

The taxonomy of educational objectives is divided into three domains: cognitive, affective, and psychomotor. The cognitive and affective domains were reviewed for this study.

The cognitive domain, which includes the largest proportion of educational objectives, involves objectives that emphasize remembering
or reproducing something previously learned. The objectives may also involve solving some intellectual task for which the individual has to determine the problem and then solve it through reordering given material or combining it with ideas, methods, or procedures previously learned. Cognitive objectives range from a simple recall of material to highly creative ways of synthesizing new ideas and material (Krathwohl et al., 1964).

The cognitive variables are concerned with "knowing" as distinguished from "feeling" or "acting." Among these variables are such behaviors as perceiving, recognizing, judging, memorizing, learning, and thinking (Anderson, 1975).

As the cognitive taxonomy of educational objectives is organized, it includes six major classes: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation (Bloom, 1956). The objectives in one class are likely to make use of and be built upon the behaviors found in the preceding classes. A definition and description of each of these major classes with examples from parent education follow.

Knowledge involves behaviors that are concerned primarily with remembering as demonstrated by either recognition or recall of ideas, material, or phenomena. The behavior expected of a student in a recall situation is very similar to the behavior expected during the original learning situation. Being able to list a child's goals for misbehavior is an example of an educational outcome at the knowledge level.

Comprehension is probably the largest general class of intellectual abilities and skills that are emphasized in schools. Comprehension involves the literal understanding of a written or oral communication. In
comprehension, the emphasis is on the grasp of the meaning and intent of
the material. Explaining the meaning of reflective listening is an example
of an accomplishment at the comprehension level.

In application, the emphasis is on remembering and using appro-
priate generalizations or principles in a given problem situation. It in-
volves using abstractions in particular concrete settings. Demonstrating
ability to use reflective listening in an interaction with a child is an ex-
ample of learning at the application level.

Analysis involves breaking down material into its constituent
parts and recognizing the relationship of those parts to each other and
to the whole. Such analyses are intended to clarify the given material
or communication and to indicate how the material is organized as well as
its basis and arrangement. Relating modes of discipline to consequences
for a child's development exemplifies learning at the analysis level.

Synthesis involves the operation of combining elements and parts
so as to form a new pattern or structure. Generally, this would involve
a recombining of parts of previous experience with new material, restruct-
tured into a new and integrated whole. This is the category within the
cognitive domain that most effectively provides for creative behavior by
the individual. Creating an environment to support a child's intellectual
development is an example of learning at the level of synthesis.

Evaluation involves the combination of all five of the other be-
haviors. It is defined as making judgments about ideas, works, solutions,
or methods on the basis of predetermined criteria and standards. Using
criteria to judge the adequacy of a child's environment to support intel-
lectual development is an example of learning at the level of evaluation.
The second category of objectives to be developed as a taxonomy is that of the affective domain. Affective objectives are those involving a feeling tone, an emotion, or a degree of acceptance or rejection. Affective objectives vary in degree from the simple act of paying attention to selected phenomena to complex but consistent qualities of character and conscience. The objectives are generally expressed in the literature as interests, attitudes, appreciations, values, and emotion sets or biases (Krathwohl et al., 1964).

As in the cognitive domain, the individual categories are hierarchical; that is, the first step must be achieved before the learner can move to the next level, and the skills involved in the earlier levels are essential to the achievement of skills at higher levels. The categories of the affective domain and their subdivisions are receiving, responding, valuing, organization, and characterization by a value complex. A definition and description of each of these categories follow.

At the receiving level there is concern about whether the learner is sensitized to the existence of particular phenomena and stimuli. An example of behavior at this level would be an awareness by potential participants that parent education classes are being held at various times and locations.

At the responding level, the learner is sufficiently motivated to actively attend to the stimuli at a very low level of commitment. In other words, the learner is doing something with or about the stimuli besides simply perceiving it. At this level, a parent might choose to attend a parent education class but has not made any sort of commitment to the value of the class or any needs that the class might fulfill.
At the valuing level, the thing, phenomenon, or behavior has worth. Behavior at this level begins to take on the characteristics of a belief or attitude. The learner displays this behavior with enough consistency to be perceived by others as holding a value. At the lowest level of valuing, the learner is willing to be perceived simply as one who holds this value, and at higher levels the learner may behave in such a way so as to actively further this impression. At this level, the parent has begun to recognize the worth of the parenting class and has begun to recommend it to friends and co-workers.

At the organization level the learner internalizes values in situations for which more than one value is relevant. This necessitates organizing the values into a system, determining the interrelationships between them, and establishing dominant and pervasive values. A system of values such as this is built up gradually and will change as new values are incorporated. An example of evaluation at this level might involve a testing device that determines the extent to which a parent's values are consistent with the desired behaviors and attitudes expressed in parent education.

At the level of characterization by a value or value complex, the values have already established a place in the individual's value hierarchy, are organized into an internally consistent system, and have controlled the behavior of the individual for a sufficient period of time that adjustments to the behavior have already been made. In addition, the behavior is no longer capable of arousing emotion or affect except when the individual is challenged or threatened.
The individual acts so consistently in accordance with the values that have been internalized at this level that (1) the generalization of this control is so much a part of the individual's behavior that one can be described and characterized as a person by these controlling tendencies and (2) these beliefs have integrated into a total philosophy or world view. An example of a method for testing a learner for this level of learning is to provide several examples of life goals and note how consistently they are chosen.

**Analysis of Evaluation of Parent Education Reported in the Literature**

Parent education programs have been evaluated for effectiveness in numerous ways. For the purposes of this study, only research involving evaluation of learning by parents in terms of attitudes and behaviors were examined.

