

COUNCIL OF EUROPE'S STRATEGIES REGARDING HUMAN RIGHTS  
TRAINING EVALUATION PRACTICES:  
A MULTI-CASE STUDY

by

Andre Konze

Copyright 2019

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Organizational Management

University of Phoenix

The Dissertation Committee for Andre Konze certifies approval of the following  
dissertation:

COUNCIL OF EUROPE'S STRATEGIES REGARDING HUMAN RIGHTS TRAINING  
EVALUATION PRACTICES: A MULTI-CASE STUDY

Committee:

Bethany Mickahail, PhD, Chair

Judith Tanner, EdD, Committee Member

Josephine Hauer, EdD, Committee Member

*Bethany K. Mickahail, PhD, FRSA*

---

Bethany Mickahail

*Judith A. Tanner, EdD*

---

Judith Tanner

*Josephine Hauer*

---

Josephine Hauer

*Hinrich Eylers*

---

Hinrich Eylers, PhD  
Vice Provost, Doctoral Studies  
University of Phoenix

Date Approved: 5/15/2019

## ABSTRACT

The Council of Europe is an international organization that promotes and protects human rights. Leaders within the Council of Europe accentuated the importance of effective training and training evaluations since 1993, but human rights training evaluation for law enforcement officials is still not sufficient to promote and to protect human rights. Program managers of the Council of Europe organize and evaluate training for law enforcement officials, but many program managers do not apply the evaluation guidelines of the Council of Europe. Kirkpatrick's four-level evaluation model has gained a broad acceptance for evaluation of training programs. While the first and second level evaluations provide assessment for internal validity, behavior and result level evaluations show the external validity of the program. Phillips expanded Kirkpatrick's four-level framework by adding a fifth level Return of Investment (ROI). The leadership style used by the Council of Europe leaders determines their strategies. Transactional leadership might be appropriate to guide program managers to adhere to the evaluation guidelines. Transactional leadership defines a contingency-reward relationship between the leader and the followers, and program managers could be motivated through a system of rewards and punishments. Council of Europe leaders who follow the transformational leadership approach are more likely to lead their program managers effectively. Transformational leaders enhance followers' motivation to reform organizations. The qualitative multi-case study design supports the generation of an understanding of the effective strategies used by Council of Europe leaders to guide program managers on the utilization of the evaluation guidelines.

## DEDICATION

This is dedicated to my uncle Paul, who did not long live enough to see the day I got my doctorate and this even in the United States. Paul has been a godfather to me, and has been a patriot in the best sense of the meaning of that word. Paul served as a Marine in WWII and the Korean War. After that, Paul was able – together with his beloved wife, my aunt Barbara – despite backlashes and turmoil to build a successful company employing quite a number of people and making himself and my aunt a wealthy couple. Paul always believed in me and wanted me to be close to him. Paul was convinced that ignorance and lack of education are the roots of the evil in the world. I share this believe with him. I am not blind and see that I am privileged to have the means and the ability to work on and to finalize this degree. I also strongly believe – like Paul – that the desire to learn, to be open minded, and to be curious is not limited to those who have access to schools and to universities. I am proud to have been loved by Paul, and I am proud to dedicate this to him.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

No person achieves a doctoral degree alone, so I want to acknowledge those individuals who guided and accompanied me during my doctoral journey. Without them, I could not have made it. From the University of Phoenix site, I would like to mention my first Chair, Dr. Mary Weber, as she me at a stage where I was far away from there were I am currently are. She never gave up shaping my scientific way of thinking and writing, although I might have been a quite hopeless case at the beginning. After getting IRB approval, which I probably would never have gotten without her tough but human guidance, she needed to step down for health reasons. Dr. Mary, thank you for being my Chair.

Dr. Bethany Mickahail, who has been a Committee Member that time, stepped in without any hesitation rather as a natural Chair than as a replacement, and was – to my understanding – a perfect match at that time in that situation. Her personal interest in my study topic, her yearning to have me finalized my studies, and her factual support was an incredible motivation to get the study completed. Dr. Bethany Mickahail was even able to recommend my Committee Members Dr. Judith Tanner and Dr. Josefina Hauer. My thanks go to all three of them for their tremendous support and understanding.

Besides of guidance and support from the University side, there are three individuals who deserve to be acknowledged as there have always supporting me through their patience, understanding, and help. There is my partner Annette, who never articulated any doubt when I spent time and money working on my studies and even when travelling to residencies from Europe to Phoenix, AZ, I could be sure about her support. The second person who followed my studies and always has been interested was my

daughter Sarah, who during my studies married, became a mother, and achieved a PhD herself. The third one is my friend Soraya, who as a native speaker and a fellow student from my times at the University of Portsmouth, in the early years of my study, in endless sessions was working with me on writing and revising my proposal. Thank you all for still being there.

I have not forgotten all others who helped and supported me, like other family members, friends and University staff. Thank you all. I owe you a lot.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents	Page
List of Tables .....	xi
Chapter 1: Introduction .....	1
Background of the Problem .....	2
Problem Statement .....	3
Purpose Statement .....	4
Population and Sample .....	4
Nature of the Study .....	5
Research Question .....	7
Conceptual Framework .....	7
Significance of the Study .....	8
Definitions .....	9
Assumptions, Limitations, and Delimitations .....	10
Summary .....	12
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature.....	14
Title Searches .....	14
History of the Council of Europe .....	15
Training .....	17
Definition and Importance .....	17
Purpose and Methods .....	18
Law Enforcement Training .....	20
Training Evaluation .....	21

Definition and Importance .....	22
Kirkpatrick’s Evaluation Model .....	24
Phillips Evaluation Model .....	27
Leadership .....	28
Leadership Theories .....	29
Transactional Leadership .....	33
Transformational Leadership .....	33
Reflection on Training, Training Evaluation, and Leadership.....	34
Literature Review Summary .....	39
Chapter 3: Method .....	40
Research Method and Design Appropriateness .....	40
Research Design .....	43
Population.....	45
Sample and Sampling Method .....	45
Informed Consent and Confidentiality.....	47
Instrumentation.....	48
Interviews.....	48
Field Test.....	49
Interview Protocol.....	49
Data Collection.....	50
Interviewing .....	50
Collecting and Examining Documents .....	53
Data Analysis .....	54

Dependability and Trustworthiness .....	56
Credibility .....	56
Transferability .....	57
Dependability .....	57
Conformability .....	58
Triangulation .....	58
Summary.....	59
Chapter 4: Analysis and Results .....	61
Research Question.....	62
Data Collection.....	62
Demographics.....	64
Data Analysis .....	66
Results .....	105
Summary.....	107
Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations .....	108
Research Question.....	108
Discussion of Findings.....	108
Limitations.....	124
Recommendations to Council of Europe Leaders.....	125
Recommendations for Future Research.....	126
Summary.....	127
References .....	129
Appendix A: Interview Questions .....	152

Appendix B: Informed Consent .....	153
Appendix C: Withdraw from Study Participation .....	156
Appendix D: Confidentiality Statement.....	157
Appendix E: Email Notification .....	159
Appendix F: Certificate of Originality .....	160
Appendix G: NVivo 10TM© Analysis .....	161

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Steps of Kirkpatrick’s Four-Level Model and Philips Evaluation Model.....	28
Table 2: Litigations European Court of Human Rights from 2010 until 2018.....	92
Table 3: CPT visits 2017 and 2018.....	95

## Chapter 1

### Introduction

Leaders within the Council of Europe accentuated the importance of effective training and training evaluations since 1993, but human rights training evaluation for law enforcement officials is still not sufficient to promote and to protect human rights. The number of European Court of Human Rights' litigations indicates how law enforcement officials within the member states upheld human rights standards. The annual amount of €90,403,000 disbursed in 2017 for human rights protection and promotion did not decrease the number of litigations issued by the European Court of Human Rights originating from a lack of effective training evaluations. Council of Europe leaders need research providing information on how to ensure program managers follow the evaluation guidelines. Law enforcement officials who have participated in training improved by evaluation findings might demonstrate a higher adherence to human rights standards.

Chapter 1 includes the background of the problem, the problem statement, the purpose statement, and the population and sample. The nature of the study provides information about the chosen method and design followed by the research question. The conceptual framework presents training evaluation models. The significance of the study is to illustrate the value of training evaluation. Definitions, assumptions, limitations, and delimitations will follow. The summary recapitulates Chapter 1.

### **Background of the Problem**

The Council of Europe is an international organization that promotes and protects human rights through international conventions since 1949 (Council of Europe, 2015b).

The Parliamentary Assembly in 1993 articulated its deep concern about the resurgence of racism, xenophobia, and intolerance throughout Europe, and recommended the introduction of human rights training, including training evaluation findings (Council of Europe, 1993). The Parliamentary Assembly in 1997 recognized continued failures in applying human rights standards by law enforcement officials due to a lack of effective evaluation of training (Council of Europe, 1997).

Additionally, the Police and Human Rights Program of the Council of Europe has countered the human rights issues since 1997. The purpose of the program and its successors was to promote the development of police services that respect and protect the human rights of the public (Council of Europe, 1998). From 2004 to 2014, the Committee of Ministers and the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights continued to emphasize the need for training evaluation of legal professionals training to improve the application of the European Convention on Human Rights (Council of Europe, 2004; 2014a). The number of litigations instigated by the European Court of Human Rights concerning law enforcement between 2006 and 2016 increased from 347 to 643 (European Court of Human Rights 2007; European Court of Human Rights, 2016). The European Court of Human Rights stressed difficulties of state parties in executing certain judgments due to the scale, nature, or costs of the problems raised (European Court of Human Rights, 2015).

The Directorate of Internal Oversight (DIO) of the Council of Europe ascertains to what extent the Council of Europe interventions have been effective to protect and to promote human rights. The evaluation guidelines issued by the DIO prescribed training evaluations in a structured way using a systematic and an impartial approach. Utilizing

the evaluation guidelines aims to make evaluations credible and useful (Council of Europe, 2014).

Program managers of the Council of Europe organize and evaluate human rights training for law enforcement officials; however, many program managers do not apply the evaluation guidelines in training programs. Summative training evaluations as described in the evaluation guidelines may enhance the accountability of training, feed into management and decision-making processes, maximize the impact of the training provided, and drive organizational learning and innovation (Council of Europe Secretariat, 2014; Bloom, Hasting, & Madaus, 1971). Over the last 10 years, the annual budget spent by the Council of Europe and the European Commission for human rights protection increased to €90,403,000 in 2017 (Council of Europe, 2015a). The regulatory and financial resources to conduct summative training evaluations are available, but many program managers of the Council of Europe do not strictly follow the evaluation guidelines. Research indicates a need for a study to explore what effective strategies Council of Europe leaders use to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines.

### **Problem Statement**

The general problem is Council of Europe program managers fail to adhere to training evaluation guidelines increasing litigation issues. Although organizations spend billions of dollars on training program development, not all training programs are evaluated (Carnevale & Shulz, 1990). The number of litigations by the European Court of Human Rights concerning human rights violations committed by law enforcement officials increased between 2006 and 2016 from 347 to 643 (European Court of Human

Rights, 2007; European Court of Human Rights, 2017).

The specific problem is that some Council of Europe leaders lack effective strategies to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines. Organizations within the U.S. annually spend between \$55.3 and \$200 billion dollars on employee training (Bassi & Van Buren, 1999), yet only 10% of training programs are evaluated (Carnevale & Shulz, 1990). Despite evidence of the growing importance of training in contemporary organizations, few organizations evaluate their training programs in adequate ways (Nickols, 2005; Twitchel, Holten, & Trott, 2000). The assignment of 20% of the budget to evaluation processes makes noncompliance with the evaluation guidelines a jeopardy to the budgeting allocations of future funding to training of the Council of Europe (Council of Europe 2015; 2017e).

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the exploratory qualitative multi-case study was to explore what effective strategies Council of Leaders use to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines. The qualitative multi-case study design choice intended to generate an understanding of the effective strategies used by Council of Europe leaders to guide program managers on the utilization of the evaluation guidelines (Burns & Grove, 2011).

### **Population and Sample**

The population of the exploratory qualitative multi-case study included 30 Council of Europe leaders. These Council of Europe leaders work within the Human Rights Directorate and within the DIO and are responsible for training and the evaluation of human rights training for law enforcement officials (Council of Europe, 2017a; 2017d;

2017f). The Council of Europe leaders work at the headquarters of the Council of in Strasbourg/France. The sample includes 11 Council of Europe leaders in charge of training evaluation for human rights training (Council of Europe, 2017a; 2017d; 2017g; 2017f).

### **Nature of the Study**

The use of the qualitative method in the exploratory qualitative multi-case study is well established. Researchers use the qualitative method to generate significant descriptive data (Punch, 2005). The qualitative method requires perceiving social life as participants experience it (Punch, 2005). Data in the qualitative method are mostly written or spoken words (Bachmann & Schutt, 2015). Researchers utilizing qualitative methods reflexively identify their biases, values, and personal background (Locke, Spirduso, & Silverman, 2013). The richness of qualitative data produced might enable the researcher to explore what effective strategies the Council of Leaders use to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines (Bachman & Schutt, 2015).

Accordingly, the quantitative method has not be used for the exploratory qualitative multi-case study. The quantitative method, which measures independent and dependent variables for hypotheses testing, is experimental in nature, and establishes and analyzes variables with correlations, manipulation, and controls (Christensen, Johnson, & Turner, 2014). Quantitative methods, such as surveys and experiments, help record social life category amounts and variations numerically (Bachmann & Schutt, 2015). In quantitative research, the researcher assumes that physical and social reality is independent of those who observe it (Gall et al., 2007). Since hypotheses testing was not

used, the quantitative method was not appropriate for the exploratory qualitative multi-case study.

The exploratory qualitative multi-case study used a multi-case study design. A case study is an in-depth examination of individuals, organizations, or processes that seek further theoretical understanding and practical knowledge of some phenomenon (Bott, 2007). The advantage of the multi-case study is that it allows the researcher to explore real-life situations and test views directly in relation to phenomena as the views unfold in practice (Flyvbjerg, 2006). In the multi-case study design, the researcher acknowledges the value of collecting, integrating, and presenting data from a variety of evidence sources as part of any given study (Yin, 2014). The multi-case study explored the question of whether Council of Europe program managers adhere to the evaluation guidelines. Case study design has its own rigor and is different from quantitative methods and different from other qualitative designs (Bott, 2007).

The study did not use the qualitative designs of phenomenology, grounded theory, or ethnography. The phenomenological research design explores the lived experiences of participants (Smith, Flowers, & Larkin, 2009). The exploration of what effective strategies Council of Leaders use to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines did not use the qualitative designs of phenomenology, grounded theory, or ethnography. The researcher has not explored lived experiences of Council of Europe leaders. The intention of grounded theory research is to move beyond description and to generate a unified theoretical explanation (Corbin & Strauss, 2007). The purpose of the exploratory qualitative multi-case study was not to generate a theoretical explanation about why program managers fail to adhere to the

evaluation guidelines. The exploratory qualitative multi-case study did not use the grounded theory design. In ethnography, the researcher describes and interprets the shared and learned patterns of values, behaviors, beliefs, and language of a culture-sharing group (Harris, 1986). As no culture-sharing group is part of the study population, the ethnographical design was inappropriate for the exploratory qualitative multi-case study

### **Research Question**

The research question is: What effective strategies do Council of Leaders use to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines?

### **Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework for the exploratory qualitative multi-case study was the Kirkpatrick four-level model of training evaluation (Kirkpatrick, 1960), and Phillips' five-level evaluation model (Phillips, 1991). Kirkpatrick originally formulated his model in 1959 and further developed the model over subsequent decades. The Kirkpatrick model focuses on four levels described as reaction, learning, behavior, and results (Kirkpatrick, 1960). Reaction is a measure of what the delegates taught of an activity or program; learning is a measure of the learning of principles, facts, skills, and attitudes; behavior is a measure of changes in aspects of job performance; and results is a measure of the changes in the criteria of organizational effectiveness (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006). Kirkpatrick's model highlights the necessity of comprehensive training evaluation including participants' behavior change evaluation as opposed to a description of training and participants' immediate reactions to training (Kirkpatrick, 1996). Kirkpatrick's four

level model is appropriate for the exploratory qualitative multi-case study as it could serve as a framework for the evaluation of Council of Europe human rights training.

Phillips (1991) developed and expanded Kirkpatrick's four level framework by adjusting the four levels and adding a fifth level and added an action plan at the reaction evaluation level. Phillips completed the learning evaluation level with the statement that a positive assessment does not indicate that participants will apply what participants have learned once they are back to their workplaces (Phillips, 1991). Phillips renamed the behavior evaluation level into job applications. Participants applying what they have learned back on the job do not guarantee positive business results (Phillips, 1991). Phillips called Kirkpatrick's results evaluation level 'business results'. The return of investment (ROI) evaluation level includes and compares the budgets spent for the training program with the benefits gained through the training (Phillips, 1997). Phillips' five level model including the ROI evaluation level was appropriate for the exploratory qualitative multi-case study as it could serve as a framework for the evaluation of Council of Europe human rights training. The use of Phillips' five-level model alone would not be sufficient to serve as a conceptual framework. Kirkpatrick focuses on the four levels reaction, learning, behavior, and results (Kirkpatrick, 1960). Phillips (1991) concentrated on the ROI evaluation level.

### **Significance of the Study**

The significance of the exploratory qualitative multi-case study was founded in the importance to explore what effective strategies Council of Leaders use to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines. Aytes and Connolly (2004) suggested the inability to find a solution to encourage compliance,

means leaders may have to force employees to comply. The exploratory qualitative multi-case study aimed to provide leaders with effective strategies to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines. Leaders in intergovernmental organizations financed by member states are accountable for the thorough management of the organization as the member states expect a return of investment.

Member states of the Council of Europe participating in human rights training programs depend on summative evaluations to assess the impact on human rights observance by law enforcement officials. Aside from Council of Europe leaders, the participants and member states may benefit from improvements of effective strategies ensuring adherence to the evaluation guidelines. The findings of the qualitative multi-case study provide useful insights for leaders in other criminal justice organizations responsible for human rights training, such as the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE, 2012). The outcomes of the exploratory qualitative multi-case study also influence other organizations with similar goals as the Council of Europe to promote organizational learning.

### **Definitions**

The definitions help readers understand the terms and eliminate vagueness. Further, the definitions serve as a guideline to standardize the understanding of terms and the terms' accurate use:

### **Evaluation Guidelines**

The evaluation guidelines present operating procedures and working methods for evaluations within the Council of Europe. The application of procedures and methods

throughout training evaluation might standardize the application of evaluation processes and assure the quality of training evaluations (Council of Europe Secretariat, 2014).

### **Council of Europe Leaders**

Council of Europe leaders are leaders within the Human Rights Directorate of the Council of Europe who supervise program managers, trainers, or experts organizing, performing, and evaluating human rights training for law enforcement officials (Council of Europe, 2017d). Council of Europe leaders also include personnel within the DIO responsible for training and training evaluation of human rights training for law enforcement officials (Council of Europe, 2017a; 2017d; 2017f).

### **Training**

Training is the systematic acquisition of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that together lead to improved performance in a specific environment (Salas et al., 1997). Training helps employees to acquire capabilities to perform on employees' present jobs (Selden, 2009).

### **Training Evaluation**

Training evaluation is examining a training program. Training evaluation assesses whether a training program has had the desired effects (John, 2012).

### **Assumptions, Limitations, and Delimitations**

Assumptions are things not under the control of a researcher (Simon, 2011). The first assumption of the exploratory qualitative multi-case study was that Council of Europe leaders have considerable experience in their respective role. Council of Europe leaders get their positions only after working a significant time within the organization and have acquired substantial experience.

The second assumption was that the function and the role within the organization influence the perspective of the participants of the study. Council of Europe leaders responsible for human rights training and training evaluations may lack the necessary depth of self-reflection when being interviewed. The lack of depth may be aggravated if program managers under their supervision do not adhere to the evaluation guidelines. The third assumption was that the participants in the study are honest and objective in answering questions about their effective strategies ensuring that program managers of human rights training comply with the evaluation guidelines. The researcher assured participants, in writing, of the confidentiality of their feedback to reduce any potential for hesitation or dishonesty in responses to the questions (Holland, 2007). The fourth assumption was that participants would comprehend the questions and the concepts discussed in the questions.

Limitations are potential weaknesses of the exploratory qualitative multi-case study and are not under the control of a researcher (Simon, 2011). The limitations in case study design include issues of reliability, validity, and generalizability (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015). The self-reported feedback, honesty, social desirability, and recollections of the participants could limit the reliability of the data in the exploratory qualitative multi-case study. The participants are Council of Europe leaders with responsibility for training evaluation. Self-rating bias were likely, as individuals tend to exaggerate their expertise and character (Goh, Lee, & Salleh, 2009). The Directorate for Human Rights and the DIO within the Council of Europe contains 30 leaders. The second limitation might be the number of Council of Europe leaders that have considerable experience in their responsibility for training evaluation. The third limitation was the researcher had a

limited amount of time to travel to the Council of Europe and perform the interviews.

The researcher must safeguard that his personal and occupational planning would allow him to take the time necessary for completing the interviews as foreseen in the Dissertation Proposal.

Delimitations are characteristics that limit the scope of the study (Simon, 2011). Delimitations define the boundaries of the study and under the control of the researcher (Simon, 2011). The exploratory qualitative multi-case study was delimited to leaders responsible for human rights training and training evaluation. The geographic location of the participants represents a delimitation. The participants were located at the headquarters of the Council of Europe in Strasbourg/France. Council of Europe leaders working in Council of Europe offices within the member states are not included in the study. Another delimitation was that data collection was delimited to participants' responses at a single point of time. Time constraints of the research do not allow a longitudinal approach of the exploratory qualitative multi-case study.

### **Summary**

Chapter 1 included an explanation that program managers of the Council of Europe do not fully comply with the evaluation guidelines, do not conduct adequate evaluations, and do not produce or disseminate summative evaluation reports. Despite the budget of €90,403,000 spent in 2017 for human rights protection, human rights training for law enforcement officials are still not sufficient to promote and to protect human rights within the member states of the Council of Europe. Effective training for all law enforcement officials and application of the European Court of Human Rights case law within the member states could lead to a reduction of applications to the European

Court of Human Rights. The researcher explored what effective strategies Council of Europe leaders use to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines.

Chapter 2 contains the review of the literature. The introduction provides information about the literature, databases, key words, and libraries where the researcher located and retrieved the reviewed sources. After the introduction, the analysis of the history of the topic follows. An intense review of literature about training, training evaluation and leadership is included in Chapter 2. A reflection on training, training evaluation, and leadership will conclude the previous review. Chapter 2 closes with a summary.

## Chapter 2

### Literature Review

The purpose of the exploratory qualitative multi-case study was to explore what effective strategies Council of Leaders use to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines. Chapter 2 provides the literature review, which was required to present relevant and credible literature specific to the research topic (Randolph, 2009). Chapter 2 consists of five sections: (a) title searches, (b) history of the Council of Europe, (c) training, (d) training evaluation, (e) reflection on training, training evaluation, and leadership, and (f) literature review summary.

#### **Title Searches**

The literature review was not an exhaustive search on all studies and research on the research topic, but it is a selective erudite review of the study subject (Kucan, 2011). The literature review process included the use of multiple databases including EBSCOhost, Emerald, ProQuest, SAGE, and Google Scholar. Critical phrases and terms allowed assembling as many relevant sources as possible. Title searches were conducted using the keywords *training*, *training evaluation*, *evaluation of training*, *program evaluation*, *training outcomes*, *transfer of training*, *training assessment*, *leadership*, *leadership theories*, and *leadership and training evaluation*. The literature review for the exploratory qualitative multi-case study also contains sources provided by the Council of Europe and by the European Court of Human Rights. The 111 references included 45 sources published since 2008. The literature search consisted of using sources primarily from 2000 to 2018 except for sources used adding a historical perspective. The literature review included 44 books, 49 peer-reviewed articles, 10 sources from the Council of

Europe and the European Court of Human Rights, three dissertations, and five reports sourced from the web. The literature review followed the funnel approach described in many literature reviews (Creswell, 2014). The funnel approach moves from general topics to specific topics, and includes peer-reviewed articles, dissertations, books, and other publications.

### **History of the Council of Europe**

The Council of Europe is an international organization established in 1949 to promote democracy, human rights, and the rule of law within its 47 member states through international conventions (Council of Europe, 2015b). The Council of Europe is distinct from the European Union although the 28-member states of the European Union are also member states of the Council of Europe (Council of Europe, 2015b). After WWII, the countries belonging to the Western part of Europe successively entered the Council of Europe and had the values of human rights and the belief in the rule of law in common. The collapse of the communist regimes in Europe in the early 1990s paved the way for former communist countries to join the Council of Europe as member states (Council of Europe, 2015b).

