Spring 2020

Improving Indigent Defense: An Evaluation of Program Effectiveness for the California Defense Investigators Association's Defense Investigator Training Academy

Sheree Martinek
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_projects

Part of the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#), and the [Public Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Martinek, Sheree, "Improving Indigent Defense: An Evaluation of Program Effectiveness for the California Defense Investigators Association's Defense Investigator Training Academy" (2020). *Master's Projects*. 942.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.kq4a-wmms>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_projects/942

This Master's Project is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Projects by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

Improving Indigent Defense: An Evaluation of Program Effectiveness for the California Defense
Investigators Association's Defense Investigator Training Academy

by

Sheree Martinek

A Thesis Quality Research Paper
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the
Master's Degree
In

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Professor Matthew Record, Ph.D.
Advisor

The Graduate School
San Jose State University
May 2020

Table of Contents

LIST OF TABLES	3
LIST OF FIGURES	4
BACKGROUND	5
Research Question.....	8
LITERATURE REVIEW	8
Gap in Literature.....	8
Background and Importance of Defense Work.....	9
Training and Employee Effectiveness	12
DITA	15
Theoretical Framework	18
METHODS	21
Variables and Measurement.....	21
Data and Sample.....	24
Design	26
RESULTS	27
Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) Regressions.....	29
Multiple Regression.....	31
Robustness Check: Stepwise Regression.....	35
Limitations	37
ANALYSIS	38
SWOT Analysis.....	39
Implications.....	43
CONCLUSION	44
REFERENCES.....	46
APPENDICES	51
Appendix A	51
Appendix B.....	53
Appendix C	55
Appendix D	60

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Benefits to the Organization and Employee.....	14
Table 2: DITA Modules	16
Table 3: Logic Model.....	18
Table 4: Kirkpatrick Levels of Evaluation	19
Table 5: Independent and Dependent Variables.....	22
Table 6: Variable Table.....	23
Table 7: Kirkpatrick Model and Associated Survey Questions.....	25
Table 8: Summary of Coefficients for OLS Regressions.....	30
Table 9.1: Multiple Regression Model Summary.....	31
Table 9.2: Multiple Regression Coefficients.....	32
Table 10: Correlation Matrix	33
Table 11.1: Stepwise Regression Model Summary.....	35
Table 11.2: Stepwise Regression Coefficients.....	36
Table 12: Comparison Between Multiple Regression and Stepwise Regression Coefficients	37
Table 13: SWOT Analysis.....	40

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure A: Results for Reaction Variable	28
Figure B: Results for Learning Variable	28
Figure C: Results for Behavior Variable.....	29
Figure D.1: Age and Higher Reports of Learning than Behavior.....	34
Figure D.2: Experience and Higher Reports of Learning than Behavior.....	35

BACKGROUND

In courtrooms across the country, judges conduct hearings where people are accused of committing crimes and attorneys prosecute or defend defendants. Fairness for defendants accused of a crime requires that they be afforded zealous advocacy by competent counsel, and that counsel be provided with the resources necessary to effectively represent their clients. Although the Sixth Amendment in the United States Constitution grants defendants the assistance of counsel in criminal cases, it does not guarantee a complete investigation before a plea bargain. *Powell v. Alabama* (1932) expanded the right to counsel by holding individuals charged with a capital crime must be provided counsel regardless of inability to pay. Prior to *Powell*, it was a defendant's federal constitutional right to hire an attorney, but only as long as the defendant could pay for their counsel. Arguably, one component of the *Powell* decision was based on a failure to investigate (1932, p. 58). Nearly thirty years later, *Gideon V. Wainwright* (1963) expanded the right of counsel to defendants in state court. According to Blume and Johnson (2013), "Even when his counsel is competent and diligent, a defendant may be deprived of the promise of *Gideon* due to a lack of investigative and expert services" (p. 2143).

The defense investigator's primary function is act as an objective factfinder. As part of their duties and functions, investigators often review discovery, locate and interview witnesses, review physical evidence, and much more. It is not uncommon to find public defense offices that do not have enough investigators. If a defense attorney is to be zealous when advocating for their clients, then the use of an investigator is paramount in establishing facts that may translate into more desirable outcomes for the client. Given the responsibility and importance of the investigator's role in criminal cases, it is crucial they be well-trained.

Organizations in both the private and public sector agree that effective training is essential to the progress and advancement of the agency (Noe, 2002). Training is a form of active learning that is aimed at developing knowledge, skills, and attitudes (Lampusova, 2015). Training is a cost effective investment for agencies and can be a powerful tool. “It can help to expand the scope of available skills within the workforce as well as improve on existing expertise, all with the goal of improving the business’s efficiency and effectiveness.” (Denby, 2010, p. 147). Training is more than teaching people new skills to improve their work performance. Training is “an ongoing process with set goals and outcomes, which are monitored, refreshed and enhanced. It can bring a continued and long-term benefit to a business” (Denby, 2010, p. 147).

Many organizations do not realize the positive impact an effective training program may have in achieving the organization’s mission and employee performance. Agencies seek to promote staff participation in evaluated training programs to enhance learning, increase performance, and contribute to organizational goals (Brinkerhoff, 2006). According to Elnaga & Imran (2013), “Training is a systematic process to enhance employee’s skill, knowledge and competency, necessary to perform effectively on the job. Overall, training impacts organizational competitiveness, revenue and performance” (p. 138). Training effectiveness is a measure of how well a training achieves its intended outcomes, such as increased job performance (Kraiger et al., 1993). Organizations may evaluate training effectiveness using one or more of Kirkpatrick’s criteria: reaction, learning, behavior, and results (Khan, 2002; Kirkpatrick, 2007).

The California Defense Investigators Association (DIA) Defense Investigator Training Academy (DITA) is a four module, four week, training academy for defense investigators. DITA was established in 1998 by vote of the Board of Directors of the DIA. DITA classes provide certified training in criminal defense investigations and address the skills and knowledge essential

to provide competent investigation on behalf of the defense in criminal cases. The DITA committee determined the topics they believed needed to be taught to criminal defense investigators (CDIA, 2017).

The objective of this study is to analyze the effectiveness of the DIA's DITA program using the Kirkpatrick model of program evaluation as a theoretical framework. The findings of this research provide a useful contribution to the field of public administration and criminal justice, as the evaluation and empirical research may provide valuable insight into the program, profession of defense investigation, and highlight the need for effective training in organizations.

Problem Statement

Training is a crucial component of investigation work; however, there is a significant discrepancy regarding the training mandated and received by prosecution-oriented and defense-oriented investigators. Prosecution investigators (such as law enforcement detectives or District Attorney investigators) have considerable resources and require extensive training aside from one's education. In respect to training, investigators who work for the prosecution are required to complete the California Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST). Completion of POST is a minimum of 664 hours of training (POST, 2020). However, there is no mandatory training program, academy, or number of cumulative training hours required for an investigator working for the defense. Although those who work in criminal defense may have a background in law enforcement or other types of investigations, those who do not may begin their career without significant experience or mandatory training. Despite a different approach in how the work is completed, and who the client may be (defendant vs. "the people"), the job is conducted with the purpose of finding the facts of a case. Training serves as a tool in that it can provide valuable skills

to increase work performance. The discrepancy in training requirements for these similar professions results in an imbalance within the criminal justice system.

An evaluation of DITA's effectiveness is crucial to the profession of criminal defense, as it is one of the only academy trainings for defense investigators in California and throughout the nation. The present research explored the effectiveness of the DIA's DITA program.

Research Question

What is the effectiveness of the California Defense Investigators Association's Defense Investigator Training Academy program?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Gap in Literature

There is a lack of literature pertaining specifically to the profession of criminal defense investigation and training. However, there is significant research regarding training program effectiveness and law enforcement or policing. For example, Marzano et al (2016) evaluated a training program for police and suicide prevention and others have conducted extensive research on police and mental health training (Loukes, 2013; Norris & Cooke, 2000). Although the role of a police officer or detective is different than that of a defense investigator, they often have the same duties, such as locate and interview witnesses and discover and analyze evidence. Unfortunately, there is significantly more research on the importance of training officers than that of defense investigators. For example, in the 1989 United States Supreme Court case, *City of Canton v. Harris*, it was concluded that a failure to adequately train officers could result in managerial liability (Grossman, 2003). The training of officers should also correspond with the tasks they are required to perform. In the case of *Hill v. Hamilton-Wentworth Regional Police Services Board* (2007), the Supreme Court of Canada held officers have a duty of care to suspects

and their conduct throughout an investigation should be compared to a standard of how others in a similar situation would have acted. This case highlighted the need for standardized practices and how the “... complex investigative knowledge required by police officers continues to increase. Failure to provide adequate education continuously throughout the span of an officer’s career may result in significant costs, both financial and otherwise, associated with inadequate investigations” (Clarke & Armstrong, 2012, n.p.).

The present research is significant, as it addresses the gap in the literature. In order to understand the significance of this profession and impact of effective training, this section provides insight into the history of defense work, the role of a defense investigator, the implication of training on an organization, and the DITA program.

Background and Importance of Defense Work

Powell v. Alabama did more than require legal counsel be appointed; it also noted the “vital importance of counsel and of ‘thorough investigation and preparation’” (Bright, 1994, p. 1836). According to Steiner (1981), the Sixth Amendment indicates the effective assistance of counsel includes a duty to investigate. According to the American Bar Association (ABA) Standards, Standard 4-4.1 outlines the Duty to Investigate:

(a) Defense counsel should conduct a prompt investigation of the circumstances of the case and explore all avenues leading to facts relevant to the merits of the case and the penalty in the event of conviction. The investigation should include efforts to secure information in the possession of the prosecution and law enforcement authorities. The duty to investigate exists regardless of the accused’s admissions,

or statements to defense counsel of facts constituting guilt or the accused's stated desire to plead guilty (np).

Regardless of the charge, whether it be a misdemeanor or felony, investigation is essential to a defendant's case. Determining the facts of a case allows for the formation of effective representation. The country's adversary system relies on both the prosecution and defense to conduct investigations, interpret the evidence, locate and interview witnesses, and present as a neutral fact finder (Bright & Sanneh, 2013). In order for the justice system to work as designed, each side should be balanced and without significant disparities. Disparities in skills and resources between the defense and prosecution may not only create unbalance, but injustice. Investigation from both sides is crucial.

A criminal defense investigator has an important role on the defense team. They are responsible for investigating the validity of the work conducted by the police department. Due to the potential impact of a defense investigator's work, it is important they have training (and experience) so they may identify errors or omissions in the work of others. Although investigators are not expected to be all-knowing, their training and experience should include a broad knowledge base. For example, investigators should be familiar with the basics of crime scene reconstruction, blood stain analysis, photography, interviewing, digital forensics, firearms, arson, and sexual assault investigations.

