

American Journal of Evaluation

<http://aje.sagepub.com/>

The "Process" of Process Use: Methods for Longitudinal Assessment in a Multisite Evaluation

Jessica Shaw and Rebecca Campbell

American Journal of Evaluation 2014 35: 250 originally published online 29 October 2013

DOI: 10.1177/1098214013506780

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://aje.sagepub.com/content/35/2/250>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



American Evaluation Association

Additional services and information for *American Journal of Evaluation* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://aje.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://aje.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

>> [Version of Record](#) - Apr 25, 2014

[OnlineFirst Version of Record](#) - Oct 29, 2013

[What is This?](#)

The “Process” of Process Use: Methods for Longitudinal Assessment in a Multisite Evaluation

American Journal of Evaluation
2014, Vol. 35(2) 250-260
© The Author(s) 2013
Reprints and permission:
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/1098214013506780
aje.sagepub.com



Jessica Shaw¹ and Rebecca Campbell¹

Abstract

Process use refers to the ways in which stakeholders and/or evaluands change as a function of participating in evaluation activities. Although the concept of process use has been well discussed in the literature, exploration of methodological strategies for the measurement and assessment of process use has been limited. Typically, empirical research on process use has been limited to cross-sectional studies in single-site evaluation projects. In this method note, we present a longitudinal study of process use in a multisite evaluation project. Stakeholders' changes in learning, attitudes, and behavior/action were assessed at three time points: prior to the onset of evaluation consultation; near the conclusion of a 1-year participatory consultation project; and 6–8 weeks after the termination of the project. Results showed that different domains of process use had differential development over time. Implications for measuring process use are discussed.

Keywords

process use, longitudinal design, evaluation methods, multisite evaluations

Process use is often referred to as the development of “evaluative thinking”: how program staff and organizations change as a result of participating in an evaluation, independent of the evaluation findings (Amo & Cousins, 2007; Patton, 1998, 2008). Although the *concept* of process use has existed for some time, the *empirical study* of it is far more recent, and only a handful of studies have explicitly measured this form of evaluation use (see Amo & Cousins, 2007; Johnson et al., 2009 for reviews). As theories of process use and its utility continue to develop, so too must designs and methods for its assessment. The purpose of this method note is to examine how process use has been measured in the literature and then to present a case example of a longitudinal study of process use in a multisite evaluation project.

¹ Department of Psychology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, USA

Corresponding Author:

Rebecca Campbell, Department of Psychology, Michigan State University, Psychology Building, 316 Physics Rm 125C, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA.

Email: rnc@msu.edu

Measuring Process Use

Patton's (1998) influential paper "Discovering Process Use" noted that evaluation scholars and practitioners have traditionally placed so much emphasis on instrumental use that "we have not had ways to conceptualize or talk about what happens to people and organizations as a result of being involved in an evaluation process" (p. 225). Since Patton's (1998) call, much of the literature on process use has focused on how to define this concept and its application to practice (e.g., Harnar & Preskill, 2007; Preskill & Caracelli, 1997), how to facilitate process use as a means of building evaluation capacity (e.g., King, 2007; Morabito, 2002; Podems, 2007), or how to categorize different types of process use (e.g., Forss, Rebien, & Carlsson, 2002). However, actual empirical studies of this form of use are few and far between. Frequently in this literature, evaluators simply share their reflections or anecdotal evidence of process use without detailing the designs and methods used to measure it (e.g., Lawrenz, Huffman, & McGinnis, 2007; Morabito, 2002). For instance, Amo and Cousins (2007) identified 18 articles from 1984 to 2005, which made reference to the occurrence of process use, but only 7 of those projects were a direct study of process use, and even fewer provided any details regarding the methods used for assessment. Similarly, in Johnson et al.'s (2009) review of 41 empirical studies of evaluation use (i.e., process use, instrumental use, conceptual use, and symbolic use), only 3 were systematic studies of process use.