Therefore, the Council of Europe contains countries with a long history of democracy, and others that have not fully internalized democracy, human rights, and the rule of law (Council of Europe, 2015b). Respect for human rights through law enforcement officials is indispensable for a police service to gain the trust of citizens (Harris, 2006). The Police and Human Rights Program of the Council of Europe was launched in 1997 and had the vision to promote the development of police services that respect and protect the human rights of the public (Council of Europe, 1998). The

successive Police and Human Rights–Beyond 2000 Program was discontinued and now integrates police training within human rights training for legal professionals within the Human Rights Directorate of the Council of Europe (Council of Europe, 2017d).

The Parliamentary Assembly consisting of parliamentarians from the national parliaments of the member states in 1993 articulated its deep concern about the resurgence of racism, xenophobia, and intolerance in law enforcement throughout Europe. The Parliamentary Assembly recommended introducing human rights training including training evaluation findings for law enforcement officials (Council of Europe, 1993; 2014b). The Parliamentary Assembly in 1997 recognized continued failures of law enforcement officials in applying human rights standards instigated through a lack of effective evaluation of training (Council of Europe, 1997). The Committee of Ministers, consisting of the ministers for foreign affairs of the member states, and the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights worked together from 2004 to 2014. They continued to emphasize the need for training evaluation of law enforcement human rights training to improve the application of the European Convention on Human Rights (Council of Europe, 2004; 2014a; Committee of Ministers, 2015).

Furthermore, the number of litigations issued through the European Court of Human Rights concerning law enforcement violations of human rights between 2006 and 2016 increased from 347 to 643 (European Court of Human Rights 2007; 2016). The European Court of Human Rights stressed difficulties of state parties in executing certain judgments due to the scale, nature, or costs of the problems raised (European Court of Human Rights, 2015). The need for valid and reliable outcome evaluations of law enforcement human rights training has increased as effective training has a substantial

impact on the success of an organization (Pineda, 2010). As the Council of Europe became more mature since its launch in 1949, leadership and leadership theories evolved over time (Bass, 1990). Council of Europe leaders use different leadership styles and strategies to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines.

## **Training**

Training is an organizations' approach to enhance employees' knowledge, skills and attitudes, and to improve individual, team, and organizational effectiveness (Shenge, 2014). Training allows organizations to compete in a changing environment, and to plan and design activities to accomplish the perceived goals of the organization (Krishnaveni & Sripirabaa, 2008). Training eliminates deficiencies and in turn reduces mistakes, errors, defects, and waste (Nickols, 2005). Training is not itself a solution to a performance problem (Nickols, 2005).

### **Definition and Importance**

There are manifold definitions of training in the literature. Aguinis and Kraiger (2009) defined training as the systematic approach to affecting individuals' knowledge, skills, and attitudes in order to improve individual, team, and organizational effectiveness. Salas, Cannon-Bowers, and Kozlowski (1997) described training as the acquisition of knowledge, skills, and competencies because of the teaching of vocational or practical skills, and knowledge that relates to specific competencies (Salas et al., 1997). The focus of training is on providing employees with specific skills, or supporting employees' efforts to correct deficiencies in their performance (Gomez-Mejia et al., 2016). Training increases upward mobility within the organization, adjusts workers to

the technological changes affecting the workplace, and introduces people to the world of work at the entry level (Deutsch, 1979).

Training includes the expansion of the individual's knowledge, skills, and attitudes (Reilly, 2006). Training is a human resources departmental activity closely related to increasing or maintaining the productivity of employees (Klinger et al., 2016). Werther and Chandler (2011) explained that training is an integrative system, which requires a high level of collaboration among various human resource management activities. Training is a short-term organizational concern, which involves helping employees to execute their jobs (Werther & Chandler, 2011).

### **Purpose and Methods**

Training serves several masters and purposes (Nickols, 2005). One purpose of training is to increase affective organizational commitment through its link to increase job scope (Mc Elroy, 2001). Another purpose of training is to enable employees to perform better for the organization on present jobs (Nadler, 1979). Training supports employees to acquire capabilities to carry out on their posts (Selden, 2009). Training gives new employees orientation, provides recognition for excellent achievement, provides motivation if poor performance occurs, corrects poor work habits, identifies potential disciplinary action, reduces absenteeism, reduces turnover, and overcomes resistance to change (Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 2001).

Effective training can increase performance, improve morale, and raise organizations' potentials (Miller, 2012; Gomez-Mejia et al., 2016). Organization training activities should encompass the entire career of a person and may support developing the employee for upcoming tasks (Reilly, 2006). Other purposes of training include focusing

energy on issues, making work and issues visible, supporting other interventions, legitimizing issues, promoting change, reducing risk, creating a community based on some shared experience, building teams, indoctrinating new staff, and communicating and disseminating knowledge and information (Nickols, 2005). Training aims at certifying and licensing, rewarding past performance, and developing skills (Nickols, 2005).

The selection of training methods regarding training content is important to achieve better training outcomes (Tannenbaum & Yukl, 1992). A very common training method is *on-the-job training* (Mitchell, 1987). On-the-job training allows trainees obtaining the necessary knowledge and skills for the job by working with a qualified employee or supervisor. On-the-job training supports an easy transfer of training (May et al., 1987). *Mentoring* occurs when a senior individual in terms of age and experience undertakes to provide information, advice, and emotional support to a junior person in a relationship lasting over an extended period of time (Rosenbach, 1993). Mentoring has a psychological function including encouragement, counseling, and coaching. Mentoring has a career facilitation function containing promotion or assignments in different positions (Yukl, 2002).

*Job rotation* allows trainees to become acquainted with different aspects of the job by working in different departments of an organization for a specific period (Yukl, 2002). Lecture is a simple and effective way of transferring theoretical and large amounts of knowledge to trainees. During lectures, trainees are in a passive position and do not actively participate in the training (May et al., 1987). Participative methods are more effective for developing attitudes, behaviors, and skills of trainees than lectures (Goldstein 1986). *Simulation-based training methods* combine with other teaching

methods (Tannenbaum & Yukl, 1992), and have three elements: a set of roles, a scenario, and an accounting system. The use of simulation-based training methods in business, education, military, and police training programs aids acquisition of knowledge, skills, and attitudes (Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 2001). *Role-play* is a simulation training method (Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 2001). Role-play can be an effective way of learning through which trainees behave and think in a situation as if they are real people (Wexley, 1984). Trainees play roles in a real or imaginary case, and discover their own behaviors and others' reactions (Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 2001).

*Case study* as another simulation method is an influential technique applicable to managerial behavior and decision-making skills (Wexley, 1984; Yukl, 2002) with trainees given a written case of organizational problem. A case study allows trainees to solve complex problems, and tolerate other viewpoints and opinions by demanding active involvement of participants (Yukl, 2002). The training method *sensitivity training groups* includes the investigation of interpersonal relations among group members, and can be distinguished into a stranger group, a cousin's group, and a family group (Goldstein, 1986).

### **Law Enforcement Training**

Within the last 50 years, police training contained shooting, defensive tactics, mechanics of arrest, and several other topics (Walker, 1996). From the 1840s until the early 1900s, police work and police training was characterized by 'watchman style' policing (Frazer, 2013). Police officer recruits learned procedures on the job (Alpert & Dunham, 1997). Police departments did not properly vet police recruits, and left training to seasoned police officers in the field. Beginning in the early 1900s, police corruption

led to reform, and the introduction of legalistic policing. Legalistic policing included basic training of police officers (Alpert & Dunham, 1997). Police training still varied widely by state, agency, and budget availability. Unsatisfactory police training left a part of the recruits insufficiently prepared for police work (Alpert & Dunham, 1997). Police training in the early 1900s focused on the technical and mechanical aspects of acquiring skills, such as marksmanship, driving skills, and defensive tactics (Alpert & Dunham, 1997), while neglecting communication and problem solving (Birzer & Tannehill, 2001).

Current policing and police training emphasize the importance of cultural diversity, communications, crime prevention, and problem solving (Johnson, 2015). One approach focusing on cultural diversity, crime prevention, and problem solving is community-oriented policing. Academicians and practitioners consider community-oriented policing the answer to crime and disorder problems, as well as police-community conflict (Rosenbaum & Luigio, 1998; Hunter-Johnson, 2012). Training is necessary for community policing to reach its full potential (King & Lab, 2000; Senna & Siegel, 2002; Zhao, Thurman, & Lovrich, 1995). Law enforcement training has achieved its own space in the broader sphere of training and development within recent decades (Chappell, 2008; Johnson, 2015).

### **Training Evaluation**

Training evaluation is a systematic process of collecting data to determine if training is effective (Goldstein & Ford, 2002). Organizations spend remarkable parts of their budgets on training in order to facilitate employees' learning of job-related competencies (Casio, 2000). As a result of the financial investments organizations make in training, it is essential to provide evidence that training efforts are being realized

(Casio, 2000). Training evaluation is concerned with the gathering, analyzing, and presentation of accurate information to support decision-making (Senel, 2014). Training evaluation has traditionally occurred in rather narrow and distinct terms, as either formative or summative (Alkin, 1970).

### **Definition and Importance**

Bramley (2005) described training evaluations as a process for establishing the value of training, and Ford and Sinha (2008) defined training evaluations as a collection of descriptive and judgmental information to make effective training decisions. Moss (1968) explained training evaluation as attributing differences between actual and comparative outcomes to program characteristics under different conditions of student characteristics and other intervening influences and making a judgment about the value of the program characteristics.

Gibbons (2004) summarized key issues on the evaluation of training activities. Doing training evaluation consumes valuable time and resources, as any effort to evaluate is complex (Rothwell, 2005). Managers and organizations should care about the effectiveness of training and training evaluation because many training programs fail to deliver the expected organizational benefits (Rothwell, 2005; Kaur & Bhatia, 2013). Many organizations do not thoroughly evaluate training events and many program managers are not actively involved in the process of evaluating training and development. Gibbons (2004) further observed that organizations oppose spending time on evaluation on the basis that it would cost too much. Training is often not optimized (Gibbons, 2004).

Training evaluation involves the collection, analysis, and presentation of information about a learning program and its consequences. Training evaluation supports decision-making and determines the worth of a training program (Griffin, 2012). Effective training evaluation requires knowledge about the reasons and the purpose of the training (Robinson & Robinson, 1989; Griffin, 2012). Training evaluation should consider the effect of training on resources, as well as the social, political, and economic external system (Griffin, 2012). Training evaluation must be comparative through comparing actual and expected outcomes (Senel, 2014).

Efficiency and effectiveness validate training because any training program can be improved (Kirkpatrick, 1994). Evaluating a training program is necessary for the improvement of the program, for making a decision to continue it, or for justifying the value of training to leaders (Kirkpatrick, 1994; Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006). “The purpose of evaluation is to provide information that will enable decision-makers to reach decisions about alternatives” (Alkin, 1970, p.11). Training evaluation is a systematic process of collecting information for and about a training activity (Certo & Certo, 2006). The collected information can be used for guiding decision making, for assessing the course, the progress, and if the objectives of the training have been met (Certo & Certo, 2006).

Training evaluation is not merely an activity at the end of the training program, it is an on-going process throughout the training (Certo & Certo, 2006). After the training program concludes, management should assess the effectiveness of the training (Certo & Certo, 2006). Training programs represent an investment that includes production loss, trainer and trainee time, and materials (Phillips & Phillips, 2016). Management should

evaluate the training program to determine if it meets the objectives of the design and if a reasonable return was achieved (Phillips & Phillips, 2009; 2016).

Training evaluation poses a problem for many trainers, program managers, executives, and other professionals with an interest in training (Kirkpatrick, 1959; 1998). The consequences of poorly conceived and haphazardly implemented training contribute to the problem (Rothwell, 2005). The minimization of the importance of integrating training with organizational strategy, assessing learning needs, ensuring the transfer of training from instructional to work settings, evaluating training results, and achieving performance gains and productivity are the consequences (Rothwell, 2005).

### **Kirkpatrick's Evaluation Model**

Kirkpatrick's four-level model is one of the most used models to measure the impact of the training (Bates, 2004), and includes four levels of evaluation criteria:

- Step 1: Reaction;
- Step 2: Learning;
- Step 3: Behavior;
- Step 4: Results (Kirkpatrick, 1959).

Kirkpatrick has made modifications over time on the guidelines of the four levels, but the main content of the four levels of the model remained the same (Kirkpatrick, 1996).

**Reaction.** The first step of Kirkpatrick's evaluation model is measuring reactions including the participants' satisfaction with the training program (Curado & Teixeira, 2014). Kirkpatrick (1976) defined reaction as how well the trainees perceived the training program and assumed the reaction measurement presents the participants' levels of

motivation, interests, attention, and reveals how the trainees feel about the program (Smidt et al., 2009). Evaluation procedures in level 1 include participants' immediate feedback through written comments or the use of a questionnaire (Curado & Teixeira, 2014).

At level 1, evaluation routines develop a standard method to measure the instant reactions toward the defined standards (Curado & Teixeira, 2014). Instant reactions are important and measure the satisfaction of customers but are limited because instant reactions do not measure participants' learning; the improvement of participants' performance at work; or the contribution of the training programs to the organization's productivity. Phillips and Phillips (2009) recommended the evaluation of each training program at level 1, as trainees who enjoyed a training program will more likely give a greater effort to learn (Kirkpatrick, 1976).

**Learning.** Level 2 evaluations assess the difference in knowledge, skills, principles, and attitudes of participants after the training program (Phillips & Phillips, 2009; Curado & Teixeira, 2014). Training evaluation at level 2 displays the degree to which trainees acquired the facts, techniques, procedures or processes presented in the training program (Kirkpatrick, 1994). Evaluation procedures in level 2 include pre- and post-tests; and the use of written tests to assess knowledge and attitudes (Curado & Teixeira, 2014). Level 2 evaluation involves performance tests to assess skills. The use of a control group who did not receive training to compare with a group that participated to the program may be helpful for a level 2 evaluation (Curado & Teixeira, 2014).

**Behavior.** Level 3 evaluation aims to determine the ability of the trainees in applying the learned skills and knowledge in the work environment (Smidt et al., 2009).

Behavior evaluation assesses changes in on-the-job behavior and implications in the workplace presented by trainees after the training program (Curado & Teixeira, 2014). Assessing the change in behavior is the most difficult and probably the most demanding evaluation and requires a more scientific approach for controlling other variables than level 1 or 2 evaluations (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006). The success of a training program is dependent on if the participants apply or do not apply what they have learnt. Such a success can be evaluated if the measurement is conducted before and after the training (pre- and post-tests) (Curado & Teixeira, 2014).

If pre- and post-tests are not feasible, evaluation should be conducted after the program and different practices in the participants' behavior should be observed (Curado & Teixeira, 2014). If no behavior change can be recognized, it might be due to participants' dissatisfaction with the program (level 1), or a failure to accomplish the learning objectives (level 2), or to factors beyond the scope of the program (McLean & Moss, 2003). Organizational conditions like transfer climate or supervisor's support may also affect training success (Burke & Baldwin, 1999; Chiaburu et al., 2010).

**Results.** Level 4 evaluation assesses changes in organizations' results in terms of performance deriving from improvements presented by trainees after the training program. Result evaluation requires considering numerous dimensions of performance and several factors that potentially contributed to differences in the organization's performance. Such dimensions may include a decreased turnover rate, working conditions upgrading, product quality improvement, waste reduction, sales increase, reduction in time to market, cost reduction, or benefits enhancement (Curado & Teixeira, 2014). Level 4 evaluation should be preferably carried out when assessing highly

important or very costly training programs (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006) Level 4 evaluation contains assessing results and pre- and post-tests (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006).

The successive evaluation of level 1 to level 4 measures the training efficiency (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006). Each level is a more accurate and representative measurement of the training efficiency and demands a more precise and lengthier analysis (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006). The four criteria are determined according to an increasing order of value of information (Kirkpatrick, 1979). Although all four categories of criteria are important, most organizations do not conduct training evaluation including all four steps (Newstrom, 1978). Evaluation becomes more difficult, complicated, and expensive as it progresses from level 1 to level 4 (Kirkpatrick, 1996). Evaluation on the last two steps is highly difficult, because of the challenges of separating other alternative explanations (Stokking, 1996).

### **Phillips' Evaluation Model**

Phillips' five-level Return of Investment (ROI) framework has been used in business to ascertain the value of an investment in financial terms. Phillips' framework – in principle - is like Kirkpatrick's four-level framework (Phillips, 1991). However, Phillips expanded Kirkpatrick's four-level framework by adding a fifth level ROI (Phillips, 1991). The calculation of ROI shows value, in financial terms, of a training investment (Phillips, 1991). The levels of Phillips' framework are (a) reaction and planned action; (b) learning; (c) job application; (d) business results; and (d) return on investment. Level one, reaction and planned action, is similar to Kirkpatrick's level 1 but also includes a plan of what participants anticipate applying from the program. The fifth

level of Phillips' model adds the cost-benefit analysis that is essential to calculate ROI (Phillips, 1996a; 2002). Another component of Phillips's five-level framework is the step to isolate the effects of training (Phillips, 1996b). Other influences or factors may contribute to improved performance (Davidove, 1993). The lack of a control group will invalidate the step to isolate the effects of training (Benson & Powell, 2015). Other methods are available to determine the cause and effect relationship, which will provide a credible ROI calculation (Phillips, 1997). The five-level framework provides a way to present immaterial data not converted to monetary value (Phillips, 1997; Shelton & Alliger, 1993).

Table 1

*Steps of Kirkpatrick's Four-Level Model and Philips Evaluation Model*

Model	Step	Content
Kirkpatrick's four-level model	Reaction	Evaluate trainees' reaction
Kirkpatrick's four level model	Learning	Evaluate what and how much trainees learned from the training
Kirkpatrick's four level model	Behavior	Evaluate how training affects trainees' behavior in their jobs
Kirkpatrick's four level model	Results	Evaluate business results of training
Phillips' addition	Return of Investment	Measure training results in monetary terms

### **Leadership**

Leadership in organizations became much more important and difficult than in the past (Yukl, 2002). Studies of leadership have been an essential part of the literature on organizational behavior and management for several decades (Yukl, 2002). Leadership

research is multidisciplinary. The concept of leadership is a topic of study in psychology, sociology, management, political science, public administration, and other professions (Yukls, 2002). Researchers, depending on individual perspectives, developed leadership theories (Day & Antonakis, 2012). A specific and widely accepted definition of leadership does not, and may never; exist given the complex nature of leadership (Day & Antonakis, 2012). Leadership is one most observed and least understood phenomena (Burns, 1978).

Yukl (2002) scrutinized leadership in terms of individual's traits, leader behavior, interaction patterns, role relationships, follower perceptions, influence over followers, influence on task goals, and influence on organization culture. Bolden and Gosling (2006) identified four common themes in leadership studies as process, influence, group context, and goal attainment (Bolden & Gosling, 2006). Northouse (2010) identified different ways of conceptualizing leadership: as the focus of group process, personality perspective, act or behavior perspective, a power relationship, transformational process, and skills perspective (Northouse, 2010). Stogdill (1974) identified eleven perspectives in defining leadership. Such perspectives of leadership are elucidated as the focus of group process, as an issue of personality, as the art of inducing compliance, influence, as a matter of behavior, as a form of persuasion, as a power relation, as an instrument to achieve goals, as an effect of interaction, as a differentiated role, and structure.

### **Leadership Theories**

A person can be a leader without being a manager and a person can be a manager without being a leader (Yukl, 2002). Managers and leaders have different values and personalities. While managers value for efficiency, stability, and order, leaders value for flexibility, adaptation, and innovation (Zaleznik, 2004). "Managers are people who do

things right and leaders are individuals who do the right thing” (Bennis & Nanus, 1985, p.21). The primary distinction between leadership and management is that while leaders influence commitment, managers are interested in task responsibilities through using their authority (Yukl, 2002).

The *trait-based leadership approach* claims that an individual achieved leadership status is a function of his personality (Van Wart, 2005). “The trait perspective suggested that certain individuals possess innate or inborn characteristics or qualities that make them leaders, and it is these qualities that differentiate them from non-leaders” (Northouse, 2008, p. 4). Leaders have innate strengths making them capable of driving positive organizational actions (Wren, 1995). From a leadership standpoint, strengths include the positive traits that enhance the leader’s ability to succeed. The traits theories asserted leaders’ characteristics are different from those of non-leaders (Wren, 1995). Bass (1990) explained the theory traditional traits were inborn or inherited qualities of the individual (Bass, 1990). The trait approach goes back to the great man theory (Bass, 1990).

Thomas Carlyle, Francis Galton, and Friedrich Nietzsche argued the history of the world was determined by the personal characteristics of great men, such as Caesar, Napoleon, George Washington, or Winston Churchill (Bass, 1990; Spotts 1974). Until the 1950s, the perspective leadership depends on the personal qualities of the leader influenced the early decades of leadership research (Judge et al., 2002). Findings of early studies concluded the most common traits of leaders were physical and constitutional factors, intelligence, self-confidence, sociability, will-initiative, persistence, ambition, dominance, talkativeness, enthusiasm, alertness, and originality (Spotts, 1974). Many researchers discarded the trait-based approach as findings suggested leadership is not a matter of

passive states or of the mere possession of certain combination of traits (Stogdill, 1948).

The trait based leadership approach is insufficient to explain leadership and leader effectiveness (Zaccora, 2007). Council of Europe leaders cannot use the trait approach to develop strategies ensuring that program managers adhere to the evaluation guidelines.

*Behavioral approaches* appeared as the consequences of researchers' dissatisfaction over the inconsistency of results with traits and leadership (Day & Antonakis, 2012). The underlying assumption of behavioral theories is that a leader's behavior induces some specific and measurable behaviors in the followers. The behavioral approach or style approach focuses on what leaders do and how they act. The behavioral approach views task behaviors and relationship behaviors of leaders important for effective leadership. The hierarchical taxonomy of leadership behaviors contains three dimensions: task-oriented behaviors, relations-oriented behaviors, and change-oriented behaviors (Yukl, 2002). The behavioral approach is not appropriate for Council of Europe leaders to guide program managers on the use of the evaluation guidelines.

*Relations-oriented leadership* behaviors include providing support and encouragement, recognizing worthy contributions, providing coaching and mentoring, consulting with others about decisions, empowering and delegating, encouraging cooperation and teamwork (Yukl, 2002). *Change-oriented leadership* behaviors include conducting external monitoring, explaining the urgent need for change, articulating an inspiring vision, encouraging innovative thinking, facilitating collective learning, taking risk to promote change, and implementing necessary change (Yukl & Lepsinger, 2005). Neither relations-oriented leadership nor change-oriented leadership support the use of strategies ensuring that program managers adhere to the evaluation guidelines by Council

of Europe leaders.

The need for leadership competencies arose from constant environmental and organizational change (Martin, 2011). Trait and behavioral approaches to leadership provide a universal set of typical leader characteristics. *Competency approaches* to leadership development and assessment have become widespread over years (Bolden & Gosling, 2006; Ennis 2008). Task-related competencies including knowledge, skills, abilities, and interpersonal competencies are fundamental to (Bass, 1990). “A competency model is a descriptive tool that identifies the competencies needed to operate in a specific role within a job, occupation, or organization” (Ennis, 2008, p. 5). Competency approaches are not appropriate for Council of Europe leaders, as the leaders do not identify the competencies of program managers to adhere to the evaluation guidelines.

The *contingency leadership* approach emerged as scholars failed to identify the set of leader behaviors and traits able to ensure leadership effectiveness in all situations (Daft & Lane, 2008). The basic assumption of the contingency theory asserts an effective leadership behavior may become ineffective under certain circumstances (Daft & Lane, 2008). The effectiveness of leadership behavior is contingent upon organizational situations (Daft & Lane, 2008). *Situational leadership approaches* purport that situational demands and situational factors determine who will emerge as leader (Bass, 1990). Situational leadership conceptualizes directive and supportive dimensions for leadership, and such dimensions apply in a given situation (Northouse, 2010). Situational contingency theories assume that the effective leadership style used in different situations is identifiable; where the human and material resources, the nature of task, the relations between leader and follower, and other environmental factors are key variables (Hollander

& Offermann, 1993). Successful leaders modify leadership patterns through considering various situational constraints such as type of organization, subordinates' characteristics, and nature of the problem (Miner, 2005). The contingency leadership approach cannot be used by Council of Leaders to develop strategies ensuring that program managers adhere to the evaluation guidelines, as the leaders do not modify leadership patterns.

### **Transactional Leadership**

The transactional leadership style first appeared in descriptions by Bass in 1981 (Burns, 2010). The transactional leadership theory views the leader-follower relation as a sequence of transactions and exchanges between the leader and the followers.

Transactional leaders focus on an exchange of resources (Burns, 2010). A transactional leader-follower relationship includes rewards or punishments, respectively, to compensate followers' compliance and efforts to achieve organizational goals, or followers' failure to meet the leader's goals (Burns, 1978). Transactional leadership is often referred to as command-and-control type leadership (Burns, 2010). Transactional leadership has been the typical type of leadership used in organizations, the military, and government service (Burns, 2010). Transactional leadership might be appropriate for Council of Europe to guide program managers to adhere to the evaluation guidelines.