According to Sylvia and Sylvia (2012), organizations illustrate their support for the attainment of their mission through the use of clear standards. Standards serve as a criteria for how an organization's services may be evaluated. The use of standards allows an organization to promote transparency, but also accountability. Public organizations are provided with standards

by appointed administrators, or legislature, and can also be enforced through professional associations. Employees must focus on adhering to the standards and ensuring their services are beneficial to their clients served. The purpose of standards is to ensure an organization is implementing their services by qualified providers. Training allows for the development of qualified providers. According to the American Bar Association (ABA) Standards, Standard 5-1.5 outlines training and professional development. The standard states:

The legal representation plan should provide for the effective training, professional development and continuing education of all counsel and staff involved in providing defense services. Continuing education programs should be available, and public funds should be provided to enable all counsel and staff to attend such programs (np).

If an investigator is able to carry out small acts of due diligence for a case, it may significantly alter the results of the case in court. The work of an investigator may result in a better plea offer, earlier resolution of a case, and other outcomes beneficial to the defense. “Effective assistance of counsel in a capital case requires a lawyer who has the requisite experience and skills to manage a thorough investigation” (Kreitzberg, 1995, np.). Effective investigation is crucial as it is paramount to the defense for counsel to have as much information, be it helpful or detrimental, as possible.

Fabelo, Reynold and Tyler (2013) conducted an evaluation of the Harris County Public Defender’s Office in Harris County Texas. One result indicated there is an association between positive outcomes and the more time that is spent on investigation by the county’s Public Defender Office.

HCPD spent \$534,174 for 3,950 cases (felony, misdemeanor, and juvenile) in a year, an average of \$135 per case, compared to the assigned counsel system, in which the county spent \$874,638 for 67,530 cases, an average of \$13 per case. More precisely, the average investigative expenditure for a felony assigned counsel case is \$34 and the average for a misdemeanor is 22 cents (p. 2).

The evaluation of the Harris County Public Defender's Office also signified how the quality of representation matters. Furthermore, the lack of proper support services, such as an investigator, by any defense agency can lead to significant negative consequences for the defendant. According to Butcher and Moore (2000), in their study one prosecutor noted:

‘An investigator was not approved in the case, the defense had to proceed without the witness. The defendant was found guilty. After trial the witness was found, the defense appealed the case and it was overturned. Now it has to be tried again. If the witness had been found by an investigator, all this time and expense could have been avoided. An investigator probably would have found the witness. The defense attorney didn't have the time and resources to do the investigation alone.’ (np).

As discussed, the role of a defense investigator is crucial. Many duties conducted by the investigator assist counsel in zealous representation of their client. Although an investigator has the ability to make significant impact on a case, they may struggle to conduct the job satisfactorily without any proper training.

Training and Employee Effectiveness

Training is important in every organization, in order to ensure employees have the proper skillset to do their job. When properly trained, employees are more apt to become qualified in their duties,

thus allowing for them to better fulfill their role. Taylor (1996) defines training and development as, “the systematic process concerned with facilitating the acquisition of skills, knowledge and attitudes which results to improved organizational performance” (p. 258). Elnaga and Imran (2013) refer to training as “bridging the gap between the current performance and the standard desired performance” (p. 139). According to Govil and Usha (2014), training has specific goals and objectives. For example, training is meant to improve an employee’s “capacity, capability, productivity, and performance” (p. 44).

Job knowledge and skills need continuous upgradation due to the changing dynamics of many professions. Training must also be implemented continuously because it allows for employees to develop attitudes resulting in the improved management of new situations or problems. The development of skills also contributes to organizational change (Valle, Martin, Romero, & Dolan, 2000). Training is crucial for organizations facing diverse, changing factors because they must maintain their employees at peak performance levels (Govil & Usha, 2014). Furthermore, effective training allows employees to enhance their creativity, which results in better decision making.

Table 1 illustrates that proper and continuous training results in benefits for both the organization and the employee. For example, an organization can benefit from training their employees because they will deliver services to their clients at a higher quality. The development of key skills can also allow for an improvement in productivity and optimal use of time. Also, well-trained employees are assets to an organization, as they may be used to complete various tasks as needed. Lastly, proper training allows for employees to be more confident in their work which naturally leads to a reduction in employee turnover. Employees can benefit directly from training by way of employer incentives when their training results in productivity increases.

Employees may also feel more confident, have higher levels of job satisfaction, and make less mistakes in regard to their work (Govil & Usha, 2014).

Table 1: Benefits to the Organization and Employee

Benefits to Organization	Benefits to Employee
Trained employees can deliver services at a higher quality and enhance organizational productivity.	Increase in productivity and quality of work resulting in more incentives, such as a promotion or raise.
Training develops skills which will improve use of time.	Increase in knowledge, job satisfaction, and morale.
Trained employees may be used to complete various tasks to meet organizational needs.	Fewer mistakes made.
Decrease in employee turnover.	Able to address changing dynamics in work

Towler, Watson, and Surface (2013) explored how managerial behaviors can influence the perception of training on their employees. In their research, they note how “...organizational life imposes a number of policies and practices on individual attitudes, behaviors, and cognitions” (p. 830). For example, managers are influential in that they are able to place importance on practices such as training and development (Baldwin & Magjuka, 1991). When managers highlight the importance of training, it can impact an employee’s perception of its prominence as well. This signaling of importance can result in a prioritization of training activities within the organization. According to Towler, Watson, and Surface (2013), “Even if training is mandatory, the signals that managers send to their subordinates, can influence the extent to which subordinates are vested in the training” (p. 830). Research in human resource development indicates employees are also more motivated to learn and transfer their new knowledge to others when managers support a training.

Michael and Combs’ (2008) research revealed how training can reduce error or failure because training effects performance. Employee performance refers to the competency and knowledge to conduct necessary work (Huselid, 1995; Ichniowski, Shaw, & Prennushi, 1997). “Effective training programs are critical for successful employee performance” (Huang, et al,

2014, p. 1095). Employees are satisfied when they believe they are competent to perform their jobs well; this may be achieved through the participation in effective training programs. Moreover, training can improve one's job performance by replacing everyday practices with those that are more efficient and effective (Elnaga & Imran, 2013).

According to Phillips and Phillips (2001), there are noteworthy benefits of conducting a training evaluation. An evaluation may assist a training program in a few different ways: determine if the program is achieving its goals and objectives, identify the program's strengths and weaknesses, identify trainee demographics and who benefits more, and it allows for data collection for the promotion of agendas and marketing. Overall, a training evaluation is a statistical and methodological approach to determine if learning outcomes are achieved and to what extent. Training effectiveness is the approach to understand the learning outcomes.

DITA

In the fall 1999 edition of the "DIAlog: A Publication of the California Defense Investigator's Association," DIA President William Van Cleave indicated the first DITA training would be held in Solvang, CA from November 10-14, 1999. In the president's message, he stated "Registrants are in line for a quality instruction that will focus on an investigator's basic responsibilities, investigative report writing, interviewing techniques, and testifying skills. Through this training the investigator will be able to provide quality service to our clients" (p. 2). In the winter 1999 edition of the DIAlog, William Van Cleave stated there were 100 students in attendance in the inaugural DITA class. He stated, "The uniqueness of some investigation methods, and the similarity of others, used by investigators across the state and beyond, provided an unexpected depth of learning" (p. 2). Since DITA's inaugural class in 1999, DITA has completed 20 full cycles

and 193 investigators have received their CCDI certificate (P. Benitez, personal communication, November 1, 2019).

Today, the training program consists of four modules: Introduction to Defense Investigations, Case Development and Procedures, Communications for the Investigator, and Investigative Sciences and Technology. Each module is presented in an “intensive workshop setting” (CDIA, 2017, np). Each module is approximately 30 hours of class participation over the course of four to five days. The modules can be taken in any order; however, an investigator must complete all four modules in order to receive the certificate in criminal defense investigations (CCDI) (CDIA, 2017). Table 2 outlines the main topics covered within each module.

Table 2: DITA Modules

<p>DITA I: INTRODUCTION TO DEFENSE INVESTIGATIONS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evolution of Criminal Defense • Interviewing Skills & Techniques • Role of the Investigator • Testifying Skills • Case Organization • Time Management • Note Taking and Report Writing 	<p>DITA II: CASE DEVELOPMENT AND PROCEDURES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criminal Procedure • Admissibility of Evidence • Investigating Police Misconduct • Subpoenas, SDT's & Subpoena Service • Confessions & Admissions • Locating Witnesses • Using Jury Instruction in Your Investigation • Search & Seizure • Juvenile Dependency/Delinquency & Investigations
<p>DITA III: COMMUNICATIONS FOR THE INVESTIGATOR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ethics • Cultural Awareness • Mitigation Investigations • Informants and Snitches • Social Media Investigations • Immigration Law • Mental Health • Investigator Safety 	<p>DITA IV: INVESTIGATIVE SCIENCES AND TECHNOLOGY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crime Scene Investigations: Both Classroom and Practical Exercises • Firearms and Ballistics • Photography and Videography • Forensic Toxicology and Pathology • Forensic Cell Phones Investigations

Source: CDIA (2017)

Logic Model

A logic model can be used for a program evaluation. Table 3 demonstrates the logic model; the intended results of DITA are represented in the outputs, outcomes (short and long term), and impact. If DITA can obtain the necessary resources, such as a facility, appropriate presenters, staff, and finances, then they are able to perform the necessary activities. For a program such as DITA, the primary activity is to host bi-annual modules, each of which includes one week of training. These modules often consist of classroom presentations by various practitioners, hands on exercises by the students, and demonstrations of new skills (such as crime scene diagramming in DITA 4). Upon completion of these activities, DITA has outputs, such as how many students have participated or completed the program. DITA participants will benefit from short and long-term positive outcomes, such as improved knowledge and skills which leads to a change in overall work behavior due to improved work performance. These positive outcomes ultimately result in an even greater impact; improved quality of defense.