When process use is explicitly assessed, it is frequently done so by measuring whether an evaluation project contributed to *new* knowledge about evaluation methods (e.g., acquiring skills in data analysis), *changes* in feelings and attitudes about evaluation (e.g., reduced anxiety about evaluation), and *emergent* behaviors regarding institutionalizing evaluation within the organization (e.g., changing internal processes, such as record keeping, to facilitate ongoing evaluation). These three broad categories are often referred to as learning, changes in affect or attitude, and changes in action or behavior, respectively (Amo & Cousins, 2007). To assess these domains, at the conclusion of a project evaluators have typically interviewed or surveyed clients regarding their perceptions of change over time (e.g., Preskill, Zuckerman, & Matthews, 2003; Russ-Eft, Atwood, & Egberman, 2002). Some evaluators have added archival document review and/or observations to survey methods for multiple method assessments of learning, attitudes, and behavioral intentions (e.g., Jacob, Ouard, & Bélanger, 2011).

Although data collection techniques to capture process use have become more varied as this literature has developed, nearly all of these empirical studies have employed cross-sectional designs.¹ Given that process use is the *development* of "evaluative thinking," such approaches are necessarily limited in capturing the phenomena of interest. Although cross-sectional designs can provide useful information regarding perceptions of change over time, longitudinal methods are better suited for documenting developmental progressions. In the study of process use, it would be useful to know whether change is steady and incremental over the course of a project or whether it occurs in "bursts" tied to specific events (e.g., training, obtaining evaluation findings, conclusion of the project). Moreover, it is possible that there are differential developmental progressions for specific forms of process use (e.g., one or more domains are precursors to changes in other domains).

The current research on process use has also focused almost exclusively on single-site projects.² Over the course of intensive work with one organization, it stands to reason that evaluators might have a demonstrable impact on clients'/evaluands' learning, attitudes, and behaviors. However, in multisite projects, the evaluators' resources are necessarily spread across many, and perhaps the intensity of the evaluation experience would not be sufficient to prompt changes in process use. In a review of empowerment evaluation projects, Miller and Campbell (2006) found that empowering outcomes were less likely to be attained in large-scale, multisite projects than in closer knit collaborations. Given that process use may also be linked to the amount and intensity of contact with evaluators, it would be useful to know whether process use is challenging in larger scale projects, or, alternatively, whether there are successful strategies for promoting this form of use in multisite settings.

A Case Example of Longitudinal Assessment in a Multisite Project

To address some of these limitations in the extant literature, we conducted a longitudinal assessment of process use in the context of a multisite evaluation project. Briefly, our goal was to assist six Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) programs in evaluating the impact of their services on sexual assault prosecution rates in their communities. SANE programs provide comprehensive health care, crisis intervention, and victim advocacy to survivors of sexual assault (Campbell, Patterson, & Lichty, 2005). In addition, the medical forensic examinations and sexual assault kit (SAK) evidence collection conducted by the nurses can be instrumental in achieving successful prosecution of sexual offenders (Department of Justice, 2013). As such, there has been tremendous interest among practitioners and policy makers alike regarding whether and how SANE programs can address the problem of underprosecution of sexual assault (Campbell, Patterson, & Bybee, 2012; Lonsway & Archambault, 2012). But, as is often the case with promising new innovations, only a handful of SANE programs have been rigorously evaluated (less than 1% of the nearly 600 now in existence throughout the United States), and all of these evaluations have been single-site projects (see Campbell et al., 2012).

To conduct a national, multisite investigation of the impact of SANE programs on prosecution rates, we decided to use a practical participatory evaluation (P-PE) approach (Cousins & Chouinard, 2012; Cousins & Whitmore, 1998) to provide comprehensive consultation and technical assistance to six SANE programs.³ Our goal was to help these programs develop rigorous evaluation designs and complete data collection and analysis regarding prosecution outcomes in their local communities. Teaching program staff standardized methods for assessing legal case outcomes ensured that their data would be comparable to previously published studies in this literature. To recruit programs to participate in this project, we collaborated with the International Association of Forensic Nurses (IAFN) and the National Sexual Violence Resource Center (NSVRC) to advertise this project to all SANE programs within the United States. In all, 73 SANE programs expressed interest in being a part of this participatory technical assistance project; 30 SANE programs completed an application; and 10 SANE programs met all eligibility criteria.⁴ Using stratified random sampling, we selected six SANE programs: two rural programs, two operating in mid-sized communities, and two urban-based programs. These programs were well established in their communities and had been in operation for 7–14 years. Consistent with a P-PE approach (Cousins & Chouinard, 2012; Cousins & Whitmore, 1998), we provided comprehensive consultation and technical assistance to each program. Briefly, our technical assistance package consisted of a step-by-step evaluation toolkit (in hard copy and pdf form), data analysis software (e.g., a preprogrammed data entry/data analysis generating file), training webinars (three 60- to 90-min webinars), individual technical assistance (each site had 5–12 individual phone calls with project staff and weekly e-mail contact, which produced over 450 e-mail threads over the course of the project), group technical assistance (three 60-min group conference call), and one full-day, on-site program visit to provide hands-on help (see Campbell et al., 2013 for details regarding the specific technical assistance package provided). Although our work with these six programs was largely (though not exclusively) remote, our contact with them was of sufficient frequency and intensity that we believed participating in this project could promote process use among agency staff.