### **Transformational Leadership**

Burns (1978) introduced and defined transforming leadership as a process whereby leaders and followers support each other to achieve a higher level of moral and motivation. Burns further explained that transforming leaders should be able to generate considerable change in the life of people, organizations, and communities (Burns, 1978). Transforming leaders possess the traits, personality, and characteristics to articulate energized vision and

challenging goals (Burns, 1978). Bass (1985) at the State University New York extended the work of Burns and used the term “transformational” instead of “transforming” to explain the psychological mechanism of the transformational leadership. Bass suggested that transactional and transformational leadership are separate concepts and that good leaders demonstrate characteristics of both (Bass, 1985).

Burns (1978) and Bass (1985) stated that transformational leaders respond to followers’ moral values and enhance their motivation and energies to reform organizations. Charismatic and transformational leadership models also see certain personal characteristics as the determinant of effective leadership (Zaccaro, 2007). The five big personality traits including agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, extraversion, and openness to experience are related to the emergence of transformational leadership (Judge & Bono, 2000). Council of Europe leaders should generate considerable change in the adherence of program managers to the evaluation guidelines when using transformational leadership.

### **Reflection on Training, Training Evaluation, and Leadership**

The importance of training has increased enormously, and contemporary organizations are paying more attention to training than in the past (Rafiq, 2015). Training developed into strategic training, as it is serving long- term strategic organizational goal (Rafiq, 2015). Previously, training was considered an expenditure, but modern training serves in the role of an investment activity (Sanders, 2011). Training is a permanent process and planning put effectiveness in training, together with trainees’ selection, administrative support, venue, moderator, and contents of training (Karen, 1996). Organizations need employees with updated skills and knowledge, which can only

be achieved through training (Byrne, 1999). Organizations compete with multinational or international organizations (Aguinis & Kraiger, 2009). Training is needed to improve individuals' skills, but also the capabilities of the whole team and the overall organization (Aguinis & Kraiger, 2009). There is a link between organizational performance and training and development (Niazi, 2011).

Training evaluation is the systematic approach to collect relevant information and raises the meaning of the training (Rafiq, 2015). Judgmental and descriptive information is obtained through training evaluation (Rafiq, 2015). Training evaluation generates the information for decision-making about participants, training methods, and training contents (Rafiq, 2015). Training evaluation is necessary for justification of investment, serves the improvement for future training programs, and helps discover whether objectives of the training were met (Rafiq, 2015).

The primary role of evaluation is to answer formative and summative questions (Moss, 1968). Trainers conduct formative evaluation to understand if the program operates as originally planned and tries to explain how the program may improve (Moss, 1968). Formative evaluation uses process criteria for evaluating training processes (Donnelly & Fitzmaurice, 2005). Formative evaluation is part of the teaching process rather than the evaluation process (Donnelly & Fitzmaurice, 2005). The goal of summative evaluation is to determine the outcome of the training program as it relates to the overall effectiveness of training (Moss, 1968). Although formative evaluation assesses if the program complies with the planning, the successful implementation of a designed program does not mean that summative evaluation is unnecessary (Goldstein, 1986). Summative evaluation contributes to deciding whether to continue or discontinue

the program, while formative evaluation contributes to the decision of which aspects of the training program can be improved (Parker, 1984).

Many evaluation models exist. The most popular model is Kirkpatrick four-level model (Bates, 2004). Initially developed in 1959 to identify the likeness and reaction of training programs by participants, the four-level model has gained a broad acceptance for evaluation of training and development programs (Bates, 2004). The most obvious reason for the popularity of Kirkpatrick's model is the four-level model is simple, easy to understand, and systematic (Alliger et al., 1997; McLean & Moss, 2003). The language of the model is clear, and the model helps training professionals to understand evaluation in a systematic way (Bates, 2004). Any organization can apply the four-level procedures and techniques (Kirkpatrick, 1976). While the first and second level evaluations provide assessment for internal validity of the training program, behavior and result level evaluations show the external validity of the program (Steensma & Groeneveld, 2010).

Cunha, Rego, Cunha, Cardoso, Marques, and Gomes (2010) criticized Kirkpatrick's model for being predicated on a hermetic and sequential logic, and on the assumption of an inter-level causation including the more people are satisfied with the training, the more they will learn (Cunha et al., 2010). Previously, Bates (2004) had asserted that the four-level model presents an oversimplified view of training effectiveness. Such an oversimplified view does not consider individual or contextual influences in the evaluation of training. Bates (2004) added that Kirkpatrick's model assumes that the levels of criteria represent a causal chain such that positive reactions lead to greater learning. Another criticism is that Kirkpatrick's model assumes that each level of evaluation provides data that is more informative than the last (Bates, 2004).

Other limitations claimed by Yamnill and McClean (2001) relate to the fact that the Kirkpatrick's model lacks the theory to elucidate the desire of trainees to change their performance after attending training. Yamnill and McClean (2001) also questioned what type of training design and organizational environment lead to the successful transfer of training. Holton (1996) argued that the four-level model is not a model, but rather a taxonomy of training outcomes.

Transactional leadership is labeled better management rather than a school of leadership in adhering to definitions of leadership (Burns, 2010). Transactional leadership defines a contingency-reward relationship between the leader and the follower (Burns, 2010). The transactional leader could have either active or passive attributes (Burns, 2010). The active or passive attributes describe how the two categories of leaders execute management by exception functionality (Molero et al., 2007). Transactional leadership includes four dimensions for attaining desired performance levels of followers. These dimensions are (a) contingent rewards, (b) active management by exception, (c) passive management by exception, and (d) laissez faire (Schermerhorn, 2011). Transactional leaders focus their leadership on motivating followers through a system of rewards and punishments (Burns, 2010).

Transformational leadership facilitates a redefinition of a people's mission and vision, a renewal of leaders' commitment and restructuring their systems for goal accomplishments (Bass, 1985). The four common I's of transformational leadership are idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual motivation, and individualized consideration.

- Idealized influence is about building confidence and trust and providing a role model that followers seek to emulate.
- Inspirational motivation is related to idealized influence but whereas charisma is held to motivate individuals, inspirational leadership is about motivating the entire organization.
- Intellectual stimulation involves arousing and changing followers' awareness of problems and followers' capacity to solve such problems.
- Individualized consideration involves responding to the specific, unique needs of followers to ensure they are included in the transformation process of the organization (Bass, 1985; Grant, 2015).

The grounding of transformational leadership in moral foundations makes it best suited for leaders willing to develop effective strategies to safeguard the evaluation guidelines and ensure effective training evaluations (Bass, 1985).

The purpose of the exploratory qualitative multi-case study was to explore what effective strategies Council of Europe leaders use to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines. The strategies used by Council of Europe leaders are determined by the leadership style utilized by the leaders.

Transactional leadership might be appropriate to guide program managers to adhere to the evaluation guidelines as this leadership style defines a contingency-reward relationship between the leader and the followers (Molero et al., 2007). Program managers can be motivated through a system of rewards and punishments (Burns, 2010). However, Council of Europe leaders following the transformational leadership approach would likely have more success leading program managers to adhere to the evaluation guidelines.

Transformational leaders enhance followers' motivation and energies to reform organizations (Bass, 1985). Transformational leaders initiate a redefinition of program managers' vision and commitment for their goal accomplishments (Bass, 1985).

### **Literature Review Summary**

The Council of Europe with 47 member states contains countries with a long history of democracy and 19 member states that have not fully internalized democracy, human rights, and the rule of law. Such countries have not incorporated a human rights culture throughout their criminal justice system. Without respecting human rights, the police in countries in transition are less likely to have the full trust of the public. The Police and Human Rights Program of the Council of Europe had the vision to promote the development of police services that respect and protect the human rights of the public. The need for valid and reliable outcome evaluations has increased, but leaders of the Council of Europe still have no access to data or information about the training transfer to the behavior of trained law enforcement officials. The Council of Europe developed and implemented evaluation guidelines. Using the evaluation guidelines will make evaluations credible, useful, and will generate an inclusive and a participatory evaluation process to increase training effectiveness. Effective training for all professionals would encourage the use of the European Court of Human Rights case law within the member states and result in a reduction of the number of applications to the European Court of Human Rights.

As leadership and leadership theories evolved, leadership in organizations became more important and difficult than in the past. Council of Europe leaders use different leadership styles to influence program managers to safeguard the use of the evaluation guidelines. The most promising leadership style to achieve the use of the evaluation

guidelines is transformational leadership. Transformational leadership facilitates a redefinition of followers' vision, a renewal of followers' commitment, and restructures followers' systems for goal accomplishments. Transformational leadership is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation, while including idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual motivation, and individualized consideration.

The exploratory qualitative multi-case study aimed to explore the effective strategies Council of Leaders use to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines. Law enforcement human rights training activities use a reaction measurement. Reaction measurement assesses how people felt about the training program they attended and is a limited training evaluation that gives only small feedback about the success of a training program. Law enforcement human rights training need to evaluate participants' training reaction, learning, behavior, and results. Council of Europe leaders should use a suitable leadership style to safeguard that program managers use the evaluation guidelines to make evaluations credible and useful. Today, no research is available that explores what effective strategies Council of Leaders use to ensure that program managers of human rights training apply the evaluation guidelines.

## Chapter 3

### Research Methodology

The purpose of the exploratory qualitative multi-case study was to explore what effective strategies Council of Leaders use to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines. The general problem was that Council of Europe program managers fail to adhere to the evaluation guidelines resulting in litigations of the European Court of Human Rights. Using training evaluation according to the evaluation guidelines would heighten the accountability of training. The specific problem is: Council of Europe leaders lack effective strategies to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines. The exploratory qualitative multi-case study research question is: What effective strategies do Council of Leaders use to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines? In Chapter 3, the researcher addresses the method and the design guiding the study. The researcher presents the population, sample, and instrumentation for data collection. The researcher further explains data collection and analysis, dependability and trustworthiness. The researcher concludes Chapter 3 with a summary.

#### **Research Method and Design Appropriateness**

The exploratory qualitative multi-case study used a qualitative methodology. Researchers use the qualitative method to explore the unique views of a small sample (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992; Starman, 2013). Qualitative research is acceptable to increase the understanding behind situations and occurrences (Gall et al., 2007). Researchers use qualitative studies to examine thoughts, feelings, values, and distinct perspectives of groups or individuals (Burns & Grove, 2011). The qualitative method has been an

emerging and interpretive method for investigating individuals or situations in a natural environment to discover individual perspectives and strategies (Yilmaz, 2013). The qualitative method was appropriate to explore what effective strategies Council of Leaders use to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines.

The quantitative method was not used for the study. The quantitative method is a method testing hypotheses and using variables and statistical analysis to determine the internal and external validity, reliability, and objectivity (Marczyk et al., 2005; Yilmaz, 2013). The key component of quantitative research is the quantifiable and generalizable nature of the results (Marczyk et al., 2005; Yilmaz, 2013). Council of Europe leaders' effective strategies cannot be explored through testing hypotheses. The quantitative method was not appropriate for the proposed study.

The study did not use a mixed methodology. Using the mixed method, the researcher mixes quantitative and qualitative research techniques into a single study. Quantitative data, qualitative data, and the hypotheses are integrated into the mixed method study (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2006). The mixed method was not appropriate to explore what effective strategies Council of Europe leaders use to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines. The best approach for the research study was the qualitative method.

There are numerous examples that show the appropriateness of a qualitative study exploring the acceptance of organizational provisions through employees. Atamuru (2016) demonstrated that that employee disengagement and the resultant attrition adversely affect companies' growth and business performance. Positive employee

engagement translates into behaviors supportive of organizational performance and results in improved business outcomes to strengthen competitiveness in the global manufacturing environment (Atamuru, 2016). Van Alstine (2010) in his qualitative study summarized that leadership, administrative support, and co-workers are the top factors affecting employees' decisions to remain motivated. If the leadership does not make a genuine effort to further investigate and address factors affecting motivation, no realistic systemic change can be expected (Van Alstine, 2010). Rowe (2015), using the qualitative method, showed that sentiments against change were mostly accompanied by a sense of anguish over new policies or changes in the company due to poorly described method changes or insufficient attention from direct supervisors and management staff. Employees who received clear explanations for recent company policies or advancements felt happy and invited the changes with excitement or at least a neutral feeling of contentment with their job performance (Rowe, 2015). Using the qualitative method allows the researcher to explore what effective strategies Council of Leaders use to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines.

### **Research Design**

The study used the exploratory multi-case study design. The case study approach allows the researcher to investigate a contemporary phenomenon in depth and its real-world context (Yin, 2014). Researchers use case study design to analyze programs, events, or groups of individuals from a rigorous perspective (Yin, 2014). The case study design could be evaluative, explanatory, descriptive, or exploratory. The evaluative case study is a psychology, assessment, or evidence-based approach (Yin, 2014). Through the

explanatory case study design, the researcher accurately describes and explains the situation (Yin, 2014). The researcher who employs the descriptive case study starts with a descriptive theory (Tellis, 1997). The use of exploratory case studies allows the researcher to determine the value of conducting a research study (Yin, 2014). The holistic approach of the exploratory case study supports exploring the effective strategies that Council of Europe leaders use to ensure that program managers adhere to the evaluation guidelines (Yin, 2014). The study was a multi-case study.

The value of the case study design was demonstrated in case studies on noncompliance with organizational provisions and leadership. Smith (2017) in her qualitative case study explored the conditions influencing employee compliance to an organization's information security policies. Smith (2017) found that even competent employees may encounter problems adhering to specific processes for completing a task, if employees are not instructed on what the organization requires of them (Smith, 2017). Aytes and Connolly (2004), applying the case study design, posited a lack of compliance when program managers understand the consequences of noncompliance do not affect program managers personally. Leaders may have to force employees to comply. D'Arcy, Hovav, and Galletta (2009) used the case study design to explore whether the decision of program managers to comply with policies are based on the program managers' moral commitment to the organization.

Researcher use the ethnography design to study people and their behavior in a cultural setting (Roberts, 2013). The ethnography design is not appropriate for the study, as the exploratory qualitative multi-case study does not involve exploring a group in a cultural-sharing setting. In addition, researchers use the phenomenology design to

explore a phenomenon in human nature through the lived experience of a small number of participants (Smith, Flowers, & Larkin, 2009; Donalek, 2004). The phenomenology design was not appropriate for the exploratory qualitative multi-case study since understanding the lived experience of the participants would not have answered the central research question. Researchers use the grounded theory design to develop theories to explain research data (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Field & Morse, 1985). The grounded theory design was not appropriate for the exploratory qualitative multi-case study since discovering or generating a theory will not answer the central research question.

### **Population**

A population is the entire group of individuals or items that share one or more characteristics, used to gather and analyze data (Simon & Goes, 2012). The population of the proposed multi-case study was Council of Europe leaders within the Human Rights Directorate and within the DIO. Council of Europe leaders are responsible for training and training evaluation of human rights training for law enforcement officials (Council of Europe, 2017a; 2017d; 2017f). The number of Council of Europe leaders within the Human Rights Directorate and within the DIO is 30 (Council of Europe, 2017a; 2017d; 2017g; 2017f). The population of the study consists of 30 Council of Europe leaders.

### **Sample and Sampling Method**

Participants of a study represent a sample of some larger population to which the researcher wishes to generalize her or his findings (Cone & Foster, 2006). There are no set sample sizes in qualitative research, but Mason (2010) explained guidelines for sample sizes in ethnography between 30 and 50 interviews, in grounded theory between

20 and 50 interviews, and in phenomenology between five and 25 interviews. Mason (2010) believed qualitative research should not go lower than 15 participants. In case study research, the researcher should follow the principle described as selection to the point of redundancy (Guba & Lincoln, 1994; Mason, 2010). Data collection through interviewing should be concluded when little new information appears to be forthcoming from additional instances (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). The researcher interviewed up to 10 participants in the proposed exploratory multi-case study.

The sample size must be sufficient to reach data saturation (Fusch & Ness, 2015). Failure to reach data saturation has an impact on the quality of the research conducted and hampers content validity (Fusch & Ness, 2015). Data saturation is reached when there is enough information to replicate the study, when the ability to obtain additional new information has been attained, and when further coding is not feasible (Fusch & Ness, 2015). The exploratory qualitative multi-case study achieved data saturation when no new data were presented. To confirm data saturation, two more interviews were conducted to meet confirmability of data saturation (Fusch & Ness, 2015).

For the exploratory qualitative multi-case study, the researcher used purposive sampling with a predetermined criterion of importance (Yin, 2014). Purposive sampling is a process researchers use to obtain samples through qualitative research, and is determined through the research question (Yin, 2014). The expertise of the population was the basis for the choice of individuals in the proposed study (Berg & Lune, 2012).

Further, personal knowledge about the population and the organization is suitable to establish predetermined criteria of importance to handpick experts for purposive samples (Polit & Hungler, 2008). The predetermined criterion of importance is that the

participating leaders serve at least three years in their current function. The researcher also gathered supplemental information to see how closely the participants match the characteristics of the population (Cone & Foster, 2006). The researcher obtained the information about the participants from the organization chart of the Council of Europe, as the participants were, or have to be, in charge for law enforcement human rights training. The researcher recruited the sample of 11 Council of Europe leaders for the exploratory multi-case study from the Headquarters of Council of Europe in Strasbourg/France serving within the Human Rights Directorate (Council of Europe, 2017d), and the DIO (Council of Europe, 2017a; 2017f). The interviews were conducted in English, as English is an official language of the Council of Europe (Council of Europe, 2017d).

### **Informed Consent and Confidentiality**

Participants of the study must obtain satisfactory information about the proposed study before such participants can make an informed decision (Yin, 2014). Following the field test, study participants learned about the study through email notification sent to their Council of Europe email account (Appendix E). The email contained information about the study topic, informed consent, participant expectations, steps to withdraw from the study, and contact information. Before the interview, participants received a copy of the informed consent (Appendix B) to read, review, understand, and sign before participating. The informed consent contained the purpose of the exploratory qualitative multi-case study. The letter advised participants about the potential for risks inherent in any research study.

The researcher must protect participant identities in recordings and written

information (Yin, 2014). All identifying participant information on the audio recordings and throughout the analysis and reporting process were protected through pseudonyms. The pseudonyms only include the word interviewee and an actual name, i.e. interviewee Alan. The master list of participants, the assigned pseudonyms, and the transcripts will remain in a locked safety deposit box at the researcher's house for three years.

Each participant received a copy of the transcribed and revised interview. The participants made their remarks in handwriting on the document provided by the interviewer. Following transcription approval, destruction of all audio recordings by means of demagnetization occurred. At the end of three years, destruction of all remaining study material by shredding will occur. Interview sessions were not video recorded to maintain participant confidentiality. To increase participant confidentiality, the researcher conducted and transcribed the interview sessions. The interviewer signed the confidentiality statement (Appendix D). If desired, the participants may receive a summary of the study findings following defense of the research study.

## **Instrumentation**

### **Interviews**

The researcher developed the interview questions based on the research question. The interview questions are related to what effective strategies Council of Europe leaders use to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines and serve as a guideline for the proposed multi-case study (Appendix A). The researcher functioned as the interviewer. The interviewer elicited responses from each respective interviewee (Yin, 2014). Semi-structured formats are common in qualitative case studies (Yin, 2014). The semi-structured format allows intense communication with

each participant and provides the flexibility to pursue a rich description based on participant responses (Christensen et al., 2014). The researcher used semi-structured questions.

### **Field Test**

The field test was an important first step in the interview process (Yin, 2014). The researcher conducted the field test with three Council of Europe leaders who supervise program managers performing and evaluating law enforcement human rights training. The researcher knew the participants of the field test as leaders who supervise program managers performing and evaluating law enforcement human rights training. These participants were not part of the original study (Seidman, 2013).

### **Interview Protocol**

The researcher used an interview protocol in the exploratory qualitative multi-case study for asking questions and recording answers during a qualitative interview (Castillo-Montoya, 2016). The interviewer recorded information from interviews by making handwritten notes and by audiotaping (Castillo-Montoya, 2016). Seidman (2013) recommended taking notes even if an interview is taped in the event that recording equipment fails. The interview protocol of the proposed study included the following components:

- A heading comprising date, place, interviewer, and pseudonyms assigned for the participants
- Instructions for the interviewer to follow
- The interview questions
- A thank-you statement to acknowledge the time the participant spent during the

interview was included in the interview protocol.

- A log kept by the researcher that would work well for primary and secondary data (Seidman, 2013).

### **Data Collection**

The researcher gathers data for qualitative studies through words or images and collects data from a few individuals or sites (Seidman, 2013). Researchers conducting a qualitative case study should show an in-depth understanding of the case (Seidman, 2013). The case study design is an in-depth examination of individuals, organizations, or processes that seek further theoretical understanding and practical knowledge of some phenomenon (Bott, 2007). The phenomenon of the exploratory qualitative multi-case study included effective strategies Council of Europe leaders use to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines. The exploratory case study design achieved a holistic analysis of problems through including several forms of qualitative data (Finn & Kohler, 2010). For the exploratory qualitative multi-case study, the researcher interviewed participants, reviewed documents including litigations of the European Court of Human Rights (European Court of Human Rights, 2017b), and evaluated reports issued by the DIO (Council of Europe, 2017b; 2017c; 2017f; Yin, 2014).

### **Interviewing**

The interview collection process comprises four important research aspects: Role of the researcher, informed consent, confidentiality, and ethics (Marczyk et al., 2005; Yin, 2014).

**Role of the researcher.** The researcher has extensive knowledge of the Council

of Europe human rights training programs for law enforcement officials. The researcher was program manager of the Police and Human Rights Program from 2006 throughout 2009, and was responsible for organizing, performing, and evaluating human rights training activities. A lack of rigor caused by the bias and the emotional attachment of the researcher could be a consequence (Yin, 2014). To reduce bias and increase the likelihood of honest responses, no participant will be interviewed who worked together with the researcher on training evaluation. The interviewer made notes on the process of participant selection (Yin, 2014). The notes included the reasoning why the participant did not work together with the interviewer between 2006 and 2009. To reduce interviewer bias, the interviewer did not interject personal opinions during the interviews (Yin, 2014). Field-testing of the interview questions minimized researcher bias and helped safeguard interview questions did not lead to an anticipated result of the study (Yin, 2014).

**Informed consent.** Participants of the study obtained satisfactory information about the proposed study before such participants made an informed decision (Yin, 2014). Following the field test, study participants learned about the study through email notification sent to their Council of Europe email account (Appendix E). The email contained information about the study topic, informed consent, participant expectations, steps to withdraw from the study, and contact information. Before the interview, participants received a copy of the informed consent (Appendix B) to read, review, understand, and sign before participating. The informed consent contained the purpose of the exploratory qualitative multi-case study. The letter advised participants about the potential for risks inherent in any research study. The informed consent contained six

specific participant responsibilities: (a) participation and withdrawal without consequences, (b) the promise of confidentiality, (c) study parameters, (d) audio recording permission, (e) storage and destruction procedures, and (f) the possibility of study publication. During the interview, participants received a copy of the Notice of Participant Intent to Withdraw form (Appendix C). Participants learned about withdrawal procedures and that withdrawal could occur at any time during the study. If a participant withdrew from the study, all information provided during or before the interview and participation would have been excluded from the proposed study and destroyed by burning, and demagnetization. No participant withdrew from the exploratory qualitative multi-case study.

**Confidentiality.** The researcher must protect participant identities in recordings and written information (Yin, 2014). All identifying participant information on the audio recordings and throughout the analysis and reporting process were replaced with pseudonyms. The pseudonyms include the word participants and an actual name, i.e. participant Alan. The master list of participants, the assigned pseudonyms, and the transcripts will remain in a locked safety deposit box at the researcher's house for three years. Each participant received a copy of the transcribed and revised interview. The participants made their remarks in handwriting on the document provided by the interviewer. Following transcription approval, destruction of all audio recordings by means of demagnetization occurred. At the end of three years, destruction of all remaining study material by shredding will occur. Interview sessions were not video recorded to maintain participant confidentiality. To increase participant confidentiality, the researcher conducted and transcribed the interview sessions. The interviewer signed

the confidentiality statement (Appendix D). If desired, the participants may receive a summary of the study findings following defense of the research study.

**Ethics.** The protection of human rights is essential in human subject research. Researchers have to exercise caution to do no harm physically, emotionally, or psychologically to study participants (Townsend et al., 2010). Harm could arise from deceptive practices, data misinterpretation or misrepresentation, breach of confidentiality, or an increased awareness of inadequacy (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Study participants could be at risk for psychological regret, embarrassment, emotional anxiety, or fear. To help relieve the possibility of emotional harm, participants were assured that no right or wrong answers existed. Participants signed the confidentiality statement. After multiple reviews of the recordings and transcripts, all recordings were destroyed.

