

## Index

- A**  
Advertising–daily sale relationship  
forecast, 51–53  
Alliger, G. M., 9  
Armstrong, J., 53
- B**  
Basic control group design, 17–18  
Brinkerhoff, R. O., 6
- C**  
Case studies  
Crack Box, Inc., 87–89  
Federal Information Agency  
(FIA), 34–36  
First Bank, 2–5  
Global Financial Services, Inc.  
(GFS), 85–87  
Healthcare, Inc. (HI), 54–57  
International Software Company,  
41–43  
Micro Electronics, 53–54  
Midwest Electric, Inc., 36–40  
Multi-National, Inc., 90–92  
National Bank, 76–80  
National Book Company, 57–59  
National Computer Company  
(NCC), 102–105  
Public Bank of Malaysia, 89–90  
Retail Merchandise Company  
(RMC), 31–34  
Chain of impact, 7, 8–10  
Contaminated control groups,  
25–26  
Control group design  
basic, 17–18  
deciding which design to select, 21  
ideal experimental, 18–20  
posttest-only, 20–21  
threats to validity of, 15–17  
Control group issues  
ethical considerations, 23–24  
feasibility as, 29–31  
FSI case example of potential  
problems, 24–29  
practicality as, 22–23  
viability as, 22  
Control groups  
designing, 15–21  
Federal Information Agency  
(FIA) example of, 34–36  
frequency of use for isolating  
effects, 109–110  
International Software Company  
(ISC) example of, 41–43  
as isolating program effects  
technique, 6, 7–8  
isolation myth regarding use of,  
108  
issues when considering, 22–31  
Midwest Electric, Inc. example of,  
36–40

## 114 Index

- Control groups (*Continued*)  
 National Computer Company  
 (NCC) example of, 102–103  
 Retail Merchandise Company  
 (RMC) example of, 31–34  
*See also* Participants  
 Crack Box, Inc. case study, 87–89  
 Customer expert estimates, 6, 83,  
 94–95
- D**  
 Data  
 building credibility regarding,  
 111–114  
 control groups, 6, 7–8, 15–44  
 expert estimates, 6, 61–97  
 forecast method for, 6, 50–53  
 issues that affect credibility of, 114  
 trend line analysis, 6, 45, 46–50,  
 53–59  
 Dou, Z., 15  
 Dressler, D., 6
- E**  
 Ethical control group issue, 23–24  
 Expert estimates  
 Crack Box, Inc. example of, 87–89  
 of customers, 6, 83  
 demonstrating power of, 92–93  
 of focus groups, 63–66, 94–95  
 frequency of use for isolating  
 effects, 110  
 Global Financial Services, Inc.  
 (GFS) example of, 85–87  
 of immediate managers, 80–82, 94  
 isolating program effects using, 6,  
 61–62, 84  
 key issues in using, 95–96  
 Multi-National, Inc. example of,  
 90–92  
 National Computer Company  
 (NCC) example of, 104–105  
 of participants, 62–80, 93–94  
 Public Bank of Malaysia example  
 of, 89–90  
 research on power of, 92  
 of senior management, 82–83, 94
- F**  
 Feasibility control group issue,  
 29–31  
 Federal Information Agency (FIA)  
 case study, 34–36  
 Financial Services, Inc. (FSI),  
 24–26  
 First Bank case study, 2–5  
 Focus groups  
 participant estimates from, 63–64  
 steps for most credible estimates  
 from, 64–66  
 validity of estimates by, 94–95  
*See also* Participants  
 Forecast method  
 advertising–daily sales  
 relationship example of, 51–52  
 described, 45–46  
 disadvantages of, 52–53  
 frequency of use for isolating  
 effects, 110  
 isolating program effects using, 6  
 linear model of, 50  
 National Computer Company  
 (NCC) example of, 102–105
- G**  
 Glaton, F., 94–95  
 Global Financial Services, Inc.  
 (GFS) case study, 85–87
- H**  
 Healthcare, Inc. (HI) case study,  
 54–57  
 Hotel staff turnover trend line  
 analysis, 48–49
- I**  
 Ideal experimental control group  
 design, 18–20  
 Immediate manager estimates,  
 80–82, 94