To measure process use, we assessed each program coordinator's knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors regarding evaluation at three time points.⁵ First, we used a brief written questionnaire to capture their "before" experiences with evaluation, prior to the onset of the project (T1). This questionnaire was part of the initial application process that sites completed prior to selection notification. Each of the six sites indicated that they had never conducted an evaluation of their program (though one had been a data collection site for a federally funded research study); all programs expressed interest and enthusiasm in being part of the project but had no plans to initiate an

evaluation on their own (other than applying to become part of this project). Thus, the current project conceptualized process use as a positive or negative *change* in learning, affect or attitude, and actions or behaviors related to participating in the evaluation. SANE program sites' general positive inclination to learn at T1, while an example of anticipatory influence, does not qualify as process use in the current study as it is not a *change* resulting from their evaluation experience. The T1 assessment was used for later comparison.

As noted previously, our 12 months of technical assistance culminated in a site visit to each program during which we helped their staff with data analyses, interpretation, and utilization planning. At the conclusion of this site visit, we conducted an in-person qualitative interview to assess process use. This T2 interview focused on the site's evaluation findings, how community context may have shaped the evaluation findings, challenges and successes during the project, and site feedback on improving the evaluation toolkit. To assess process use specifically, sites were asked what was it like to go through the entire evaluation from start to finish; what allowed them to complete the evaluation (i.e., facilitating factors and resources); what adaptations they made in carrying out the evaluation; what other SANE programs may need to conduct the evaluation; and what kind of SANE programs may not be able to carry out the evaluation. This set of questions gave program sites the opportunity to demonstrate changes in learning, affect or attitude, and action or behavior in relation to evaluation.

A follow-up qualitative interview (T3) was conducted via phone 6–8 weeks after the final completion of the project (which was, on average, 13 weeks after the T2 data collection). In this follow-up interview, we again asked a broad set of questions that would give program sites the opportunity to demonstrate process use; specifically, we asked how the sites were using the findings from the evaluation to create change in their community; their plans, if any, for future evaluation projects; what activities, if any, they had engaged in since the last contact with the evaluation team; and what additional insight they had gained into the findings of the evaluation and community partners reactions. Additionally, sites were asked what they would like to share now having had time to reflect on the entire evaluation process (See Campbell et al., 2013 for interview protocols). The T3 follow-up interview was a critical piece in our assessment of process use as we wanted to see how their engagement in evaluation changed (or did not change) after the project formally ended and the evaluation team was no longer “on call” to assist them with their efforts.

The T2 and T3 interviews were transcribed verbatim, and we conducted a directed content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) to explore whether this project promoted process use. The coding team consisted of the three evaluators who conducted the interviews (which included the project's principal investigator). Although it is common in qualitative research and evaluation to have a sole data analyst (see Charmaz, 2006; Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Lincoln & Guba, 1985), we felt a team approach was useful in this project so that each interviewer's work was cross-checked by the other interviewers and by the principal investigator (see MacQueen, McLellan-Lemal, Bartholow, & Milstein, 2008).⁶ Given that this was a qualitative content analysis, we did not compute quantitative indices of inter-rater reliability; instead, disagreements among analysts were noted, *all* data were rechecked, and a group consensus approach was used to reach *all* final coding/interpretation decisions.

