

Name of the author:

Dr. Purvi Kothari

{HOD,B.com.,Honours}

PAPER ON:

**“Parameters for
measuring Effectiveness
OF A SOCIAL
PROGRAM”**

Email I.D.: purvi.kothari@ymail.com

FACULTY AT: Sir k.p. college of commerce ,Surat.

RESIDENTIAL ADD: 1/B, RUDRAVAN APT, ATHWALINES,SURAT.

CONTACT NO. : 09825658833.

INTRODUCTION:

Francis (Thomas Arthur L., 1976) contends that the basic reason that a social programs fails is not lack of the sorts of data traditionally provided by Accountants – Cost of providing these program or the market prices of their results, test of compliance, cost benefit, cost efficiency and cost effectiveness analysis and other tools of modern-management are some of the other reasons. However, the biggest problem in measuring social programs arises with lack of basic knowledge related to the working of social phenomena on the part of social program administrators. The social program administrators need to chew and digest the below mention criteria's to make a social programme effective.

- (1) What people's real needs are?
- (2) Why the problem being treated exists?
- (3) What the nature of the environment is in which the problem occurs?
- (4) What social program outputs actually are?
- (5) Which of the resulting benefits and detriments should be included in their evaluation?
- (6) How these should be weighed?
- (7) What time dimension should be used?

A thorough understanding of these will help to generate an effective social programme as these problems are the crux of any social programme. The researcher has explored various parameters for measuring effectiveness of a social prog. Confiding the study to teenagers behavioral change .The following parameters highlighted by authors were used by the researcher for the study.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

Four Parameters of Interest:

The problem of evaluating the effectiveness of a social programme or a "treatment" is a central problem in social science and in medicine as well. (Heckman James, Tobias Justin L. and Vytlacil Edward) The problem of selection bias could arise in any evaluation.

- Individuals observed participating in a programme or receiving treatment often possess different characteristics than an average person.
- Evaluating the economic return to a programme requires accounting for the nonrandom assignment of individuals into the treated and untreated states.

Gronau (1974) and Heckman (1974,1976) derive that individuals participate in a programme if net utility is positive (or non negative) and do not participate if net utility is negative.

Heckman James, Tobias Justin L. and Vytlacil Edward, 2001, focus on four treatment parameters that are commonly used for programme evaluation and effectiveness.

1. The Average treatment effect
2. The effect of treatment on the treated
3. The local average treatment effect
4. The marginal treatment effect

However, these parameters are used for advance statistical researches and are not applicable to a social program. That is why the researcher has not emphasized on these parameters for effective measurement:

Wiebe's Analysis (Kotler, Zaltman, 1971) for relative effectiveness of social programs denotes five major factors for effectiveness which were noted significant by the researcher:-

- (a) **The force :**

The force defines the intensity of a person's motivation towards the goal as a combination of his predisposition prior to the message and the stimulation of the message. This corresponds to the "Promotion of a Product" as stated by Lazarsfeld and Melton which act as an important parameter to measure effectiveness of a social programme. The force with which a behaviour change is advocated to the segment results into motivation and ultimately to the consumption of the behaviour.

(b) **The Direction:**

The direction refers to the knowledge of how or where the person might go to consummate his motivation. This responds to "Place" (Lazarsfeld and Melton) i.e. knowledge of availability from where the segment can purchase the advocated behaviour. Any social programme can be effective if the direction for motivation can be purchased easily.

(c) **The mechanism:**

The mechanism refers to existence of an agency that enables the person to translate his motivation into action. The existence of a "product" in a tangible or intangible form is very necessary for the purchaser. (Lazarsfeld and Melton) Hence, the mechanism advocated by Wiebe refers to a product that can be used to translate motivation into action.

(d) **Adequacy and compatibility:**

The adequacy and compatibility means the ability and effectiveness of the agency in performing its task. This resembles Lazarsfeld and Melton's idea of "Place and Price". The lesser the price and better the availability, the more salable is the behaviour. Hence, Wiebe emphasizes on adequacy and compatibility for increasing effectiveness of a social programme.

(e) **Distance :**

The distance signifies the audience member's estimate of the energy and cost required to consummate the motivation in relation to the reward. In a way, Wiebe's concept of distance counts upon the cost benefit analysis, where the purchaser prefers to buy a behaviour when the benefits exceed the cost of giving up a behaviour. Hence, Lazarsfeld and Melton's "Price" corresponds to the distance criteria proposed by Wiebe to measure the effectiveness of a social programme.

