



Analysis of Pre- and Post-Workshop Questionnaires From 2014 Transformational Resiliency Workshops

By Dr. Jean Stockard, TRIG Research Director January 26, 2015

Summary

Surveys given to participants in five Transformational Resilience Leaders Self-Care workshops in 2014 show an extremely positive response from participants especially in terms of how much they learned and the usefulness of this information from the workshop. Data on participants in these workshops indicated that they had relatively good self-care and resilience skills and rated themselves as moderately resilient prior to the workshop. However, at the end of the workshop the vast majority (87+%) reported that they had learned a great deal, believed they had obtained skills that will enable them to be much more resilient, and that they would be very likely to use what they had learned in their work. They also gave very high ratings to the way in which the workshop was conducted.

In other words, the vast majority of attendees reported that the workshop was very valuable in enhancing their personal resilience skills and their ability to help other people develop resilience skills and practices. Interestingly, those who reported the most positive views of the workshop were those who had higher self-rated skills prior to attendance.

There were some differences in results among the five workshops with those in the Portland workshop reporting lower levels of resiliency prior to attending and being somewhat less likely to report that they had learned a great deal or would use what they had learned in their work. However, none of the attendees at the Portland workshop had negative views. Around half of the Portland participants noted that work was their reason for attending the workshop, which is a higher percentage than other workshops and could be part of the reason for these differences. However, it is impossible to tell from the present data set the source of these admittedly very small differences.

An additional comparison analysis ([available here](#)) was completed after the first two Leaders Self-Care Workshops: March 2014 in Eugene, Oregon and June 2014 in Oakland, California. In places as seemingly dissimilar as Eugene and Oakland, the Transformational Resilience Leaders Self-Care Workshop had very similar and very positive responses, which strongly suggests that the methods and skills covered in the workshops are effective in building resilience skills and are applicable to different populations facing very different traumatic stresses.

Analysis

This report summarizes data from questionnaires given both before and after five TRIG-sponsored Leaders Self-Care Transformational Resilience workshops held from March through November

2014. While all of the workshops had very similar content there were slight differences in their format. Four of the workshops were conducted over two days, while one spanned a period of 6 weeks. Fees were charged for all but the 6-week workshop, which was donation based. Fees ranged from \$45 for the first two workshops to \$185 for the September and November sessions. A substantial proportion of attendees received financial support from their employers or, in the case of the Oakland workshop, scholarships for attendance. All of the workshops had a number of co-sponsors, including non-profit groups and government bodies. The most common reason participants gave for attending the workshops involved learning skills to help themselves and others deal with stress. Most attendees appeared to have voluntarily chosen to attend. The exception involved the Portland workshop where close to half attended as part of their assigned work load.

Pre-workshop data were available for a total of 108 participants. Data from the post-workshop questionnaire were available for 87 participants, and data that matched participants from both pre and post workshops were available for 80 attendees. The largest number of respondents was from the March Eugene workshop and the June Oakland workshop (Table 1). Not all respondents answered all questions, and the sample size for each analysis is noted below and in the tables. Both questionnaires are attached to this report.

Data on demographic characteristics were provided by 108 participants in the pre-workshop questionnaire (Table 2). The majority of respondents were middle aged (between 35 and 64). Slightly more than three-quarters were women, more than half were married or partnered, and the majority did not have children living at home. Of those who did have children at home, the average age of the youngest child was in the early teens. There were no significant differences between the workshop sites in these variables.

Before the workshop began participants answered a series of 35 questions related to how they usually handled stressful and problematic times. Attendees' responses to the questions were highly correlated and the answers were combined into a scale (Cronbach's alpha = .94, indicating very high reliability). The scale was averaged to correspond to the original 5 point range (1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=neutral, 4=disagree, and 5=strongly disagree). The results, which are summarized in Table 3, indicate that most of the respondents rated themselves as being relatively resilient and having relatively good coping skills. Only one of the 108 who responded to these questions reported a substantial lack of skills and the average was just less than an "agree" response. There were slight differences between the five workshop sites, with the Portland workshop attendees rating themselves as having the fewest skills and the Eugene 6-week group rating themselves as having the most.