Table 3: Logic Model

Inputs	Activities	Outputs*	Outcomes		Impact
			Short Term	Long Term	
Presenters/Expertise Volunteers/Staff Time Money Development of training curriculum Facilities Recruitment of students	Conduct on-site training modules Delivery of classroom curriculum Networking amongst agencies Demonstrations Hands-on activities/lessons Group work & one-one work	5 complete program cycles (20 years of DITA) 193 graduates with CCDI DITA 1: 349 students participated DITA 2: 308 students participated DITA 3: 284 students participated DITA 4: 283 students participated	Enhanced specialty for each module completed Connections due to networking Improved: Knowledge Skills Attitude Awareness Motivation	Increased number of investigators with well-rounded training Improved: Behavior Practices Policies/ Procedures	Improved quality of defense

*Source: (P. Benitez, personal communication, November 1, 2019)

Theoretical Framework

Conducting an evaluation on a program's training effectiveness is beneficial to both employees and management. Training effectiveness is determined by an evaluation of whether or not an employee achieved the training's goals (Warner & DeSimone, 2009). The Kirkpatrick evaluation model served as the theoretical framework for this study. This model was established in 1959 by Donald Kirkpatrick and has served as the most common approach to program evaluation (Newsom, 1995). Kirkpatrick's (1976, 1994) training evaluation model outlines four levels of training level outcomes: reaction, learning, behavior and results. Table 4 outlines each of the levels. Several factors can be attributed to analyzing why the model is popular. According to Shelton & Janak (1989), the model has provided organization professionals a tool to understand

evaluation in a systematic way. The model provides a straight-forward guide and simplifies the process of program evaluation.

Table 4: Kirkpatrick Levels of Evaluation

Source: Kirkpatrick (1994)

The first level, Reaction, includes the trainee's reaction to the program. Kirkpatrick (1959) originally discussed this level as how well the program was liked by the trainee. At this level, a trainee's overall perception of the program is analyzed. Since the original development of the model, this level has evolved to the quality of the training. For example, items such as an instructor's knowledge of the material is included in the first level. The disadvantage of evaluating a program solely at this level is information regarding program satisfaction cannot determine if a program achieved its objectives (Warner & DeSimone, 2009).

The second level, Learning, measures the extent to which a trainee learned the material they were intended to learn. This level determines if a trainee increased in knowledge, improved a skill, or changed an attitude as a result of participating in the training. According to Kirkpatrick (1994), it is assumed that a change in behavior is representative of one or more of the training's objectives being met.

The third level, Behavior, refers to the knowledge or skills learned and if the trainee was able to transfer it to their job. This level attempts to determine if a trainee applies their new knowledge or skills upon returning to their organization (Kirkpatrick, 1994). If a trainee is unable to apply the knowledge or skill from a training to their work, it is determined the training program was unsuccessful in garnering a positive impact on the employee and, transversely, the organization.

Level four, Results, refers to the overall results that occurred because a trainee participated in the program (Kirkpatrick, 1994). Examples of final results for this level may include less errors in final work product, increased productivity or efficiency, or attainment of organizational goals.

Limitations to the Kirkpatrick Model

Despite its popularity, the Kirkpatrick model has notable limitations. Researchers believe the model is incomplete disregards the assumption of causality (Tracy, Tannenbaum, & Kavanaugh, 1995; Alliger & Janak, 1989).

Although Kirkpatrick's popularity is in part due to the ability to understand the complexity of program evaluation in a systemic way, the model is over simplified in that it does not take into account individual characteristics. Tracy, Tannenbaum, and Kavanaugh (1995) note the model also fails to address influences such as the learning culture of the organization. Moreover, there is an assumption that the Kirkpatrick model's four levels represent a hierarchal relationship. It assumes that a positive reaction (level one) would lead to increased learning (level two), which would produce a greater transfer of knowledge (level three), and this would all result (level four) in more successful organizational achievements (Bates, 2004). Holton (1996) notes the model implies a causal relationship between each of the four levels of evaluation. According to Alliger and Janak

(1989), this model assumes that each increasing level of evaluation provides more substantial information than the previous level.

Despite the criticisms and limitations to this model, Kirkpatrick (2006) notes, "...if training is going to be effective, it is important that the trainees react favorably..." (p. 27) and "without learning, no change in behavior will occur" (p. 51). Furthermore, Alliger et al (1997) found little evidence of correlations between the measures at the four levels or evidence of linear causality.

Hypotheses

To answer the research question, three research hypotheses served as the guides for the data to be collected and analyzed.

1. Hypothesis (H₁). It is hypothesized that as a trainee's level of reaction (Kirkpatrick level 1) increases, the likelihood of the program being considered effective will increase.
2. Hypothesis (H₂). It is hypothesized that as a trainee's level of learning (Kirkpatrick level 2) increases, the likelihood of the program being considered effective will increase.
3. Hypothesis (H₃). It is hypothesized that as a trainee's level of behavior (Kirkpatrick level 3) increases, the likelihood of the program being considered effective will increase.

METHODS

Variables and Measurement

The variables in this study, as well as their corresponding sources of information, are identified in Table 5.

Table 5: Independent and Dependent Variables

Independent variables. The independent variables are Kirkpatrick’s levels one through three: Reaction, Learning, and Behavior. Each independent, ordinal variable was coded with a seven point Likert scale of 1=Strongly Agree, 2= Somewhat agree, 3= Agree, 4= Neither agree or disagree, 5= Somewhat disagree, 6= Disagree, 7= Strongly disagree. The independent variable of Reaction was measured by survey question “Overall, I was satisfied with this training program.” The independent variable Learning was measured by survey question “Participation in this training enhanced my skills as a criminal defense investigator.” The independent variable Behavior was measured by survey question “I am able to apply the knowledge I learned to my everyday work.”

Dependent variable. The dependent variable was program effectiveness, which was measured by survey question “The quality of my work improved due to this training.” The dependent variable was coded with a seven point Likert scale of 1=Strongly Agree, 2= Somewhat agree, 3= Agree, 4= Neither agree or disagree, 5= Somewhat disagree, 6= Disagree, 7= Strongly disagree.

Control Variables. Gender, ethnic background, years of experience, age, and salary were controlled for in this study.

Table 6 illustrates each type of variable, provides a description, and identifies the source.

Table 6: Variable Table

Type of Variable	Variable	Description	Source
Independent	Reaction	The degree to which the trainee enjoyed the training overall.	Survey question #20: "Overall, I was satisfied with this training program."
Independent	Learning	The degree to which trainees acquired the intended knowledge, skills and attitudes as a result of the training.	Survey question #22: "Participation in this training enhanced my skills as a criminal defense investigator."
Independent	Behavior	The degree to which trainees applied knowledge and skills to the job.	Survey question #24: "I am able to apply the knowledge I learned to my everyday work."
Dependent	Program Effectiveness	The degree to which a trainee believed their work improved due to the training.	Survey question #28: "The quality of my work improved due to this training."
Control	Gender	If a trainee is male or female.	Survey question #1: "Gender"
Control	Ethnic Background	If a trainee is White, Black or African American, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Hispanic or Latino, or Other.	Survey question # 2: "Ethnic Background"
Control	Years of Experience	If a trainee has 1-3 years, 4-6 years, 7-9 years, 10-12 years, 13-15 years, 16-18 years, 19-21 years, or 22+ years of experience.	Survey question #3: "Number of years in your current position, or similar."
Control	Age	If a trainee is 20 years or younger, 21-25 years, 26-30 years, 31-35 years, 36-40 years, 41-45 years, 46- 50 years, or 50+ years of age.	Survey question #4: "What is your age?"
Control	Salary	If a trainee earns less than \$24,999, \$25,000- \$34,999, \$35,000- \$49,999, \$50,000- \$74,999, \$75,000-\$99,000, \$100,000- \$149,999, \$150,000- \$199,999, or \$200,000 or more in annual salary.	Survey question #5: "What is your annual salary?"

Data and Sample

A questionnaire was comprised of 28 multiple choice and four open ended questions. Table 7 illustrates which survey question was associated with each of the Kirkpatrick's four levels of program evaluation, or the independent variables. Of the questions asked in each category, only one question that best answered and addressed the appropriate level was identified as an independent variable. The researcher determined which question best represented the associated Kirkpatrick level. The questionnaire was administered through Qualtrics, an online survey tool. Qualtrics assisted in the participant's identity remaining anonymous.

The questionnaire was sent to 458 members of the DIA, which was obtained from the 2017 DIA Directory. Of the 458 emails, 59 emails were returned as "undeliverable." According to Hoonakker and Carayon (2009), some of the issues with web-based surveys is due to undeliverable emails, invalid or incorrect email addresses, and emails may be mistaken as junk or spam mail. The researcher received a few email responses indicating they would not open the survey link due to fear of a virus, as they were unfamiliar with the researcher. In addition, an email was sent to the DIA board asking if the board members would send an email with the survey link to their respective agencies. This was an attempt to contact additional participants who completed DITA, but may not have been listed on the DIA Directory. The total sample size was 82 (N=82), which is a 20.5% response rate. It is important to note that the emails were distributed to the DIA membership, and not solely to those who have participated in the DITA program. The number of investigators who participated in DITA and were also on the DIA Directory list is unknown.

Table 7: Kirkpatrick Model and Associated Survey Questions

Kirkpatrick Model of Evaluation	Survey Question(s)
Level 1: Reaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The program objectives were clearly defined. • The course materials were well organized. • The material was relevant to my needs. • The facilitators demonstrated a good understanding of the material. • The material was the right level of complexity for my background. • I enjoyed the DITA modules. • The training was beneficial to my work as a criminal defense investigator. • The training style was conducive to learning. Consider pace, delivery method, location, content, etc. • I would recommend this training to others. • Overall, I was satisfied with this training program.
Level 2: Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I learned the skills and information intended to be taught. • Participation in this training enhanced my skills as a criminal defense investigator. • The final test for the module was a fair representation of the program content.
Level 3: Behavior	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am able to apply the knowledge I learned to my everyday work. • I often use the knowledge I learned in my everyday work. • I feel supported and motivated to use the new skills I learned. • I am able to transfer what I learned in this training to another person.
Level 4: Reaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The quality of my work improved due to this training. • DITA assisted in preparing my for my future endeavors.

Frequencies for the control variables illustrate more information regarding the sample. Of the total sample, 39% were White, 9.8% were Black or African American, 3.7% were American Indian or Alaska Native, 9.8% were Asian, 30.5% were Hispanic or Latino, and 7.3% identified as Other. In regard to years of experience, 29.3% had 1-3 years, 18.3% had 4-6 years, 11% had 7-9 years, 13.4% had 10-12 years, 8.5% had 13-15 years, 4.9% had 16-18 years, 6.1% had 19-21 years, and 8.5% had 22 or more years of experience. In regard to the respondent's age, 15.9% were 21-25 years old, 23.2% were 26-30 years old, 9.8% were 31-35 years old, 18.3% were 36-40 years old, 12.2% were 41-45 years old, 12.2% were 46-50 years old, and 8.5% were 50 or more years old. In regard to the respondent's average salary, 2.4% made \$35,000-\$49,000, 34.1% made

\$50,000-\$74,000, 28% made \$75,000-\$99,000, 31.7% made \$100,000-\$149,000, 2.4% made \$150,000-\$199,000, and 1.2% reported an average salary of \$200,000 or more. See Appendix C.