A parallel study has been conducted by Jonathan Cranes on measures of effectiveness of a social programme. Cranes outlined several test that social programme must pass in order to be considered successful. In addition to asking "**whether the benefits outweigh the costs of the programme evaluators must determine whether the programme has a statistically significant effect on the treatment group**" (Wagner Cynthia G., 1999). Keeping this in mind the researcher has tried to statistically measure the effectiveness of a social programme on a treatment group by conducting before and after study to get a clear preview of the change in the behaviour of the selected segment. The key questions which act as a thermometer to "**measures of effectiveness of a social programme**" are specified by Jonathan Cranes as:

1. The Magnitude of a Programs Effect:

A programme that works must have 'substantial' effect on the participants' lives. Unfortunately, the definition of what constitutes a substantial effect size is completely subjective. To put it in oxford terms "substantial" refers to the effect being of paramount or real importance or value of a considerable amount. However, assessing the substantial effect is very complicated and so the simple understanding explains that a vital effect should be created.

2 The longitivity of Impact of a Social Programme:

One of the simplest measures of effectiveness is the longitivity of memory which a programme creates on the minds of the participants. "The longer the effect, the more benefits the programme will generate." Cranes has however not specified approximate time duration to qualify for long-lasting effect.

3 The relationship of the evaluator to programme :

As the third dimension of measuring effectiveness, Cranes emphasizes on the relationship between the evaluator to the social programme. One of the biggest contributors to a social programme is the government. However, the government is often accused of implementing the programme without proper planning and organizing. As far as

social programmes are concerned Novelli (1980) points out that managers and planners for social programmes look for a panacea or a “quick fix” and may rush to launch a social programme with inflated “expectations”.

4 The replication of the programme and its results:

Further, Cranes opines that **“No matter how impressive the results no matter how good the study design and no matter how objective the researchers, a single evaluation of a single program is never enough to prove that it really works”**. Hence, to prove whether the social programme has been effective a number of evaluation criterias be prescribed

5 The effectiveness of a programme on larger scale:

The last dimension of effectiveness stated by Cranes relates to the **“beneficiary population”**. No social programme is designed for a single participant. The goal of every social programme is to cover the largest mass and get maximum co-operation in modifying or abstaining from behaviour. According to Cranes **“The ultimate goal of a social programme research is to develop good programme that can benefit lots of people”**. Hence, every social programme aims at creating impact on the mass and not on a single segment. Using all these criterias, the researcher conducted a detailed study on a social program –Traffic Week 2011, to measure its impact on the minds of teenagers

DATA ANALYSIS:

Paired Two Sample Z-test for Means for Teenagers

To measure the effectiveness of the social programme (traffic week celebration) the researcher selected a controlled group of teenagers and parent respondents covering major zones through reputed schools in each zone. The pre and post event respondents were matched and paired for greater accuracy. The impact of effectiveness can be measured by a final score of all the variables to assess the success or failure of traffic week. The time lag for the survey was also specific (a week before and a week after) and simultaneous for all the respondents, to confirm uniformity in the data collection process. After summing up of all the variables for each group of respondents for pre-post event, the researched applied t-test to find out the overall impact of the programme and measure the effectiveness of the social programme.

Hypothesis:

H_0 : There is no significant difference between pre and post event for awareness regarding traffic week celebration amongst the teenagers.

H_1 : There is a significant difference between pre and post event for awareness regarding raffic week celebration amongst the teenagers.

. Z-test: Two Sample Test

| | <i>Variable 1</i> | <i>Variable 2</i> |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Mean | 0.027522936 | 0.201834862 |
| Known Variance | 0.027013252 | 0.162589195 |
| Observations | 109 | 109 |
| Hypothesized Mean Difference | 0 | |
| Z | -4.179442772 | |
| P(Z<=z) one-tail | 1.46112E-05 | |
| z Critical one-tail | 1.644853627 | |
| P(Z<=z) two-tail | 2.92224E-05 | |
| z Critical two-tail | 1.959963985 | |

Conclusion: Here, P value is less than 0.05. So we reject Null Hypothesis at 5 percent level of significance..The p-value suggests that the increment in awareness regarding traffic week programme as a social campaign is significant for teenagers. This depicts that the efforts and investment put in by various intermediaries during this social campaign has been able to strike an impact on the teenagers.

Suggestions:

- The researcher suggests free check-ups as (eye check up, blood pressure, blood groups)etc for older and unfit drivers during this week to make the traffic week more successful. Underage and Unfit drivers be given more education and recommendations to alter their travel behavior. Licenses of unfit drivers should be withdrawn to avoid miseries. Special test and exams should be conducted for highway drivers. Senior citizens should be showcased in interviews reflecting ideas on how to change the current road scenario .Media coverage of accident survivors be highlighted and lessons learnt be shown. Blood donation camps be organized with the motto of collecting blood for accident struck. Emotional slogans be put on bill boards and banners and hoardings at visible points. Signing and talent competitions on self composed lyrics with the theme of “Let’s make life worth living” be organized. Instead of flowers and chocolates, band-aid and medical kits be distributed to emotionally activate the minds. A compulsory subject should be introduced in schools for teens to spread awareness which will benefit one and all in the long run.

On the whole the researcher feels that the traffic week should be celebrated as a “**Mega festival**” by lighting up the city as it is a celebration towards “**saving human lives**”.