In our thematic coding of the longitudinal interviews, we found evidence of process use in all three major domains: (1) program staff *learned* new evaluative techniques and strategies; (2) program staff developed positive *affect and attitudes* toward evaluation and its utility; and (3) program staff showed emergent *behaviors* regarding institutionalizing evaluation within their agencies.⁷ Table 1 summarizes our findings regarding the development of each process use domain over time. It is important to note that if a site is not listed in a particular domain at a particular time point, it does not necessarily indicate the absence of learning, attitude and affect, or action and behavior change; rather, it indicates that program staff from that site did not explicitly discuss that specific domain

Table 1. Process Use Domains Over Time.

| Process Use Domains | T2: On-Site Interview | T3: Follow-Up Interview | Overall |
|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Learning | 4 Sites (A, B, C, F) | 2 Sites (D, F) | 5 Sites (A, B, C, D, F) |
| Affect/attitude | 1 Site (F) | 3 Sites (B, C, F) | 3 Sites (B, C, F) |
| Action/behavior | No Sites | 6 Sites (A, B, C, D, E, F) | 6 Sites (A, B, C, D, E, F) |

Note: While we report the overall presence of process use across the multiple time points, it is possible that process use reversed or diminished after it was initially reported.

during that interview. It is also important to note that the evaluation team was intentional in their attempts to elicit both positive and negative aspects of process use. For example, because the overall goal of this project was to release the toolkit and technical assistance package for national dissemination, the evaluation team needed to collect constructive data (e.g., negative aspects and experiences) that would aid in revisions prior to its release. The overwhelming representation of positive experiences with process use was not because negative experiences were not invited and explored but because they were not often reported by project sites.

Changes in learning appeared to develop first, as four of the six sites noted in the T2 interview that participating in this project increased their knowledge about evaluation methods and tools. Program staff noted that they were able to recognize not only what technical decisions needed to be made throughout the evaluation process but also what was needed to make strategic decisions at each juncture and continue with the evaluation. For example, while the evaluation toolkit provided program staff with guiding evaluation questions, they still gained an understanding of how logic models can aid in making this important decision, as one site explained:

I can't even go through everything that was informative for me but the logic models that we did early on about how do you even decide what you're going to evaluate and how do you, how do you look at that? How do you pull it apart so that you can get to one thing that you can understand?

Logic models were presented in the very beginning of the evaluation toolkit, so this site's later recollection of the logic model and its primary purpose in terms of evaluation illustrates that they learned this information and maintained it over time.

During the T2 site-visit interview, program staff also discussed how they learned so much about the intricacies of gaining access to evaluation data. Many assumed they would have carte blanche to review their own records (or other agencies' records), and so learning about institutional review boards and other mechanisms to protect data/clients was eye-opening. For example, one staff member noted:

[I] had no idea what an IRB was and had to go through the board and all that. I thought I'd get permission from, basically the hospital attorney that we can do something like this and be done with it . . . but not, I had no idea what an IRB was.

Similarly, sites were not expecting barriers and/or delays when partnering with outside organizations to gain access to data. It was an unwelcome surprise to programs when they learned that they may not be granted direct access to the data they desired (e.g., prosecution outcomes) due to confidentiality and instead would have to work alongside a representative of the partnering organization. As one nurse noted:

I learned that when you're dependent on other organizations things don't perhaps move as quickly as you would like for them to and you have to tread carefully. The last thing I can afford to do is push [community partner] too hard and she's like, you know what? You can take your little project . . . I kept going

back and going back . . . when are we going to get the data? So just being persistent but being persistent in a very nonthreatening sort of a way so they're still your friends.

Through this, sites learned that it takes time to develop cross-system collaborations and that this must be budgeted into evaluation plans and timelines.

During the site-visit T2 interview, sites also commented that their knowledge about the usefulness of evaluation had changed dramatically over the course of the project:

I thought it was very interesting to see how much information we could tease out with the type of findings . . . We'll be able to look at the data that was collected and be able to see the peaks and the valleys and then describe what was going on with our program at the time. I think is very interesting to sit there and being able to talk with several people and say oh yeah, that's when this happened and that's what these – I thought that was a lot of information to gather from the data that was collected . . . We'll be able to discuss with our community partners what our findings are; to be able to discuss within our SANE program and work at making our response better.

This reflection on the usefulness of the evaluation findings was especially striking because this specific site had previously noted that they did not see as much value in quantitative findings because it did not help very much to “talk about or look at the numbers.” After completing the evaluation, however, the site developed a better understanding of how quantitative evaluation findings can provide a “big picture” look at their program and their community.

Although four of the six sites demonstrated changes in learning and knowledge at the on-site T2 interview, one program did not articulate process use in this domain until the T3 follow-up interview. At that time (6–8 weeks after the project ended), they were able to discuss what they had learned about evaluation, and more specifically the value of evaluation findings in garnering support for their work and training opportunities:

It's the data that you needed in order to be able to substantiate your needs for your patients in your community. I need this type of finding to be able to say, well this is why it's a need, this is why we need it.