Hereford (1963) conducted a 4-year study, which involved 916 parents. Those parents attending discussion group meetings for six 2-hour weekly meetings were compared with three control groups of parents. The three control groups were identified as lecture, non-attendant, and random. Results showed that the experimental group of parents exhibited a significantly greater change in attitudes than did the control groups of parents.

Croake and Glover (1977) cited a 1964 study by Chilman, who surveyed parent education program to evaluate their effectiveness with low-income families. The evidence showed that parent education had little effect in altering the attitudes or behavior of low-income parents.
Anchor and Thomason (1977) cited a 1973 study by Chilman in which she concluded after reviewing the literature on parent training and conducting her own study that the impact of parent training groups was minimal. In fact, Brim (cited by Anchor and Thomason, 1977) had stated in 1959 that most research failed to show significant changes in parent information, attitudes, or behavior at any socioeconomic level.

Anchor and Thomason (1977) cited the findings of several other researchers. Glidewell in 1961 and Friedman in 1969 reported that they had failed to show that parent groups had a significant effect in modifying the child-rearing attitudes of parents. Similarly, Swanson in 1970 and Stearn in 1971 reported that parents who attended training groups did not report fewer problems with their children after 3 months. Saltzinger, Feldman, and Portnoy found in their 1970 study that group counseling produced only modest success in the alteration of target behaviors. They found that parents with a better educational background were more successful in achieving changes in behavior.

In 1975, Croake (cited in Croake and Glover, 1977) reported that parents who had attended as few as four Adlerian parent study groups made significant changes in their attitudes and behavior toward their children. Parents from five different study groups made significantly higher mean scores in tests designed to measure democratic attitudes and positive behavior toward their children than the parents in three different control groups.

In summary, a review of studies concerning effectiveness of parent education classes revealed that parental knowledge, attitude, and behavior were general areas that were evaluated. Thus, evaluation of
Effectiveness was done at the product level of the CIPP model and at the KASA change, practice change, or end results levels of the Bennett model of evaluation. No consistent pattern as to the effectiveness of parent education emerged. A partial reason for this may be that no one method of evaluation or one objective has been addressed consistently over a period of time.

**Summary of the Review of Literature**

The review of literature represents an attempt to define and combine two areas of study: parent education and evaluation of learners. Both parent education and evaluation have been defined, two models of evaluation have been applied to parent education, and then processes for combining the two areas of study have been suggested through the use of specified evaluation procedures and taxonomies of educational objectives. Finally, the literature was reviewed concerning research studies in which parent education was evaluated. The investigator located no studies that examined the process and types of evaluation used in informal, non-credit parent education classes.
CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURES

The procedures for the investigation of evaluation of learners in informal, non-credit courses in parent education in Tucson, Arizona, are described in five sections: population and sample, characteristics of classes taught by subjects, the interview instruments, the interview process, and analysis of data.

Population and Sample

For this study, the population consisted of instructors of informal, non-credit courses for adults in parent education that were offered from January to June, 1980 in Tucson, Arizona. Identification of the members of the population was accomplished through contact with various educational agencies such as the University of Arizona Continuing Education, Pima Community College Community Services, Tucson Unified School District Career Guidance Program, Tucson Association for Child Care, and the Red Cross. As members of the population were identified, they served as a source for names of other persons who also qualified as members of the population.

Individuals identified as instructors were then contacted by telephone by the investigator, who used the first interview instrument (Appendix A) to determine eligibility and willingness to participate in the study. All potential participants who were contacted expressed willingness to participate at the conclusion of the first interview. A list of
40 interested participants was then compiled by the investigator. These 40 individuals were contacted again by telephone by the investigator, using the second telephone interview (Appendix B) and appointments were set up for the purpose of conducting the interviews.

The 40 participants was later reduced to 35. Four of the potential subjects were eliminated for one of two reasons: they had not taught a parent education class during the specified time period or they had begun a class but cancelled it before completion due to lack of attendance. One potential subject failed to keep the interview appointment on two occasions and was therefore assumed to be unwilling to participate.

**Characteristics of Classes Taught by Subjects**

Descriptive information was gathered about the classes in parent education taught by the subjects in the study. The 35 instructors taught a total of 66 classes within the time period covered by the study. The number of classes taught by each subject is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of Subjects by Number of Parent Education Classes Taught. -- N = 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Classes</th>
<th>Instructors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The names given to the classes taught by the subjects of the study varied. Of the 65 course titles used, 44 included the word "parent" or "parenting." Three titles included the words "child development," one dealt with "understanding," one with "growth," and another with "expectations." The remaining titles were descriptors of the subject matter. Four classes were about self-esteem, three were concerned with divorce and remarriage, and one each was involved with television, creativity, sexuality, death, anger, and discipline. Two classes were named by the major textbook or kit used in the class.

Half of the subjects' classes met for a series of six to nine sessions, whereas a quarter were workshops that met for one session. A few of the subjects' classes met continuously with no definite starting or ending points. This information is shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Distribution of Parent Education Classes by Number of Class Sessions. --N = 66

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Class Sessions</th>
<th>Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 or over</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The parent education classes taught by subjects in this study were most often held in the morning and evening, with over three-fourths of the classes occurring at these times. The remaining classes were held in the afternoon or at more than one time of day.
Over two-thirds of the class sessions were 2 hours in length as is indicated in Table 3. Only one of the classes met for more than 3 hours.

Table 3. Distribution of Parent Education Classes by Length of Class Sessions. -- N = 66

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Class Sessions</th>
<th>Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 hours</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 hours</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;3 hours</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next data analysis involves characteristics of the learners enrolled in the classes taught by the subjects. Table 4 shows the size of classes. Over three-fourths of the classes had 15 or fewer members.