Design

For purposes of this research, three ordinary least square (OLS) regressions, a multiple regression, and a stepwise regression (to serve as a robustness check) were conducted. The objective of this research was to determine if a trainee's reaction to the program, belief they learned what was intended for them to learn, and ability to apply their new knowledge or skills to their job is correlated with an improvement in their work. The regression analyses determined the best linear associated between trainee's reaction, learning, and behavior in order to predict DITA's program effectiveness. All analyses were conducted through statistical analysis software, Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

Regression analyses

Three OLS regression analyses were conducted with each of the independent variables (Reaction, Learning, and Behavior) in order to determine their individual relationship with the dependent variable. When using multiple regression analysis, the goal was to determine which independent variable contributed significantly to explain the dependent variable's variability while controlling for others. One objective was to minimize the residual mean square, thus maximizing the multiple correlation value (R square). A model which contains all independent variables provided the maximum R square; however not all variables may be significant, or they are too correlated. The regression analyses were conducted by using the questionnaire data for the predictor and dependent variables.

Robustness Check: Stepwise Regression

A robustness check was conducted in order to examine how the regression coefficient estimates behave when the regression is modified by the adding of regressors. This research applied the forward selection method of stepwise regression where one independent variable was added at a time based on the variable's significance. The focus of a stepwise multiple regression is to determine which combination of independent variables best predicts the dependent variable.

Correlation Matrix

The role of multicollinearity was also assessed. Multicollinearity is a statistical phenomenon in which a strong correlation occurs between some predictor variables. When independent variables are correlated, it is more challenging to isolate the effect of each variable individually. Although it is good to have the variable be significantly correlated, in multiple regression they should not be highly correlated with one another.

RESULTS

The independent variable Reaction was measured by the survey question "Overall, I was satisfied with this training program." Results from this question are located in Figure A and concluded 30.77% of respondents strongly agreed, 20.51% agreed, 15.38% somewhat agreed, 17.95% neither agreed or disagreed, 7.69% somewhat disagreed, 5.13% disagreed, and 2.56% strongly disagreed.

Figure A: Results for Reaction Variable

Overall, I was satisfied with this training program.

The independent variable Learning was measured by the survey question “Participation in this training enhanced my skills as a criminal defense investigator.” Results from this question are located in Figure B and concluded 29.49% of respondents strongly agreed, 17.95% agreed, 20.51% somewhat agreed, 15.38% neither agreed or disagreed, 8.97% somewhat disagreed, 6.41% disagreed, and 1.28% strongly disagreed.

Figure B: Results for Learning Variable

Participation in this training enhanced my skills as a criminal defense investigator.

The independent variable Behavior was measured by the survey question “I am able to apply the knowledge I learned to my everyday work.” Results from this question are located in Figure C and concluded 28.21% of respondents strongly agreed, 19.23% agreed, 24.36% somewhat agreed, 19.23% neither agreed or disagreed, 6.41% somewhat disagreed, 2.56% disagreed, and none of the respondents strongly disagreed.

Figure C: Results for Behavior Variable

I am able to apply the knowledge I learned to my everyday work.

In addition, a majority of respondents, 26.58% reported “neither agree or disagree” when asked if they feel supported and motivated to use the new skills they learned. Moreover, a majority of respondents, 28.21%, “strongly agreed” the material as the right complexity for their background.

Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) Regressions

A series of OLS regressions was calculated using each of the three predictor variables to predict program effectiveness. A summary of the coefficients, significance, and R^2 is in Table 8.

Table 8: Summary of Coefficients for OLS Regressions

Coefficients^a			
	OLS Regression 1	OLS Regression 2	OLS Regression 3
Reaction	.717***	-	-
Learning	-	.813***	-
Behavior	-	-	.707***
Years of Experience	.045	.029	.034
Age	-.014	-.028	.168
Ethnic Background	-.014	.077	-.055
Annual Salary	.215*	-.015	.047
Gender	-1.99	-.130	-.330
R ²	.700	.757	.377

Significance codes: '***' 0.01 '**' 0.05 '*' 0.1

In the first column of Table 8, OLS Regression 1 includes the independent variable Reaction and control variables. A significant regression was found ($F(6,75) = 29.236$, $p < .000$), with an R^2 of .700. Reaction's R^2 value of .700 indicates the variables in this regression account for 70.0% of the variance in program effectiveness. Participants' predicted improvement in work performance is equal to $3.092 + .717$ (Reaction) units when program effectiveness is measured as a unit. A participant's improvement in their work increased by .717 units for each unit increase of their reaction to the program. As indicated, this model is statistically significant and shows a positive correlation between Reaction and program effectiveness.

In the second column of Table 8, OLS Regression 2 includes the independent variable Learning and control variables. A significant regression was found ($F(6,75) = 23.327$, $p < .000$), with an R^2 of .757. Learning's R^2 value of .757 indicates the variables in this regression account for 75.7% of the variance in program effectiveness. Participants' predicted improvement in work performance is equal to $3.916 + .813$ (Learning) units when program effectiveness is measured as

a unit as well. A participant's improvement in their work increased by .813 units for each unit increase of their reported learning. As indicated, this model is statistically significant and shows a positive correlation between Learning and program effectiveness.

In the third column of Table 8, OLS Regression 3 includes the independent variable Behavior and control variables. A significant regression was found ($F(6,75) = 11.609$, $p < .000$), with an R^2 of .377. Behavior's R^2 value of .377 indicates the variables in this regression account for 37.7% of the variance in program effectiveness. Participants' predicted improvement in work performance is equal to $3.735 + .707$ (Behavior) units when program effectiveness is measured as a unit as well. A participant's improvement in their work increased by .707 units for each unit increase in how what they learned was applied to their behavior. As indicated, this model is statistically significant and shows a positive correlation between Behavior and program effectiveness.

Multiple Regression

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to evaluate how participant's reaction learning, and behavior predicted DITA's effectiveness.

Table 9.1: Multiple Regression Model Summary

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			
						F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.907 ^a	.822	.803	.671	.822	42.224	8	73	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Level 1: Reaction, Ethnic Background, Gender, Annual salary, Years of Experience, Level 3: Behavior, Level 2: Learning, Age

Table 9.2: Multiple Regression Coefficients

Coefficients^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.482	.512		6.804	.000
	Level 1: Reaction	.277	.079	.299	3.496	.001
	Level 2: Learning	.536	.080	.573	6.687	.000
	Level 3: Behavior	.209	.089	.140	2.360	.021
	Gender	-.216	.156	-.072	-1.389	.169
	Ethnic Background	.006	.033	.010	.192	.848
	Years of Experience	.036	.053	.055	.688	.494
	Age	-.049	.073	-.063	-.679	.500
	Annual salary	.022	.099	.014	.224	.823

a. Dependent Variable: The quality of my work improved due to this training.

A multiple linear regression was calculated to predict program effectiveness on participants' reported reaction, learning, and behavior. A significant regression was found ($F(8,73) = 42.224$, $p < .000$), with an R^2 of .822. The model explains 82.2% of the variance in the dependent variable is explained by the independent variables (see Table 9.1). The model fails to explain 17.8% of the variability, also known as error. Participants predicted program effectiveness is equal to $3.482 + .277$ (Reaction) $+ .536$ (Learning) $+ .209$ (Behavior), where each variable is coded as a Likert scale unit of measure (see Table 9.2). As the Reaction index increases by one value, or for every one unit of change, there is a .277 increase in the "quality of work improved" dependent variable (or program effectiveness). The more trainees are satisfied with the program (as measured by the index), the more they believe the program improved the quality of their work. As the Learning index increases by one value, or for every one unit of change, there is a .536 increase in program effectiveness. The more trainees who reported they learned what was intended by the program (as measured by the index), the more they will believe the program improved the quality

of their work. As the variable Behavior index increases by one value, or for every one unit of change, there is a .209 increase in program effectiveness. The more trainees who report they are able to apply what they learned to their daily work (as measured by the index), the more they will believe the program improved the quality of their work. Results of the multiple linear regression indicated there was a collective significant effect between all three predictor variables and program effectiveness.

Table 10: Correlation Matrix

Correlation Matrix				
	Level 1: Reaction	Level 2: Learning	Level 3: Learning	Program Effectiveness
Level 1: Reaction	1.000	.780	.509	.815
Level 2: Learning	.780	1.000	.422	.869
Level 3: Behavior	.509	.422	1.000	.526
Program Effectiveness	.815	.869	.526	1.000

Table 10 illustrates a correlation matrix amongst Reaction, Learning, and Behavior. Reaction and Learning have an equal correlation of .780, which indicates there is a problem with multicollinearity. Multicollinearity is a problem in research, as each predictor variable should be independent of one another.

Another indication of a problem with multicollinearity is the difference between the Reaction variable in the OLS regression compared to the multiple regression. In the OLS regression, the predictor variable Reaction has a significantly higher coefficient value when analyzed alone versus with the other predictor variables of Learning and Behavior. The coefficient for Reaction, changes from .717 in the OLS regression to .277 in the multiple regression. The Reaction coefficient is significantly inflated when analyzed alone. For empirical reasons, the variable Reaction should have been removed from the final model.

The p value for each independent value was $<.000$. The results of the analyses indicate Reaction, Learning, and Behavior each have an independent effect on program effectiveness. Therefore, null hypothesis H₁, null hypothesis H₂, and null hypothesis H₃ is rejected.

The research did not indicate any statistically significant findings regarding a participant's age, experience, salary, or ethnic background in relation to training effectiveness. However, the results illustrate some trends with the data. For example, 36.58% of respondents reported a higher score for Learning than Behavior. Of these respondents, they are older (see Figure D.1) and have more experience (see Figure D.2).

Figure D.1: Age and Higher Reports of Learning than Behavior

Figure D.2: Experience and Higher Reports of Learning than Behavior **Robustness Check: Stepwise Regression**

Table 11.1 illustrates the model summary for model 1 indicated a R^2 of .754 for Learning. When the predictor variable Reaction was added into the model (model 2), an additional .049, or 4.9%, variance in program effectiveness was accounted and increased the overall R^2 to .803, or 80.3%. When Behavior was added into the model (model 3), an additional .012, or 1.2%, variance in program effectiveness was accounted and increased the overall R^2 to .816, or 81.6%.