This case example highlights the importance of longitudinal follow-up when assessing process change. Most, but not all, programs showed early signs of change in the learning/knowledge domain, but this one program did not articulate growth in this area until after the project, and all its lessons, had time to settle.

In our T1 assessment, project staff were enthusiastic about participating in the project but were worried that it would be overwhelming and that they may not have the appropriate skills or knowledge to be able to carry out the evaluation. At the T2 site-visit interview, we did not yet see much change in their affect or attitude, the second domain of process use. Only one of the six sites noted that although evaluation has challenges, it was an overall positive and rewarding experience:

Well, adding the data, the 339 cases took me about an hour, an hour and a half, maybe something like that. It was interesting to go see what those outcomes were as I was typing them in because I hadn't seen them all. It was interesting to run that—hit that little button and watch the tape come back at you. So then when that happens you sort of forget about, it's sort of like having a baby, the rewards tend to overcome or compensate for some of the grunt work you did earlier on.

Although the other sites may have experienced changes in their affect or attitude, they needed additional time to reflect upon the experience and how it impacted their affect or attitude in relation to evaluation before they were able to articulate this change. At the T3 follow-up interview, three additional sites showed attitude changes toward evaluation. For instance:

I really didn't think that the project was difficult. And really, once you got past the fact that any time you're looking at starting and looking at 14 years, it seems pretty intimidating to go through all of that information, but it really wasn't bad once you got started. And it didn't, it just seems more daunting than it is actually is when you start to do it.

At the T3 follow-up interviews, sites also reported increased self-efficacy or confidence in understanding and conducting evaluation more generally. One site reflected on the entire experience and explained:

Well, what I will say about the opportunity to participate in this for the past year, has been that I think I'm better, or I will be better, when I look at research at understanding what it means. Usually when I go look at publications, I go to the summary because I don't have a clue about what all the rest of the stuff means, and now I think I could probably open somebody's research that I'm reading and not skip over the hard core material. I think I have a better ability to understand what it means which is valuable to me. So that piece, I don't know that I've said that before, I've learned that. I can come away from this project with that better understanding and I also think if my board were to say, we need to do an evaluation of this or that or the other, I have a better sense of what that means and what it needs to look like depending on how formal of an evaluation they want done.

Changes in affect or attitude were slower to emerge than changes in learning and knowledge; only one site articulated attitudinal changes at the T2 interview, but this increased to three sites (total) at the T3 follow-up interview. Program evaluation *is* very labor intensive, and it may take time for programs to weigh the costs of their efforts versus the benefits of what they received before deciding how they feel about evaluation. It is important to note that changes in self-efficacy and confidence only appeared at the T3 interview, suggesting that these particular manifestations of attitudinal process use may take more time to emerge.

After participating in the evaluation, all sites had plans to continue their projects and wanted to make evaluation a regular part of their programs' operations. These changes in *action and behavior*, however, did not emerge until the T3 follow-up interview, 6–8 weeks after the site-visit interviews. Once their involvement in this project had had time to settle, all six sites noted that they planned to continue conducting evaluation and had hopes for institutionalizing the process. For example, one site explained how they planned to continue with the current evaluation as originally structured:

And as far as keeping [track of the prosecution outcomes], I would really like to keep the database that you helped to create going. I mean I know that we stopped, we had a defined stopping point just because of cases making it to prosecution but I would like to catch it up and then start to keep it current so that we can continue to track our findings and continue to see if we're having an impact.

A second site detailed their plan and rationale to continue evaluation at their home institution while also *expanding* to a neighboring county:

First of all, I want to separate out the other county because I want them—we've opened a program in that county and I want them to go on with it. That's going to take a little more time . . . I plan to separate things out and just do our county by itself and then continue to add to it to see. I mean I know it's different because I know we're prosecuting way more cases . . .

This site, like the other sites, was able to identify strategies to streamline the evaluation process, such as maintaining an ongoing database with the relevant evaluation information.