In addition to the series of questions, the respondents were asked to describe the most recent stressful event they had faced in the last 6 months and then to indicate "on a scale of zero to ten, with ten indicating highly satisfied, how satisfied [they were] with the way [they] responded to this stress and adversity." Average scores on this question for the total group and attendees at each workshop are given in Table 4. On average attendees rated their satisfaction at 7 out of 10, slightly above the midpoint of the scale. There were slight variations among the group, with the lowest scores from the March Eugene group and the highest from the September Eugene group. These self-ratings were moderately correlated with the scale score on pre-workshop resiliency and coping ($r = .33$).

At the end of the workshop participants were asked to fill out another short questionnaire. The first 17 questions were closed-ended in nature and asked participants about how much they had learned about various skills and practices and how they would use the material in the future. A factor analysis (results available on request) indicated that items related to these two areas comprised two different factors. One involved questions about how the skills learned would be used in the future (with high loadings from items numbered 2, 3, 4, 15, 16, and 17) and the other involved questions about how much they had learned during the workshop (high loadings on items numbered 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14). Paralleling the work with the pre-workshop questionnaire, respondents' scores on these were summed and averaged. Cronbach's alpha values were again quite high (.91 for the measure of use and .94 for the measure of learning), indicating that the scales are highly reliable measures of respondents' views.

The results regarding the perceptions of usefulness are in the first panel of Table 5. Over half of the respondents strongly agreed that what they had learned would be helpful in their work (average scores of 1.5 or less). Only 3 percent of the total group reported neutral or more negative attitudes regarding the utility. The second panel in Table 5 gives results regarding how much participants learned. Again the results were very positive. In all but one workshop 90 percent or more of the attendees agreed that they had developed and improved their skills for coping with adversity. In the one exception, the Portland Workshop, half agreed or strongly agreed that they had learned and improved their skills and the other half were neutral. Only one person (not from the Portland Workshop) had average scores that were less favorable than neutral (less than 3.5). Differences between workshops on the two measures were not statistically significant, although with both measures the Portland attendees were less likely to have positive views.

Questions 18 to 21 on the post-workshop survey asked respondents' views about the instructors, presentations, and exercises and the extent to which they felt that they attained "something of lasting value and importance as a result of participating in the workshop." The answers to these questions were also highly correlated, and so they were combined into an additive scale (Cronbach's alpha = .88), again averaging the result to be comparable to the original five point measure. Table 6 shows the average value on each of the items and the total scale, both for the total group and for those at each workshop. For each item, for the total scale, and for each workshop, the average response fell between strongly agree and agree. In other words, the vast majority of the attendees agreed or strongly agreed that the instructors were knowledgeable and skilled, the presentations and materials were clear and easy to understand, the exercises were clear and helpful, and that they got something of lasting value as a result of participating in the workshop. More important only a very small minority, from one to three people per question, disagreed with these items. The distribution on the last open-ended question, which asked whether they had received something of "lasting value or importance" as a result of their participation, is especially important to note. Ninety-four percent of the participants agreed or strongly agreed with this statement; 59 percent strongly agreed.

As a final step the way in which participants' self-assessments prior to the workshop were related to their post-workshop views was examined. This analysis was conducted to see if there were any association between participants' level of resiliency and skills prior to attending and the extent to which they felt the workshop aided them. There were at least two possible scenarios. First, those who had lower rated skills pre-workshop might feel that they had learned more simply because they felt in need of additional learning. Alternatively, those who had higher rated skills pre-workshop might be more "primed" or ready for additional learning.

Simple bivariate correlations were used to examine this question, looking at the association of the various scales described above. The results are given in Table 7 and support the second hypothesis. Attitudes toward the workshop were significantly higher for those who rated themselves as being more resilient and better able to cope with life stresses. This relationship remained when demographic variables, such as age and partnered status were controlled.

An additional comparison analysis was completed after the first two Leaders Self-Care Workshops: March 2014 in Eugene, Oregon and June 2014 in Oakland, California. In places as seemingly dissimilar as Eugene and Oakland, the Transformational Resilience Leaders Self-Care Workshop had very similar and very positive responses. Workshop participant demographics were similar for both workshops in terms of age, gender composition, and parental status. In response to a pre-workshop question about a recent stressful event, the issues reported by the Oakland group were far more traumatic than reported in Eugene including more serious health, financial issues, and systemic oppression. In the post-workshop survey, there were only statistically significant differences in the responses of each group for two out of 21 post-workshop survey questions, which ask about changes in themselves and the content of the workshop. This information strongly suggests that the methods and skills covered in the workshops are effective in building resilience skills and are applicable to different populations facing very different traumatic stresses. The full analysis is available here: <http://www.theresourceinnovationgroup.org/storage/trans-resilience/AnalysisEugeneOakland2014StockardDec2014.pdf>