Table 11.1: Stepwise Regression Model Summary

Model Summary									
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig F Change
1	.869 ^a	.754	.751	.753	.754	245.839	1	80	.000
2	.896 ^b	.803	.798	.678	.049	19.560	1	79	.000
3	.903 ^c	.816	.809	.661	.012	5.245	1	78	.025

a. Predictors: (Constant), Level 2: Learning

b. Predictors: (Constant), Level 2: Learning, Level 1: Reaction

c. Predictors: (Constant), Level 2: Learning, Level 1: Reaction, Level 3: Behavior

When the variable Reaction was added to the regression in model 2, the coefficient for Learning decreased from .813 to .556. When the variable Reaction was added to model 3, the coefficient for Learning decreased further to .548. Learning has a higher coefficient when it is alone than when it is with the other variables, such as Behavior. When controlling for Behavior, the trainees who changed their behavior due to the program are a self-selecting group of people who also believed they also learned what they intended to learn.

The stepwise regression model's results are provided in Table 11.2. All three independent variables had p values $< .05$, thereby indicating they are significant. All three independent variables significantly predicted overall program effectiveness. The p values suggest that the model is a good fit of a data. For example, the value of R^2 is 81.6%, which is an increase from 75.4% at the first model attempt. This can be interpreted that 81.6% of the total variance in program effectiveness was explained by Reaction, Learning, and Behavior. Table 11.2 was important, as it determined the individual and combined effect of the variables on overall program effectiveness.

Table 11.2: Stepwise Regression Coefficients

Model	Coefficients				
	Unstandardized	Coefficients	Standardized		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1 (Constant)	3.638	.165		22.013	.000
Level 2: Learning	.813	.052	.869	15.679	.000
2 (Constant)	3.447	.155		22.221	.000
Level 2: Learning	.556	.075	.594	7.454	.000
Level 1: Reaction	.327	.074	.352	4.423	.000
3 (Constant)	3.196	.187		17.137	.000
Level 2: Learning	.548	.073	.585	7.533	.000
Level 1: Reaction	.272	.076	.293	3.584	.001
Level 3: Behavior	.194	.085	.129	2.290	.025

a. Dependent variable: Program Effectiveness

The stepwise regression analysis removed all control variables from the model as they were statistically insignificant. The final model (model 3) also included all three independent variables, which indicated they were the best predictors for the variance of program effectiveness. In comparing the multiple regression results with the stepwise regression results in Table 12, there were little differences amongst the values of the coefficients. This may be interpreted as evidence of structural validity. The independent variables were insensitive to the adding and dropping of other variables, as seen by the little change in the coefficients.

Table 12: Comparison Between Multiple Regression and Stepwise Regression Coefficients

Coefficients ^a

	Multiple Regression	Stepwise Regression
Reaction	.277	.272
Learning	.536	.548
Behavior	.209	.194
R ²	82.2	81.6

Limitations

The present study has several limitations, such as multicollinearity as previously discussed. In addition, the data collected relied on self-assessment measures. The use of self-assessment measures may have caused variance issues by inflating observed relationships amongst the variables. Ideally, the survey should have also been performed by multiple sources, such as the investigator who participated in the program, the investigator's direct supervisor(s), the investigators' subordinates (if applicable), and the investigator's colleagues (including other investigators and attorneys). Moreover, this study did not control for a variety of specific individual variables (such as motivation) that may have influenced the investigator's experiences

and evaluation of the training they received. Lastly, the DITA program does not have specified learning outcomes for each of the four modules. This poses a challenge, as many program evaluations focus on determining whether or not trainees achieved the program outcomes. A measure of the program's stated outcomes would have allowed for the research to be more specific in regard to what outcomes are being met and which are not.

ANALYSIS

The results of the analyses demonstrated a strong positive relationship between the independent and dependent variables. A participant's reaction, learning, and behavior regarding DITA contributed significantly to the prediction of training effectiveness. Trainees reported they overall enjoyed the DITA trainings, learned the material that was intended, were able to apply the new knowledge and skills learned to their job, and ultimately felt that their work improved. In light of the statistically significant results of the regression analyses, one can conclude the DITA program is in fact effective.

Approximately a third of respondents indicated a higher response on whether they learned what was intended versus if they applied what they learned to their work. These results were driven by age and experience. Investigators who are older and have more experience may have still learned what was intended by DITA; however, they believe they applied the knowledge or skill to their work less. Individual characteristics can explain why this is the case. For example, some experienced investigators may be less apt to change how they conduct their work because they have been doing tasks the same way for years. Other experienced investigators may complain about making changes, but are adaptive and will eventually apply new techniques they learned. If the new skill involves the use of technology, Millennials may also be more apt to apply it to their everyday work versus Baby Boomers.

The literature review highlighted the impact managerial support can have on a trainee's motivation to complete a training program. Results from the survey indicated a majority of respondents did not agree or disagree with the statement they felt supported and motivated to use their new skills. This result may be interpreted that there is a lack of managerial support for investigators to attend DITA, as a manager who supports DITA should also support investigators implementing the new skills they learned. If managers within the organization show their support for the program, it will excite investigators to attend and motivate them to implement their new knowledge upon returning to work. It is important for investigators to feel they are able to be creative and apply new techniques when completing their tasks. If respondents are unsure if they feel supported or motivated, this indicates an issue with the organization's lack of support for DITA rather than the investigators'.

SWOT Analysis

A SWOT analysis was conducted in order to further assess the current state of the DITA program. Table 13 illustrates the SWOT analysis and provides additional insight into the program's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats by incorporating some of the collected questionnaire data. The SWOT analysis used data collected from the questionnaire's open-ended questions, such as what trainees enjoyed or did not enjoy the most about the DITA program. Some answers from the "enjoyed the most" survey question were identified as being some of the program's strengths or opportunities. Some answers from "enjoyed the least" survey question were identified as being the program's weaknesses or threats. Below is an illustration of the SWOT analysis conducted using the open-ended questionnaire questions. For a complete list of answers to the questionnaire's four open-ended questions, reference Appendix B.

Table 13: SWOT Analysis

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows for networking opportunities amongst investigators • Expertise of the presenters • Well-rounded variety of subject matter • The focus is on defense investigations • Hands on activities • 20 years of experience hosting the modules 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of follow-through following completion of the training • Preparedness of presenters • Program cost • Long hours and days of training • Not appropriate for investigators with more experience • Some overlap with law enforcement (presenters ex-law enforcement)
Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive impact in the field of criminal defense • Continued collaboration post training • Changed behavior in work following training • A balance in the training of those in defense-oriented work compared to their prosecution-oriented counterparts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in organizational management and budget could result in lack of volunteer staff to host training, time to organize it, and students to attend • Many trainees seek online trainings due to the flexibility and cost • Lack of prioritization by management • Lack of interest (or continued interest)

Strengths. One of the most noted components of DITA, as indicated by respondents, is the ability to meet investigators from other counties or agencies. Networking allows connections to be made and partnerships to form. This is a significant benefit, as investigators may find themselves needing the assistance of investigators in various counties throughout the state. Another internal strength of DITA is the combination of classroom lectures and hands-on activities and demonstrations. By providing trainees opportunities to engage in group work, as well as practice the skills they learn, it appeals to many students in that they are allowed the opportunity to learn and absorb information in different ways. Another DITA strength is the focus on defense investigation. As previously stated, DITA is one of the only academy-style trainings that appeal specifically to defense investigation. Whereas most training programs cover a wide variety of topics befitting for anyone on the defense team, DITA is unique in that it provides defense investigators with specific knowledge and tools to do their investigative work effectively. With 20

years of experience, DITA has experience hosting the modules. They have been able to improve the implementation of the training based on trainee feedback and continue to enhance the program.

Weaknesses. One of the most noted comments from the survey participants regarded the cost of the program, necessary travel, and time away from their work. Internally, the program requires the financial ability to host the program, which they obtain through registration fees. Many participants expressed unease about paying the high cost to participate. This could be due to their agency's lack of ability to sponsor them to go to the training or other budgetary limitations. Some investigators noted they did not like the long training days and felt the presenters were not prepared. DITA staff can increase communication with their presenters ahead of time to ensure they have what they need for their presentation. An increase of breaks or re-organization of the training day can minimize the feeling of long, overwhelming days. Another noted weakness for DITA is their lack of follow-through post training. It is important for DITA to connect with investigators following the training, should they indicate they will. For example, if DITA staff specify they will provide feedback from an assignment, then investigators expect to hear from them. If DITA does not follow-through as indicated, then it can contribute to investigators' feeling of diminished legitimacy in the program and lack of interest in participating in future modules. Lastly, DITA must find a balance in the complexity of information provided. DITA is open to all investigators with various levels of experience, but less experienced investigators should not leave the training feeling overwhelmed. Conversely, more experienced investigators should not complete the training believing they did not learn enough.

Opportunities. Networking was identified as a strength, but it also serves as an opportunity for future collaboration. When organizations in the same field create more connections throughout

the state, it can result in opportunities for collaboration on larger-scale projects or organizational goal attainment. DITA also allows for the opportunity to have a positive impact in the criminal justice system, as effective training naturally lends to more productive investigation which is beneficial for representation of any defendant. Moreover, DITA provides a balance to the training of those in comparable professions. DITA is an opportunity to train defense investigators for better case outcomes and levels the playing field regarding prosecution and defense.

Threats. Despite DITA's positive successes and opportunities, DITA faces some external threats. One of the largest threats is the additional cost for some investigators attending the training program, coupled with the issue of managerial support. When considering DITA is available to defense investigators across the state but is always located in the same general area (southern California), travel considerations become another obstacle for those who are not in proximity to the training location. The fiscal impact can be significant for all investigators who have to pay out of pocket for tuition and suffer a loss of vacation hours but this is even more so for investigators who live out of the area and must shoulder the added cost travel expenses. In many cases an investigator's tasks and work continue to accumulate the longer they are away. The workload that is left behind for a week while a participant is away may result in additional hardships on the organization and investigator. This may result in attendance at the training being less of a priority in comparison to the work needing to be completed. These factors could be a deciding factor in training attendance becoming less of a priority than maintaining control of the work at hand. There is a chance the internal cost of the program and external management support are also correlated. As the research indicates, managerial attitudes have a significant impact on trainees supporting a training. A lack of managerial support towards employees attending the program for any reason, let alone a fiscal one, will negatively affect employee attendance and participation. The financial

burden placed on employees due to the cost, travel, and possible lack of manager support may result in a loss of interest to complete all four modules. Reportedly, this factor, combined with previously mentioned negative factors, has led to participants losing interest in completing all four modules. Moreover, programs like DITA are in competition with the prevalence of online trainings which are becoming more common due to convenience and typically lower tuition costs.

