

Management accountability systems

[Business](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

The authors of the book have exceptionally employed the use of style that informs the conduct through verbal description to experiment the conduct. As compared to the first book the second one uses active voice to the level that it calls for the third person. Throughout the narration the book avoids the use of the first person and construction than the earlier one.

Besides, it applies the use of past tense since it is presented in a reported form. In the book, the Methods part is not bit by bit, but directive, protocol as indicated by the forensic lab manual. The results The book extensively directs that when posing a testable hypothesis the police need to ask questions that can be answered through collection of samples which will help in accumulating observations regarding the phenomena or organisms. These observations can later on be examined in order to provide answers to the queries raised. In general, the book provides tangible insights that lead to answer imperative issues raised. Magnitude, differences, and directionality The book provides that reporting results to the reader is much possible in regards to the nature of relationships and differences.

For instance, Cole and Smith (165) observes that if one is testing for differences among groups, and finds significant differences, then it is not sufficient for one to simply report that “ groups A and B were importantly different”. Unlike the earlier book, the second one demands that the reporter should be able to indicate how these groups are different, and the depth of that difference. The book extensively provides that it is imperative to show group information like, “ Group A people were 27% greater than individuals in Group B”, or, “ Group B pups increased in weight at a rate that is twice that of Group A pups.” It also shows the benefits of reporting based on the

direction of differences (smaller, greater, larger, etc) as well as the magnitude of variances like (how many times, percentage difference, etc.) whenever it is appropriate and possible. According to Alpert and Noble (75) the book provides greater insights unlike the earlier one by informing those officers in charge of reporting to present their experimented results in a sequence that can logically support and/or provide facts against the hypothesis, or even answer the question raised during the Introduction part.

For instance, the book provides that during reporting an examination of the effect in experimental diet. The book demands that the reporter should foremost consider providing the data on skeletal mass for the rats. Reporting negative results Negative results reports are very important! The book provides that in the event one did not attain the anticipated results might be an indicator that the hypothesis was incorrect and therefore needs to be reformulated. It might also be because he or she came by something unexpected that requires further examination. Besides, the book cites that the absence of an effect might be very indicative in most situations. In any case, ones results might be of significance to others even though they might not have supported his or her hypothesis.

Therefore, it is important not to fall into the trap of belief that outcomes contrary to what you expected are automatically “ bad data”. The book continues to direct that if one did not carry out his or her work well, then it simply means that the results need to be interpreted. This is because most significant revelations have been traced to “ bad data.” ConclusionIn conclusion the difference that is noted in the second book as compared to the first one is that it provides the police officers and the general public with <https://assignbuster.com/management-accountability-systems/>

fundamental questions that one needs to answer (Alpert and Noble 96).

These include: Does provided results offer answers to the testable hypotheses? If it does, how they interpret the findings? Do the findings agree with what others have indicated? If they do not, do the findings suggest another explanation or even perhaps an unforeseen design flaw in the experiment? Given the conclusions, what is the contemporary understanding of the matter investigated and the outlined in the Introduction? If necessary, what would be the next step of study, e.

g., what experiments can be done next? Therefore it is true to observe that this second book unlike the earlier one meets its profound objectives by providing concrete understandings regarding the dynamics of police and citizen interactions when applying force. It also serves to offer better and sensible approaches to the involved persons and perceptions, and, eventually, to look into the processes within the deference and the resistance range.