In addition to continuing or expanding the current evaluation, some sites had plans to change their action or behavior by *extending* their evaluation projects into new areas. Although the focus of this project was legal prosecution rates, program staff recognized that they can use the same strategies

and techniques to evaluate their impact on other outcomes (e.g., patient medical outcomes, psychological outcomes, etc.) and other services provided by their program (e.g., services for patients reporting domestic violence [DV], services for postmortem forensic exams, etc.). For instance, one site explained their plans for new projects:

I would like to be able to do some other evaluation. We started doing the DV program here but we don't have the historical data like we have for SANE. We've only been doing it for almost 2 years now. But I think it would be really valuable for me in terms of funding the program and being able to articulate its value to be able to look some formal evaluation of it, and I don't know what that looks like. I don't know what sort of question I would be asking but first off I think it's probably a little early. I'm thinking maybe when we have 3 years of data and experience with this program, it might be a good time to look at it.

It is worth noting that the sites planned to continue evaluation irrespective of the specific findings they obtained in this project. In other words, regardless of whether their substantive findings showed positive or negative effects, program staff had plans to continue their evaluation efforts, which is a clear indication of process use. Their decision to continue with evaluation may have been a result of their increased understanding of the evaluative process (i.e., learning) and identifying it as a rewarding and positive experience (i.e., changes in affect or attitude), though the current analysis provides descriptive, not explanatory, findings.

Discussion

In this project, we used a longitudinal design to assess process use over the course of a year-long project. Changes in learning appeared quite quickly, as four of the six sites showed changes in this domain at the T2 site-visit interview, and this increased to five sites at the T3 follow-up interview. Changes in affect or attitude were evident in only one site at the site-visit interview and increased to three sites with the additional longitudinal assessment. Finally, changes in action or behavior did not appear in any of the sites at T2 interview, yet all six sites exhibited this process use domain during the follow-up data collection point (T3; see Table 1). These findings of differential "uptake" are interesting to be compared with the results of Jacob, Ovard, and Bélanger's (2011) cross-sectional study of process use within a diverse group of social service agency personnel. In that project, Jacob and colleagues found that evaluative learning and attitude change occurred within many stakeholders, but changes in action/behavior were limited to only one subgroup. Although it is possible that their findings truly reflect the full extent of process use in that evaluation, it is also possible that changes in action/behavior emerged *after* the evaluation ended but were not assessed due to the cross-sectional nature of the design.

Taken together, these findings suggest that when process use is assessed, it could have a significant impact on the nature of the findings. Without the T3 interviews, we would have concluded, incorrectly, that the project was unsuccessful in bringing about action/behavioral intention change. We would have likely attributed that shortcoming to the challenges of working in multisite settings and would have argued that it may be difficult to achieve process use in larger scale projects. That may indeed be true, but it was not true in this project. In other words, we would have made a substantive misinterpretation due to a methodological limitation. By including three points of data collection, we saw that different domains of process use emerged at different times over the course of the project. Changes in learning, followed by attitude change, and then a lag for action/behavior are consistent with some theories of behavior change (e.g., Theory of Reasoned Action and the Theory of Planned Behavior, see Montaña & Kasprzyk, 2002 for a review), but these findings merit replication as it seems quite possible that in other evaluation settings, the domains could emerge in a different sequence or at different time intervals. Furthermore, it would be useful to examine whether behavior/action changes sustain over time (see Campbell et al., 2004) with an additional longitudinal data collection time point.

Process use is typically studied in the context of single-site projects in which there has been sustained contact between the evaluator and the stakeholders. Although theories of process use have not explicitly stated that ongoing collaborative, participatory engagement is a necessary condition for process use, such suppositions are certainly implied (King, 2007; Morabito, 2002; Podems, 2007). In this project, we wanted to explore whether process use was attainable in a larger scale project whereby the contact between the evaluator and stakeholders was largely remote. Our results suggest that process use can occur in a multisite context, but we cannot disentangle our findings from the guiding theory used to generate these results. In other words, it may be most accurate to state that our findings indicate that participatory evaluation approaches can be used effectively in a multisite, remote consultation setting to promote process use. Whether these same results would occur under different theoretical conditions—or different site conditions—is unknown. There is more empirical work to be done to ascertain which theories and which settings are most effective in promoting process use.