Implications

Organizations may incorporate DITA into their training policy. According to Halachmi (1981), a training policy refers to the “decisions concerning the allocation and utilization of two important resources—money and people” (p. 34). In other words, training policy serves as a guideline concerning the use of resources which will improve the quality of human resources. The uniqueness of the DITA program may serve as a model, mandatory training program for the profession of defense investigation. Just as prosecution-oriented investigators must complete their POST training requirements, DITA may serve as the equivalent for those who work in defense. Although the thought of making a training program, such as DITA, mandatory for defense investigators who are beginning their career may appear to be an unattainable goal, it will begin a discussion of the importance of minimum training requirements for defense investigators moving forward. An organization that implements DITA into their training policy and plan can budget for costs accordingly.

Training comes as a cost to an organization and therefore, it is important to note any return on investments. For an organization to justify the expense of sending staff to a training program, such as DITA, it must be cost-effective. The benefits must outweigh the costs and training is only beneficial if it is effective. Managers should not assume a training is effective; they should demand training evaluations are continuously conducted to show effectiveness. In other words, support for

training evaluations should emanate from management and be carried out by program staff. Moreover, when management is aware of a program evaluation's results, they develop increased support for a training. Managerial support results in an increase in employee motivation to learn and transfer their new knowledge to others.

Furthermore, management and training programs should determine specific training needs prior to the development of a training course. Programs such as DITA should make sure to monitor "hot topics" in the field of defense investigation and incorporate the appropriate lectures for the associated module. These "hot topics" should then be communicated and advertised when enrollment for the module begins. Based on the training needs, programs should create a training plan, or agenda, and establish a pre/post assessment evaluation to determine employees learned what was intended. It is important for the evaluations to be routinely analyzed so strengths and weaknesses can be determined.

Lastly, many of the discussed weaknesses and threats to DITA involved cost, investigators being away from the office for a week, and lack of managerial support. The implementation of blended learning has become increasingly popular. Blended learning, or hybrid courses, is the combination of online and classroom learning. DITA may implement the recording of lectures or presentations and create group-work assignments which can be discussed later in the classroom method. The implementation of blended learning is cost-effective and will likely increase participation, interest, and support for the program.

CONCLUSION

The objective of any training program is to add value to an employee's performance. The role of a defense investigator is significant to the balance of the criminal justice system; therefore,

effective training of individuals in this role is paramount. Research such as this can be useful for evaluations of significant training programs.

This research explored DITA training effectiveness in regard to trainee's reported reaction to the program, information learned, and if they were able to apply their new knowledge or skills to their work. There is a gap in the literature regarding the importance of training for this particular profession. Defense investigators must be able to receive training that is comparable to similar professionals. A review of the literature notes the many benefits to effective training for both the organization and employee: improved work performance, increased job satisfaction, and achievement of the organization's mission and goals. The literature also notes the significance managerial support has in regard to employee's interest in particular training programs.

Many organizations do not meet employee demands in regard to training. This study indicated the DITA program provides employees with knowledge and skills to help them grow as investigators. Training programs, such as DITA, have been designed according to the specific needs of the profession and organization. The input from the participants allows for a reevaluation of DITA's objectives in consideration of their professional needs. There is a reported positive relationship between DITA's training activities and employee performance; therefore, training and development should not be disconnected from an organization's regular activities.

REFERENCES

- Alliger, G. M., and Janak, E. A. (1989). Kirkpatrick's levels of criteria: Thirty years later. *Personnel Psychology*, 42, 331-341.
- Alliger, G. M., Tannenbaum, S. I., Bennett, W., Jr., Traver, H., & Shotland, A. (1997). A meta-analysis of the relations among training criteria. *Personnel Psychology*, 50(2), 341-358.
- Baldwin, T.T. & Magjuka, R.J. (1991). Organizational training and signals of importance: linking pretraining perceptions to intentions to transfer. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 2(1), 25-36.
- Bates, R. (2004). A critical analysis of evaluation practice: The Kirkpatrick model and the principle of beneficence. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 27(3), 341-347.
- Blume, J. H., & Johnson, S. L. (2013). Gideon exceptionalism? (Symposium on *Gideon v. Wainwright*). *Yale Law Journal*, 122(8), 2126-2148.
- Bright, S. (1994). Counsel for the poor: The death sentence not for the worst crime but for the worst lawyer. *The Yale Law Journal*, 103(7), 1835-1883.
- Bright, S., & Sanneh, S. (2013). Fifty years of defiance and resistance after *Gideon v. Wainwright*. *The Yale Law Journal*, 122(8), 2150-2174.
- Brinkerhoff, R. O., (2006). Increasing impacts of training investments: An evaluation strategy for building organizational learning capability, industrial and commercial banking. *Emerald Group of Publishers*, 38(6), 302-307.
- CDIA (2017). California Defense Investigators Association. Retrieved from:
<https://www.cdia.org>
- Clarke, C.A., Armstrong, K. (2012). Beyond Reproach: The Need for Effective and Responsive Training. In: Habersfeld M., Clarke C., Sheehan D. (eds) *Police Organization and*

- Training. Springer, New York, NY
- Denby, S. (2010). The importance of training needs analysis. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 42(3), 147-150.
- Elnaga, A. & Imran, A. (2013). The effect of training on employee performance. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 5(4), 137-147.
- Fabelo, T., Reynolds, C., & Tyler, J. (2013). Improving indigent defense: Evaluation of the Harris County Public Defender. *The Council of State Governments Justice Center*.
- Gideon v. Wainwright*, 372 U.S. 335 (1963).
- Govil, S., & Usha, K. (2014). The importance of training in an organization. *Advances in Management*, 7(1), 44-46.
- Grossman, R. (2013). *Law enforcement liability risk, loss control best practices*. Tampa, FL: Florida Partnership for Safety and Health.
- Halachmi, A. (1981). Evaluating training policy in local governments. *State & Local Government Review*, 13(1), 33-37.
- Holton, E. F. (1996). The flawed four-level evaluation model. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 7, 5-21.
- Hoonakker, P., & Carayon, P. (2009). Questionnaire survey nonresponse: A comparison of postal mail and internet surveys. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 25, 348-373.
- Huang, Y., Strawderman, L., Babski-Reeves, K., Ahmed, S., & Salehi, A. (2014). Training effectiveness and trainee Performance in a voluntary training program: Are trainees really motivated? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(6), 1095-1110.
- Huselid, M. A. (1995). The impact of human resource management practices on turnover,

- productivity and corporate financial performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(3), 635-72.
- Ichniowski, C., Shaw, K. and Prennushi, G. (1997). The effects of human resource management practices on productivity: a study of steel finishing lines. *American Economic Review*, 87(3), 291-313.
- In re Gault*, 387 U.S. 1 (1967).
- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1967). Evaluation of training. In R. L. Craig (Ed.), *Training and development handbook: A guide to human resources development*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1994). *Evaluation training programs: The four levels*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1996). Invited reaction: Reaction to Holton article. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 7, 23-25.
- Kirkpatrick, D. L. and Kirkpatrick, J.D. (2006). *Evaluating Training Programs: The four levels*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Kreitzberg, E. (1995). Death without justice. *Santa Clara Law Review*, 35, 485-1379.
- Lampusova, Y. (2015). Training of the development of skills of professional communication the security officer of the criminal investigation department of the internal affairs. *Sovremennye Issledovania Social'nyh Problem*, 0(4), 12-20.
- Loucks, J. S. (2013). Educating law enforcement officers about mental illness: Nurses as teachers. *Journal of Psychosocial Nursing and Mental Health Services*, 51(7), 39-45.
- Marzano, L., Smith, M., Long, M., Kisby, C., & Hawton, K. (2016). Police and suicide prevention evaluation of a training program. *Crisis-The Journal Of Crisis Intervention And Suicide Prevention*, 37(3), 194-204.

- Michael, C. & Combs, G. (2008). Entrepreneurial failure: The case of franchisees. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 46(1), 73-90.
- Norris, C., & Cooke, E. (2000). Mental health training scheme for police officers. *Professional Nurse*, 15, 655–658.
- Noe, R. A. (2002). Employee training & development (2nd ed.). Boston: McGraw- Hill/Irwin.
- Phillips, P. P., & Phillips, J. J. (2001). Symposium on the evaluation of training:
Editorial. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 5(4), 240-247.
- Towler, A., Watson, A., & Surface, E. (2014). Signaling the importance of training. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 29(7), 829-849.
- Steiner, M. L. (1981). Adequacy of fact investigation in criminal defense lawyers' trial preparation. (A study of the fact investigation practices of criminal lawyers in Phoenix, Arizona). *Arizona State Law Journal*, 1981(2), 523-556.
- Sylvia, R. & Sylvia, K. (2012). Program Planning & Evaluation for the Public Manager, Waveland Press, ISBN 1-57766- 778-6. 2012.
- Taylor, D.S. (1996) ‘Training and Developing People’, in C. Molander (ed.) *Human Resources at Work*, Sweden: Chartwell-Bratt (Publishing and Training) Ltd., pp.256-303.
- The DIAlog (Fall, 1999). A Publication of the California Defense Investigators Association.
- The DIAlog (Winter, 1999). A Publication of the California Defense Investigators Association.
- Tracey, J. B., Tannenbaum, S. I. and Kavanagh, M. J. (1995). Applying trained skills on the job: the importance of the work environment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(2), 239-252.
- Powell v. Alabama*, 287 U.S. 45 (1932).
- Valle, R., Martin, F., Romero, P.M. and Dolan, S. (2000). Business strategy, work processes and

human resource training: are they congruent? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 2
83-97

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Survey Distribution Agencies

Agencies	
SSA Security Group	La Jeune Investigations
Accredited	Law Office of Ciro Hernandez
ACE Investigations	Law Offices of Pub Defender, San Bernardino Co. Central Division
ADH Investigations	Law Offices of Pub Defender, San Bernardino Co. Joshua Tree Branch
Alameda Co Public Defender	Legacy Quest International
All Valley Detectives	Lepore Associates
Alliance Forensic Services	Los Angeles County Alternate Public Defender
Ami's Investigations	Los Angeles County Public Defender
Anne Fields & Associates	Madera Alternate Defense Office
Astute Investigations	Maguire & Ashbaugh
Blackburn Investigative Services	Marin County Public Defender
Ciummo & Associates	Mena Investigative Service
Coastline Detectives Inc	Mendocino County Public Defender
Cody S Investigations	Mike Hermann Investigations
Contra Costa County Public Defender	Moore Professional Invest. Services
Cordis Bilingual Services	N F Rusteen Company
Counterpoint Investigations	Napa County Public Defender
County of El Dorado Office of the Public Defender	Nolan, Armstrong & Barton
Cox Investigations	Nor Cal Professional Services
Crowell Defense Investigations	Orange County Alternate Public Defender
D.A.L.M. Investigations	Orange County Public Defender
Daniel DeSantis and Associates	Owls Investigations
Ed Oasa Investigations	Palma & Palma Investigations
Enterprise Investigations	Performance Investigations, Inc,
Expert Data Forensic Federal Public Defender	Peter Lewis Mazzone International Investigations
Federal Public Defender	Pinnacle Investigations
FYI Research and Investigations	Pitney Investigations
Habeas Corpus Resource Center	Placer County Public Defender
Humboldt County Public Defender Office	R. Curtis Stewart & Associates
Imperial County Public Defender	R. Ward & Associates
J. Greg Lewis Investigative Services	Richard A. Ciummo & Associates
J. Ornelas Investigations	Rivera & Associates
J.A. Stevenot and Associates	Riverside County Public Defender