### **Collecting and Examining Documents**

Documents that have been included in the data set are documents including litigations of the European Court of Human Rights (European Court of Human Rights, 2017b), and reports issued by the DIO (Council of Europe, 2017f). The researcher used the documents as part of the three points for meeting triangulation of the proposed exploratory multi-case study (Yin, 2014). The documents reviewed included any references made from Council of Europe participants. All the Court's judgments and a large selection of decisions, information on communicated cases, advisory opinions, press releases, legal summaries and Commission decisions and reports are published in the Human Rights Documentation of the European Court of Human Rights (HUDOC) (European Court of Human Rights, 2017b). HUDOC allowed the narrowing of the search to litigations concerning human rights violations committed by law enforcement

officials.

Reports issued by the DIO contain information about training and other activities of the Council of Europe to promote human rights (Council of Europe, 2017f). The website of the DIO allows retrieval of reports. The researcher limited the search both on HUDOC and from the DIO to documentation on member states of the Council of Europe, which are not member states of the European Union. Member states of the European Union are not covered by the human rights training of the Council of Europe. Through the assessment of the documents, the researcher explored what effective strategies Council of Leaders use to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines.

### **Data Analysis**

Data analysis provides order, structure, and interpretation to data collected (Marshall & Rossman, 2014). Analyzing data involves preparing the data and interpreting the data to achieve a greater understanding of the phenomenon under investigation. The analysis is an ongoing process throughout the research study, and starts with the first interview (Yin, 2014). Data analysis includes coding, identifying categories, and building themes from the data collected (Cooper et al., 2009).

The researcher used NVivo 10TM© to complete the data analysis for the exploratory qualitative multi-case study. NVivo 10TM© supports qualitative studies by providing a forum for collecting, organizing, and analyzing information derived from data collection. NVivo 10TM© can process information obtained from interviews and other forms of data collection methods, such as audio recordings. The responses obtained from participants of the study was entered into NVivo 10TM© software (QSR

International, 2012). The process of qualitative data analysis consists of consolidating, reducing, and interpreting information from participants and documents that may be relevant to the study under investigation (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015; Marshall & Rossman, 2014).) Qualitative researchers conduct data analyses to seek in-depth meaning from information collected through interviews, archival records, direct observations, participant observations, documents, and physical artifacts (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015).

Qualitative researchers use tools such as the QSR NVivo10© software to help identify nodes of similar text for theme development (Hutchison, Johnston, & Breckon, 2010). NVivo10© is a software program used to assist management and analysis of data. NVivo10© can also help to identify patterns in data (Blaney, Filer, & Lyon, 2014). The storage of each transcribed audio-recorded interview is in a separate Microsoft Word® document that is a format compatible with Nvivo 10© (QSR International, 2012). NVivo10© nodes are metaphoric containers for organizing data within the software that corresponds with the various topics of discussion based on the predetermined interview protocol (Yin, 2009). The use of Nvivo 10© qualitative data analysis tool assists in classifying, sorting, and arranging unstructured information generated from the semi-structured interview questions (QSR International, 2012).

NVivo10© qualitative data coding software facilitated the coding process after the researcher transferred the transcripts to NVivo10©. NVivo10© sorted the data according to codes identified before the data analysis process, based on the research questions. Using the NVivo10© program, a data report was produced within each code to allow for an easy comparison of responses across the data sources. After the addition of codes, the researcher analyzed the data (QSR International, 2012).

## Dependability and Trustworthiness

The terms internal validity, external validity, reliability, and objectivity originate from quantitative research and were commonly used before the 1990s in qualitative research (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Those terms were replaced in qualitative research with credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016):

<b>Quantitative Research</b>	<b>Qualitative Research</b>
Internal Validity	Credibility
External Validity	Transferability
Reliability	Dependability
Objectivity	Confirmability

### Credibility

Researchers attempting to establish credibility use reflexivity, member checking, and peer debriefing or peer examination (Thomas & Magilvy, 2011). Another method to achieve credibility is triangulation. Triangulation includes using multiple methods, multiple sources of data, multiple investigators, or multiple theories to confirm emerging findings. Saturation, or the collection of adequate data, is another way to achieve credibility, including negative case analysis (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015). Within the proposed multi-case study, the researcher achieved credibility through triangulation of multiple sources. The researcher triangulated conducted interviews, litigations of the European Court of Human Rights obtained through the HUDOC database (European

Court of Human Rights, 2017b), and reports issued by the DIO (Council of Europe, 2017f; Yin, 2014).

### **Transferability**

Transferability describes the process of applying the results of research in one situation to other similar situations (Barnes et al., 2012). Transferability is a procedure performed by readers of research (Barnes et al., 2012). Readers recognize the details of the research situation and compare such details to the specifics of an environment or situation the readers are familiar with (Barnes et al., 2012).

Researchers must deliver a detailed description of the research situation and methods to allow the reader to determine whether the presented research situation is similar to their own (Barnes et al., 2012). Transferability is most relevant to qualitative research methods such as ethnography and case studies (Barnes et al., 2012). The researcher described the selection of the sample to achieve transferability (Barnes et al., 2012). The field test of the interview questions supports transferability (Yin, 2014). Furthermore, the researcher discussed the selection of the sample and field-testing of interview questions to achieve transferability in the exploratory qualitative multi-case study (Yin, 2014).

### **Dependability**

Dependability in qualitative research is synonymous with reliability in quantitative research. Demonstrating dependability is difficult in qualitative research (Chowdhury, 2015). If consistency is the goal, the study must be repeated in the same contexts, with the same methods, and with the same participants (Chowdhury, 2015). Researchers often use stepwise replication, audit trails, and overlap methods in their pursuit of dependability (Chowdhury, 2015). Dependability and confirmability are

established through an auditing of the research process (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Triangulation, evaluation by peers, examination of researcher's position, and audits increase dependability, reliability and consistency (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015). In addition, peer participation, detailed method descriptions, and repeating the study are also viable methods to achieve dependability (Thomas & Magilvy, 2011). To enhance dependability and to maintain consistency, each participant received the same six semi-structured interview questions. Audio recording of each interview ensured accuracy and consistency during transcription. To avoid bias and to validate content, multiple reviews and replaying of each transcription occurred during the transcription process (Locke, Spirduso, & Silverman, 2013).

### **Confirmability**

Researchers are interested in finding the value of data (Chowdhury, 2015). Such value can be met through (a) triangulation; (b) practicing reflexivity; and (c) arranging for a confirmability audit (Chowdhury, 2015). Auditing of the research process establishes both confirmability and dependability (Seidman, 2013).

### **Triangulation**

Triangulation was achieved using several sources when retrieving data (Yin, 2014). The first triangulation source included the one-on-one interviews with Council of Europe leaders who ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines. The interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed to guarantee content accuracy after study participants signed the informed consent. Interview questions were semi-structured, so participants could discuss their rationales and attitudes towards their effective strategies to ensure that program managers adhere to the

evaluation guidelines.

The second and the third triangulation sources include the document review (Yin, 2014). The researcher reviewed documents including litigations of the European Court of Human Rights, and evaluated reports issued by the DIO. The litigation reports of the European Court of Human Rights displayed how law enforcement officials have transferred the human training activities to their daily duties. Litigation reports include a detailed reasoning about the judgments. The reasoning allowed the researcher to assess the efficiency of the perceived human rights training for law enforcement officials. The reports issued by the DIO include accounts of Council of Europe activities within the member states. Such activities mirror the impact of law enforcement training for law enforcement officials in the field. The researcher can evaluate the human rights adherence of law enforcement officials. The use of the three sources of triangulation allowed assessing the dependability and trustworthiness of the study.

### **Summary**

Chapter 3 included the research method and design selection, population, sample and sampling method, instrumentation, data collection and analysis, and dependability and trustworthiness. An analysis of the data gathered could help Council of Europe leaders with detailed evidence of enterprise challenges across different functions. These functions include leaders' responsibility for training evaluation and training evaluation provisions. Studying the challenges from a Council of Europe leader perspective could provide information on how to overcome existing challenges in evaluating human rights training for law enforcement officials.

Chapter 4 contains the results of the study. After the findings, the data analysis includes the data collected and a description of the survey population. A description of the study success findings follows. The researcher explores the leadership findings, and Chapter 4 closes with a summary.

## Chapter 4

### Analysis and Results

Chapter 1 of the qualitative exploratory multi-case study includes the explanation program managers of the Council of Europe do not fully comply with the evaluation guidelines, do not conduct adequate evaluations, and do not produce or disseminate summative evaluation reports. Human rights training for law enforcement officials are still not sufficient to promote and to protect human rights within the member states of the Council of Europe. Chapter 2 contains an intense review of literature about training, training evaluation, and leadership. Chapter 3 includes the research method and design selection, population, sample and sampling method, instrumentation, data collection and analysis, and dependability and trustworthiness. Chapter 4 contains the analysis and results. The researcher presents the gathered data including interviews, and collected and examined documents.

The general problem is Council of Europe program managers fail to adhere to training evaluation guidelines increasing litigation issues of the European Court of Human Rights concerning law enforcement officials from the member states of the Council of Europe. The specific problem is that some Council of Europe leaders lack effective strategies that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines.

The purpose of the exploratory qualitative multi-case study was to explore what effective strategies Council of Europe leaders use to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines of the Council of Europe. The study used the exploratory qualitative multi-case study design. The process of qualitative

data analysis consists of consolidating, reducing, and interpreting information from participants and documents that are relevant to the study under investigation (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015; Marshall & Rossman, 2014). The researcher included several forms of qualitative data in the exploratory qualitative multi-case study. The researcher interviewed eleven Council of Europe leaders. The researcher, for triangulation purposes, reviewed documents containing litigations of the European Court of Human Rights (European Court of Human Rights, 2017b), reports of the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT, 2018), and reports issued by the Department of Internal Oversight (Council of Europe, 2017b; 2017c; 2017f; Yin, 2014).

### **Research Question**

The research question is: What effective strategies do Council of Europe leaders use to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines?

### **Data Collection**

The population of the multi-case study was Council of Europe leaders within the Action against Crime Department (AACD) and within the Department of Internal Oversight (DIO). The total number of Council of Europe leaders within the Action Against Crime Department and within the Department of Internal Oversight is 30 (Council of Europe, 2017a, 2017d; 2017g; 2017f). The population of the study consisted of 30 Council of Europe leaders. For the exploratory qualitative multi-case study, the researcher used purposive sampling from the population of the study. The researcher recruited the sample of Council of Europe leaders for the exploratory multi-case study

from the Headquarters of the Council of Europe in Strasbourg/France serving within the Action against Crime Department and within the Department of Internal Oversight.

The researcher developed the interview questions based on the research question. The interview questions are related to what effective strategies Council of Europe leaders use to ensure that program manager of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines.:

1. What effective strategies have you used to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines?
2. What method did you find worked best to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines?
3. How did the program managers respond to your strategies to ensure that they adhere to the evaluation guidelines?
4. What strategies were least effective to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines?
5. What modifications did you apply to any strategy to improve the effectiveness of achieving adherence to the evaluation guidelines?
6. Is there anything else you would like to address that you did not address about the adherence to the evaluation guidelines?

The interview questions served as a guideline for the exploratory qualitative multi-case study. The semi-structured format allowed intense communications with each interviewee, and provided the flexibility to pursue a rich description based on participant responses (Christensen et al., 2014).

Participants of the study obtained satisfactory information about the study before

participants made an informed decision (Yin, 2014). The participants learned about the exploratory qualitative multi-case study through email notification sent to their Council of Europe account (Appendix E). The email contained information about the study topic, informed consent, participant expectations, steps to withdraw from the study, and contact information. Participants received a copy of the informed consent (Appendix B) before the interview to read, review, understand, and sign before participating. The informed consent contained the purpose of the exploratory qualitative multi-case study and advised the participants about the potential risks inherent in any research study. During the interview, the researcher shared a copy of the Notice of Participant Intent to Withdraw from (Appendix C), and participants learned about withdrawal procedures and that withdrawal could occur any time of the study.

The researcher replaced all information that would identify the participants on the audio recordings and throughout the analysis through pseudonyms. The pseudonyms for the eleven interviewees are Alan, Betty, Carol, Dorothy, Emma, Florence, Gloria, Harold, Ian, Kathleen, and Leroy. The master list of participants, the assigned pseudonyms, and the transcripts will remain in a locked safety deposit box at the researcher's house for three years. The participants approved the transcripts after revision. If desired, the participants may receive a summary of the study findings following defense of the study.

### **Demographics**

The researcher conducted eleven interviews from October 8, 2018, through October 10, 2018. The interviews took place in room B4.06.C in the Agora building of the Council of Europe in Strasbourg/France. The researcher had sole possession of the interview room. The room was free from disturbances. The interviewees had their offices

in walking distance of room B4.06.C. During the interviews, only the respective interviewee and the researcher were in room B4.06.C.

Eleven interviewees previously or at the time of the interview worked in the Action against Crime Department (AACD). All interviewees worked at the Council of Europe during the time of the interview:

<b>Number of Interviewees (4 male, 7 females )</b>	<b>Unit/Task during the time of the interview</b>
5	Interviewees were working in the Criminal Law Cooperation Unit within the AACD.
1	Interviewee was working in a unit that coordinates cooperation projects or projects of technical assistance in the fields of probation, police, and prisons.
1	Interviewee was working with projects in the criminal justice field.
1	Interviewee was working in the Justice and Political Cooperation Department of the Council of Europe.
1	Interviewee was working as a project manager of projects involving training in the field of human rights.
1	Interviewee was in charge of a program including human rights education for judges, prosecutors, and lawyers.
1	Interviewee was in charge of a program including human rights education for judges, prosecutors, and lawyers.

No participant from the Department for Internal Oversight accepted the invitation for an interview from the researcher.

## Data Analysis

### NVivo

The researcher initially performed the data analysis of the interviews for the exploratory multi-case study using NVivo 10TM©. NVivo 10TM© supports qualitative studies by providing a forum for collecting, organizing, and analyzing information derived from the data collection (QSR International, 2012). NVivo 10TM© nodes are metaphoric containers for organizing data within the software that correspond with the various topics of discussion based on the predetermined interview protocol (Yin, 2009). The researcher identified the nodes for the exploratory multi-case study related to the interview questions:

- Current Training Evaluation
- Training Evaluation Guidelines of the Council of Europe
- Improving Training Evaluation
- The HELP Program

NVivo 10TM© was going to be the primary tool for data analysis, but the assessment of the interview transcripts in NVivo 10TM© showed that a different approach identifying themes within the interview transcripts would produce more valuable findings than the results achieved through NVivo 10TM©. The themes within the interview transcripts were the results of the in-depth communication between the interviewees and the researcher during the interviews. Interviewees initially stuck to the interview questions, but each interviewee took the opportunity to present individual points of views in the exchange with the researcher. The researcher explored the patterns through intense evaluation of each interview transcript validated through member

checking with the interviewees (Carlson, 2010). The graphics produced through NVivo 10™ are presented in Annex J.

### **Training Financing and Evaluation.**

Training evaluation of human rights training for law enforcement officials of the Council of Europe is dependent on the budget line of training activities. Council of Europe training financed by the European Union is organized within the framework of projects including activities with budgets lines assigned for training evaluation. Council of Europe training activities outside of a project are financed by the ordinary budget of the Council of Europe. Such training activities take place within the Council of Europe where, locally or thematically, no projects financed by the European Union are allocated.

However, some member states of the Council of Europe are requesting specific training activities, financed by the ordinary budget of the Council of Europe. Additionally, the Council of Europe is conducting multi-lateral conferences in Strasbourg/France. The Council of Europe is inviting experts from the Member States to share experiences. Such conferences result in publications containing the content of the conference and good practices. The publications could be seen as an evaluation as the publications cover the results of the multi-lateral conferences.

### **Interviews' Evaluation and Themes**

The researcher evaluated the transcribed interviews identifying common themes. The interview questions at the beginning of each interview served as a guideline and a door opener. The researcher developed the interview questions assuming the evaluation guidelines of the Council of Europe are the core document for program managers when it comes to training evaluation. When conducting the interviews, the researcher detected

that the interviewees do not include the evaluation guidelines when preparing and performing training evaluation. The semi-structured format allowed the researcher intense communication with each interviewee and provided the flexibility to pursue a rich description based on participant responses (Christensen et al., 2014). The researcher triggered the interviewees to present the current training evaluation, which in most cases disregards the evaluation guidelines. The researcher either left out those interview questions based solely on the adherence to the evaluation guidelines or adjusted those questions to the previous answers of the respective interviewee. At the end of each interview, the researcher offered participants the opportunity to add comments about training evaluation not directly related to a specific interview question.

The presentation of the interviews includes the date and time of each interview, core information about the respective interviewee, and essential statements of each interviewee. The researcher extracted the essential statements from the transcripts of the interviews. The essential statements do not include any interpretation of the transcripts. The researcher rephrased the statements without changing the meaning when necessary to understand the dialogue. The researcher deleted inessential parts of the transcripts.

**Interview of Alan.** Date/time of the interview: October 8, 2018, 03:00 – 03:25 p.m.

Interviewee Alan: Interviewee Alan is working at the Criminal Law Cooperation Unit of the Council of Europe since January 2016. Interviewee Alan is an advisor for the police program. Interviewee Alan oversees the organization and planning of training for police officers around Europe for member states of the Council of Europe.

Essential statements of interviewee Alan:

Alan stated that training evaluation within the Council of Europe is not developed. Alan explained that through short contracts the motivation of program managers is affected. Alan elucidated that there is a lack of evaluation of the staff providing training. Such a lack of evaluation may lead to weak performance of program managers. Alan explicated that he does not use the evaluation guidelines of the Council of Europe and does not know where to find it.

The researcher received explicit confirmation from interviewee Alan on the following statements: “When I started my current position, I was surprised that the Council of Europe has no training evaluation system in place. .... The only current training evaluation is the training report. The training report is subjective because it is the personal view of the program manager. Through a lack of internal communication, important information regarding training and training evaluation is not transferred to and between program managers.”

**Interview of Betty.** Date/time of the interview: October 8, 2018, 04:00 – 04:25 p.m.

Interviewee Betty: Interviewee Betty is working at the Criminal Law Cooperation Unit of the Council of Europe. In the past, Interviewee Betty was working at the European Committee on Crime Problems. Interviewee Betty was occupied with training in both entities. Interviewee Betty currently deals with training of staff in the field of prisons. In her previous position, Interviewee Betty was dealing with training for legal professionals, judges and prosecutors, and lawyers.

Essential statements of interviewee Betty:

Betty elaborated that training evaluation does not follow the evaluation

guidelines. Betty elucidated that it is necessary to develop the training in the same way it is implemented in the field. Betty summarized that it is important not only for the trainees but for the donors that the training implemented is useful. The training she provided was based on a curriculum drafted for about one year and a half with the help of different schools of judges. The trainer was evaluating all trainees every fifteen days.

The researcher received explicit confirmation from interviewee Betty on the following statements: “I do not know about the evaluation guidelines of the Council of Europe. Program managers or trainers write a report about the training. These reports are not a summative training evaluation. The reports do not include an objective description of the training elements, the training implementation, or the training outcome. Council of Europe human rights training does not include training evaluation except evaluation on a trainer based personal initiative.... After law enforcement training in Georgia, questionnaires are handed out to the trainees. The questionnaires contain questions about the satisfaction of the trainees, which include even the quality of the coffee. It is critical to know if the trainees have received the necessary information, useful for their current day-to-day work.”

**Interview of Carol.** Date/time of the interview: October 8, 2018, 4:40 – 05:10 p.m.

Interviewee Carol: Interviewee Carol is in charge of a program within the Council of Europe including human rights education for judges, prosecutors, and lawyers. Interviewee Carol has been working for more than twenty years with human rights and development cooperation, responsible for educational programs. In 1998, interviewee Carol was particularly a fund rater of an educational program at national level financed

by the European Union.

Essential statements of Interviewee Carol:

Carol explicated that training evaluation is a long-term exercise. Carol clarified that the success of training can be checked one year after the project has ended. It can be evaluated how many people are still using the training materials, if participants who once used this training are coming back to check those online training, if participants are interested in getting other training, and if participants have used training materials in their work. Evaluation is a continuation of the monitoring during the implementation.

Carol stated that the Council of Europe is the best institution for work on human rights through law and democracy. Compared to the European Union, the Council of Europe is a much more resourced organization with a different mandate, with economic power, with strong political leverage. When it comes to rule of law, human rights and democracy, the standards are produced in the Council of Europe.

The researcher received explicit confirmation from interviewee Carol on the following statements: “Training evaluation could be conducted ex-ante or ex-post to the training. (...) Feedback should be integrated in programming of future training. Evaluation is nothing new. Evaluation was already part of the Marshall Plan and the project cycle management. For training, delivered in the framework of Project Management, evaluation has always been included.”

**Interview of Dorothy.** Date/time of the interview: October 9, 2018, 10:00 – 10:25 a.m.

Interviewee Dorothy: Interviewee Dorothy is working in the Criminal Law Cooperation Unit of the Council of Europe as a project manager. Interviewee Dorothy is

working on various projects within three different member states of the Council of Europe. Interviewee Dorothy previously worked for the HELP (Human Rights Education for Legal Professionals) program as a project manager. Interviewee Dorothy worked in a unit that developed training for legal professionals including judges, prosecutors, and lawyers.

Essential statements of interviewee Dorothy:

Dorothy in her previous position was involved in the guidelines “The HELP Course from Design to Evaluation” Dorothy explained that the idea of the guidelines was to develop guidelines to help trainers but also project managers from the first phase of development up to the evaluation. Dorothy explained that chapter four of this process is called ‘How to evaluate the course and plan its follow up.’ Dorothy believes that the guidelines are useful and very comprehensive. Dorothy disseminates or disseminated those guidelines. Dorothy reiterated that is very important to make sure that evaluation is an important part of training. It is crucial to make clear to the participants why evaluation is important for them. Participants who see the importance are prepared to participate in an evaluation.

Dorothy summarized that it is important to make sure that program managers link their learning objectives to their evaluation. If the evaluation does not allow evaluating whether these learning objectives were met, then it is not an effective evaluation.

The researcher received explicit confirmation from interviewee Dorothy on the following statements: “I was involved in the development of guidelines for the development of training for legal professionals. These guidelines were called “The HELP Course from Design to Evaluation”. It is critical that program managers see the

need of training evaluation. At the beginning and at the end of each training, a questionnaire will be handed out. The questionnaire allows assessing the evolution during the training. Another questionnaire should be handed out after three months and another one after six months...When a project or training is being developed, the learning objectives should be defined.”

**Interview of Emma.** Date/time of the interview: October 9, 2018, 10:00 – 10.40 a.m.

Interviewee Emma: Interviewee Emma is working in a unit that coordinates cooperation projects or projects of technical assistance in the field of probation, police, and prisons. The task if Interviewee Emma is to assist Member States of the Council of Europe to introduce new standards or to improve implementation of already adopted standards and standards that are in their system. Most of these standards are connected to the European Convention of Human Rights, European prison rules, European probation rules, and the Police Code of Ethics. Interviewee Emma previously has worked with human rights training for prosecutors and human rights training for judges. Interviewee Emma, before her arrival at the Council of Europe, was a human rights lawyer working in an ombudsman office.

Essential statements of interviewee Emma:

Emma explained the way in which training evaluation of human rights training for law enforcement officials within the Council of Europe is currently conducted. Emma referred to training reports. The reports include how many participants went through training, which is quantitative measurement. Emma explained that program managers try to achieve qualitative evaluation as well. Evaluation should take place six months after

the training, which is done on very rare occasions. Emma elucidated that questionnaires to our evaluators are quite mixed because the participants do not necessarily recall the training itself. Participants are not completely aware that they have changed something. However, when they start to think about, shifts in acceptance of what we are talking about can be observed. The European Court of Human Rights Case Law always usually has a very interesting story. Many of our participants recognize themselves in similar situations. Participants might have violated human rights by acting like this or not acting like that. Case law is a brilliant tool for training. We have different standards like European prison rules, like European court of police updates. Now there is a recommendation to Member States on children of imprisoned parents. Therefore, there is plenty of material.

The researcher received explicit confirmation from interviewee Emma on the following statements: “Evaluation guidelines do not exist within the Council of Europe. There is no structured training evaluation at the Council of Europe. Qualitative evaluation should measure knowledge at the beginning and at the end of the training course. Current training evaluation does not include such measuring. Project managers organize training evaluation on their own initiative. Program managers are constantly working on improving evaluation. Program managers must submit training reports. The European Court of Human Rights case law is extremely important when teaching prison guards and law enforcement officials.”

**Interview of Florence.** Date/time of the interview: October 9, 2018, 11:05 – 11:47 a.m.

Interviewee Florence: Interviewee Florence is working with projects in the

criminal justice field. Interviewee Florence experience is related to project management and to experts undertaking training evaluation. Interviewee Florence worked previously with training related projects in other fields.