Table 4. Distribution of Parent Education Classes by Class Size. -- N = 66

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Size</th>
<th>Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 or more</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The average age of learners in the classes is shown in Table 5. In over two-thirds of the classes the average age was between 26 and 35.

Table 5. Distribution of Parent Education Classes by Average Age of Learners. -- N = 66

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Age</th>
<th>Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30 years</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35 years</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40 years</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 indicates the proportion of males in the parent education classes included in the study. Over a third of the classes enrolled no men. In only six of the classes did men make up over 40 percent of the enrollment.

Table 6. Distribution of Parent Education Classes by Percentage of Male Learners. -- N = 66

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Males Enrolled</th>
<th>Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-90</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Interview Instruments

The development of the interview instruments for this study was done in three stages: initial development, field testing, and revision. The stages of development are described in turn.

Initial Development

Three interview instruments were developed for this study. Two were designed to be used over the telephone. The first interview instrument (Appendix A) was designed to explain the purposes of the study to the potential participants and to determine their willingness to participate in the study. The purpose of the second telephone interview (Appendix B) was to make an appointment with the participants to conduct the personal interview, which used the interview schedule (Appendix D). The major resource for the development of the two telephone interview instruments was *Mail and Telephone Surveys* (Dillman, 1978).

The third instrument, the interview schedule, which was designed for a face-to-face interview, included two types of questions. The first type of question, which made up most of the schedule, was limited response type, and the second type of question was the short answer or open-ended type. The first few questions on the interview dealt with individual characteristics of the learning situation of each subject. The next series of questions was designed to determine what types of formal evaluation procedures were being used by the subjects in their classes. The basis for these questions was adapted from the classification of evaluation procedures by Wolf (1979). Another question on the interview schedule was intended to determine the timing of evaluation in the
subjects' classes. The remaining questions on the interview schedule were designed to determine the needs and concerns of the subjects in their role as adult educators, their expertise in the area of evaluation, and their concerns in this area. Most of the questions appearing on the interview schedule, with the exception of those concerning individual characteristics of subjects and classes, corresponded directly to questions on the problem statement.

Once the first drafts of these instruments were completed, they were submitted to the University of Arizona Human Subjects Committee for approval and were subsequently approved. A consent form for use with each subject (Appendix C) was developed at the request of the Human Subjects Committee.

Field Testing

The field test for this study was conducted in Phoenix, Arizona, with a sample of parent educators who worked for the parent study group sponsored by Maricopa Community College. The reason for conducting the field test in Phoenix was the relatively small size of the potential participant population in Tucson. The investigator wanted to be able to use all of the members of the Tucson population for the actual research project. The field test sample consisted of five individuals who had been selected by the administrator of the parent study project for reasons not available to the investigator.

The investigator met individually with the five participants in May 1980 and conducted the interview schedule with each of them. At the completion of the interview, the subjects for the field test were asked to
complete a short questionnaire (Appendix E) dealing with the effectiveness of the interview instrument.

Revision

Using the results of the interviews conducted with the field test subjects and the results of the questionnaire completed by these subjects, the investigator revised the interview schedule. Major revisions involved rephrasing questions for clarification and adding a series of questions involving the use of specific informal evaluation procedures by the subjects.

Following the revision, the interview schedule was re-submitted to the Human Subjects Committee for approval and was subsequently approved.

The Interview Process

Interviews for this study were conducted during June 1980. The investigator met with each of the subjects at the time and place preferred by the subject. After each subject had read through and agreed to the conditions on the consent form, the investigator began asking the interview questions. As the subject responded to the questions, the answers were recorded on the interview form.

If the subject used evaluation devices in the classes, copies of these devices were collected at the end of the interview. If the subject had further questions, an attempt was made by the investigator to answer them at this time. The names of subjects who expressed an interest in the results of the study were recorded by the investigator.
Analysis of Data

All data resulting from this study were analyzed by descriptive statistics. Data from the first group of questions concerning characteristics of classes taught by the subjects were placed in table form for comparison. Data from the question about when evaluation is carried out were also placed in the form of a table, which illustrates the tendencies of these instructors in timing of evaluation. Data from the series of questions about specific evaluation procedures, both formal and informal, were placed in table form to illustrate the use of these specific procedures by the subjects. The questions concerning the needs and concerns of the subjects were of the open-ended type. The investigator listed the responses to these questions and tallied the numbers of similar responses.

One of the questions on the interview schedule asked for copies of evaluation devices used by the subjects in their classes. In response to this question, the investigator was provided with copies of several evaluation devices. The reason for obtaining these devices was to determine the cognitive or affective level of the individual items on the devices according to the taxonomies of education objectives of Bloom (1956) and Krathwohl et al. (1964). This judgment was to be determined by a panel of experts and the results of their decisions were to be recorded on an assessment form devised by the investigator.

After examination of the evaluation devices provided by the subjects, the investigator found that it was not possible to determine cognitive or affective levels of items because of their highly varied and subjective nature.
Accordingly, the plan of consulting with a panel of experts regarding the taxonomic level of the devices was deemed infeasible by the investigator and her graduate committee, and an alternative plan was devised for categorizing the items on the evaluation devices. The alternative plan involved combining the two models of evaluation identified as relevant for nonformal parent education, the CIPP model, and Bennett's Cooperative Extension model into one classification of evaluation at eight levels.