It is important to acknowledge that although we had three time points of data collection, our methods of assessing process use were limited to a single data source—surveys and interviews with program staff. We developed strong collaborative relationships with the staff in all six sites, which we contend was a desirable and positive aspect of the project, but we also recognize that it creates the potential for response bias in the interviews.⁸ The literature on process use has shown that archival document reviews and observational methods are quite useful in capturing process use (e.g., Jacob et al., 2011), and archival documentation may be particularly important to verify that action/behavioral change actually occurred, as opposed to an intention to change. This project relied upon self-reports of process use, which may be an overestimate of actual process use. It is also possible that actual process use extended far beyond what was reported if sites were not yet ready or able to articulate their changes in learning, affect or attitude, and behavior that had occurred. As such, we recommend that future research on this topic include multiple methods of assessment in a longitudinal framework.

We also note that our study cannot pinpoint the causes and underlying mechanisms that contributed to process use. There may have been key differences between the sites and/or between their host communities and partner organizations that strongly influenced the development of process use. For instance, if the board of directors in one particular site was highly engaged and worked with program staff throughout the evaluation project, that involvement could have been a key contributing factor to process use, above and beyond the evaluators' contact with program staff. If stakeholders have regular day-to-day interactions with their local colleagues that promotes additional reflection and discussion about participating in evaluation and its utility (as often happens in true learning organizations, see Torres & Preskill, 2001), then the opportunities for and mechanisms by which process use develops are markedly different. As such, we recommend that future empirical studies of process use examine how different contextual conditions affect if and how this form of use emerges.

Despite these limitations, our case example highlights the utility of assessing process use within a longitudinal framework. Given that process use is theorized as a developmental *process*, methodological congruence with that supposition is critical for advancing our understanding of how and why stakeholders develop evaluative thinking.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: This project was supported by a grant from the National Institute of Justice, 2009-MU-MU-0002, awarded to the second author. The views expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not reflect the official policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Notes

1. We found no longitudinal studies in the peer-reviewed published literature, though Kamm's (2004) dissertation research is an excellent example of a longitudinal, multimethod (interviews, focus groups, observations, archival record review) investigation of process use.
2. We found no multisite studies in the peer-reviewed published literature, though Gibbons (2010) dissertation examined process use in 54 higher education institutions funded by federal Grants to Reduce Violence Against Women on Campus.
3. See Campbell, Townsend, Bybee, Shaw, and Markowitz (2013) for details regarding our choice of practical participatory evaluation (P-PE) and the specific technical assistance package provided. The focus of this method note is our assessment of process use within this project; we do not make any claims as to whether our work is an exemplar of P-PE or whether P-PE was a causal factor in the development of process use.
4. Eligible programs had (1) a full-time SANE program coordinator; (2) nursing staffing levels appropriate for their current patient caseloads so that staff would be able to devote time to participating in an evaluation project without adversely affecting program services; (3) a mean score above the 25th percentile on Preskill and Torres's (2000) Readiness for Organizational Learning and Evaluation Instrument (ROLE) scale, which indicates good organizational readiness for evaluation activities; and (4) secured access to the different data sources needed for assessment of the evaluation outcomes (e.g., legal case records).
5. For some sites, a secondary staff person also played a significant role in the evaluation and those individuals participated in the interviews as well.
6. We acknowledge that there are multiple approaches to qualitative research in general and coding in particular and that in some traditions, it is preferable that the coders are masked to study aims. However, our approach was rooted in the classic works of Lincoln and Guba (1985), such that the analysts were deeply involved in all aspects of the project to enhance the credibility of the findings.
7. Process use regarding institutionalizing evaluation is distinct from instrumental use. The former refers to behavioral intentions to continue and/or extend evaluation in the future; the latter refers to how the substantive findings of a specific project were actually utilized to create change.
8. Additionally, the same team analyzed the data regarding process use. Given that we hoped to see process use, there is potential for additional bias in analysis and interpretation. This, however, is not dissimilar to other qualitative and/or quantitative studies in which the researchers hopes to see a relationship between the independent and dependent variables. To attend to potential bias, we employed a team approach in which all disagreements among analysts were noted, all data were cross-checked, and consensus was reached on all final coding and interpretation decisions.