- Impact of other factors, 10–12, 84–85
  - Improvement
    - First Bank case study identifying reasons for, 2–5
    - identifying other factors contributing to, 10–12
    - isolating program effects to identify reasons for, 1–12
    - isolation myth regarding, 108
  - International Software Company (ISC) case study, 41–43
  - Interviews, 74
  - Isolating program effects
    - building credibility regarding, 109–112
    - First Bank case study showing importance of, 2–5
    - matching exercise for, 99–102
    - myths related to, 107–109
    - preliminary issues in, 5–12
    - recognizing importance of, 1, 105–107
    - required to understand program's impact, 2
    - See also* Programs
  - Isolating program effects issues
    - identifying chain of impact, 8–10
    - identifying factors other than program, 10–12, 84–85
    - need to isolate program effects, 6–8
  - Isolating program effects techniques
    - control groups, 6, 7–8, 15–44, 102–103, 108, 110
    - expert estimates, 6, 61–97, 104–105, 108
    - forecast method, 6, 50–53, 110
    - frequency of use of specific, 110
    - listed, 6
    - National Computer Company (NCC) case study on different, 102–105
    - using multiple, 110–111
    - selecting the right, 109–110
    - trend line analysis, 6, 45, 46–50, 53–59, 103, 112
- J**
- Janak, E. A., 9
- K**
- Kaufman, R., 10
  - Keuler, D., 22
- L**
- Lee, N., 15
- M**
- Management
    - expert estimates from immediate, 80–82, 94
    - expert estimates from senior, 82–83, 94
    - isolation myth regarding, 108–109
  - Matching exercise, 99–102
  - Micro Electronics case study, 53–54
  - Midwest Electric, Inc., case study, 36–40
  - Mortality of participants, 16
  - Multi-National, Inc., case study, 90–92
- N**
- National Bank case study, 76–80
  - National Book Company case study, 57–59
  - National Computer Company (NCC) case study
    - using control group, 103
    - using expert estimates, 104–105
    - using mathematical forecasting, 103–104
    - using trend line analysis, 103
- O**
- Other factors impact, 10–12, 84–85

116 Index

**P**

- Participants
  - advantages/disadvantages of estimates from, 75–76
  - expert estimates from, 62–80, 93–94
  - interviews to obtain estimates from, 74
  - mortality of, 16
  - National Bank case study on estimates from, 76–80
  - questionnaires to obtain estimates from, 68–74
  - testing effects on, 16
  - See also* Control groups; Focus groups
- Phillips, J. J., 22, 34, 36, 40, 57, 89
- Phillips, P. P., 22, 34, 36, 40, 57, 89
- Posttest-only control group design, 20–21
- Practicality issue, 22–23
- Preskill, H., 6
- Programs
  - identifying chain of impact, 7, 8–10
  - identifying contribution of, 7
  - impact of factors other than, 10–12, 84–85
  - isolating program effects for understanding impact of, 2
  - See also* Isolating program effects
- Proving the Value of HR: ROI Case Studies* (Phillips and Phillips), 34, 36, 40, 57, 89
- Public Bank of Malaysia case study, 89–90

**Q**

- Questionnaires
  - examples of questions used in, 69–70
  - Guiding Principles used to create, 72–73

- participant estimates using, 68–74
- sample of input from, 71

**R**

- Retail Merchandise Company (RMC) case study, 31–34
- ROI Guiding Principles
  - for immediate managers' estimates, 81
  - for participant estimate questionnaire, 72–73
- ROI Methodology
  - Guiding Principles of, 72–73, 81
  - isolation as credibility issue in, 109–112
  - isolation as key issue for, 105–107
- Russ-Eft, D., 6

**S**

- Sale revenue trend line analysis, 47–48
- Salkind, N., 48
- Senior management estimates, 82–83, 94
- Sexual harassment trend line analysis, 54–57
- Shipment productivity trend line analysis, 57–59
- Stakeholder isolation myth, 108
- Surowiecki, J., 94, 95

**T**

- Testing effects, 16
- Time issue, 16
- Trend line analysis
  - conditions required for, 46, 49
  - described, 45–46
  - frequency of use for isolating effects, 110
  - guidelines for working with, 49–50
  - Healthcare, Inc. (HI) example of, 54–57

hotel staff turnover example of,  
48–49  
isolating program effects using, 6  
Micro Electronics example of,  
53–54  
National Book Company example  
of, 57–59  
National Computer Company  
(NCC) example of, 103–104  
sale revenue example of, 47–48  
True experimental control group  
design, 18

## V

### Validity

isolating program effects for study,  
109  
threats to control group, 15–17  
Verizon Communications, 22  
Viability issue, 22

## W

Wang, G., 15

*The Wisdom of Crowds:*  
(Surowiecki), 94