Essential statements of interviewee Florence:

Florence stated that program managers and training experts have developed entry and exit questionnaires to measure the level of knowledge. The questionnaires are evaluated on a scale of one to five. Florence added that she plans to improve the questionnaires together with her team. Moreover, the questionnaires should be completed again three months and six months after the training to assess where the participants are standing with their knowledge to assess if the participants apply the training into practice. Florence mentioned that she is in touch with all institutions her unit is working with. Moreover, we are keeping regular contact. This evaluation is not been done systematically for all the projects.

In some of our projects, we also have an evaluation of the project done by an independent consultant or an independent company that will come will interview colleagues, the beneficiaries, and us, and will evaluate the results of the project. We have in some of the projects a budget aside for the evaluation purposes. That is done at the end of the project. It is an evaluation of the results from the very beginning to the end. We are having this kind of evaluation in the projects now and at the end of the project. It would be useful to have it also in the middle, somewhere, or at least to have it twice and not only once. In terms of timing and financing maybe, it will not be very easy to adjust it.

The researcher received explicit confirmation from interviewee Florence on the

following statements: “There are no general training evaluation guidelines within the Council of Europe. There are evaluation guidelines developed by the Department for Internal Oversight. I have partly read them. I do not apply these guidelines for training activities. I forgot to mention interim reports, progress reports, and final reports. Such reports are a good tool to collect information of a project. I used self-developed questionnaires as an evaluation tool for training activities. I was satisfied with the results as these questionnaires allowed to assess the level of knowledge after the training course.”

**Interview of Gloria.** Date/time of the interview: October 9, 2018, 02:00 – 02:44 p.m.

Interviewee Gloria: Interviewee Gloria is working in the justice and political cooperation department of the Council of Europe. Interviewee Gloria specifically acts in the service on justice sector reform in the Member States of the Council of Europe. Interviewee Gloria is implementing projects related to the judicial reform in the Member States of the Council of Europe. The judicial reform concerns legislation including the legislative framework and how it is connected to the constitution. Also included are concerns of legislation related to the role of the judiciary, judges, advocates and prosecutors.

Essential statements of interviewee Gloria:

Gloria elucidated that the Council of Europe should focus not only on establishing its own mechanisms of training evaluation. The Council of Europe should seriously focus on the respective projects and should develop a common guidance about evaluation length of the projects, and target groups with certain donors. The Council of Europe

should have common policies and one common guideline on the evaluation, discussed with all of the people concerned, and drafted or designed and then adopted as guideline mechanism for the evaluation.

The researcher received explicit confirmation from interviewee Gloria on the following statements: “There are no evaluation guidelines of the Council of Europe. Self-developed multiple-choice questions and oral exams should be considered as internal training evaluation. Training evaluation is one of the most important elements of training. The donors do not impose us to evaluate the training.”

**Interview of Harold.** Date/time of the interview: October 9, 2018, 03:00 – 03:25 p.m.

Interviewee Harold: Interviewee Harold is working in the last 15 years at the Council of Europe. Interviewee Harold worked as a project manager or as a supervisor of projects and cooperation projects involving training in the field of human rights. These projects included fundamental freedom and fundamental human rights.

Essential statements of interviewee Harold:

Harold stated that evaluation started several years ago by asking organizers of events or project managers to do a specific structured evaluation with a questionnaire at the end of any training that the Council of Europe conducted. Later, donors, especially the European Union, introduced a more extensive evaluation as a part of the contract that evaluation must be conducted. In several cases, it was specified that it must be an external evaluation, which implies financial issues. Later, the Council of Europe created the Directorate of Internal Oversight.

Harold explained that initially program managers considered themselves qualified

to evaluate themselves as trainers and organizers. Harold elucidated that the Directorate of Internal Oversight in a later stage, when the DIO did more structured evaluation, talked to program managers. In principle, the evaluation was targeted at the participants. Harold elucidated that evaluations were developed, and follow-up evaluations were invented. Evaluations in rare occasions then included the immediate evaluation and after several months, a follow-up evaluation including, “How do you feel now? How have you been able to apply, or learn and practice?” Harold shared that regularly after the end of a project the team that conducted the training does not exist anymore. Furthermore, there is no budget available to conduct an evaluation. An external evaluator cannot be paid.

Harold explained that in cases where projects are based on a contract there is no way out that an external evaluation must be conducted. It is known and is planned in the budget at the beginning when the contract is signed with the donor. Harold summarized that the evaluation itself is recently done within the Council of Europe through the Directorate of Internal Oversight. It is surprisingly professionally for a place that does not have professional evaluators for the outside evaluators. I cannot say anything bad. They are professional evaluators. They are paid to do that. The Council of Europe should limit evaluation within reasonable limits. Evaluation eats the time of the people who have to do the training and to implement the projects.

The researcher received explicit confirmation from interviewee Harold on the following statements: “Evaluation guidelines did not exist when I started working on projects and training 15 years ago. That was a time of big enthusiasm after the fall of the Berlin Wall. It was not so much time of evaluation. That was the time of action. For the program manager it was interesting to see if the participants did benefit from the training.

At the beginning, the questions were simple like how the training material was, ‘was the trainer good, what would you like to see improved, what are the topics you would like to see’. External evaluation differs from internal evaluation. Initially, the Council of Europe conducted internal evaluation with questionnaires connected to the organization of each training. In contrary, external evaluation is evaluation performed by a company, a firm, an institution, or a consultant that is external to the Council of Europe, external to the donor and that conducts the evaluation. The way the Council of Europe works, including evaluation, became very bureaucratic and too hierarchical. It should be more flexibility and not too much evaluation. The evaluation guidelines are rather impractical, written by people with limited experience with project management. Evaluation guidelines should include more freedom, more autonomy, and more flexibility. A project manager should have the choice, where to spend the money. I would prefer to spend it on training rather than on evaluation when there is no sufficient budget to hire the necessary team.

**Interview of Ian.** Date/time of the interview: October 9, 2018, 04:00 – 04:25 p.m.

Interviewee Ian: Interviewee Ian works in the Community Law Cooperation Unit of the Council of Europe. Interviewee Ian worked in similar organizations and was conducting training, conducting research, and working on human rights issues.

Essential statements of interviewee Ian:

Ian explained that evaluation was developed in the last six months or year, and is related to the lack of clear evaluation guidelines. Program managers were asked by donors to report on how they evaluate their training activities and what the impact of the training activities on the participants is. Evaluation is a learning by doing process, from

experience, from colleagues, or from common sense. Ian referred to the Training of Trainers where the program managers are asked to submit an evaluation and to provide a scoring of the participants that are potential trainers in their service. Sometimes we ask the program manager to attend the first and the second cascade training, so that they see how the cascade trainer performs, and if he has good presentations skills or if he has good knowledge. The trainer of trainer stays there and provides coaching, and provides advice for the cascade trainer.

Ian asserted that the Council of Europe did not provide the evaluation tools. The unit of Ian has developed the tools. The Council of Europe is not following a certain methodology. The respective units developed the questionnaires and the questions, as there is no standard operating procedure in place. Ian stressed the fact that the program managers would like to see how the training worked and what the impact of the training is.

The researcher received explicit confirmation from interviewee Ian on the following statements: “The Council of Europe does not have evaluation guidelines. There is an evaluation unit, which has developed some guidelines. These guidelines should not be considered as an evaluation strategy. Although program managers do not have training evaluation guidelines, program manager try to assess and evaluate the training that has been conducted. Program managers developed questionnaires that are completed by the participants. Program managers monitor training sessions and coach the trainers. Program managers ask the trainers to provide the pre- and post-questionnaires to the participant. My unit launched evaluation techniques to conduct a long-term evaluation. We use focus groups of ten or twenty participants for hundred or two hundred

participants to evaluate the training after six months, after one year, and after two years.”

**Interview of Kathleen.** Date/time of the interview: October 10, 2018, 10:00 – 10:35 a.m.

Interviewee Kathleen: Interviewee Kathleen is working in a monitoring mechanism of the Council of Europe. Interviewee Kathleen in the past was working on cooperation programs, which included as a main task training and technical assistance provided on anti-discrimination issues.

Essential statements of interviewee Kathleen:

Kathleen stated that her unit does not follow the evaluation guidelines because her unit is not familiar with the guidelines. However, Kathleen explained that her unit assures that effective strategies for evaluation are used. Kathleen explained that evaluation is and was mainly based relying on previous experiences of the trainers. Kathleen specified that her unit was seeking to be realistic and pragmatic about what the concrete impact of the training would be for the professionals concerned. Kathleen works mostly with law enforcement and exercise-based training.

Kathleen believes that bureaucracies and protocols are killing the spirit and the efficiency of the work. Kathleen stated that her first reaction on inventing evaluation guidelines would probably be not another procedure to follow. We as program managers are under a lot of pressure. We do multiple things, and if we need to satisfy some donor by checking numbers and indicators, we just put in a lot of seminars and things that can be measured in terms of participants. It would need to be very flexible.

Kathleen stated it is harder to convince the participants than the trainers to participate in an evaluation. If the evaluation is multiple choice and the participants can

cross a few things quickly, it is ok. If the participants are asked to develop and describe explanations, examples, and feedback, I think this is where we lose the participants.

The researcher received explicit confirmation from interviewee Kathleen on the following statements: “Evaluation has been conducted on the initiative of program managers. I designed a tool for trainers where different types of scenarios like role-playing have been included. The participants should identify themselves with victims and investigators on the crime scene. It is important to observe the multiplying effect of training and to work with academies incorporating exercises into their curriculum... Flexibility of evaluation guidelines is important.”

**Interview of Leroy.** Date/time of the interview: October 10, 2018, 11:00 – 11:40 a.m.

Interviewee Leroy: Interviewee Leroy is working in the Criminal Law Cooperation Unit, Action against Crime Department, of the Council of Europe. The Criminal Law Cooperation Unit provides technical assistance in form of trainings to prison police, probation and monitoring bodies, national monitoring bodies. Interviewee Leroy has experience in training evaluation of training of judges and prosecutors through a position Leroy hold with the Center for Continuing Education of Judges and Prosecutors. The main task of Leroy, while working for the Center for Continuing Education of Judges and Prosecutors, was to support the training of judges and prosecutors on the European Convention of Human Rights including the evaluation of training.

Essential statements of interviewee Leroy:

Leroy explained that the evaluation guidelines leave the space and the room for

project managers to adjust the methodology in terms of the specific needs of the respective project. The main user of the guidelines is the Department for Internal Oversight DIO. Leroy explicated that his unit is more or less referring to the methodology described in the guidelines when proceed with evaluation of training, evaluation of pilot sessions, and evaluation of projects in general. Lately, with the new cooperation agreement signed by the Council of Europe and the European Union, we switched from specific project evaluation to a program evaluation scheme, which is done externally, plus the internal evaluation done by DIO.

Leroy explained that she believes that the Department for Internal Oversight has its own annual plan. The Department for Internal Oversight does not evaluate specific training or training coordinators, but they evaluate projects/programs. The Department for Internal Oversight would evaluate the whole process that I explained under the auspices of the project evaluation that they would conduct. Training evaluation is a systematic approach.

Leroy summarized that the main user of the evaluation guidelines developed by the Department for Internal Oversight is the Department of Internal Oversight itself. However, the guidelines give some basic directions for using terms of methodology, and in terms of tools to be applied when conducting the evaluation.

The researcher received explicit confirmation from interviewee Leroy on the following statements: “The evaluation guidelines of the Council of Europe are very general and leave a lot of room for flexibility. An example of training evaluation are Training of Trainers activities with the pre- and post- knowledge and skills tests, which measure the immediate success rate of training. Training evaluation is different

depending on the respective unit of the Council of Europe. Program managers adjust their evaluation to the needs, the beneficiaries, and the target group, which could include judges, prosecutors, academies, or judicial training centers. The Department for Internal Oversight does not systematically conduct evaluation of each project or program.”

*Analytical Grid: Interview Data Supporting Themes*

<b>Themes / Interviewee</b>	<b>Evaluation guidelines</b>	<b>Current summative self-developed training evaluation</b>	<b>Current formative training evaluation</b>	<b>Proposals to improve training evaluation</b>
<b>Alan</b>	When I started in my current position, I was surprised - that the Council of Europe has no training evaluation system in place.	Through a lack of internal communication, important information regarding training and training evaluation is not transferred to and between program managers.	The only current training evaluation is the training report. The training report is subjective because it is the personal view of the program manager.	
<b>Betty</b>	I do not know about the evaluation guidelines of the Council of Europe.	Council of Europe human rights training does not include training evaluation except evaluation on a trainer based personal initiative.	After law enforcement training in Georgia, questionnaires are handed out to the trainees. The questionnaires contain questions about the satisfaction of the trainees, which include even the quality of the coffee. Program managers or trainers write a report about the training. These reports are not a summative training evaluation. The reports do not include an objective description of the training elements, the training implementation, or the training outcome.	It is critical to know if the trainees have received the necessary information, useful for their current day-to-day work.

<b>Themes / Interviewee</b>	<b>Evaluation guidelines</b>	<b>Current summative self-developed training evaluation</b>	<b>Current formative training evaluation</b>	<b>Proposals to improve training evaluation</b>
<b>Carol</b>		For training, delivered in the framework of Project Management, evaluation has always been included.		Training evaluation could be conducted ex-ante or ex-post to the training. The feedback should be integrated in programming of future training. Evaluation is nothing new. Evaluation was already part of the Marshall Plan and the project cycle management.
<b>Dorothy</b>	I was involved in the development of guidelines for the development of training for legal professionals. These guidelines were called “The HELP Course from Design to Evaluation”.	It is critical that program managers see the need of training evaluation.		At the beginning and at the end of each training, a questionnaire will be handed out. The questionnaire allows assessing the evolution during the training. Another questionnaire should be handed out after three months and another one after six months. When a project or training is being developed, the learning objectives should be defined.

<b>Themes / Interviewee</b>	<b>Evaluation guidelines</b>	<b>Current summative self-developed training evaluation</b>	<b>Current formative training evaluation</b>	<b>Proposals to improve training evaluation</b>
<b>Emma</b>	Evaluation guidelines do not exist within the Council of Europe. There is no structured training evaluation at the Council of Europe.	Project managers organize training evaluation on their own initiative. [...] Program managers are constantly working on improving evaluation.	Program managers must submit training reports.	Qualitative evaluation should measure knowledge at the beginning and at the end of the training course. Current training evaluation does not include such measuring. The European Court of Human Rights case law is extremely important when teaching prison guards and law enforcement officials.
<b>Florence</b>	There are no general training evaluation guidelines within the Council of Europe. There are evaluation guidelines developed by the Department for Internal Oversight. I have partly read them. I do not apply these guidelines for training activities.	Program managers and training experts have developed entry and exit questionnaires to measure the level of knowledge. The questionnaires are evaluated on a scale of one to five.	I forgot to mention interim reports, progress reports, and final reports. Such reports are a good tool to collect information of a project.	

<b>Themes / Interviewee</b>	<b>Evaluation guidelines</b>	<b>Current summative self-developed training evaluation</b>	<b>Current formative training evaluation</b>	<b>Proposals to improve training evaluation</b>
<b>Gloria</b>	There are no evaluation guidelines of the Council of Europe.	Self-developed multiple-choice questions and oral exams should be considered as internal training evaluation. Training evaluation is one of the most important elements of training. The donors do not impose us to evaluate the training.		
<b>Harold</b>	Evaluation guidelines did not exist when I started working on projects and training 15 years ago. That was a time of big enthusiasm after the fall of the Berlin Wall. It was not so much time of evaluation. That was the time of action.	For the program manager it was interesting to see if the participants did benefit from the training. At the beginning, the questions were simple like how was the training material, was the trainer good, what would you like to see improved, what are the topics you would like to see?	External evaluation differs from internal evaluation. Initially, the Council of Europe conducted internal evaluation with questionnaires connected to the organization of each training. In contrary, external evaluation is evaluation performed by a company, a firm, an institution, or a consultant that is external to the Council of Europe, external to the donor and that conducts the evaluation.	The way the Council of Europe works, including evaluation, became very bureaucratic and too hierarchical. It should be more flexibility and not too much evaluation. Evaluation guidelines should include more freedom, more autonomy, and more flexibility. A project manager should have the choice, where to spend the money. I would prefer to spend it on training rather than on evaluation when there is no sufficient budget to hire the necessary team.

<b>Themes / Interviewee</b>	<b>Evaluation guidelines</b>	<b>Current summative self-developed training evaluation</b>	<b>Current formative training evaluation</b>	<b>Proposals to improve training evaluation</b>
<b>Ian</b>	The Council of Europe does not have evaluation guidelines. There is an evaluation unit, which has developed some guidelines. These guidelines should not be considered as an evaluation strategy.	Although program manager do not have training evaluation guidelines, program manager try to assess and evaluate the training that has been conducted. Program manager developed questionnaires that are completed by the participants. Program managers are monitoring training sessions and coach the trainers. Program manager ask the trainers to provide the pre- and post-questionnaires to the participants.		My unit launched evaluation techniques to conduct a long-term evaluation. We use focus groups of ten or twenty participants for hundred or two hundred participants to evaluate the training after six months, after one year, and after two years.
<b>Kathleen</b>		Evaluation has been conducted on the initiative of program managers. I designed a tool for trainers where different types of scenarios like role-playing have been included. The participants should identify themselves with victims and investigators on the crime scene.		It is important to observe the multiplying effect of training and to work with academies incorporating exercises into their curriculum. Flexibility of evaluation guidelines is important.

Themes / Interviewee	Evaluation guidelines	Current summative self-developed training evaluation	Current formative training evaluation	Proposals to improve training evaluation
<b>Leroy</b>	The evaluation guidelines of the Council of Europe are very general and leave a lot of room for flexibility.	An example of training evaluation are Training of Trainers activities with the pre- and post-knowledge and skills tests, which measure the immediate success rate of training.	The Department for Internal Oversight does not systematically conduct evaluation of each project or program.	Training evaluation is different depending on the respective unit of the Council of Europe. Program managers adjust their evaluation to the needs, the beneficiaries, and the target group, which could include judges, prosecutors, academies, or judicial training centers.

### **Triangulation**

The collected data for the study included eleven interviews of Council of Europe leaders supervising training organization, training performance, and training evaluation of human rights training for law enforcement officials (Council of Europe, 2017d). The findings of the analysis of the interviews confirmed the general and the specific problem. The general problem is Council of Europe program managers fail to adhere to training evaluation guidelines increasing litigation issues of the European Court of Human Rights concerning law enforcement officials from the member states of the Council of Europe.

The specific problem is that some Council of Europe leaders lack effective strategies to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines. Through the data analysis, training evaluation was scrutinized intensely. The data analysis showed that training evaluation of human rights training for law enforcement officials need to be improved. Triangulation was achieved using several sources when retrieving data (Yin, 2014). The first triangulation was the one-on-one interviews with Council of Europe leaders. The interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed to guarantee content accuracy after study participants signed the informed consent.

The second and the third triangulation sources were the document review (Yin, 2014). The researcher reviewed documents including litigations of the European Court of Human Rights (Council of Europe, 2017f), reports from the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. (CPT, 2018), and reports issued by the Department of Internal Oversight of the Council of Europe (Council of Europe, 2017f). Such documents allow assessment of how law enforcement officials adhere to human rights when performing their duty. The litigations of the European Court of Human Rights, the reports of the CPT, and the reports of the DIO mirror the impact of law enforcement training for law enforcement officials in the field. If human rights training does not have the anticipated effectiveness, law enforcement officials show diverting behavior in their performance. Law enforcement officials will not follow human rights provisions if their training is not effective in member states of the Council of Europe. The document review allowed the researcher to evaluate the human rights adherence of law enforcement officials. The use of the three

sources of triangulation allowed assessing the dependability and trustworthiness of the study.

### **European Court of Human Rights.**

The European Court of Human Rights is an international human rights judicial body based in Strasbourg/France, created under the auspices of the Council of Europe. The Court began operating in 1959. It has delivered more than 10,000 judgments regarding alleged violations of the European Convention on Human Rights (European Court of Human Rights (2018)). The Human Rights Documentation of the European Court of Human Rights HUDOC database provides access to the case law of the European Court of Human Rights, the European Commission of Human Rights, and the Committee of Ministers. The Court's judgments and a large selection of decisions, information on communicated cases, advisory opinions, press releases, legal summaries and Commission decisions and reports are published in HUDOC (European Court of Human Rights, 2017b).

The researcher used the HUDOC database to identify litigation of the European Court of Human Rights against member states of the Council of Europe, where misconduct of law enforcement officials led to a violation of Human Rights. The researcher limited the research to the years 2010 until 2018. The researcher selected litigations against member states of the Council of Europe, which are not member states of the European Union. The Council of Europe includes 19 countries, which are not member states of the European Union. Such member states are still considered to be in the stage of transition from a communist regime to a country following international human rights laws. Member states of the European Union are not covered by human

rights training of the Council of Europe as such states follow international human rights laws.

Table 2

*Litigations European Court of Human Rights from 2010 until 2018*

<b>Date</b>	<b>Case</b>
December 18, 2018	Case of Murtazaliyena v. Russia
November 15, 2018	Case of Navalny v. Russia
October 12, 2017	Case of Burmych and others v. Ukraine
June 20, 2017	Case of Bayev and others v. Russia
May 30, 2017	Case of Davydov and others v. Russia
April 13, 2017	Case of Tagayeva and others v. Russia
September 1, 2016	Case of Mikhno v. Ukraine
September 1, 2016	Case of Svitlana Atamanyuk and others v. Ukraine
March 23, 2016	Case of Blokhin v. Russia
February 23, 2016	Case of Mozer v. The Republic of Moldova and Russia
January 19, 2016	Case of Gulcu v. Turkey
January 5, 2016	Case of Frumkin v. Russia
June 30, 2015	Case of Khoroshenko v. Russia
June 16, 2015	Case of Sargsyan v. Azerbaijan
June 16, 2015	Case of Chiragov and others v. Armenia
April 14, 2015	Case of Mustafa Tunc and Fecire Tunc v. Turkey
November 14, 2014	Case of Blokhin v. Russia
June 12, 2014	Case of Avilkana and others v. Russia
June 12, 2014	Case of Biblical Centre of the Chuvash Republic v. Russia

March 18, 2014	Case of Ocalan v. Turkey
July 23, 2013	Case of Izci v. Turkey
June 6, 2013	Case of Sabachiyeva and others v. Russia
June 6, 2013	Case of Maskhadova and others v. Russia
October 19, 2012	Case of Catan and others v. The Republic of Moldova and Russia
April 19, 2012	Case of Saso Georgiev v. “The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”
January 17, 2012	Case of Kosheleva and others v. Russia
January 12, 2012	Case of Gorovenky and Bugara v. Ukraine
January 10, 2012	Case of Ananyev and others v. Russia
December 20, 2011	Case of Finogenov and others v. Russia
July 1, 2010	Case of Davydov and others v. Ukraine
February 18, 2010	Case of Baysakov and others v. Ukraine
January 7, 2010	Case of Rantsev v. Cyprus and Russia

The high number of litigations concerning human rights violations by law enforcement officials proves that human rights training is not efficient in member states of the Council of Europe. Protocols in place are not effective. Evaluation of human rights training did not safeguard that the training was effective to achieve the anticipated goals.

**European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.**

The CPT is the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. (CPT, 2018). CPT visits places of detention in

the member states of the Council of Europe to assess how persons deprived of their liberty are treated. Places of detention are police stations, prisons, juvenile detention centers, immigration detention centers, psychiatric hospitals, or social care homes (CPT, 2018). CPT carries out approximately 18 visits per year (CPT, 2018). CPT publishes a report about each visit.

The researcher used the HUDOC database to identify CPT visits to member states of the Council of Europe, where severe physical ill-treatment of persons detained by the police as criminal suspects led to a violation of Human Rights. The researcher limited the research to the years 2017 and 2018. The researcher selected reports about member states of the Council of Europe, which are not member states of the European Union. Member states of the European Union are not covered by human rights training of the Council of Europe. The Council of Europe includes 19 countries, which are not member states of the European Union. Such member states are still considered to be in the stage of transition from a communist regime to a country following international human rights laws. Member states of the European Union are not covered by human rights training of the Council of Europe as such states follow international human rights laws. The table includes the dates of the publications of the CPT reports, followed by the executive summaries containing reporting about law enforcement agencies.

Table 3

*CPT visits 2017 and 2018*

Member State of the Council of Europe	Publication date of the CPT report	Executive summary
Azerbaijan	26 March 2018	Visit 2017 CPT/Inf (2018) 37   Section: 1/18   Date: 26/03/2018
Ukraine	27 July 2018	Visit 2017 CPT/Inf (2018) 41   Section: 1/32   Date: 27/07/2018
Serbia	22 November 2017	Visit 2017 CPT/Inf (2018) 21   Section: 1/16   Date: 22/11/2017
Ukraine	27 April 2017	Visit 2016 CPT/Inf (2017) 15   Section: 2/18   Date: 27/04/2017

**Executive summary Azerbaijan visit 2017 CPT/Inf (2018) 37 | Section: 1/18 | Date: 26/03/2018.**

Law enforcement agencies.