References

- Amo, C., & Cousins, J. B. (2007). Going through the process: An examination of the operationalization of process use in empirical research on evaluation. *New Directions in Evaluation, 116*, 5–26.
- Campbell, R., Dorey, H., Neageli, M., Grubstein, L. K., Bennett, K. K., Bonter, F., Smith, P., Grzywacz, J., Baker, P. K., & Davidson, W. S. (2004). An empowerment evaluation model for sexual assault programs: Empirical evidence of effectiveness. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 34*, 251–262.
- Campbell, R., Patterson, D., & Bybee, D. (2012). Prosecution of adult sexual assault cases: A longitudinal analysis of the impact of a sexual assault nurse examiner (SANE) program. *Violence Against Women, 18*, 223–244.
- Campbell, R., Patterson, D., & Lichty, L. F. (2005). The effectiveness of sexual assault nurse examiner (SANE) program: A review of psychological, medical, legal, and community outcomes. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse: A Review Journal, 6*, 313–329.
- Campbell, R., Townsend, S. M., Bybee, D., Shaw, J. L., & Markowitz, J. (2013). *Implementation of a sexual assault nurse examiner (SANE) practitioner evaluation toolkit*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Cousins, J. B., & Chouinard, J. A. (2012). *Participatory evaluation up close: An integration of research-based knowledge*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Cousins, J. B., & Whitmore, E. (1998). Framing participatory evaluation. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 80, 5–23.
- Department of Justice. (2013). *A national protocol for sexual assault medical forensic examinations (adults/adolescents)* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Forss, K., Rebbien, C. C., & Carlsson, J. (2002). Process use of evaluations: Type of use that precede lessons learned and feedback. *Evaluation*, 8, 29–45.
- Gibbons, R. E. (2010). *Violence against women on the college campus: Evaluating anti-violence programming* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses. (UMI Number 3398306)
- Harnar, M. A., & Preskill, H. (2007). Evaluators' descriptions of process use: An exploratory study. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 116, 27–44.
- Hsieh, H., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15, 1277–1288.
- Jacob, S., Ouvrard, L., & Bélanger, J. (2011). Participatory evaluation and process use with a social aid organization for at-risk families and youth. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 34, 113–123.
- Johnson, K., Greenesid, L. O., Toal, S. A., King, J. A., Lawrenz, F., & Volkov, B. (2009). Research on evaluation use: A review of the empirical literature from 1986-2005. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 30, 377–410.
- Kamm, B. J. (2004). *Building organizational learning and evaluation capacity: A study of process use*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertation and Theses. (UMI Number 3154944)
- King, J. (2007). Developing evaluation capacity through process use. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 116, 45–59.
- Lawrenz, F., Huffman, D., & McGinnis, J. R. (2007). Multilevel evaluation process use in large-scale multisite evaluation. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 116, 75–85.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Lonsway, K. A., & Archambault, J. (2012). The “justice gap” for sexual assault cases: Future directions for research and reform. *Violence Against Women*, 18, 145–168.
- MacQueen, K. M., McLellan-Lemal, E., Bartholow, K., & Milstein, B. (2008). Team-based codebook development: Structure, process, and agreement. In G. Guest & K. M. MacQueen (Eds.), *Handbook for team-based qualitative research* (pp. 119–136). Lanham, MD: Altamira/Rowman & Littlefield.
- Miller, R. L., & Campbell, R. (2006). Taking stock of empowerment evaluation: An empirical review. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 27, 296–319.
- Montaño, D. E., & Kasprzyk, D. (2002). The theory of reasoned action and the theory of planned behavior. In K. Glanz, B. K. Rimer, & F. M. Lewis (Eds.), *Health behavior and health education: Theory, research, and practice* (3rd ed., pp. 67–98). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Morabito, S. M. (2002). Evaluator roles and strategies for expanding evaluation process influence. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 23, 321–330.
- Patton, M. Q. (1998). Discovering process use. *Evaluation*, 4, 225–233.
- Patton, M. Q. (2008). *Utilization-focused evaluation* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Preskill, H., & Caracelli, V. (1997). Current and developing conceptions of use: Evaluation use TIG survey results. *Evaluation Practice*, 18, 209–225.
- Preskill, H., & Torres, R. (2000). The readiness for organizational learning and evaluation instrument (ROLE). *Evaluation in Organizations*, 421–434.
- Preskill, H., Zuckerman, B., & Matthews, B. (2003). An exploratory study of process use: Findings and implications for future research. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 24, 423–442.
- Podems, D. (2007). Process use: A case narrative from Southern Africa. *New Directions in Evaluation*, 116, 87–97.
- Russ-Eft, D., Atwood, R., & Eggherman, T. (2002). Use and non-use of evaluation results: Case study of environmental influences in the private sector. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 23, 19–31.
- Torres, R. T., & Preskill, H. (2001). Evaluation and organizational learning: Past, present, and future. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 22, 387–395.