Table 1

Workshop Locations and Number of Respondents

	<u>Pre-Workshop</u>		<u>Post-Workshop</u>		<u>Both Pre and Post</u>	
	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Eugene March	34	31%	29	33%	28	35%
Eugene 6 week	19	18%	11	13%	11	14%
Oakland June	38	35%	31	36%	25	31%
Eugene September	7	7%	6	7%	6	8%
Portland November	10	9%	10	11%	10	12%
Total	108	100%	87	100%	80	100%

Table 2

Characteristics of Workshop Participants (N=108)

<i>Age of Participant</i>	
	<u>Percent</u>
Less than 25 years	5.6
25 to 34	13.9
35 to 44	23.2
45 to 54	23.2
55 to 64	25.0
65 to 74	8.3
75 and older	0.9
<i>Gender</i>	
	<u>Percent</u>
Female	77.8
Male	22.2
<i>Marital Status</i>	
	<u>Percent</u>
Married or Partnered	58.9
Single	41.1
<i>Children at Home</i>	
	<u>Percent</u>
No	55.6
Yes	44.4
<i>Age of Youngest Child at Home</i>	
Mean	13.7
S.D.	8.4

Table 3

Preworkshop Report of Resiliency and Coping Skills

<u>Workshop</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>% Strongly Agree</u>	<u>% Agree</u>	<u>% Neutral or Less</u>
Eugene March	2.17	9	67	24
Eugene 6 week	1.97	16	79	5
Oakland June	2.22	13	63	24
Eugene September	2.15	0	86	14
Portland November	2.52	0	50	50
Total	2.18	10	68	22

Note: Scores on individual items ranged from 1 to 5 with a value of 1 = strongly agree, indicating higher coping and resiliency, and a value of 5 = strongly disagree. The average reflects the average score of the 108 respondents to the 35 items that asked about resiliency and coping skills. The "strongly agree" category (the second column of numbers) indicates the percentage of attendees with an average score across all items between 1 and 1.5 and thus reporting very high resiliency. The "agree" category indicates the percentage with scores between 1.5 and 2.5, and the "neutral or less" corresponds to those with average scores of 2.5 or greater, indicating neutral to poor rated coping and resiliency. Only one attendee had an average score that was larger than 3.5. Analysis of variance comparing mean scores across workshops was 2.12, df 4, 103; $p = .08$.

Table 4

Reported Satisfaction with Way Handled Recent Stressful Event (10 = highly satisfied), by Workshop (n=99)

<u>Workshop</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>
Eugene March	6.52	2.05	31
Eugene 6 week	7.26	1.67	17
Oakland June	6.83	2.37	34
Eugene September	8.79	0.91	7
Portland November	7.40	0.97	10
Total Group	7.00	2.03	99

Table 5
Post-Workshop Views

<i>Perceived Usefulness of What learned</i>				
<u>Workshop</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>% Strongly Agree</u>	<u>% Agree</u>	<u>% Neutral or Less</u>
Eugene March	1.56	48	52	0
Eugene 6 week	1.47	82	9	9
Oakland June	1.62	48	46	6
Eugene September	1.47	50	50	0
Portland November	1.90	30	70	0
Total	1.60	51	46	3

<i>Report of How Much Learned and Better Ability to Cope</i>				
<u>Workshop</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>% Strongly Agree</u>	<u>% Agree</u>	<u>% Neutral or Less</u>
Eugene March	1.82	17	76	7
Eugene 6 week	1.6	45	46	9
Oakland June	1.82	35	55	10
Eugene September	1.58	50	50	0
Portland November	2.29	10	40	50
Total	1.83	29	58	13

Note: Scores ranged from 1 to 5 with a higher score indicating more favorable views. The category marked "strongly agree" reflects the percentage with average scores between 1 and 1.5 and thus reporting very positive attitudes. The "agree" category corresponds to those with scores from 1.51 to 2.5, and the "neutral or less" category corresponds to those with scores of 2.5 or less. Analysis of variance comparing mean scores across workshops for the utility measure was 0.82, df 4, 82; p = .52 and for the learning measure was 2.03, p = .10. N=87.