The delegation received numerous and very widespread allegations of severe physical ill-treatment of persons detained by the police as criminal suspects (or who had recently been in police custody), including juveniles as young as 15. The alleged police ill-treatment appeared to follow a very consistent pattern throughout the different regions visited. It was said to have occurred mostly in police establishments during initial interviews by operational police officers (in some cases, also by investigators and senior officers in charge of police establishments), with the aim to force the persons to sign a confession, provide other information or accept additional charges.

The types of ill-treatment alleged included slaps, punches, kicks, truncheon blows, blows inflicted with a wooden stick, a chair leg, a baseball bat, a plastic bottle filled with water or with a thick book. There were also many allegations of more severe forms of ill-treatment, including torture, such as truncheon blows on the soles of the feet (often while the person was suspended) and infliction of electric shocks (including with the use of electric discharge weapons).

**Executive summary Ukraine visit 2017 CPT/Inf (2018) 41 | Section: 1/32 | Date: 27/07/2018**

However, the delegation received a considerable number of recent and credible allegations from detained persons regarding the excessive use of force during apprehension by the police (mostly plainclothes operational officers, more rarely uniformed patrol police officers), as well as allegations of physical ill-treatment after being brought under control, mainly consisting of kicks, punches and truncheon blows, as well as too tight and prolonged handcuffing.

Such allegations were heard more frequently in Kyiv than in other regions visited, and it was also mostly in the capital that the delegation received allegations regarding physical ill-treatment by operational officers during initial questioning, with the aim of obtaining additional information or extracting a confession. Outside Kyiv, such allegations were received relatively rarely, the least frequently in Chernivtsi and Ivano-Frankivsk regions. Overall, the delegation gained the impression that, compared to the findings of the 2016 visit, the severity of the ill-treatment alleged had diminished. However, the frequency of allegations remained at a worrying level, especially in Kyiv.

Law enforcement agencies.

The CPT's delegation received a significant number of allegations of physical ill-treatment of detained persons by police officers, notably in larger urban areas. The physical ill-treatment alleged consisted of slaps, punches, kicks and truncheon blows, strikes with various non-standard objects (such as baseball bats) and also several claims of criminal suspects being subjected to shocks from electrical discharge devices at the time of apprehension or during questioning. The intended purpose of the ill-treatment was apparently to coerce suspects to admit to certain offences or to punish them. The report refers to several cases where the CPT's delegation gathered medical evidence and other documentation, which were consistent with the allegations of ill-treatment made by detained persons.

The Serbian authorities must recognize that the existence of ill-treatment by police officers is a fact; it is not the work of a few rogue officers but rather an accepted practice within the current police culture, notably among crime inspectors. Therefore, the competent authorities must promote a fundamentally different approach towards methods of police investigation, which is not based on confession evidence but upon obtaining accurate and reliable information in order to discover the truth about the matter under investigation. The Serbian authorities need to take determined action to combat police ill-treatment, which should include training for crime inspectors on appropriate interview and investigation techniques and holding senior officers accountable for their line-management responsibilities. Further, the Serbian authorities should establish dedicated

interview rooms with audio and/or video equipment for recording police interviews. CPT recommends that the Serbian authorities create a dedicated property store for all confiscated items in every police station, starting with the district police headquarters. At the same time, they should ensure that any weapons or other items seized during criminal investigations are entered in a separate register and properly labelled (identifying the case to which they refer), and placed in the dedicated property store. Confiscated electro-shock devices, knuckle-dusters, baseball bats, electrical extension cords etc. should never be kept in offices where detained persons may be interviewed or held...

**Executive summary Ukraine visit 2016 CPT/Inf (2017) 15 | Section: 2/18 | Date: 27/04/2017**

However, the delegation received a considerable number of credible allegations from detained persons (including juveniles) of recent physical ill-treatment by police officers, consisting mainly of slaps, punches, kicks or blows with a truncheon or a plastic bottle filled with water. In a few cases, the ill-treatment alleged was of such severity that it could be considered as amounting to torture. Most of the allegations concerned ill-treatment during initial questioning by operational police officers in an attempt to obtain confessions or other information. In a number of cases, the delegation gathered medical evidence (including injuries directly observed by the delegation's doctors) consistent with the allegations made. Overall, the delegation gained the impression that, compared to the findings of the 2013 visit, the severity of ill-treatment alleged had diminished. However, the frequency of allegations remains at a worrying level. The CPT calls upon the Ukrainian authorities to pursue a policy of "zero tolerance" of police ill-treatment, considering various precepts set out in the report.

The high number of credible allegations from detained persons (including juveniles) of recent physical ill-treatment by police officers, human rights violations by law enforcement officials proves that human right training is not efficient in member states of the Council of Europe. Evaluation of human rights training did not safeguard that the training was effective to achieve the anticipated goals.

### **Directorate of Internal Oversight.**

The Directorate of Internal Oversight (DIO) of the Council of Europe provides independent oversight, objective assurance, and consulting services designed to add value to and improve the Organization's operations (Council of Europe, 2017f). DIO assists management in the effective discharge of its responsibilities by assessing its internal control and governance processes (Council of Europe, 2017f). DIO evaluates the medium-term effects of Council of Europe's activities, and their worth or significance in terms of the changes created (Council of Europe, 2017f). DIO carries out audits and evaluations, in particular in areas of strategic relevance, consults with management on their concerns and needs, and provides analyses, assessments, recommendations and advice concerning the operations reviewed (Council of Europe, 2017f). In addition, the DIO is responsible for carrying out investigations into cases of alleged fraud (Council of Europe, 2017f).

The researcher evaluated the annual reports 2016 and 2017 issued by the Directorate of Internal Oversight and assessed the reports concerning the statements of the DIO about training evaluation.

### **Annual report 2017 of the Directorate of Internal Oversight.**

Promoting evaluation culture: As mentioned above, the DIO conducted a lessons learnt overview of 20 evaluations commissioned by other MAEs. Its results will be promoted through videos and other means in order to disseminate the benefits of evaluation and sharing experiences. Providing advice and technical support to MAEs on evaluations that they manage and building evaluation capacity is a permanent and increasing part of DIO's work. Sectors and programmatic areas covered by support to decentralized evaluation functions include the national implementation of human rights, justice reform, freedom of expression, good governance and human trafficking. In 2017, field offices were trained on evaluation in Albania and Ukraine. Efforts will be made in 2018 to enhance evaluation capacities of r more field offices.

### **Annual report 2016 of the Directorate of Internal Oversight.**

MAEs completed the implementation of 210 recommendations during the year. The implemented recommendations provide the organization with more transparent and efficient processes, greater controls, and better compliance with the existing regulations including the following: Training offered by the Council of Europe...

The reports of the Directorate of Internal Overview demonstrated the need for improvement in the evaluation culture of the Council of Europe. Evaluation of human rights training did not achieve the anticipated goals.

### **Triangulation evaluation and results**

The one-on-one interviews as the first source of triangulation have been presented in the previous section. The second and third triangulation sources were the reviewed documents of litigations of the European Court of Human Rights (Council of Europe,

2017f), reports from the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT, 2018), and reports from the Department of Internal Oversight of the Council of Europe (Council of Europe, 2017f).

#### **European Court of Human Rights document review.**

The researcher reviewed litigations where misconduct of law enforcement officials led to a violation of human rights. The researcher limited the research to the years 2010 until 2018. Table 2 shows that the European Court of Human Rights issued 32 litigations, which is an annual average of 3,6 litigations a year. The European Court of Human Rights accepts cases only if the national jurisdiction is exhausted (Council of Europe, 2017f). The majority of cases where human rights were violated by law enforcement officials within the member states did not reach the Court. The number of litigations through the Court concerning human rights violations through law enforcement officials remained relatively high over the last ten years, which confirms the results from the one-on-one interviews. Training and training evaluation of human rights training did not led to an improved adherence of law enforcement to human rights standards.

#### **European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment document review.**

The researcher reviewed reports from the CPT about visits to places of detention to assess how the treatment of persons who are deprived of their liberty. The researcher reviewed reports published in 2017 and 2018 about visits to Azerbaijan, Ukraine, Serbia, and Ukraine. The reports had in common that the CPT delegations received numerous and very widespread allegations of severe physical ill-treatment of persons detained by

the police. The delegations during their visits frequently received also accusations regarding the excessive use of force during apprehension by the police. The reports of CPT visits in the member states confirmed the results from the one-on-one interviews. Training and training evaluation of human rights training did not led to an improved adherence of law enforcement to human rights standards.

#### **Directorate of Internal Oversight document review.**

The researcher reviewed the annual reports 2016 and 2017 issued by the DIO. The DIO in its reports focused on the promotion of the evaluation culture, on processes, greater control, and better compliance with the existing regulations including training offered by the Council of Europe. The reports confirmed the findings of the one-on-one interviews. The DIO considers training evaluation as not sufficient as evaluation of human rights training did not achieve the anticipated goals.

#### **Bias in qualitative case study research analysis**

Research conducted by, and with, human subjects runs the risk of bias. The researcher has extensive knowledge of the Council of Europe human rights training programs for law enforcement officials. The researcher was the program manager of the Police and Human Rights Program from 2006 throughout 2009, and was responsible for organizing, performing, and evaluating human rights training activities. A lack of rigor caused by the bias and the emotional attachment of the researcher could be a consequence (Yin, 2014).

Further, the Institutional Review Board authorized the exploratory qualitative multi-case study, the case site and community involved in the study, and the participants who were integral members of this research study using detailed and rigorous review

processes and informed consent forms. Chapter 3 described the various steps the researcher put in place to safeguard this study from bias. The researcher has the obligation to limit bias within the study. The following paragraphs include the steps taken to admit and to reduce researcher bias during gathering and analyzing data.

The researcher responsible for the exploratory qualitative multi-case study took several steps to limit potential bias. Field-testing of the interview questions minimized researcher bias and helped safeguarding that interview questions did not lead to an anticipated result of the study (Yin, 2014). Constant reporting to university personnel took place. The analysis of the results followed the pre-set protocols that were formulated before data collection. Following the protocols is crucial when it comes to case study analysis (Yin, 2009).

Accordingly, to reduce bias and increase the likelihood of honest responses, no participant was interviewed who worked together with the researcher on training evaluation. The researcher took notes how he selected the participants (Yin, 2014). The notes included the reasoning why the participant did not work together with the interviewer between 2006 and 2009. To reduce interviewer bias, the researcher did not interject personal opinions during the interviews (Yin, 2014). The researcher held as close as possible to what the participants said, not what the participants implied.

It is difficult to guard against bias because the nature of interviews is a combination of thoughts and perceptions of the researcher and the participants (Seidmann, 2013). Interviews are subject to a host of other factors such as interview experience and skill level of the researcher and participants; researcher to participant relationship; location of the interview; time of day; fatigue level of all parties; and family

and personal life (Seidman, 2013). One way to limit the affecting factors was to have interview protocols that were member checked. The researcher adhered to such protocols while providing a forum for each participant to express his or her views. Adhering to pre-set protocols involved constant reference to research questions and was an important step in remaining true to the participants' views as well as the goals and objectives of the exploratory qualitative multi-case study.

Constant reflection and interrogation support the goal of reanalyzing the findings under different lights, through different lenses, and with different perspectives (Ellingson, 2006; Yin, 2009). Constant review of the study findings included the incorporation of rival explanations into the case study analysis (Yin, 2009). Concerning qualitative data generated from interviews and collection tools, Marshall and Rosman (2011) recommended using predetermined research questions and subsequent literature to develop frameworks used as guidelines during the final analysis phases. The tables illustrated in this chapter are the result of this advice. The researcher made efforts to link the research question to the final analysis of collected data, and the final pages of discussion and implications for future research.

## **Results**

The importance of training has increased enormously, and contemporary organizations are paying more attention to training and training evaluation than in the past (Rafiq, 2015). The data analysis of the qualitative multi-case study explored whether training evaluation of Council of Europe leaders supported the development of increased emphasis and value in training. Training evaluation is the systematic approach to collect relevant information (Rafiq, 2015). Training evaluation generates the

information for decision-making about participants, training methods, and training contents (Rafiq, 2015). Training evaluation is necessary for justification of investment, serves the improvement for future training programs, and helps to find out whether the objective of the training was met (Rafiq, 2015). The data analysis of the collected data needs to include an analysis on whether the training evaluation of Council of Europe leaders generates information for decision-making and serves the objective of training improvement.

The four-level Kirkpatrick evaluation model was initially developed in 1959. It has gained a broad acceptance for the evaluation of training (Bates, 2004). While the first (reaction) and second (learning) level evaluations provide assessment for the internal validity of the training program, the third (third) and fourth (results) level show the external validity of the program (Steensma & Groeneveld, 2010). The data analysis of the qualitative multi-case study explored if Council of Europe leaders are applying the four-level Kirkpatrick evaluation model for training evaluation of human rights training for law enforcement officials.

Transactional leadership defines a contingency-reward relationship between the leader and the follower (Burns, 2010). Active and passive attributes describe how the two categories of transactional leaders execute management by exception functionality (Molero et al., 2007). Transformational leadership facilitates a redefinition of a people's mission and vision, a renewal of a leader's commitment and restructuring their systems for goal accomplishment (Bass, 1985). The data analysis of the qualitative multi-case study explored if Council of Europe leaders are following the transactional or transformational leadership approach.

## Summary

In Chapter 4, the researcher presented the data collected for the exploratory qualitative multi-case study. Chapter 4 includes the essential statements extracted from interviews of eleven Council of Europe. Each essential statement is followed by a member-checked quote from the interviewees. The analysis conducted through NVivo 10TM© can be found in Appendix J. In the triangulation section, the documents collected and examined are displayed and scrutinized. The collected and examined documents include litigations from the European Court of Human Rights, reports from the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, and annual reports from the Directorate of Internal Oversight of the Council of Europe. The section on bias in qualitative case study research analysis is followed by the results of Chapter.

Chapter 5 continues the case study report with an open-ended discussion allowing reanalysis of the data. Chapter 5 comprises the conclusion and recommendations of the exploratory qualitative multi-case study. Chapter 5 starts with the discussion of findings followed by limitations. The recommendations for Council of Europe leaders and the recommendations for future research complete the study.

## Chapter 5

### Conclusions and Recommendations

Chapter 5 includes the conclusion and recommendations from the exploratory qualitative multi-case study. Chapter 5 follows the structure of the data analysis provided in Chapter 4. The discussion of findings starts after the research question. The discussion of findings includes findings from the interviews, the evaluation guidelines of the Council of Europe, current formative and summative training evaluation, improving training evaluation, the HELP program, and the review of documents. The recommendations for Council of Europe leaders and the recommendations for future research complete the study.

#### **Research Question**

The research question is: What effective strategies do Council of Europe leaders use to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines?

#### **Discussion of Findings**

The importance of training has increased enormously, and contemporary organizations are paying more attention to training and training evaluation than in the past (Rafiq, 2015). The analysis of the data qualitative multi-case study explored whether training evaluation of Council of Europe leaders supports the development of increased training importance. Training evaluation is the systematic approach to collect relevant information (Rafiq, 2015). Training evaluation generates the information for decision-making about participants, training methods, and training contents (Rafiq, 2015). Training evaluation is necessary for justification of investment, serves the

improvement for future training programs, and helps to find out whether the objective of the training was met (Rafiq, 2015). The data analysis of the collected data needs to include an analysis on whether the training evaluation of Council of Europe leaders generates information for decision-making and serves the objective of training improvement.

The four-level Kirkpatrick evaluation model was initially developed in 1959. It has gained a broad acceptance for the evaluation of training (Bates, 2004). While the first (reaction) and second (learning) level evaluations provide assessment for the internal validity of the training program, the third (third) and fourth (results) level show the external validity of the program (Steensma & Groeneveld, 2010). The data analysis of the qualitative multi-case study should explore if Council of Europe leaders are applying the four-level Kirkpatrick evaluation model for training evaluation of human rights training for law enforcement officials.

Transactional leadership defines a contingency-reward relationship between the leader and the follower (Burns, 2010). Active and passive attributes describe how the two categories of transactional leaders execute management by exception functionality (Molero et al., 2007). Transformational leadership facilitates a redefinition of a people's mission and vision, a renewal of a leader's commitment and restructuring their systems for goal accomplishment (Bass, 1985). The data analysis of the qualitative multi-case study should explore if Council of Europe leaders are following the transactional or transformational leadership approach.

## **Interviews**

Training evaluation within the Council of Europe is dependent on the budget line of training activities. For human rights training financed by the European Union, the Council of Europe is regularly used as the facilitator of the respective training. The Council of Europe organizes the training in the framework of projects with budgets lines assigned for training evaluation. The Council of Europe also organizes and performs training outside of a project financed by the ordinary budget of the Council of Europe. Such Council of Europe training take place in member states in which no training projects financed by the European Union are organized. Training financed by the ordinary budget of the Council of Europe might also be conducted where there is a specific need that is not part of a European Union project. The Council of Europe is also conducting and financing conferences or multi-lateral conferences that are organized in Strasbourg/France. Training and conferences financed by the Council of Europe have no budget lines assigned for training evaluation.

## **Evaluation Guidelines of the Council of Europe**

The purpose of the evaluation guidelines is to provide Council of Europe staff implementing evaluations with guidelines and standards that can be applied throughout their evaluation work in order to standardize the application of procedures and to assure quality of evaluations (Council of Europe Secretariat, 2014). The evaluation guidelines were signed and distributed in April 2014. The data analysis of the exploratory qualitative multi-case study provided insights into the use of the evaluation guidelines of the Council of Europe. The statements from the interviewees were heterogeneous. No interviewee stated that he or she follows the evaluation guidelines. Most of the

interviewees asserted that there are no evaluation guidelines of the Council of Europe, or that there is no structured training evaluation. One interviewee admitted that she partly read the guidelines, but she does not apply the guidelines for her training activities, as the guidelines do not match her needs. Another interviewee summarized that her unit does not follow the evaluation guidelines because her unit is not familiar with the guidelines. Another reason provided for not using the guidelines was that the program manager does not know where to find it. The guidelines should not be considered as an evaluation strategy. The evaluation guidelines leave the space and the room for project managers to adjust the methodology in terms of the specific needs of the respective project. The main user of the guidelines is the Department for Internal Oversight DIO.

Interviewees clarified that through a lack of internal communication, important information regarding training and training evaluation is not transferred to and between program managers. Without a training evaluation system, training cannot be effectively developed. There is also a lack of evaluation of the staff providing training. Such a lack of evaluation may lead to weak performance of program managers. Another issue affecting the motivation of program managers is their short-term employment contracts.

### **Current Formative and Self-Developed Summative Training Evaluation**

Program manager are assigned to organize human rights training financed by the European Union within the framework of budgets and by the ordinary budget of the Council of Europe. Evaluation started when program managers were requested to perform structured evaluation with questionnaires at the end of human rights training conducted by the Council of Europe. The European Union introduced intensive evaluation as a part of the project contracts. Some evaluation must be an external

evaluation, implying financial issues. External evaluation is different from internal evaluation. Interviewees explained that the whole system, including evaluation, became too bureaucratic and too hierarchical.

Program managers make use of trainers to conduct human rights training for law enforcement officials. Program managers and trainers write training reports such as interim reports, progress reports, and final reports for projects and human rights training. The reports include the number of trainees, as well as major difficulties and major items highlighted by the trainees. The interviewees felt such training reports are subjective because the reports include the personal point of view of the program manager. The training report disregards the point of view of the trainees. The interviewees do not consider the training reports as a proper and objective training evaluation. The reports do not include an objective description explaining what the major elements were, how the training was implemented, and what the outcome of the training was. The reports do not include any information about the usefulness of the training. The reports should also include the lacunae, the loopholes, and further needs. For training facilitated in the framework of a project financed by the European Union, the reports do not fulfill the requirement of the evaluation requested by the European Union. The reports are a quantitative.

Program managers of the Council of Europe do not rely on the evaluation guidelines. Interviewees asserted the Council of Europe has no system to evaluate the training. It is up to the individual project manager to organize evaluation of activities. Interviewees confirmed they have developed and conducted evaluations on their own initiative. Training evaluation of program managers depends on the funding of the

respective training activity. Training activities financed by the European Union require training evaluation implemented in the project plan. The results of the training evaluation are submitted to the financing authority. Program managers developed a wide range of training evaluation tools and activities, including self-developed strategies for training evaluation to fulfil the requirements of the European Union. The self-developed strategies are based on the previous experiences of the program managers and trainers.

Interviewees invented self-developed evaluation-like questionnaires because from their perspective it is important to know the point of view of the trainees. Only after an evaluation, could program managers change the approach of the training. Simple questionnaires contain questions about whether the trainees were happy with the content, whether the training was useful, whether the premises were good, and whether the coffee was served hot. Several items about the training, which should be addressed through a proper, evaluation-training questionnaire, are not included in such simple questionnaires. One interviewee elaborated that his unit introduced follow-up evaluation sessions for the local trainers who have undertaken the Training of Trainers courses.

One interviewee elucidated that she uses self-developed questionnaires as an evaluation tool for training activities she organized herself. The questionnaires allow assessment of the level of knowledge after the trainees exit the training. The team of the respective unit collaborates to improve the questionnaires. Questionnaires should be completed again after three months and after six months to assess the knowledge of the participants and to assess if the participants apply the training in their daily life. All institutions involved in the training are involved in the training evaluation. The described evaluation is not applied systematically for all projects.

Training evaluation developed by program managers for human rights training including Training of Trainers activities often contain pre- and post-knowledge and skills tests. Such tests measure the immediate result of the training. Pre- and post-tests are distributed and collected by trainers and sent back to program managers after the training. Pre- and post-tests may be complemented by self-developed multiple-choice questions and oral exams. Another self-developed evaluation tool for trainers includes exercises, handouts, and ideas about different types of scenarios, most role-playing. The aim is that the participants should identify themselves with victims and investigators on the crime scene. Program managers together with experts and trainers are developing entry and exit questionnaires based on the substance of the respective training to measure the level of knowledge at the entrance and level of knowledge at the exit.

One interviewee explained that his unit recently started launching evaluation techniques to make long-term evaluations. For such long-term evaluations, a focus group of ten or twenty is selected from a group of hundred or two hundred participants to evaluate the training after six months, after one year, and after two years. The same unit developed a questionnaire that was addressed to police officers. A population of 1,000 up to 1,200 police officers answered the questionnaires. It was not an evaluation on a specific training but there were general questions about participants' attendance, if participants remember the training, and if the participants believe that they need more training. The questionnaires also include questions regarding specific knowledge about Swedish standards and about the European Convention on Human Rights. The evaluation needs to be developed in a more systematic and a more long-term way.

Program managers developed an additional internal evaluation to evaluate the overall project performance. Such internal evaluation contains three up to five self-designed matrixes to be completed every three or four months. The internal evaluation is not required by the European Union for the projects financed but allows program managers to monitor and to assess if the goals of the projects have been achieved. Program manager consider such internal evaluation as indispensable to start further activities in the member states.

Program managers are involved in the programmatic scheme of developing projects. Program managers are focusing on internal evaluation. Internal evaluation concerns the knowledge and skills gained by the beneficiary and by the trainees at various capacity building activities provided by the Council of Europe within the scope of the project. Interviewees asserted that the Directorate of Internal Oversight recently performs evaluation within the Council of Europe. The Directorate of Internal Oversight works professionally without outside evaluators. They are professional evaluators, and are paid to evaluate units dealing with European Union financed projects.

### **The HELP Program**

One interviewee stated she was involved in the development of guidelines for the development of training for legal professionals in her previous position. This guidebook is called “The HELP Course from Design to Evaluation”. The interviewee explained that the idea of the guidebook was to develop guidelines to help trainers but also program managers from the first phase of development up to the evaluation. The respective chapter is called ‘How to evaluate the course and plan its follow up.’ The interviewee considers the guidelines as useful and comprehensive. The guidelines propose that at the

beginning and at the end of a training activity, a questionnaire should be handed out, which would allow at the end of the training to assess the evolution. Further questionnaires might be handed out after three months and after six months. The only challenge that appeared connected to training evaluation was the unwillingness of participants to provide feedback. As evaluation has been not compulsory, the trainers now make evaluation part of the course. Evaluation has been included as an objective. The interviewee reiterated that is very important to make sure that evaluation is an important part of training.

### **Improving Training Evaluation**

The interviewees underlined the need to know if the trainees have received the necessary information for their current day-to-day work. Program managers try to obtain such information by qualitative evaluation. Qualitative evaluation should measure knowledge at the beginning and at the end of the training. Evaluation should take place six months after the training. This is rarely done with Council of Europe human rights training. There is a contractual obligation to evaluate European Union financed projects including standardized questionnaires.

Interviewees asserted that it is no problem to let the participants fill the pre- and the post-training questionnaires. The feedback from local trainers is provided in the form of a report. There is a lack of a formal midterm evaluation on the application of the gained knowledge, skills and practice. The interviewees proposed to use the personnel of the beneficiary in the respective member state, because the personnel of the beneficiary has participated in the cascade training sessions. Such personnel could facilitate the

evaluation through five or six focus group sessions within the organization. The length of the focus sessions would not extend one or two hours.