Each of the evaluation devices was marked with a number that corresponded to the participant who provided it, and each item on the devices was marked with a Roman numeral. In some cases, more than one item on a device was to be answered in the same way, and for these a single Roman numeral was used. Then each item or group of items was examined and placed on a chart according to the type of evaluation it represented.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Responses from interviews with 35 teachers of informal, non-credit courses in parent education in Tucson, Arizona, from January to June, 1980 were tabulated and analyzed by using descriptive statistics. The results are presented in relation to the research question in the following sections: use of formal and informal evaluation by teachers, timing of use of evaluation, procedures used for formal evaluation, procedures used for informal evaluation, analysis of evaluation devices provided by subjects, and the perception by teachers of their needs in evaluation.

Use of Formal and Informal Evaluation

Data relative to the question, How many teachers of informal, non-credit courses in parent education use formal and/or informal evaluation of students' learning?, are summarized. These data show that whereas all of the teachers used informal evaluation procedures, nearly half used no formal evaluation procedures. Of those who did use formal evaluation, most used 1 of the 10 specified procedures and none used more than 3 of the specified formal evaluation procedures. These data are shown in Table 7.

Timing of Use of Evaluation

Responses to the question, When was evaluation of learners carried out in the informal, non-credit course in parent education?, are shown in Table 8. In nearly half of the courses, the use of evaluation
Table 7. Distribution of Teachers by Type and Number of Evaluation Procedures Used. -- N = 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Procedures Used</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Distribution of Parent Education Classes by Time of Evaluation. -- N = 50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Evaluation</th>
<th>Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of class</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-session</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of class</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throughout class</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not used at any time</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
occurred at the end of the course; for almost one-fourth of the courses, no evaluation was used at any time. The remaining courses were divided fairly evenly among those in which evaluation was conducted at the beginning of a course, at mid-session, or throughout the course.

**Formal Evaluation Procedures Used**

Responses to the questions concerning the use of specific evaluation procedures are shown in Table 9. As indicated, none of the teachers used objective or essay test items to determine what students had learned in class. Only one teacher used the procedures involving the judgment of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure Used</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Method to determine students' beliefs about achievement of personal or group goals</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up device to determine change in students' behavior as a result of class activities</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method to contrast students' self-reports of behavior before and after class</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire to learn about students' past experience</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise requiring students to agree or disagree with given statements or situations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratings of observations of students' performance with children</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgments of completed student projects</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective test of students' preclass knowledge, skill</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective test of students' postclass knowledge, skill</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay test of students' learning of ideas taught</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
completed student projects or the observation of the student performance with children. Three teachers used an exercise that required the students to agree or disagree with given statements or situations. Four teachers each used a method to contrast student behavior before and after class or questionnaire to learn about the past experiences of the students. Six teachers used a follow-up device to determine changes in the students' behavior as a result of the class. Eight teachers used a method of determining whether the students believed that personal or group goals were achieved during the course. Although this last group of eight teachers represents the greatest use of a specified formal evaluation procedure, this number comprises less than one-fourth of the total sample.

**Informal Evaluation Procedures Used**

As indicated in Table 10, all of the teachers used the three types of informal evaluation procedures involving judgments of students' reaction to material, judgments of the quality of students' questions, and judgments of the students' ability to solve problems presented in class. All but one teacher used the two other informal evaluation procedures specified during the interview, which involved judgments of students' references to previously presented material and students' ability to answer questions orally.

Three of the evaluation procedures in the formal evaluation section of the interview schedule were found to be used informally by some of the teachers. The two questions involving the use of a questionnaire to learn about the past experiences of the learners and the use of a method of contrasting students' behavior before and after class were used by over
Table 10. Distribution of Teachers Who Used Specific Informal Evaluation Procedures by Type of Procedure Used. -- N = 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure Used</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judgments of students' reaction to class material</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgments of quality of students' questions</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgments of students' ability to solve problems presented in class</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgments of students' ability to answer questions orally</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire to learn about students' past experience</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method to contrast students' self-reports of behavior before and after class</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method to determine students' beliefs about achievement of personal or group goals</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Participants indicated informal rather than formal use of these procedures.

three-fourths of the teachers. The third procedure involved the use of a method to determine students' beliefs about the achievement of personal or group goals. This procedure was used by one-third of the teachers in an informal manner.

Analysis of Evaluation Devices Provided by Subjects

Twenty-two of the 35 teachers who participated in the study responded to the investigator's request to provide copies of evaluation devices used in their classes.
Evaluation of Levels of Cognitive and Affective Learning

There were 107 evaluation items in the 22 devices provided. Of these none dealt with specific knowledge gained from the classes. Five items dealt with attitude change but were so general that a level of behavior could not be identified.

Kinds of Information Evaluation Items Were Designed to Provide

Inspection of the 22 evaluation devices provided by the subjects revealed that many of the 107 items included were not intended to evaluate the learning of the students. Rather they were intended to provide other information for decision making in the educational process.

The system devised by the investigator for analysis of the 107 items on the evaluation devices was a combination of the CIPP model of evaluation (Stufflebeam et al., 1971) and the Cooperative Extension model of evaluation (Bennett, 1977). The combined CIPP/Cooperative Extension model is shown in Table 11.

Data relative to the question, What different kinds of information were items on evaluation devices used in informal, non-credit courses in parent education designed to provide?, can be found in Table 12.