JB Tucker & Associates	Rush Investigations
Jerry T Wynne Investigations	S & R Investigations
Kern County Public Defender	S.A.S. Legal & Investigative Services
Klopper Investigations	San Bernardino County Public Defender
Kootenai County Public Defender	San Diego Alternate Public Defender
San Diego County Public Defender	Solano County Public Defender
San Diego Multiple Conflicts Office	Sonoma County Public Defender
San Francisco County Public Defender	Special Investigations Group Inc.
San Luis Obispo Public Defender	Stockham Computer Forensics and Investigations
San Mateo County Private Defender	T. Grant & Associates, Inc.
Santa Barbara County Public Defender	T.T. Williams, Jr. Investigations, Inc.
Santa Clara County Alternate Public Defender	Tactical Investigative Services
Santa Clara County Public Defender	Townsend, Carden & Rose, Inc.
Scott R. James II Investigative Services	Trial Attorney Support Services
SDS Investigations	Tulare County Public Defender
Shasta County Public Defender	Yolo County Public Defender
Solano County Alternate Public Defender	Ventura County Public Defender
Solano County Public Defender	Vera Investigations

Appendix B: Open- Question Responses

What do you like the most about the DITA program?
Networking with the investigators from different counties.
It really depended on the presenter. Some were great, others were a complete waste of time. It also depended on the module. DITA I, during which we had to interviews in front of our peers and "testify" to our reports, was really good. The other three were not nearly as good. The final one really had nothing to do with what we do as defense investigators.
Interaction with other defense investigation from different counties.
The different backgrounds of the presenters. The hands on training (i.e. scenarios).
The interactive opportunities to apply theory into practice- the court testimony and report writing portion.
There was a well-rounded variety of subject matter being taught.
The crime scene
Getting to know the other investigators from the different counties
Networking
The presentation were interesting and easy to follow.
The instructors and material were useful
Getting different perspectives.
DITA 1
The forensics one was at times fun.
The attention to investigator perspective was great, it is rare to find trainings much less certifications designed for the defense investigator.
Variety of coverage; hands on scenarios; handouts; team building; on par with basic police academy
Small classrooms and detailed course
Taught by industry experts and leaders. It's not by retired people with old ideas. It's relevant to today and current case law.
I liked discussing techniques and skills with investigators from other counties.
Organized learning
Networking and learning

What do you like the least about the DITA program?
I participated in a testifying training and never received feedback, as promised.
As referenced above, some of the modules were a waste. DITA should focus exclusively on areas that we address as defense investigators, not what cops do.
Some presenters were more prepared than others.
The lack of organization.
The horribly long hours sitting in a chair being spoken to all day! the law enforcement minded professionals who teach. we should be experiencing DEFENSE professionals and those with defense experience, not detectives and cops teaching
There were only a handful of presenters that were not prepared for their audience and a couple who let their political views interfere with their training.
They try to cram too much information in a short period of time
The price
The cost of travel and boarding.
Long days
Repetitive courses.
Module 4 seemed law enforcement focused
DITA 3
Often boring and repetitive, mostly covering things I knew or am unlikely to use.
Hard to say, it is hard to take a week from work for each module, but also see the value in focusing on this training for the same time frame.
It was basic best learned on the job.
long hours
Late students, disrupting the flow of the presentation.
A lot of the instructors are ex-law enforcement. Their role as law enforcement is fundamentally different from ours as PDIs. As such, sometimes it felt like they forgot who their audience was and what their new role as PDIs is supposed to be.

If you have not completed all four modules, why?
Employer has not sponsored other trainings
I have not been financially able to pay for the travel and boarding required.
It is difficult to take a whole week off.
I have not been able to fit it into my schedule.
My department allows one training per year. Can't afford it on my own.
I didn't enjoy or find useful.
Lost interest

Do you have recommendations on how to make DITA more effective?
Change up the faculty. Bring in more psychologists, psychiatrists, and social workers. Lose the macho-man cops. Also, eliminate the overlap, as many classes touch on the same topics.
Better speakers
More hands on opportunities and chances to be tested with practical exercises.
Shorter modules, more interactive, less repetitive.
Focusing on issues or skills defense investigators need/use. If teaching about law enforcement issues (CSI, sciences, etc.) add more discussion on why it's important for the defense, what we should look for, how to use the information we learned, etc.
Bigger range of topics.

Appendix C: Survey

1.) Gender:

1. Female
2. Male

2.) Ethnic Background (check only one of the most appropriate responses)

1. White
2. Black or African American
3. American Indian or Alaska Native
4. Asian
5. Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
6. Hispanic or Latino
7. Other

3.) Number of years in your current position, or similar

1. 1-3 years
2. 4-6 years
3. 7-9 years
4. 10-12 years
5. 13-15 years
6. 16-18 years
7. 19-21 years
8. 22+ years

4.) What is your age?

1. 20 years or younger
2. 21-25 years
3. 26-30 years
4. 31-35 years
5. 36-40 years
6. 41-45 years
7. 46- 50 years
8. 50+ years

5.) What is your annual salary?

1. Less than \$24,999
2. \$25,000- \$34,999
3. \$35,000- \$49,999
4. \$50,000- \$74,999
5. \$75,000-\$99,000
6. \$100,000- \$149,999
7. \$150,000- \$199,999
8. \$200,000 or more

6.) I have completed DITA Module 1: Introduction to Defense Investigations

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure

7.) I have completed DITA Module 2: Case Development and Procedure

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure

8.) I have completed DITA Module 3: Communications for the Investigator

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure

9.) I have completed DITA Module 4: Investigative Sciences and Technology

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not sure

10.) The program objectives were clearly defined.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Undecided
4. Agree
5. Strongly agree

11.) The course materials were well organized.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Undecided
4. Agree
5. Strongly agree

12.) The material was relevant to my needs.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Undecided
4. Agree
5. Strongly agree

13.) The facilitators demonstrated a good understanding of the material.

1. Strongly disagree
 2. Disagree
 3. Undecided
 4. Agree
 5. Strongly agree
- 14.) The final test for the module was a fair representation of the program content.
1. Strongly disagree
 2. Disagree
 3. Undecided
 4. Agree
 5. Strongly agree
- 15.) The material was the right level of complexity for my background.
1. Strongly disagree
 2. Disagree
 3. Undecided
 4. Agree
 5. Strongly agree
- 16.) I enjoyed the DITA modules.
1. Strongly disagree
 2. Disagree
 3. Undecided
 4. Agree
 5. Strongly agree
- 17.) The training was beneficial to my work as a criminal defense investigator.
1. Strongly disagree
 2. Disagree
 3. Undecided
 4. Agree
 5. Strongly agree
- 18.) The training style was conducive to learning. Consider pace, delivery method, location, content, etc.
1. Strongly disagree
 2. Disagree
 3. Undecided
 4. Agree
 5. Strongly agree
- 19.) I would recommend this training to others.

1. Strongly disagree
 2. Disagree
 3. Undecided
 4. Agree
 5. Strongly agree
- 20.) Overall, I was satisfied with this training program.
1. Strongly disagree
 2. Disagree
 3. Undecided
 4. Agree
 5. Strongly agree
- 21.) I learned the skills and information intended to be taught.
1. Strongly disagree
 2. Disagree
 3. Undecided
 4. Agree
 5. Strongly agree
- 22.) Participation in this training enhanced my skills as a criminal defense investigator.
1. Strongly disagree
 2. Disagree
 3. Undecided
 4. Agree
 5. Strongly agree
- 23.) DITA assisted in preparing my for my future endeavors.
1. Strongly disagree
 2. Disagree
 3. Undecided
 4. Agree
 5. Strongly agree
- 24.) I am able to apply the knowledge I learned to my everyday work.
1. Strongly disagree
 2. Disagree
 3. Undecided
 4. Agree
 5. Strongly agree
- 25.) I often use the knowledge I learned in my everyday work.

1. Strongly disagree
 2. Disagree
 3. Undecided
 4. Agree
 5. Strongly agree
- 26.) I feel supported and motivated to use the new skills I learned.
1. Strongly disagree
 2. Disagree
 3. Undecided
 4. Agree
 5. Strongly agree
- 27.) I am able to transfer what I learned in this training to another person.
1. Strongly disagree
 2. Disagree
 3. Undecided
 4. Agree
 5. Strongly agree
- 28.) The quality of my work improved due to this training.
1. Strongly disagree
 2. Disagree
 3. Undecided
 4. Agree
 5. Strongly agree

What do you like the most about the DITA program?

What do you like the least about the DITA program?

If you have not completed all four modules, why?

Do you have recommendations on how to make DITA more effective?