Interviewees asserted that the Council of Europe does not provide the evaluation tools. The respective units performing the human rights training have developed the tools. The Council of Europe is not following a certain methodology. Interviewees asserted that proper training monitoring and evaluation requires clarity when a training is programmed. The success of a training can be checked one year after the project has ended. Therefore, an evaluation methodology should include follow up evaluation.

The evaluation instrument itself must be flexible, adaptable to different types of training, to different type of recipients, and to different training groups. Capacity building and evaluation of training in combination with all other factors is a difficult area. Interviewees elaborated that donors like the European Union are asking the program manager to show the results of the training. The donor is not specifically asking for an evaluation, rather the donor is asking for the results. Interviewees highlighted that flexibility of evaluation guidelines is important, and that bureaucracies and protocols are killing the spirit and the efficiency of the work. A reaction on inventing evaluation guidelines is not just create another piece of bureaucracy but make the guidelines relevant.

Interviewees propose to improve the evaluation guidelines through more freedom, more autonomy, and more flexibility. The guidelines should also fit if the project is relatively small and has limited resources. In the case, a program manager or supervisor is left with the choice about where to spend the money it should be possible to spend the respective budget solely on training.

## **Documents**

The purpose of the triangulation was to confirm the findings of the analysis of the results of the exploratory qualitative multi-case study. Summative training evaluations may enhance the accountability of training, feed into management and decision-making processes, maximize the impact of the training provided, and may drive organizational learning and innovation (Bloom, Hasting, & Madaus, 1971). Summative training evaluations should lead to a reduction of litigations from the European Court of Human Rights against law enforcement officials in member states of the Council of Europe. Summative training evaluation should also be reflected in reports from the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, and in annual reports from the Directorate of Internal Oversight.

## **Litigations of the European Court of Human Rights**

The researcher used the HUDOC database to identify litigation of the European Court of Human Rights against member states of the Council of Europe, where misconduct of law enforcement officials led to a violation of human rights. The researcher limited the research to the years 2010 until 2018. The researcher selected litigations against member states of the Council of Europe, which are not member states of the European Union. Member states of the European Union are not covered by human rights training of the Council of Europe. The researcher identified 32 cases in which misconduct of law enforcement officials was considered a serious violation of human rights of citizens. The research was limited to the years 2010 until 2018 and to member states of the Council of Europe, which are not member states of the European Union. The high number indicates that law enforcement official still lack effective human rights

training. Human rights training for law enforcement official would be more effective, if the training would include findings from a summative training evaluation.

### **Reports from the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.**

The researcher used the HUDOC database to identify reports of visits of the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment to member states of the Council of Europe, where severe physical ill-treatment of persons detained by the police as criminal suspects led to a violation of human rights. The researcher limited the research to the years 2017 and 2018. The researcher selected reports about member states of the Council of Europe, which are not member states of the European Union. Member states of the European Union are not covered by human rights training of the Council of Europe. The researcher has evaluated four reports issued in 2017 and 2018 for Azerbaijan, Ukraine (2 visits/reports), and Serbia. All reports include that the CPT received numerous and widespread allegations of severe physical ill-treatment of persons detained by the police as criminal suspects including juveniles as young as 15. The alleged police ill-treatment appeared to follow a very consistent pattern throughout the different regions visited. Police ill-treatment was said to have occurred mostly in police establishments during initial interviews by operational police officers, with the aim to force the persons to sign a confession, provide other information or accept additional charges. Law enforcement officials have not been trained effectively to refrain from misconduct. Summative training evaluation would have led to a more effective human rights training for law enforcement officials.

## **Annual Reports from the Directorate of Internal Oversight.**

The Directorate of Internal Oversight (DIO) of the Council of Europe provides independent oversight, objective assurance, and consulting services designed to add value to and improve the Organization's operations (Council of Europe, 2017f). The researcher evaluated the annual reports 2016 and 2017 issued by the Directorate of Internal Oversight. The reports were assessed concerning the statements of the DIO about training evaluation. The reports contained recommendations to provide the Council of Europe with more transparent and efficient processes, greater controls, and better compliance with the existing regulations including training offered by the Council of Europe.

## **Leadership**

The purpose of the qualitative multi-case study was to explore Council of Europe's strategies regarding human rights training evaluation. The analysis of results focused on the analysis of the interviews of eleven Council of Europe leaders and their strategies regarding training evaluation. Two leadership styles show promise in providing effective strategies to assure that program manager are following the evaluation guidelines. The leadership styles are transactional leadership and transformational leadership. Bass (1985) suggested that transactional and transformational leadership are separate concepts and that good leaders demonstrate characteristics of both.

## **Leadership Styles**

The transactional leadership theory views the leader-follower relation as a sequence of transactions and exchanges between the leader and the followers. Transactional leaders focus on an exchange of resources (Burns, 2010). A transactional

leader-follower relationship includes rewards or punishments, respectively, to compensate followers' compliance and efforts to achieve organizational goals, or followers' failure to meet the leader's goals (Burns, 1978). Transactional leadership is often referred to as command-and-control type leadership (Burns, 2010). Transactional leadership has been the typical type of leadership used in organizations, the military, and government service (Burns, 2010).

Transforming leadership is a process whereby leaders and followers support each other to achieve a higher level of moral and motivation. Transforming leaders should be able to generate considerable change in the life of people, organizations, and communities (Burns, 1978). Transforming leaders possess the traits, personality, and characteristics to articulate energized vision and challenging goals (Burns, 1978).

### **Council of Europe Leaders**

Program managers are led when Council of Europe leaders provide policies and guidance to achieve the goals of the organization. Program managers are leaders themselves when they develop and perform training evaluation. Program managers are assigned to organize human rights training financed by the European Union in the framework of budgets and by the ordinary budget of the Council of Europe. Program managers make use of trainers to conduct human rights training for law enforcement officials. Program managers and trainers write training reports about the training activities. The reports are quantitative.

The analysis of the results showed that program managers are developing and performing training evaluation tools. Current training evaluation for human rights training is based on tools developed by program managers supported by trainers and

experts. Program managers must provide training results to the European Union, which is financing projects. The tools that are developed and used by program managers have a wide variety and include inter alia ranges from pre- and post-questionnaires, exercises, focus groups, and long-term questionnaires. Program managers realize that the tools used are not sufficient to provide data that would enable them to develop human rights further.

Program managers do not apply the evaluation guidelines of the Council of Europe. The reasons for not applying the guidelines are manifold. Program managers assert that there are no evaluation guidelines or that they do not know where to find them. Program managers also believe that the evaluation guidelines are only applicable for the Department of Internal Oversight. Program managers consider the guidelines as too hierarchical and bureaucratic. A few program managers admitted that they have read the guidelines.

The HELP program serves as an example how evaluation can be implemented successfully in a training project. Within the HELP program, a guidebook called “The HELP Course from Design to Evaluation” has been implemented. The idea of the guidebook was to develop guidelines to help trainers but also program managers from the first phase of development up to the evaluation. The respective chapter in the guidebook is called ‘How to evaluate the course and plan its follow up.’ The guidebook proposes that at the beginning and at the end of training, a questionnaire should be handed out, which would allow at the end of the training to assess the evolution. Further questionnaires might be handed out after three months and after six months.

Program managers have room for improvement even though they are using self-developed evaluation tools to maintain the requirements formulated in the projects.

Program managers assert that there are no evaluation guidelines and that the Council of Europe does not have an evaluation strategy. Program managers could use all means of the Council of Europe prepared for training evaluation. The evaluation guidelines are publicly available and contain tools for training evaluation. Program managers could adjust the content of the evaluation guidelines to their needs and could request advice from the Department for Internal Oversight on training evaluation.

Council of Europe leaders above the level of program managers guided the Council of Europe into the cooperation with the European Union. Such Council of Europe leaders used the implementation of projects financed by the European Union to safeguard business continuation. Projects financed by the European Union assure that the Council of Europe can achieve the goals of the organization. Council of Europe leaders implemented projects through tasking program managers with performing the projects. Council of Europe leaders missed the opportunity to implement a training evaluation policy that efficiently serves all program managers. The implementation of the evaluation guidelines through Council of Europe leaders has not been accepted within the organization. The analysis of results indicates that a lack of communication might have supported the failed acceptance. The Department for Internal Oversight led by Council of Europe leaders is seen as a competent service within the organization. The evaluation guidelines issued by the Department for Internal Oversight are nevertheless not included into the training evaluation for human rights training. The evaluation guidelines are seen as a tool exclusively developed for the Department for Internal Oversight.

Council of Europe leaders utilizing transformational leadership could articulate energized vision and challenging goals. Transformational leadership is grounded in

moral foundations. It seems to be the best suited for leaders to develop effective strategies, which safeguard the application of the evaluation guidelines and ensure effective training evaluation (Bass, 1985). Council of Europe leaders are encouraged to guide program managers to apply the evaluation guidelines. To achieve compliance with the evaluation guidelines, Council of Europe leaders should use all communication means available to achieve acceptance from the program managers on the evaluation guidelines. Program managers claim that the exchange of information and experiences is limited within the organization. Council of Europe leaders should stimulate the exchange of information by simultaneously improving the transparency of information flows. Council of Europe leaders should not hesitate to delegate information management to program managers. Applying transformational leadership includes transforming followers to leaders.

### **Limitations**

The researcher got permission to use the premises of Council of Europe to conduct the interviews within the framework of a study visit. In its letter from August 28, 2018, the Council of Europe granted the researcher permission to use a room within the Council of Europe within the period from October 8 through October 10, 2018. The researcher needed to schedule the interviews within the period October 8 through October 10, 2018. The number of interviews led to data saturation and none of the participants denied the invitation because of not being available within the given period. The limited time might have caused time pressure for participants to be less open, calm, or affected their moods.

## **Recommendations to Council of Europe Leaders**

Program manager act as transactional leaders when they follow the project plans, perform evaluation, and provide such evaluation to the donors of the activities. Program managers do not apply the evaluation guidelines for training evaluation. Program manager are filling the gap of policies when they develop their own evaluation tools. Program managers safeguarded the compliance with the requirements of projects and prevented the Council of Europe from breaking the rules. Some program managers are trying to interconnect projects, but program managers are organizationally and financially bound to their projects and therefore unable to find a higher level of ethical guidelines and motivation. The tools developed and applied by program manager might fulfill the project requirements but lack the achievement of an interconnected strategy.

Council of Europe leaders should create considerable change in the adherence of program managers to the evaluation guidelines when using transformational leadership. Transformational leadership facilitates a redefinition of a people's mission and vision, a renewal of leaders' commitment, and restructuring their systems for goal accomplishments (Bass, 1985). Council of Europe leaders should make use of the motivation and enthusiasm of program managers. Council of Europe leaders, together with the Department for Internal Oversight, should use effective communication and transparency to introduce effective evaluation tools to program managers. Program managers are hesitant to use means provided by the Council of Europe. Council of Europe leaders need to convince program managers that the use of such means is serving their own goals and the goals of the organization. Program managers should be asked to contribute to the development of an evaluation strategy of the organization.

Council of Europe leaders and program managers achieved remarkable results when evaluating human rights training for law enforcement officials. Council of Europe leaders implemented European Union financed projects to assure business continuation of the Council of Europe. Program managers provided a cornerstone of evaluation when using self-developed evaluation tools to provide the required results to the European Union. Council of Europe leaders through transformational leadership should develop training evaluation further to achieve the goals of the organization.

### **Recommendation for Future Research**

The exploratory qualitative multi-case study provided recommendations to improve training evaluation of human training for law enforcement officials. Improved training evaluation should have an impact on human rights adherence of law enforcement officials in member states. A failure to adhere to the evaluation guidelines results in litigations of the European Court of Human Rights. Training evaluation according to the evaluation guidelines would enhance the accountability of training and would diminish the number of litigations against law enforcement officials through the European Court of Human Rights.

A recommendation resulting from the exploratory qualitative multi-case study is to improve communication within the Council of Europe. The researcher did not explore communication within the Council of Europe. Future research could help to explore the communication threads within the organization. Internal communication has an impact on how an organization achieves its goals not limited to training evaluation. Future research on communication within the Council of Europe is recommended.

The exploratory qualitative multi-case study did not explore how human rights training for law enforcement officials can be measured. The study proved that training evaluation should be improved. However, it did not provide indicators for such a training evaluation. Measuring training effectiveness is challenging. Exploring how training effectiveness can be measured would complement the exploratory qualitative multi-case study. A study to explore training effectiveness of human rights training for law enforcement officials of the Council of Europe is recommended.

### **Summary**

Training evaluation generates the information for decision-making about future training methods, training contents, and training participants. Although the Council of Europe Secretariat in 2014 has introduced the evaluation guidelines as a binding document, program managers of the Council of Europe do not apply the evaluation guidelines for training evaluation of human rights training for law enforcement officials. The only current systematic training evaluation is the training report. Training reports are formative. Each individual program manager decides how the evaluation of activities will be organized. Program managers develop and conduct training evaluations on their own initiative. The self-developed training evaluation contains elements of summative training evaluation. Program managers made constructive proposals about conducting training evaluations for human rights training.

Council of Europe leaders and program managers achieved remarkable results when evaluating human rights training for law enforcement officials adding elements of summative evaluation. Program managers provided a cornerstone of evaluation when using self-developed evaluation tools to provide the required results to the European

Union. Council of Europe leaders using transformational leadership should support each other to achieve a higher level of morale and motivation. Council of Europe leaders should generate considerable change concerning training evaluation, as they possess the traits, personality, and characteristics to articulate energized vision and challenging goals. Council of Europe leaders, through transformational leadership, should develop further training evaluation to achieve the goals of the organization.

## References

- Agar, M. H. (1986). *Speaking of ethnography*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Aguinis, H., & Kraiger, K. (2009). Benefits of training and development for individuals and teams, organizations, and society. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *60*, 451-474. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163505
- Alkin, M. C. (1970). Evaluation theory development. *Evaluation Comment*, *2*, 2-7.  
Retrieved from  
<http://web.ics.purdue.edu/~rfrisbie/Professional/Dissertation/FrisbieDissertation7Bibliography.pdf>
- Alliger, G. M., Tannenbaum, S. I., Bennett, W., & Traver, H. (1997). A meta-analysis of the relations among training criteria. *Personnel Psychology*, *50*(2), 341-358. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1997.tb00911.x
- Alpert, G. P., & Dunham, R. G. (1997). *Critical issues in policing* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- American Society for Training and Development (2009). *The value of evaluation: Making training evaluation more effective*. Retrieved from  
<http://www.astdnews.org/>
- Atamuru, Y. (2016). *Exploring employee disengagement perceptions in Canadian manufacturing companies: A multiple case study*. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database.
- Aytes, K., & Connolly, T. (2004). Computer security and risky computing practices: A rational choice perspective. *Journal of Organizational and End User Computing*, *16*(3), 22-40. doi:10.4018/joeuc.2004070102

- Bachman, R., & Schutt, R. K. (2015). *Fundamentals of research in criminology and criminal justice* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Barnes, J., Conrad, K., Demont-Heinrich, C., Graziano, M., Kowalski, D., Neufeld, J., Zamora, J., & Palmquist, M. (2012). *Generalizability and transferability*. Retrieved from <https://writing.colostate.edu/guides/pdfs/guide65.pdf>
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19-31. doi:10.1016/0090-2616(90)90061-S
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Bassi, J. L., & Van Buren, M. E. (1999). Sharpening the leading Edge. *Training and Development*, 53, 23-31.
- Bates, R. (2004). A critical analysis of evaluation practice: The Kirkpatrick model and the principle of beneficence. *Valuation and Program Planning*, 27(3), 341-347. doi:10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2004.04.011
- Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Benson, M. S., & Powell, M. B. (2015). Evaluation of a comprehensive interactive training system for investigative interviewers of children. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 21, 309-322. doi:10.1037/law0000052
- Berg, B. L., & Lune, H. (2012). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

- Birzer, M., & Tannehill, R. (2001). A more effective approach for contemporary policing. *Police Quarterly*, 4, 233-252. doi:10.1177/109861101129197815
- Blaney, J., Filer, K., & Lyon, J. (2014). Assessing high impact practices using NVivo: An automated approach to analyzing student reflections for program improvement. *Research & Practice in Assessment*, 9, 997-100. Retrieved from <http://www.rpajournal.com/dev/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/NIB.pdf>
- Bloom, B.S., Hasting, J. T., & Madaus, G. F. (1971), *Handbook on formative and summative evaluation of student learning*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Bolden, R., & Gosling, J. (2006). Leadership competencies: Time to change the tune? *Leadership*, 2(2), 147-163. doi:10.1177/1742715006062932
- Bramley, P., (2005). Evaluating effective management learning. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 23, 145-153. doi:10.1108/03090599910261826
- Burke, L. A., & Baldwin, T. T. (1999). Workforce training transfer: A study of the effects of relapse prevention training and transfer study site mate. *Human Resource Management*, 38, 227-241. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-050X
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY. Harper & Row.
- Burns, J. M. (2010). *Leadership*. New York, NY. Harper & Row.
- Burns, N., & Grove, S. K. (2011). *Understanding nursing research* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Maryland Heights, MO: Elsevier.
- Bott, J. P. (2007). Case study method. In S. G. Rogelberg. (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of industrial and organizational psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. doi:10.4135/9781412952651.n28

- Byrne, S. M. (1999). *The value of human resource development to an organization: Providing technical assistant to small manufacturing companies*. Doctoral Dissertation. Retrieved from <https://theses.lib.vt.edu/theses/available/etd-041899-231130/unrestricted/etd.pdf>
- Carlson, J. A. (2010). Avoiding Traps in Member Checking. *The Qualitative Report*, 15(5), 1102-1113. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol15/iss5/4>
- Carnevale, A. P., & Shulz, E. R. (1990). Return on investment: Accounting for training. *Training and Development Journal*, 44, 1-32. Retrieved from <http://www.worldcat.org/title/return-on-investment-accounting-for-training/oclc/743493513?referer=di&ht=edition>
- Casio, W. F. (2000). *Costing human resources: The financial impact of behavior in Organizations* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Cincinnati OH: South-Western.
- Castillo-Montoya, M. (2016). Preparing for interview research: The interview protocol refinement framework. *The Qualitative Report*, 21. Retrieved from <http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol21/iss5/2>
- Certo, S. C., & Certo, S. T. (2006). *Modern management*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall.
- Chappell, A. (2008). Police academy training: Comparing across curricula. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 31(1), 36-56.  
doi:10.1108/13639510810852567
- Chiaburu, D., Van Dam, K., & Hutchins, H. (2010). Social support in the workplace and training transfer: a longitudinal analysis. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 18, 187-200. Retrieved from

<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.920.4478&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

- Chowdhury, I. A. (2015). Issue of quality in a qualitative research: An overview. *Innovative issues and approaches in social science*, 8(3), 142-162.  
doi:10.1590/0104-070720150001150015
- Christensen, L. B., Johnson, R. B., & Turner, L. A. (2014). *Research methods, design, and analysis* (12<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Committee of Ministers (2015). *Consolidated financial statements of the Council of Europe for the year ended 31 December 2014*. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=09000016804b7dae>
- Cone, J. D., & Foster, S. L. (2006). *Dissertations and theses from start to finish*. American Psychological Association. Washington, D.C.: APA
- Cooper, S., Endacott, R., & Chapman, Y. (2009). Qualitative research: Specific designs for qualitative research in emergency care? *Emergency Medicine Journal*, 26(11), 773-776. doi:10.1136/emj.2008.07115
- Council of Europe (1993). *Recommendation 1222–Fight against racism, xenophobia and intolerance*. Retrieved from <http://www.assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-en.asp?fileid=15256&lang=en>
- Council of Europe (1997). *Recommendation 1346–Human rights education*. Retrieved from <http://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-EN.asp?fileid=15380&lang=en>
- Council of Europe (1998). *Yearbook of the European convention on human rights 1997*. Leiden, NL: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

Council of Europe (2000). *Yearbook of the European convention on human rights 1999*.

Leiden, NL: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

Council of Europe (2004). *Recommendation (2004)4 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on the European Convention on Human Rights in university education and professional training*. Retrieved from

[https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result\\_details.aspx?ObjectID=09000016805dd13a](https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?ObjectID=09000016805dd13a)

Council of Europe (2013). *ECHR: Need to reinforce the training of legal professionals*.

Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights. Retrieved from <http://websitepace.net/documents/19838/166208/20140131-PRESSajdoc39.pdf/ac911b33-bab6-4ae4-a926-dac124010c15>

Council of Europe (2014a). *The European Convention on Human Rights: The need to reinforce the training of legal professionals*. Retrieved from

<http://www.assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTML-en.asp?fileid=20550&lang=en>

Council of Europe (2014b). *Parliamentary assembly*. Retrieved from

[https://www.coe.int/t/democracy/migration/bodies/pace\\_en.asp](https://www.coe.int/t/democracy/migration/bodies/pace_en.asp)

Council of Europe (2015a). *Council of Europe program and budget 2016-2017*.

Retrieved from

<https://wcd.coe.int/com.instranet.InstraServlet?command=com.instranet.CmdBlobGet&InstranetImage=2864512&SecMode=1&DocId=2342508&Usage=2>

Council of Europe (2015b). *Human rights, democracy, rule of law*. Retrieved from

<http://www.coe.int/en/web/about-us/values>

- Council of Europe (2017a). *Evaluation activities*. Retrieved from <http://www.coe.int/en/web/internal-oversight/evaluation-activities>
- Council of Europe (2017b). *What is HELP?* Retrieved from <http://www.coe.int/en/web/help/about-help>
- Council of Europe (2017c). *Training as a sine qua non to human rights protection*. Retrieved from <http://www.coe.int/en/web/help/training-as-a-sine-qua-non-to-human-rights-protection>
- Council of Europe (2017d). *Mandate and organizational chart*. Retrieved from <http://www.coe.int/en/web/human-rights-rule-of-law/mandate-organigramme>
- Council of Europe (2017e). *Joint programmes between the Council of Europe and the European Union*. Retrieved from <http://www.jp.coe.int/>
- Council of Europe (2017f). *Directorate of Internal Oversight*. Retrieved from <http://www.coe.int/en/web/internal-oversight/dio>
- Council of Europe (2017g). *Headquarters and offices*. Retrieved from <http://www.coe.int/en/web/about-us/headquarters-and-offices>
- Council of Europe (2018). The committee of ministers. Retrieved from <https://www.coe.int/en/web/cm/home?desktop=true>
- Council of Europe Secretariat (2014). *Evaluation guidelines*. Retrieved from <https://www.coe.int/en/web/internal-oversight/evaluation-activities>
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2007). *Basics of qualitative research techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

- Cunha, P., Rego, A., Cunha, R., Cardoso, C., Marques, C., & Gomes, J. (2010). *Manual de Gestão de Pessoas e do Capital Humano* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Edições Silabo, Lisboa.
- Curado, C., & Teixeira, S. M. (2014). Training evaluation levels and ROI: The case of a small logistics company. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 38, 845-870. doi:10.1108/EJTD-05-2014-0037
- Daft, R. L., & Lane, P. G. (2008). *The leadership experience* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Mason, OH: Thomson South Western.
- D'Arcy, J., Hovav, A., & Galletta, D. (2009). User awareness of security countermeasures and its impact on information systems misuse: A deterrence approach. *Information Systems Research*, 20(1), 155-157. doi:0.1287
- Davidove, E. A. (1993). Evaluating the return on investment of training. *Performance Improvement*, 32, 1-8. doi:10.1002/pfi.4170320103
- Day, D. V., & Antonakis, J. (2012). *The nature of leadership* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Deutsch, A. (1979). *The human resources revolution: Communicate or litigate*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Donalek, J. G. (2004). Demystifying nursing research: Phenomenology as a qualitative research method. *Urologic Nursing*, 24, 516–517.