Analysis of the evaluation items according to the CIPP/Cooperative Extension model showed that one-third were at the context level and were designed for use in the setting of objectives. None was at the inputs level, the process/activities level, or the process/people involvement level. Almost half of the items were at the process/reactions level and asked for opinions of the class members about the class content, process, or
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CIPP Model</th>
<th>Cooperative Extension Model</th>
<th>CIPP/Cooperative Extension Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
<td>Provides a rationale for determining objectives; defines the environment; identifies unmet needs and unused opportunities; diagnoses problems</td>
<td>(There is nothing comparable to context evaluation in this mode; the setting of objectives is assumed)</td>
<td>Provides information as to unmet needs and unused opportunities of learners; diagnoses problem of learners; gives basis for objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Input</strong></td>
<td>Identifies alternative means of achieving goals and the cost and benefit likely to results from these choices; provides information for determining how to use resources to meet objectives</td>
<td>Provides for collecting and interpreting data basic to the allocation of kinds and amounts of resources to a program as necessary to reach objectives</td>
<td>Provides information about alternative kinds, amounts, and uses of resources needed to reach objectives; identifies costs and benefits likely to result from alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process</strong></td>
<td>Provides feedback for use in making decisions concerning continuing or changing implementation and procedures</td>
<td>Provides information about the number of specified activities necessary to reach objectives</td>
<td>Provides information for selecting, continuing, or changing the numbers and types of activities as needed to achieve objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>People Involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provides information for making decisions about involvement of types and numbers of persons, groups, and committees as needed to achieve objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides for the collection of evidence concern­ing the involvement of types and numbers of persons, groups, and committees as necessary to reach objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provides information about the accomplishment or results of a program according to changes in the knowledge, attitudes, skills, and aspirations of the participants as a result of the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Reactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provides information about reactions of participants for use in making decisions about changing or continuing program elements as needed to achieve objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides for obtaining certain given reactions from the participants as necessary to reach objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product</strong></td>
<td>Focuses on identifying the accomplishment or result of a program; assesses and interprets achievements at the end of a project and as often as needed during the project term</td>
<td><strong>KASA Change</strong></td>
<td>Provides information about the accomplishment or results of a program according to changes in knowledge, attitudes, skills, and aspirations of the participants as a result of the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Practice Change</strong></td>
<td>Provides for collecting evidence of a change in knowledge, attitudes, skills, and aspirations by the participants as a result of the program</td>
<td>Provides information about the accomplishment or results of a program according to changes in individual practices, technology, and social structures as a result of the practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>End Result</strong></td>
<td>Provides for collecting evidence of certain changes in individual practices, technology, and social structures as a result of the program</td>
<td>Provides information about the accomplishment or results of a program according to changes in individual practice, technology, and social structure of the participants as a result of the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provides that certain end effects will be achieved through practice change; this level emphasizes prevention or solution of overall problems</td>
<td>Provides information about the results of a program according to end effects such as the prevention or solution of overall problems as identified in the objectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12. Distribution of Items Found on the Evaluation Devices by Level on the CIPP/Cooperative Extension Model. -- N = 107

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level on the CIPP/Cooperative Extension Model</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inputs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process/Activities</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process/People Involvement</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process/Reactions</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product/KASA Change</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product/Practice Change</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product/End Results</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

instructor. Nearly one-fourth were at the product/KASA change level and dealt with changes in the knowledge, attitudes, skills, and aspirations of the learners. A few were at the product/practice change level, and none was found to be at the product/end results level.

At the context level, the items were further classified into five categories of information about class members: current practice, attitude, needs, expectations, and non-specific (Table 13).

Table 13. Distribution of Items Involving Context Evaluation by Categories within the Context Level. -- N = 36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories within the Context Level</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Practice</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonspecific</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Over one-third of the items involving context evaluation were concerned with current practice, one-fourth each involved attitudes and needs. Five items were non-specific, and the smallest number of items were in the category that involved students' expectations of the class.

All of the items at the process level involved students' reactions to course content, the teaching process, the teacher/leader, or non-specific reactions. Nearly half of these items were non-specific, one-fourth were involved with course content, and the remaining one-fourth were divided fairly evenly between process and teacher/leader. See Table 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories within Process/Reactions Level</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/Leader</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-specific</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the product level, three-fourths of the items involved KASA change (Table 15). These items were classified according to the four different concepts included in KASA, knowledge, attitudes, skills, and aspirations. One fourth of the items were in the attitude category, another three-fifths were in the non-specific category, and the remaining three items were in the aspirations category. There were no items in either the knowledge or the skills categories.
Table 15. Distribution of Items Involving Product/KASA Change Evaluation by Categories within Product/KASA Change Level. -- N = 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories within Product/KASA Change Level</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-specific</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teachers' Perceptions of Their Needs in Evaluation**

Question 8 asked What did instructors who did and did not use formal evaluation in their classes perceive their needs in the area of evaluation to be? The answer to this question was sought in several ways.

First, the subjects were asked to explain their choice to use or not to use formal evaluation of learners in their classes. In response to the question about why they had chosen not to use more formal evaluation procedures in their classes, nearly half said that this type of evaluation was inappropriate in an informal class setting. Another one-fifth stated that formal evaluation was too threatening to their clientele. Other answers involved low reading ability of learners and time restrictions.

In response to the question concerning the subjects' reasons for using evaluation, over one-fourth stated reasons of feedback, future reference, and the verifications of the achievement of the teacher's goals. Another one-fifth used evaluation devices because they were provided by the agency they worked for. A small percentage replied that they used a particular evaluation device because it was effective and non-threatening.
Another approach to identifying perceived needs of instructors in evaluation involved asking about the amount of training in evaluation these instructors had and their interest in further training. Table 16 shows that of those instructors with formal training in evaluation, approximately five-sixths expressed interest in further training. Of those instructors with no formal training in evaluation, all expressed interest in further training.

Table 16. Distribution of Teachers with and without Training in Evaluation Who Expressed Interest in Further Training. -- N = 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training in Evaluation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With formal training</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With no formal training</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The subjects were then asked what types of training in evaluation would be most interesting to them. Over half of the subjects expressed interest in workshops. Six each expressed interest in college courses and learning packages, and six indicated no interest in training of this nature. See Table 17.