Table 6

Average Responses to Specific Questions Regarding the Workshop, Total and by Site

	<u>Eugene</u> <u>March</u>	<u>Eugene</u> <u>6 Week</u>	<u>Oakland</u> <u>June</u>	<u>Eugene</u> <u>Sept.</u>	<u>Portland</u> <u>Nov.</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>Prob.</u>
18. The instructors were knowledgeable and skilled in the subjects taught.	1.21	1.27	1.61	1.00	1.50	1.38	2.17	0.08
19. The presentations and materials were clear and easy to understand.	1.95	1.36	1.84	1.17	1.50	1.73	2.01	0.10
20. The exercises were clear and helpful.	1.71	1.27	1.68	1.00	1.70	1.59	1.98	0.10
21. Feel something of lasting value... as a result of participating....	1.41	1.36	1.65	1.00	1.80	1.51	1.68	0.16
Summative Scale (averaged)	1.56	1.32	1.69	1.04	1.63	1.55	1.80	0.14

Note: N=86, df for the analyses of variance = 4, 81

Table 7

Correlations of Pre-Workshop Skills and Post-Workshop Views

	1	2	3	4
1) Pre workshop coping skills	1.00			
2) Post-workshop rating of utility	0.48	1.00		
3) Post-workshop rating of Learning	0.46	0.83	1.00	
4) Post-workshop rating of workshop quality	0.46	0.72	0.69	1.00

Note: All correlations were statistically significant at beyond the .001 level. N=80.



Pre-Workshop Questionnaire Leaders Self-Care Workshop

Thank you for coming to the Leaders Self-Care Workshop. This short questionnaire is designed to assess your strengths in facing adversity and to give you a starting point from which to measure your progress and growth in learning about self-care. The questions will also begin to reinforce some of the goals of the workshop. There is nothing tricky about the assessment. It is just a way for you to think about your skills and strengths and to assess how you may grow and change in the future. So, please relax and be as honest as you can.

With your permission we would like to have researchers who are helping with this project examine changes in your self-assessment after participating in the workshop. Please be assured that the information you provide will be kept in strict confidence. No personal data will ever be shared with anyone else and you will not be identified as an individual in any analysis nor in any publications that might result from it. Your responses will be given a code number and this cover sheet will be removed from the rest of the questionnaire. This way your name will not be seen by those who examine your answers.

If you are willing to share your data with our researchers and to have us contact you in the future, please indicate in the spaces below.

____ Yes, I agree that my information can be used in research analysis and that I can be contacted in the months following the workshop to find out how my views and behaviors have changed.

____ No, I do not want my information to be used in research analysis and do not want to be contacted after the workshop.

Name (Please print): _____

Signature: _____

Email: _____

Phone # Work: _____

Home: _____

Please rate yourself on the following questions. By circling 1 you strongly agree, by circling 5 you strongly disagree, and by circling one of the other options you see yourself somewhere between those levels. Remember, this is primarily for your information and there are no right or wrong answers.

Statement

	1	2	3	4	5
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I generally feel strong and capable of overcoming my problems.	1	2	3	4	5
2. When I get stressed, I usually bounce back fairly quickly.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I generally function well in my job.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I generally function well in my relationships.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I generally function well in my leisure activities.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I generally stay calm and steady when the going gets tough.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I am generally flexible, meaning if my usual way of doing things isn't working I readily try something else.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I am in a good mood most of the time.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I think well of myself and like who I am inside.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Difficult times don't change the way I feel about myself.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I believe that if I try my best things will usually turn out well.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I am good at reaching out and connecting with other people.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I usually try to solve my problems, but I know when to bend if something is beyond my control.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I anticipate difficult situations, make a plan, and carry out my plan.	1	2	3	4	5

Statements (cont.)

	1	2	3	4	5
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
15. I enjoy life and am satisfied at what I am contributing to the world.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I am generally aware of, and do not get carried away by, my emotions.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I am good at separating myself from people who get me down or upset me.	1	2	3	4	5
18. I have goals and am optimistic about the future.	1	2	3	4	5
19. I'm involved with a variety of activities I enjoy.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I don't have self-destructive habits.	1	2	3	4	5
21. I feel at peace with myself and my past.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I generally use traumas and adversities to grow wiser and stronger.	1	2	3	4	5
23. I don't beat myself up when my best efforts don't succeed.	1	2	3	4	5
24. I stay focused and think clearly under pressure.	1	2	3	4	5
25. I am persistent, determined, and resolved.	1	2	3	4	5
26. I am generally aware of different sensations in my body.	1	2	3	4	5
27. I am generally aware of, and do not get carried away by, my thought patterns.	1	2	3	4	5
28. I generally have compassion for myself when I make a mistake.	1	2	3	4	5
29. I generally have compassion for other people when they make mistakes.	1	2	3	4	5
30. I recognize the personal skills and strengths I have to cope with stress and trauma.	1	2	3	4	5

Statements (cont.)