- Donnelly, R., & Fitzmaurice, M. (2005). Designing modules for learning. In: O'Neill, G., et al. (eds.). *Emerging issues in the practice of university learning and teaching*. Dublin: Aishe.
- Ellingson, L. L. (2009). *Engaging crystallization in qualitative research: An introduction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Ennis, M. R. (2008). *Competency models: A review of the literature and the role of the Employment and Training Administration (ETA)*. Retrieved from [http://www.americascareers.com/CompetencyModel/Info\\_Documents/OPDRLiteratureReview.pdf](http://www.americascareers.com/CompetencyModel/Info_Documents/OPDRLiteratureReview.pdf)
- European Court of Human Rights (2007). *Annual Report 2006*. Retrieved from [http://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/Annual\\_report\\_2006\\_ENG.pdf](http://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/Annual_report_2006_ENG.pdf)
- European Court of Human Rights (2016). *Brussels declaration*. Retrieved from [http://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/Brussels\\_Declaration\\_ENG.pdf](http://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/Brussels_Declaration_ENG.pdf)
- European Court of Human Rights (2017a). *Annual Report 2016*. Retrieved from [http://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/Annual\\_report\\_2016\\_ENG.pdf](http://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/Annual_report_2016_ENG.pdf)
- European Court of Human Rights (2017b). *HUDOC*. Retrieved from <http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/>
- Field, P. A., & Morse, J. M. (1985). *Nursing research: The application of qualitative approaches*. Rockville, MD: Aspen.
- Finn, J. E., & Kohler, P. D. (2010). Transition outcomes project: Perceptions of school personnel explored through a multiple case study. *Journal of Ethnographic & Qualitative Research*, 4, 95-107. doi:10.1177/0192636517743788

- Ford, J. K., & Sinha, R. (2008). Advances in training evaluation research. In C. Cooper, & S. Cartwright (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Personnel Psychology*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Frazer, D. R., (2013). *Origins and evolution of American policing*. Retrieved from <https://www.pearsonhighered.com/assets/samplechapter/0/1/3/3/0133028313.pdf>
- Fusch, P. I., & Ness, L. R. (2015). Are we there yet? Data saturation in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, 20. 1408. Retrieved from <http://nsuworks.nova.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2281&context=tqr>
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2007). *Educational Research: An Introduction* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman Publishers
- Gibbons, A. (2004). *Key issues on the evaluation of training and development activities*. Retrieved from [www.andrewgibbons.co.uk](http://www.andrewgibbons.co.uk)
- Goh, J. W. P., Lee, O. K. & Salleh, H. (2010). Self-rating and respondent anonymity. *Journal Educational Research*, 52, 229-245. doi:10.1080/00131881.2010.504060
- Goldstein, I. L. (1986). *Training in Organizations: Needs assessment, development and evaluation*. Monterey, CA: Brooks Cole Publishing Company.
- Goldstein, I. L., & Ford, J. K. (2002), *Training in organizations: Needs assessment, development, and evaluation* (4<sup>th</sup> ed). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Group.
- Gomez-Mejia, L .R., Balkin, D. B., & Cardy, R. L. (2016). *Managing human resources* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). Toronto: Pearson.
- Grant, C. S. (2015). *A case study of transformational leadership characteristics of a principal in a high poverty high achieving school*. Retrieved from

<https://mospace.umsystem.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10355/46914/research.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y>

Griffin, R. (2012). *A stakeholder approach to training evaluation*. Retrieved from [www.trainingjournal.com](http://www.trainingjournal.com)

Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Harris, F. (2006). *Evaluation models and methods. The Role of Capacity-Building in Police Reform. Department of Police Education and Development*. OSCE Mission in Kosovo. Retrieved from <http://www.osce.org/kosovo/19783>

Hunter-Johnson, Y. (2012). *Perceptions of a learning organization and factors within the work environment that influence transfer of training in law enforcement*. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text. UMI 3548098.

Hutchison, A. J., Johnston, L. H., & Breckon, J. D. (2010). Using QSRNVivo to facilitate the development of a grounded theory project: An account of a worked example. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 13(4), 283-302. doi: 10.1080/13645570902996301

Holland, J. (2007). Emotions and research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 10(3), 195-209. doi:10.1080/13645570701541894

Hollander, E. P., & Offermann, L. R. (1993). Power and leadership in organizations. In W. E. Rosenbach and R. L. Taylor (Eds.), *Contemporary issues in leadership studies* (62-86). Boulder, CO: Westview Press, Inc.

- Hollenbeck, G. P., Morgan W., McCall Jr., & Silzer, R. F. (2006). Leadership competency models. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *17*, 398-413.  
doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.04.003
- Holton, E. F., (1996). The flawed four-level evaluation model. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *7*(1), 5-21. doi:10.1002/hrdq.3920070103
- Holton, E. F., & Baldwin, T. T. (2003). *Improving Learning Transfer Systems in Organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Josey Bass and Pfeiffer.
- John, L. D. (2012). *Human resource management in the public sector: Policies and practices*. New York, NY: Sharpe.
- Johnson, R. R. (2015). Police organizational commitment: The influence of supervisor feedback and support. *Crime & Delinquency*, *61*, 1155-1180.  
doi:10.1177/0011128712466887
- Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research. *Educational Researcher*, *33*(7), 14-26. Retrieved from  
<http://www.socsci.uci.edu/~castellj/fieldstudies/webdocs/F-Readings/MixedMethodsResearch.pdf>
- Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2000). Five factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *85*, 751-765. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.85.5.751
- Judge, T. A., Joyce E. B., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology* *87*, 765-780. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.87.4.765

- Karen, K (1996). *What is effective training?* IHRN Human Rights NGO Capacity Building Programme - Iraq. Retrieved from <http://www.ihrnetwork.org/files/7.%20What%20is%20Effective%20Training.PDF>
- Kaur, L., & Bhatia, A. (2013). Involvement of stakeholders in evaluation: A prerequisite for success of training programs. *International Journal of Management Research and Review*, 3, 3229-3237. Retrieved from [www.ijmrr.com](http://www.ijmrr.com)
- Klinger, D. E. Nalbandian, J., & Llorens, J. (2016). *Public personnel management: Contexts and strategies* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- King, W. R., & Lab, S. P. (2000). Crime prevention, community policing, and training: Old wine in new bottles. *Police Practice and Research*, 1, 241-252.
- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1959). *Evaluating training programs* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). San Francisco, CA: Berrett Koehler.
- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1960). Techniques for evaluating training programs. *Journal of ASTD*, 14(1), 13-18.
- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1976). Evaluation. In R. L. Craig, & L. R. Bittel (Eds.). *Training and Development Handbook* (301-309). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1979). Techniques for evaluating training programs. *Training and Development Journal*, 33(6), 78-92.
- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1994). *Evaluating training programs*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1996). Great ideas revisited. *Training & Development*, 50(1), 54-60.

- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1998). *Evaluating training programs: The four levels* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Kirkpatrick, D. L., & Kirkpatrick, J.D. (2006). *Evaluating training programs—The four levels* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Kucan, L. (2011). Approximating the practice of writing the dissertation literature review. *Literacy Research and Instruction, 50*, 229-240.  
doi:10.1080/19388071.2010.514037
- Krishnaveni, R., & Sripirabaa, B. (2008). Capacity building as a tool for assessing training and development activity: an Indian case study. *International Journal of Training and Development, 12*(2), 121-134. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2419.2008.00299.x
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*.
- Locke, L. F., Spirduso, W. W. & Silverman, S. J. (2013). *Proposals that work* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Martin, X. (2011). Toward a new conceptual model of management and leadership competencies and their impact on organizations' performance. In C. Despres (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 7th European conference on management leadership and governance* (270-276). London, UK: Academy Publishing Company.
- Marczyk, G., DeMatteo, D., & Festinger, D. (2005). *Essentials of research design and methodology*. New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.

- Mason, M. (2010). Sample size and saturation in PhD studies using qualitative interviews. *Qualitative Social Research*, 11(3). Retrieved from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1428/3027>
- May, L. S., Moore, C. A., & Zammit, S. J. (1987). *Evaluating business and industry training*. Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2014). *Designing qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McElroy, J. C. (2001). Managing workplace commitment by putting people first. *Human Resources Management Review*, 11, 327-335. doi: 10.1016/S1053-4822(00)00054-1
- McLean, S. and Moss, G. (2003). They're happy, but did they make a difference? Applying Kirkpatrick's framework to the evaluation of a national leadership program. *Revue Canadienne D'Évaluation de Program*, 18, 1-23. Retrieved from <https://evaluationcanada.ca/secure/18-1-001.pdf>
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2015). *Qualitative Research: A guide to design and implementation*. (4<sup>th</sup> ed). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, L. (2012). ASTD 2012 state of the industry report - organizations continue to invest in workplace learning. *Training & Development Magazine*, 66, 42-48. Retrieved from <https://www.td.org/Publications/Magazines/TD/TD-Archive/2012/11/ASTD-2012-State-of-the-Industry-Report>
- Miner, J. B. (2005). Role motivation theory. *Organizational behavior 1: Essential theories of motivation and leadership*. 319-336. New York, NY: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Mitchell, G. (1987). *The trainer's handbook the AMA guide to effective training*. New York, NY: Amacom.

- Molero, F., Cuadrado, I., Navas, M., & Morales, J. F. (2007). Relations and effects of transformational leadership: A comparative analysis with traditional leadership styles. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 10(2), 358-368.  
doi:10.1017/S1138741600006624
- Moss, J. (1968). The evaluation of occupational education programs. *Technical Report*. 23-33.
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, SA: Sage.
- Nadler, L. (1979). *Designing training programs*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Niazi, A. S. (2011). Training and development strategy and its role in organizational performance. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 1, 42-57.  
doi:doi.org/10.5296/jpag.v1i2.862
- Nickols, F. (2005). Evaluating training – there is no cookbook approach. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 13, 84–109. doi:10.1111/j.1937-8327.2000.tb00177.x
- Noonan, E. (1993). *Tradition in training*. In L. Spurling (ed.): From the words of my mouth – Tradition in psychotherapy. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Northouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Neuman, W. L. (2009). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon
- Newstrom, J. (1978). Catch-22: The problem of incomplete evaluation of training. *Training and Development Journal*, 32(11), 22-24.

- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Leech, N. L. (2006). Linking research questions to mixed methods data analysis procedures 1. *The Qualitative Report*, 11, 474–498. Retrieved from <http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol11/iss3/3>
- OSCE (2012). *Guidelines on human rights education for law enforcement officials*. Retrieved from <http://www.osce.org/odihr/93968?download=true>
- Parker, B. L. (1984). Summative evaluation in training and development: A review and critique of the literature, 1980 through 1983. Working Paper Four.
- Parry, S. B. (1996). The quest for competencies. *Training*, 33(7), 48-56. doi: 10.1111/j.1477-7053.1996.tb01197.x
- Patton, M. Q. (2005). *Qualitative research*. New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.
- Phillips, J. J. (1991). *Handbook of training evaluation and measurement methods* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Houston, TX: Gulf
- Phillips, J. J. (1996a). How much is the training worth? *Training and Development*, 50(4), 20-24.
- Phillips, J. J. (1996b). Was it the training? *Training and Development*, 50(2), 28-32.
- Phillips, J. J. (1997). *Return on investment in training and performance improvement programs*. Boston, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Phillips, J. J., & Phillips, P. P. (2009). Using ROI to demonstrate performance value in the public sector. *Performance Improvement*, 48(4), 22-28. doi:10.1002/pfi.20066
- Phillips, P. P. (2002). *The bottomline on ROI*. Atlanta, GA: Center for Effective Performance.
- Phillips, J. J., & Phillips, P. P. (2016). *Handbook of training evaluation and measurement methods* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Routledge.

- Pineda, P. (2010). Evaluation of training in organizations: A proposal for an integrated model. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 34, 673-693.  
doi:10.1108/03090591011070789
- Polit, D. F., & Hungler, B. P. (2008). *Essentials for nursing research: Methods, appraisals, and utilization*. Philadelphia, PA: JB Lippincott Company.
- Punch, K. F. (2005). *Introduction to social research: Quantitative and qualitative approaches* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- QSR International. (2012). *What is qualitative research software?* Retrieved from <http://www.qsrinternational.com/what-is-qualitative-research.aspx>
- Randolph, J J. (2009). A guide to writing the dissertation literature review. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 14(13), 1-13. Retrieved from <http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=14&n=13>
- Rafiq, M. (2015) Training evaluation in an organization using Kirkpatrick model: A case study of PIA. *Journal of Entrepreneurship & Organization Management*, 4, 151-159. doi:10.4172/2169-026X.1000151
- Reilly, T. (2006). *The science of training*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Roberts, T. (2013). Understanding ethnography. *British Journal of Midwifery*, 17, 291-294. doi:10.12968/bjom.2009.17.5.42220
- Robinson, D. G., & Robinson, J. C. (1989). *Training for impact: How to link training to business needs and measure the results*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rothwell, W. J. (2005). *Beyond training and development: the groundbreaking classic on human performance enhancement*. New York, NY: Amacom.

- Rosenbach, W. E. (1993). Mentoring: Empowering followers to be leaders. In W. E. Rosenbach and R. L. Taylor (Eds.), *Contemporary issues in leadership studies* (141-151). Boulder, CO: Westview Press, Inc.
- Rosenbaum, P. D., & Luigio, A. J. (1998). *The prevention of crime: Social and situational strategies*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Rowe, C. D. (2015). *Employee resistance to the implementation of new information technology programs in a government organization*. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database.
- Salas, E., & Cannon-Bowers, J. A. (2001). The science of training: A decade of progress. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 471-499. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.471
- Salas, E., Cannon-Bowers, J. A., & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (1997). *The science and practice of training-current trends and emerging themes*. In K. J. Ford, S. W. J. Kozlowski, K. E. Kraiger, E. Salas, E. & M. S. Teachout, (Eds.). *Improving Training Effectiveness in Work Organizations*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Sanders T (2011) Hotel front office training: Turning expenses into investment. *UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones*. 3, 1-85. Retrieved from <http://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations/1103>
- Schermerhorn, J. R. (2011). *Management* (11<sup>th</sup> ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Seidman, I. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Selden, S. C. (2009). *Human capital: Tools and strategies for the public sector*. Washington D. C.: CQ Press.

- Senna, J. J., & Siegel, L. J. (2002). *Introduction to Criminal Justice* (9<sup>th</sup> ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth,
- Senel, S. (2014). *Evaluation of a leadership program by applying Kirkpatrick's Four-Level-Model: The case of Turkish prefect interns training and development program*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. UMI Number: 3668953.
- Shelton, S., & Alliger, G. (1993). Who's afraid of level 4 evaluation? A practical approach. *Training and Development*, 47, 43–46.
- Shenge, N. A. (2014). Training evaluation: Process, benefits, and issues. *Ife Psychologia*, 22, 50-80. Retrieved from <https://www.questia.com/library/journal/1P3-3602461421/training-evaluation-process-benefits-and-issues>
- Simon, M. K. (2011). *Dissertation and scholarly research: Recipes for success*. Seattle, WA: Dissertation Success, LLC.
- Simon, M. K., & Goes, J. (2012). *Dissertation and scholarly research: Recipes for success*. Retrieved from <http://dissertationrecipes.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/samplesizematters.pdf>
- Smidt, A., Balandin, S., Sigafoos, J., & Reed, V. A. (2009). The Kirkpatrick model: A useful tool for evaluating training outcomes. *Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability*, 34, 266-274. doi:10.1080/13668250903093125
- Smith, C. (2017). *Conditions influencing employee compliance to an organization's information security policies: A qualitative case study*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from SAS Dissertations and Theses.

- Smith, J. A., Flowers, P., & Larkin, M. (2013). *Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis: Theory, Method and Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Spotts, J. B. (1974). The problem of leadership: A look at some recent findings of behavioral science research. In W. R. Lassey, and R. R. Fernandez (Eds.), *Leadership and social change*, (44-63). La Jolla, CA: University Associates.
- Starman, A. B. (2013). The case study as a type of qualitative research. *Journal of Contemporary Educational Studies*, 1. 28-43. Retrieved from <http://www.sodobna-pedagogika.net/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/Starman1.pdf>
- Steensma, H., & Groeneveld, K. (2010). Evaluating a training using the “four levels model”. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 22(5), 319-331.  
doi:10.1108/13665621011053226
- Stogdill, R. M. (1948). *Personal factors associated with leadership*. Ohio State University.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Stokking, K. M. (1996). Levels of evaluation: Kirkpatrick, Kaufman and Keller, and beyond. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 7, 179-183.  
doi:10.1002/hrdq.3920070208
- Tannenbaum, S. I., & Yukl. G. (1992). Training and development in work organizations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 43, 399-441.  
doi:10.1146/annurev.ps.43.020192.002151
- Tellis, W. M. (1997). Introduction to case study. *The Qualitative Report*, 3(2), 1-14. Retrieved from <http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol3/iss2/4>

- Thomas, E. & Magilvy, J. K. (2011). Qualitative rigor or research validity in qualitative research. *Journal for Specialists in Pediatric Nursing*, 16(2), 151-155.  
doi:10.1111/j.1744-6155.2011.00283.x
- Townsend, A., Cox, S. M., & Li, L. C. (2010). Qualitative Research Ethics: Enhancing Evidence-Based Practice in Physical Therapy. *Physical Therapy*, 90. 615-628.  
doi:10.2522/ptj.20080388
- Van Alstine, R. (2010). *Factors contributing toward special education teacher attrition: A case study of Orange County public schools*. Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database (UMI No. 3414565).
- Van Wart, M. (2005). *Dynamics of leadership in public services – theory and practice* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York, NY: Sharpe.
- Walker, S. (1996). *The Police in America: An Introduction*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Werther, W. B., & Chandler, D. B. (2011). *Strategic Corporate Social Responsibility: Stakeholders in a Global Environment*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Werther, W. B., & Davis, K. (1993). *Human resources and personnel management*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Wexley, K. N. (1984). Personnel training. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 35, 519-551.  
doi:10.1146/annurev.ps.35.020184.002511
- Wren, J. T. (1995). *The leader's companion: Insight on leadership through the ages*. New York, NY: The Free Press
- Yamhill, S., & McLean, G. N. (2001). Theories supporting transfer of training. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 12, 195–208. doi:10.1002/hrdq.7
- Yilmaz, K. (2013). Comparison of quantitative and qualitative research traditions: epistemological, theoretical, and methodological differences. *European Journal of Education*, 48, 193-325. doi:10.1111/ejed.12014

- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research—design and methods* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yin, R. K. (2016). *Qualitative research – from start to finish*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organizations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Yukl, G., & Lepsinger, R. (2005). Why integrating the leading and managing roles is essential for organizational effectiveness? *Organizational Dynamics*, 34, 361-375.
- Zaccaro, S.J. (2007). Trait-based perspectives of leadership. *American Psychologist*, 62, 6–16.
- Zaleznik, A. (2004). Managers and leaders: Are they different? *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2004/01/managers-and-leaders-are-they-different>
- Zhao, J., Thurman, Q., & Lovrich, N. (1995). Community-oriented policing across the U.S.: Facilitators and impediments to implementation. *American Journal of Police*, 14, 11-28. Retrieved from <http://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/ajpol14&div=7&id=&page=>

## Appendix A

### Interview Questions

The researcher will conduct semi-structured audio-recorded interviews with Council of Europe leaders, and will ask the following questions:

1. What effective strategies have you used to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines?
2. What method did you find worked best to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines?
3. How did the program managers respond to your strategies to ensure that they adhere to the evaluation guidelines?
4. What strategies were least effective to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines?
5. What modifications did you apply to any strategy to improve the effectiveness of achieving adherence to the evaluation guidelines?
6. Is there anything else you would like to address that you did not address about the adherence to the evaluation guidelines?

Appendix B

Informed Consent



**Informed Consent: Participants 18 years of age and older**

Dear \_\_\_\_\_,

My name is ANDRE KONZE and I am a student at the University of Phoenix working on a doctoral degree. I am doing a research study entitled COUNCIL OF EUROPE'S STRATEGIES REGARDING HUMAN RIGHTS TRAINING EVALUATION PRACTICES: A MULTI-CASE STUDY.

The purpose of the research study is to explore what effective strategies Council of Europe Leaders use to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines.

Your participation will involve to be interviewed on the study topic. The interview will last about an hour and will be audio taped. You will be informed about the possibility to terminate your participation any time and without the necessity to give a reason for that.

A termination of your participation has no consequences. The sample size is 10. You can decide to be a part of this study or not. Once you start, you can withdraw from the study at any time without any penalty or loss of benefits. The results of the research study may be published but your identity will remain confidential and your name will not be made known to any outside party.

In this research, there are no foreseeable risks.

Although there may be no direct benefit to you, a possible benefit from your being part of this study is to contribute to the development of law enforcement human rights training of the Council of Europe.

If you have any questions about the research study, please call me at + XXX or email me YYY@YYYY.YYY. For questions about your rights as a study participant, or any concerns or complaints, please contact the University of Phoenix Institutional Review Board via email at IRB@phoenix.edu.

As a participant in this study, you should understand the following:

1. You may decide not to be part of this study or you may want to withdraw from the study at any time. If you want to withdraw, you can do so without any problems. You can withdraw any time orally or in writing (email).
2. Your identity will be kept confidential.
3. ANDRE KONZE, the researcher, has fully explained the nature of the research study and has answered all of your questions and concerns.
4. If interviews are done, they may be recorded. If they are recorded, you must give permission for the researcher, ANDRE KONZE, to record the interviews. You understand that the information from the recorded interviews may be transcribed. The data will be coded to assure that your identity is protected.
5. Data will be kept secure. The data will be kept in a locked drawer on secured usb stick. The data will be kept for three years, and then destroyed. The usb sticks will be mechanical destroyed.
6. The results of this study may be published.

“By signing this form, you agree that you understand the nature of the study, the possible risks to you as a participant, and how your identity will be kept confidential. When you sign this form, this means that you are 18 years old or older and that you give your permission to volunteer as a participant in the study that is described here.”

I accept the above terms.       I do not accept the above terms.

**(CHECK ONE)**

Signature of the research participant \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of the researcher \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Appendix C

Notice of Intent to Withdraw from Study Participation

I, \_\_\_\_\_, hereby serve notice to Andre Konze of my intent to withdraw from the descriptive qualitative case study entitled, COUNCIL OF EUROPE'S STRATEGIES REGARDING HUMAN RIGHTS TRAINING EVALUATION PRACTICES: A MULTI-CASE STUDY.

I acknowledge that my participation was voluntary and that I had the option to withdraw at any time without penalty or repercussion. I further acknowledge that I have not been coerced into continuing with the study or to withdraw from the study.

I understand that all information provided during my interview and participation will be excluded from the proposed study and destroyed by shredding, burning, or demagnetization as applicable.

I acknowledge that I may contact Andre Konze with any questions via e-mail or telephone. I also acknowledge that I have the right to contact the Institutional Review Board Office with any questions or concerns.

Interviewee signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Researcher signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Appendix D

Confidentiality Statement



COUNCIL OF EUROPE'S STRATEGIES REGARDING HUMAN RIGHTS

TRAINING EVALUATION PRACTICES: A MULTI-CASE STUDY

ANDRE KONZE

**CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT**

As a researcher working on the above research study at the University of Phoenix, I understand that I must maintain the confidentiality of all information concerning all research participants as required by law. Only the University of Phoenix Institutional Review Board may have access to this information. "Confidential Information" of participants includes but is not limited to: names, characteristics, or other identifying information, questionnaire scores, ratings, incidental comments, other information accrued either directly or indirectly through contact with any participant, and/or any other information that by its nature would be considered confidential. In order to maintain the confidentiality of the information, I hereby agree to refrain from discussing or disclosing any Confidential Information regarding research participants, to any individual who is not part of the above research study or in need of the information for the expressed purposes on the research program. This includes having a conversation regarding the research

project or its participants in a place where such a discussion might be overheard; or discussing any Confidential Information in a way that would allow an unauthorized person to associate (either correctly or incorrectly) an identity with such information. I further agree to store research records whether paper, electronic or otherwise in a secure locked location under my direct control or with appropriate safe guards. I hereby further agree that if I have to use the services of a third party to assist in the research study, who will potentially have access to any Confidential Information of participants, that I will enter into an agreement with said third party prior to using any of the services, which shall provide at a minimum the confidential obligations set forth herein. I agree that I will immediately report any known or suspected breach of this confidentiality statement regarding the above research project to the University of Phoenix, Institutional Review Board.

_____	_____	_____
Signature of Researcher	Printed Name	Date

_____	_____	_____
Signature of Witness	Printed Name	Date

## Appendix E

### Email notification to the participants

Dear Participant,

My name is Andre Konze. I am a Doctoral Learner at the University of Phoenix. I am doing a research study entitled COUNCIL OF EUROPE'S STRATEGIES REGARDING HUMAN RIGHTS TRAINING EVALUATION PRACTICES: A MULTI-CASE STUDY.

The purpose of this study is to explore what effective strategies Council of Leaders use to ensure that program managers of human rights training adhere to the evaluation guidelines.

I would appreciate your participation in this study. Your participation will include reading and signing an informed consent and participating in an interview on your views on human rights training evaluation.

I will come back to you by phone to make the necessary arrangements for the interview including a date and place.

## Appendix F



### CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINALITY

I certify that the attached paper is my original work. I am familiar with, and acknowledge my responsibilities which are part of, the University of Phoenix Student Code of Academic Integrity. I affirm that any section of the paper which has been submitted previously is attributed and cited as such, and that this paper has not been submitted by anyone else. I have identified the sources of all information whether quoted verbatim or paraphrased, all images, and all quotations with citations and reference listings. Along with citations and reference listings, I have used quotation marks to identify quotations of fewer than 40 words and have used block indentation for quotations of 40 or more words. Nothing in this assignment violates copyright, trademark, or other intellectual property laws. I further agree that my name typed on the line below is intended to have, and shall have, the same validity as my handwritten signature.

Student's signature (name typed here is equivalent to a signature):

\_\_\_\_\_