The last method used for determining the needs of instructors in the area of evaluation was to ask several open-ended question about their needs and concerns as adult educators, their perception of what needed to be changed in the way that parent education was taught and their frustrations in their teaching. Although the investigator recorded
Table 17. Distribution of Teachers Expressing Interest in Further Training in Evaluation by Type of Training. -- N = 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Training</th>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College courses</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning packages</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

93 answers to these questions, only one involved a desire for an increased use of learner evaluation.

Other related information which resulted from these questions revealed that over half of the teachers expressed concern about reaching more people through parent education, offering more classes, and increasing publicity about class offerings and the value of parent education.

Ten percent of the teachers suggested that parent education should be a mandatory part of the public school system. Another 10 percent expressed concern about the participants' tendency to be unwilling to make changes; and another 10 percent suggested that a more eclectic approach toward teaching parent education would make the classes more effective.

Summary of Findings

One finding that resulted from this study was that whereas all instructors of informal, non-credit parent education use informal evaluation procedures, less than one-fourth use formal evaluation in their classes. Of this one-fourth, none used more than 3 of the 10 formal evaluation procedures specified in the interview. When the participants
were questioned about this lack of formal evaluation usage, they most often expressed the opinion that it was inappropriate to this type of learning situation and was threatening to the learners.

It was found that of those instructors who used evaluation of learners, most conducted it at the end of the course. Almost one-fourth of the instructors stated that they used no evaluation at any time.

Data collected from the evaluation devices provided the following information. Of the eight levels of the CIPP/Cooperation Extension model (see Table 11), there were five levels into which no items were categorized. The vast majority of evaluation that took place in these instructors' classes was concerned with the learners' reactions to the class and the learners' goals and existing skills upon entering the class. Only one-fifth of the items were concerned with changes in the learners' knowledge, attitudes, skills, aspirations, and practices. And even within this small group, most of the items were subjective and intended to be used as self-evaluation devices.

In short, there was little evidence from this study that instructors used evaluation for the purpose that is attributed to it by definition, that of determining the extent to which objectives have been achieved.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to explore the use of evaluation of learners in informal, non-credit parent education courses in Tucson, Arizona, from January to June, 1980. Specifically, the study explored: (1) how many teachers used formal and/or informal evaluation of learners in their classes, (2) when evaluation was carried out, (3) whether or not specific formal and informal evaluation procedures were used, (4) what kinds of information were items on the evaluation devices furnished by subjects designed to provide, and (5) what were the needs and concerns of the parent education teachers in the area of evaluation.

The findings of this study showed that whereas almost all of the instructors of informal, non-credit parent education used informal evaluation, very few used formal evaluation techniques. The reasons most often stated for the lack of formal evaluation usage were that it was inappropriate in this education setting and was threatening to the learners. Both of these reasons are unsupported by the literature on parent education and non-formal adult education.

Dressel (1961) agreed that it is inappropriate to use traditional evaluation techniques with individuals who have acquired their education in a non-traditional manner, but he also said that evaluation is an intrinsic part of every learning experience, and even in a non-credit setting which lacks the sanction of grades, there is a need to assess an individual's
performance or ability to deal with ideas, materials, and problems. Such evaluation is necessary to maximize the potential of the teaching-learning situation.

The concept that evaluation is threatening to learners is also unsupported. It has been found that adults welcome assessment and appreciate the diagnoses of their strengths and weaknesses, as well as the monitoring of their achievements (Los Angeles Unified School District, 1979).

The instructors in this study did not appear to recognize the value and importance of formal evaluation of students' learning to both the teacher and the learner. Evidence of this lack of recognition of the potential of evaluation is found in the items on the evaluation devices provided by the subjects. Almost all of the items served the purpose of providing feedback to the instructor only. This feedback enables the instructor to set appropriate course objectives, to determine the learners' needs upon entering the course, and to determine whether or not the learner enjoyed the course and liked the instructor. Although all of these are important functions of the evaluation process, little attention was given to another purpose of evaluation, which is to determine the extent to which objectives have been achieved. As indicated in the literature, the ways in which evaluation is beneficial to the learner are many. Motivation to learn is one benefit of evaluation. Feedback from evaluation devices can help a learner to become aware of individual strengths and weaknesses and can stimulate the student to set realistic goals in the development of knowledge or skills. Evaluation can help learners to organize their thoughts, prioritize important concepts, and apply learned knowledge to their daily
lives (Cross, 1973). These benefits were either not recognized or understood by the subjects of this study.

Further evidence of the lack of recognition of the importance of evaluation of learners' accomplishments in the educational process was found in the subjects' expressed concerns about parent education. Although most of them expressed interest in further training in evaluation, only one named evaluation as an area of need or concern. This gives the impression that, although subjects expressed interest in learning more about evaluation, on the whole, it was of low priority as a concern. Furthermore, none of the subjects indicated as a concern the need or desire to know whether the learners used the information from the classes and whether it made a difference in their relationships with their children.

The question remains to be answered as to whether or not parent education as it is currently being taught is achieving its ultimate aim: changing the parents' behavior in their relations with their children over time. Some parent educators believe that it is unreasonable to expect that participating in a parent discussion group weekly for a short period of time can exert any significant influence on parent-child interactions. Other professionals believe that educational programs have the potential to produce change, although these changes are difficult to identify (Endres and Evans, 1968). The literature supports this discrepancy of opinion. There are equal numbers of studies such as those by Hereford (1963) and those cited by Croake and Glover (1977) and Anchor and Thomason (1977) that support and deny the effectiveness of parent education.
Perhaps the reason for this lack of conclusive evidence lies in the fact that the studies all used a different criterion for determining effectiveness. There are as many teaching methods, formats, schedules, and evaluation techniques as there are studies. Neither in parent education literature nor in the sample of subjects involved in this study was the use of learner evaluation recognized as an important factor in the teaching-learning process. Is the evaluation of learners, or the lack thereof, the key to effectiveness in informal, non-credit courses? The investigator suggests some ideas for future research projects that would provide information relevant to this question. Future projects might include:

1. An investigation of the educational background of teachers of parent education and their specific background and experience in educational evaluation.

2. A study of the attitudes of instructors of parent education toward evaluation of learners.

3. An investigation of the attitudes of participants in informal education settings toward evaluation of learners.

4. An exploration of procedures for evaluating students' learning for the purpose of finding those forms that are useful and appropriate to the informal educational setting.

5. A study of procedures for evaluating students' learning to see if they provide for changes in parental attitudes and/or behavior over time.

6. The design and evaluation of a process of educating or reeducating informal parent educators in the use and purposes of evaluation and appropriate evaluation procedures for informal settings.
Hello. This is Marla Spicer. Is this ____________________________?

I am a graduate student in Home Economics Education at The University of Arizona. I am conducting a study of non-credit child development classes for adults. I plan to interview the teachers of these classes to learn about some aspects of the learning situation in the classes. I understand that you teach an adult class in child development for (name of organization). Is that right? (pause for answer)

By participating in the study, you will help us a great deal in finding out some valuable information about adult education. The interview will take about 30 minutes and will be scheduled at your convenience. Your answers will be kept strictly confidential and will be treated anonymously.

Would you be willing to participate in this study? _____yes  ____no

Note to interviewer: if the answer is "no": Thank you, Good bye.
If the answer is "yes": All right. Thank you. Let me make sure that I have your name, telephone number, and the organization for which you work correct. (pause for answers)

At this point, I am just making a list of names and telephone numbers from which I will draw a random sample of respondents for the study. If you are part of the sample, I'll be calling back in the next few days to set up an appointment for the interview. Is there a particular time that is
best for calling you back? (pause for answer) Thank you very much for your interest and cooperation. Good bye.
APPENDIX B

SECOND TELEPHONE INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

Hello. This is Marla Spicer from The University of Arizona calling back. Is this ___________________? I spoke to you a few days ago about participating in a study of non-credit classes in child development. Your name was chosen as one of the teachers in the sample. Are you still willing to participate? ____yes ____no

Note to interviewer: if the answer is "no": Thank you, Good bye.
If the answer is "yes": go on.
Good. Let me remind you that the interview will take about 30 minutes and that your answers will be kept confidential.

When would be a good time for us to meet? (pause for answer and discussion).

What would be a convenient place? (pause for answer and discussion)
Fine. Then I will see you (date and time) at (location). Thank you again. Good bye.
APPENDIX C

CONSENT FORM

The Use of Evaluation of Learners in Informal Non-credit Courses in Parent Education in Tucson, Arizona

I am requesting your voluntary participation in the completion of this interview. The purpose of this interview is to gather information about non-credit child development classes for adults.

Please answer as many of the questions as you can. You do not have to answer all of the questions. Completion of the interview will indicate your consent as a willing participant in this study. All data received will be treated with confidentiality and anonymity. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time without incurring ill will from either the interviewer or the School of Home Economics of The University of Arizona.

Marla Spicer
Research Investigator
APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Interview Number __

Hello. I'm Marla Spicer. Are you ________________? I'm very pleased to meet you. Thank you for agreeing to meet with me today.

Before we begin the interview, let me tell you a little bit about myself. I am working on a master's degree in Home Economics Education with an emphasis on child development. In the past, I have taught home economics to adults and I am very interested in adult education, particularly in the area of child development. So, I've decided to devote my graduate research to finding out what I can about the way in which child development classes for adults are now being taught and the needs of the instructors of these classes. One reason for choosing to work in this area is because it is one which we know very little about. Therefore, any information which you can provide will be a great help and possibly we can begin to get some ideas about how we might help you and other teachers of non-credit child development classes.

Please feel free to interrupt me with comments or questions at any time. If you have no comments or questions at this point, let's begin the interview.

First of all I'd like to get some general information about your classes and your students.
1. How many classes have you taught since January 1980?

Note: If the respondent has taught more than three classes, ask, him/her to choose the three classes that are most representative.

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

2. What are the names of your classes?

3. What time of day do the classes meet?

4. How long is each class meeting?

5. For how many sessions do the classes meet?

6. What is the average age of your students?

7. How many men are in your classes?

7a. How many participants are in your classes?

My study involves examining the ways that teachers of non-credit classes for adults determine whether their students are learning what is being taught. Evaluation is the term I will use for the process of finding out what the students have learned.

There are many methods for determining what students have learned. I'm going to name some different techniques which might be used. For each, tell me if you have used the technique. If you have used it, give an example of how the technique was used in your classroom.
8. Have you made informal judgments of what students have learned based on their reactions to material presented in class?
   ___yes
   ___no
   ___If the answer is yes, please give an example:

9. Have you made informal judgments of what students have learned based on the quality of their questions in class?
   ___yes
   ___no
   ___If the answer is yes, please give an example:

10. Have you made informal judgments of what students have learned based on their ability to solve their own problems or those of others which are presented in class:
    ___yes
    ___no
    ___If the answer is yes, please give an example?

11. Have you made informal judgments of what students have learned based on the fact that they make references to material previously presented in class?
    ___yes
    ___no
    ___If the answer is yes, please give an example:

12. Have you made informal judgments of what students have learned based on their ability to answer questions orally in class?
    ___yes
    ___no
    ___If the answer is yes, please give an example:

13. Have you used a method of determining whether the students believe that their personal or group goals were achieved during the course?
    ___yes
    ___yes, informal
    ___no
    ___If the answer is yes, please give an example:
14. Have you used a follow-up device to determine behavior change as a result of class activities?
   _____yes
   _____no
   _____If the answer is yes, please give an example:

15. Have you used a method of contrasting a student's report of past behavior with the student's report of behavior at class completion?
   _____yes
   _____yes, informal
   _____no
   _____If the answer is yes, please give an example:

16. Have you used objective test items as a pretest to determine the level of knowledge and skills possessed by students at the beginning of a class or lesson?
   _____yes
   _____no
   _____If the answer is yes, please given an example:

17. Have you used objective test items to determine whether students learned ideas taught in the class?
   _____yes
   _____no
   _____If the answer is yes, please give an example?

18. Have you used an exercise which requires students to agree or disagree with given statements or situations?
   _____yes
   _____no
   _____If the answer is yes, please give an example:

19. Have you used a questionnaire to learn about the past experiences of the students?
   _____yes,
   _____yes, informal
   _____no
   _____If the answer is yes, please give an example:
20. Have you used essay test items to determine whether students have learned the ideas taught?
   ___ yes
   ___ no
   ___ If the answer is yes, please give an example:

21. Have you asked the students to complete a project, such as a toy, which is then evaluated on the basis of criteria?
   ___ yes
   ___ no
   ___ If the answer is yes, please give an example:

22. Have you observed students while they are working with children and rated their performance on the basis of criteria?
   ___ yes
   ___ no
   ___ If the answer is yes, please give an example:

23. Do you use other types of student evaluation that are not mentioned here?
   ___ yes
   ___ no
   ___ If the answer is yes, please name the types of evaluation used, and describe the way in which it is used:

24. When is evaluation of students done?
   ___ at the beginning of a course
   ___ throughout the course
   ___ at the end of a course
   ___ Comments:

25. May I take a copy of your evaluation device(s) for further study?
   ___ yes
   ___ no
   ___ Comments:

26. Why have you chosen to use these particular evaluation devices?
27. Are there specific reasons why you have chosen not to use other evaluation devices such as ______________in your classes?

28. Have you ever had formal training in evaluation of learners?
   ___yes
   ___no
   ___If the answer is yes, name the place of training:

29. Would you be interested in taking some sort of training program in evaluation of learners?
   ___yes
   ___no

30. What sort of training would you be interested in?
   ___workshops
   ___college courses
   ___individualized learning packages or modules
   ___none
   ___other, specify:

31. Are there other aspects of teaching (besides evaluation) that you would be interested in learning more about?
   ___yes
   ___no
   ___If the answer is yes, please specify:

32. What are some of your needs and concerns as an adult educator in child development:

33. What (if anything) would you like to see changed about the teaching of child development for adults?

34. Does the teaching of child development to adults involve particular frustrations that you would like to share?
35. Are there comments or questions that you would like to add?

Thank you very much for your help in this study. The study could not have been successful without your help. I'm sure that your answers will prove to be extremely valuable, not only to this particular project, but also to others with an interest in non-credit adult courses.

Thank you again for your time and cooperation.
APPENDIX E

FIELD STUDY

The following questions are to be asked of the participants in the field study only. Their purpose is to determine any changes that may be needed to further the effectiveness of the interview schedule.

1. What are your reactions to the interview you have just completed?

2. In your opinion, what are the strengths and/or weaknesses of the interview schedule?

3. Did any of the questions make you uncomfortable?

4. Were the questions understandable and relatively easy to answer?

5. What might be done to make the questions easier to answer?

6. Do you have suggestions to make toward increasing the effectiveness of the instrument?
Ms. Marla N. Spicer  
School of Home Economics  
Department of Consumer Studies  
Home Economics, 206  
MAIN CAMPUS  

Dear Ms. Spicer:

We are in receipt of your project entitled, "The Use of Evaluation of Learners in Informal Non-Credit Courses in Child Development in Tucson, Arizona", which was submitted to the Human Subjects Committee for review. We concur with the opinion of your College Review Committee that this is a minimal risk project. Therefore, approval is granted effective 21 April 1980.

Approval is granted with the understanding that no changes will be made in either the procedures followed or in the questionnaire used (copies of which we have on file) without the knowledge and approval of the Human Subjects Committee and the College Review Committee. Any physical or psychological harm to any subject must also be reported to each committee.

Sincerely yours,

Milan Novak, M.D., Ph.D.  
Chairman  
Human Subjects Committee

MN/jm

cc: Edward T. Sheehan, Ph.D.  
College Review Committee
Ms. Marla N. Spicer  
School of Home Economics  
Department of Consumer Studies  
Home Economics, 206  
MAIN CAMPUS

Dear Ms. Spicer:

Thank you for submitting a copy of the revised questionnaire for your project entitled, "The Use of Evaluation of Learners in Informal Non-Credit Courses in Child Development in Tucson, Arizona". Since this revision represents changes in format, not intent, approval is granted effective 21 May 1980.

Approval for these changes is granted with the understanding that no additional changes will be made in either the procedures followed or in the questionnaire used (copies of which we have on file) without the knowledge and approval of the Human Subjects Committee and the Departmental Review Committee. Any physical or psychological harm to any subject must also be reported to each committee.

Sincerely yours,

Milan Novak, M.D., Ph.D.
Chairman
Human Subjects Committee

cc: Edward T. Sheehan, Ph.D.
Departmental Review Committee
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