Appendix D: Survey Question Response Breakdown

Gender:

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	Gender:	1.00	2.00	1.52	0.50	0.25	82

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Male	47.56%	39
2	Female	52.44%	43
	Total	100%	82

Ethnic Background (check only one of the most appropriate responses):

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	Ethnic Background (check only one of the most appropriate responses):	1.00	7.00	3.43	2.34	5.49	82

#	Answer	%	Count
1	White	39.02%	32
2	Black or African American	9.76%	8
3	American Indian or Alaska Native	3.66%	3
4	Asian	9.76%	8
5	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.00%	0
6	Hispanic or Latino	30.49%	25
7	Other	7.32%	6
	Total	100%	82

Number of years in your current position, or similar:

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	Number of years in your current position, or similar:	1.00	8.00	3.35	2.29	5.25	82

#	Answer	%	Count
1	1-3 years	29.27%	24
2	4-6 years	18.29%	15
3	7-9 years	10.98%	9
4	10-12 years	13.41%	11
5	13-15 years	8.54%	7
6	16-18 years	4.88%	4
7	19-21 years	6.10%	5
8	22+ years	8.54%	7
	Total	100%	82

Age:

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	Age:	2.00	8.00	4.60	1.92	3.67	81

#	Answer	%	Count
1	20 years or younger	0.00%	0
2	21-25 years	16.05%	13
3	26-30 years	22.22%	18
4	31-35 years	9.88%	8
5	36-40 years	18.52%	15
6	41-45 years	12.35%	10
7	46- 50 years	12.35%	10
8	50+ years	8.64%	7
	Total	100%	81

Annual salary:

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	Annual salary:	3.00	8.00	5.04	0.96	0.92	81

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Less than \$24,999	0.00%	0
2	\$25,000- \$34,999	0.00%	0
3	\$35,000- \$49,999	1.23%	1
4	\$50,000- \$74,999	34.57%	28
5	\$75,000-\$99,000	28.40%	23
6	\$100,000- \$149,999	32.10%	26
7	\$150,000- \$199,999	2.47%	2
8	\$200,000 or more	1.23%	1
	Total	100%	81

I have completed DITA Module 1: Introduction to Defense Investigations:

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	I have completed DITA Module 1: Introduction to Defense Investigations:	1.00	2.00	1.46	0.50	0.25	81

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	54.32%	44
2	No	45.68%	37
3	Not sure	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	81

I have completed DITA Module 2: Case Development and Procedure

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	I have completed DITA Module 2: Case Development and Procedure	1.00	3.00	1.41	0.52	0.27	81

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	60.49%	49
2	No	38.27%	31
3	Not sure	1.23%	1
	Total	100%	81

I have completed DITA Module 3: Communications for the Investigator

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	I have completed DITA Module 3: Communications for the Investigator	1.00	3.00	1.34	0.50	0.25	80

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	67.50%	54
2	No	31.25%	25
3	Not sure	1.25%	1
	Total	100%	80

I have completed DITA Module 4: Investigative Sciences and Technology

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	I have completed DITA Module 4: Investigative Sciences and Technology	1.00	2.00	1.35	0.48	0.23	80

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	65.00%	52
2	No	35.00%	28
3	Not sure	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	80

The program objectives were clearly defined.

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	The program objectives were clearly defined.	11.00	17.00	12.23	1.26	1.59	78

#	Answer	%	Count
11	Strongly agree	30.77%	24
12	Agree	39.74%	31
13	Somewhat agree	15.38%	12
14	Neither agree nor disagree	7.69%	6
15	Somewhat disagree	3.85%	3
16	Disagree	1.28%	1
17	Strongly disagree	1.28%	1
	Total	100%	78

The course materials were well organized.

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	The course materials were well organized.	18.00	24.00	19.28	1.15	1.33	78

#	Answer	%	Count
18	Strongly agree	24.36%	19
19	Agree	42.31%	33
20	Somewhat agree	23.08%	18
21	Neither agree nor disagree	3.85%	3
22	Somewhat disagree	5.13%	4
23	Disagree	0.00%	0
24	Strongly disagree	1.28%	1
	Total	100%	78

The material was relevant to my needs.

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	The material was relevant to my needs.	4.00	10.00	5.42	1.41	1.99	78

#	Answer	%	Count
4	Strongly agree	33.33%	26
5	Agree	24.36%	19
6	Somewhat agree	23.08%	18
7	Neither agree nor disagree	10.26%	8
8	Somewhat disagree	5.13%	4
9	Disagree	2.56%	2
10	Strongly disagree	1.28%	1
	Total	100%	78

The facilitators demonstrated a good understanding of the material.

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	The facilitators demonstrated a good understanding of the material.	4.00	8.00	4.71	0.88	0.77	78

#	Answer	%	Count
4	Strongly agree	50.00%	39
5	Agree	35.90%	28
6	Somewhat agree	8.97%	7
7	Neither agree nor disagree	3.85%	3
8	Somewhat disagree	1.28%	1
9	Disagree	0.00%	0
10	Strongly disagree	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	78

The final test for the module was a fair representation of the program content.

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	The final test for the module was a fair representation of the program content.	4.00	9.00	5.17	1.02	1.04	76

#	Answer	%	Count
4	Strongly agree	26.32%	20
5	Agree	43.42%	33
6	Somewhat agree	21.05%	16
7	Neither agree nor disagree	6.58%	5
8	Somewhat disagree	1.32%	1
9	Disagree	1.32%	1
10	Strongly disagree	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	76

The material was the right level of complexity for my background.

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	The material was the right level of complexity for my background.	4.00	10.00	5.85	1.59	2.51	78

#	Answer	%	Count
4	Strongly agree	28.21%	22
5	Agree	17.95%	14
6	Somewhat agree	19.23%	15
7	Neither agree nor disagree	16.67%	13
8	Somewhat disagree	12.82%	10
9	Disagree	3.85%	3
10	Strongly disagree	1.28%	1
	Total	100%	78

I enjoyed participating in the DITA module(s).

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	I enjoyed participating in the DITA module(s).	1.00	7.00	2.87	1.72	2.97	79

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Strongly agree	26.58%	21
2	Agree	26.58%	21
3	Somewhat agree	13.92%	11
4	Neither agree nor disagree	11.39%	9
5	Somewhat disagree	11.39%	9
6	Disagree	7.59%	6
7	Strongly disagree	2.53%	2
	Total	100%	79

This training was beneficial to my work as a criminal defense investigator.

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	This training was beneficial to my work as a criminal defense investigator.	1.00	6.00	2.20	1.25	1.55	79

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Strongly agree	37.97%	30
2	Agree	26.58%	21
3	Somewhat agree	20.25%	16
4	Neither agree nor disagree	8.86%	7
5	Somewhat disagree	5.06%	4
6	Disagree	1.27%	1
7	Strongly disagree	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	79

I would recommend this training to others.

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	I would recommend this training to others.	1.00	7.00	2.67	1.60	2.55	79

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Strongly agree	30.38%	24
2	Agree	22.78%	18
3	Somewhat agree	18.99%	15
4	Neither agree nor disagree	15.19%	12
5	Somewhat disagree	5.06%	4
6	Disagree	5.06%	4
7	Strongly disagree	2.53%	2
	Total	100%	79

Overall, I was satisfied with this training program.

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	Overall, I was satisfied with this training program.	1.00	7.00	2.76	1.65	2.71	79

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Strongly agree	30.38%	24
2	Agree	21.52%	17
3	Somewhat agree	15.19%	12
4	Neither agree nor disagree	17.72%	14
5	Somewhat disagree	7.59%	6
6	Disagree	5.06%	4
7	Strongly disagree	2.53%	2
	Total	100%	79

I learned the skills and information intended to be taught.

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	I learned the skills and information intended to be taught.	1.00	5.00	2.29	1.06	1.12	79

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Strongly agree	22.78%	18
2	Agree	43.04%	34
3	Somewhat agree	21.52%	17
4	Neither agree nor disagree	7.59%	6
5	Somewhat disagree	5.06%	4
6	Disagree	0.00%	0
7	Strongly disagree	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	79

Participation in this training enhanced my skills as a criminal defense investigator.

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	Participation in this training enhanced my skills as a criminal defense investigator.	1.00	7.00	2.78	1.62	2.62	79

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Strongly agree	30.38%	24
2	Agree	17.72%	14
3	Somewhat agree	20.25%	16
4	Neither agree nor disagree	15.19%	12
5	Somewhat disagree	8.86%	7
6	Disagree	6.33%	5
7	Strongly disagree	1.27%	1
	Total	100%	79

DITA assisted in preparing me for my future endeavors.

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	DITA assisted in preparing me for my future endeavors.	1.00	7.00	3.09	1.78	3.17	79

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Strongly agree	24.05%	19
2	Agree	18.99%	15
3	Somewhat agree	21.52%	17
4	Neither agree nor disagree	13.92%	11
5	Somewhat disagree	6.33%	5
6	Disagree	11.39%	9
7	Strongly disagree	3.80%	3
	Total	100%	79

I am able to apply the knowledge I learned to my everyday work.

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	I am able to apply the knowledge I learned to my everyday work.	1.00	6.00	2.65	1.36	1.85	79

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Strongly agree	27.85%	22
2	Agree	18.99%	15
3	Somewhat agree	25.32%	20
4	Neither agree nor disagree	18.99%	15
5	Somewhat disagree	6.33%	5
6	Disagree	2.53%	2
7	Strongly disagree	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	79

I often use the knowledge I learned in my everyday work.

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	I often use the knowledge I learned in my everyday work.	1.00	6.00	2.76	1.49	2.23	79

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Strongly agree	25.32%	20
2	Agree	24.05%	19
3	Somewhat agree	18.99%	15
4	Neither agree nor disagree	20.25%	16
5	Somewhat disagree	3.80%	3
6	Disagree	7.59%	6
7	Strongly disagree	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	79

The training style was conducive to learning. (Consider pace, delivery method, location, content, etc.)

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	The training style was conducive to learning. (Consider pace, delivery method, location, content, etc.)	1.00	7.00	3.62	1.84	3.40	79

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Strongly agree	15.19%	12
2	Agree	18.99%	15
3	Somewhat agree	16.46%	13
4	Neither agree nor disagree	12.66%	10
5	Somewhat disagree	17.72%	14
6	Disagree	12.66%	10
7	Strongly disagree	6.33%	5
	Total	100%	79

I feel supported and motivated to use the new skills I learned.

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	I feel supported and motivated to use the new skills I learned.	1.00	6.00	2.89	1.30	1.70	79

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Strongly agree	18.99%	15
2	Agree	21.52%	17
3	Somewhat agree	22.78%	18
4	Neither agree nor disagree	26.58%	21
5	Somewhat disagree	8.86%	7
6	Disagree	1.27%	1
7	Strongly disagree	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	79

I am able to transfer what I learned in this training to another person.

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	I am able to transfer what I learned in this training to another person.	1.00	6.00	2.67	1.43	2.04	79

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Strongly agree	29.11%	23
2	Agree	18.99%	15
3	Somewhat agree	21.52%	17
4	Neither agree nor disagree	20.25%	16
5	Somewhat disagree	6.33%	5
6	Disagree	3.80%	3
7	Strongly disagree	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	79

The quality of my work improved due to this training.

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	The quality of my work improved due to this training.	4.00	9.00	5.97	1.53	2.33	78

#	Answer	%	Count
4	Strongly agree	23.08%	18
5	Agree	19.23%	15
6	Somewhat agree	17.95%	14
7	Neither agree nor disagree	23.08%	18
8	Somewhat disagree	10.26%	8
9	Disagree	6.41%	5
10	Strongly disagree	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	78