	1	2	3	4	5
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
31. I have a sufficient number of people and other external resources I can rely on for support or assistance in times of stress and trauma.	1	2	3	4	5
32. I feel ample love in my life from other people.	1	2	3	4	5
33. I think about the consequences of my actions on other people before acting.	1	2	3	4	5
34. I think about the consequences of my actions on the natural environment before acting.	1	2	3	4	5
35. I am generally very aware of what I am thinking and doing and do not move through the day on autopilot.	1	2	3	4	5

Questions 1-25 reprinted with minor adaptations with permission, from Schiraldi, G. R. (2011). *The Complete Guide to Resilience: Why It Matters How To Build and Maintain It*. (Ashburn, VA: Resilience Training International. © 2011 Glenn R. Schiraldi. All rights reserved). Remainder adapted from Cann, A., L. G. Calhoun, R. G. Tedeschi, K. Taku, T. Vishnevsky, K. N. Triplett, and S. C. Danhauer. (2010). A Short Form of the Posttraumatic Growth Inventory. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping*. Vol 23(2): 127-137.

What is your main reason for participating in the Leaders Self-Care Workshop?

What has been the most stressful event that you have faced in the last six months?

On a scale of zero to ten, with ten indicating highly satisfied, how satisfied are you with the way you responded to this stress and adversity?

Finally a few personal questions. Your answers will help our researchers see if other factors in your life might be related to your responses. Please remember that your name will not be associated with these answers:

Age:

- _____ younger than 25
- _____ 25-34
- _____ 35-44
- _____ 45-54
- _____ 55-64
- _____ 65-74
- _____ 75 or older

Gender

- _____ Female
- _____ Male

Are you

- _____ Married or Partnered
- _____ Single

Do you have children living at home?

- _____ No
- _____ Yes*

*If Yes, What is the age of your youngest child? _____



Post-Workshop Questionnaire Leaders Self-Care Workshop

Thank you for filling out this questionnaire. We realize the personal nature of these questions. However, the information from your responses may be useful to you. The information may also be useful for statistical research purposes to determine the kinds of changes people experience as a result of participating in the workshop. Please be assured that the information you provide will be kept in strict confidence. No personal data will ever be shared with anyone else and you will not be identified as an individual in any analysis nor in any publications that might result from it.

Workshop Outcomes

Please rate yourself on the following questions. By circling 1 you strongly agree, by circling 5 you strongly disagree, and by circling one of the other options you see yourself somewhere in between those levels. Remember, this is for your information as well as ours and there are no right or wrong answers.

<u>Statement</u>	1	2	3	4	5
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The workshop has been very important for me.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I am likely to use some or all of the information and skills taught in this workshop in my work.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I am likely to use some or all of the information and skills taught in this workshop in my personal life.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I am likely to use some or all of the information and skills taught in this workshop in my community.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I know how to take better care of myself now.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I believe I can improve my own health now.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I feel more self-confident now in my ability to deal with adversity.	1	2	3	4	5

Statement

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
8. I am more aware of what is stressful in my life now.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I feel more hopeful now.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I feel more able to notice and regulate my thoughts and emotions now.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I feel more able to handle trauma and stress now as they are happening.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I feel more able to correct negative self-habits and self-destructive behaviors now.	1	2	3	4	5
13. My understanding of the principles of self-care increased as a result of the workshop.	1	2	3	4	5
14. My self-care skills improved significantly as a result of the workshop.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I feel better about my abilities to help others deal with adversity.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I am likely to use some or all of the information and skills taught in the workshop to provide support to others.	1	2	3	4	5
17. The workshop will help me in the work I do.	1	2	3	4	5
18. The instructors were knowledgeable and skilled in the subjects taught.	1	2	3	4	5
19. The presentations and materials were clear and easy to understand.	1	2	3	4	5
20. The exercises were clear and helpful.	1	2	3	4	5
21. I feel something of lasting value or importance as a result of participating in the workshop.	1	2	3	4	5

Please write short comments in response to the following questions

22. The best part of the workshop for me was:

23. Things that could be improved include: