Evaluation: The International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice, Volume 10(4), October 2004

Daniela C. Schröter

The most recent issue of *Evaluation* contains six articles, one contribution to *A Visit to the World of Practice*, and *News from the Community* respectively.

Widmer and Neuenschwander discuss in their article—*Embedding Evaluation in the Swiss Federal Administration: Purpose, Institutional Design, and Utilization*—how evaluation is embedded within the Swiss political system and conclude that currently used evaluation measures in the government can be improved through purposeful differentiation of evaluation types. They first summarize four purposes of evaluation—accountability, improvement, basic knowledge, and strategy; secondly, five uses of evaluation—instrumental, conceptual, interactive, legitimating, and tactical; and thirdly, two predominant institutional designs in which evaluation is implemented—centralized and decentralized. Thereafter, Widmer and Neuenschwander demonstrate how evaluation is embedded within the different federal agencies of the Swiss government. Key findings of their study include that (i) accountability and improvement were the most relevant purposes in these organizational contexts; (ii) evaluation findings were most commonly utilized instrumentally, followed by legitimizing and interactive uses; (iii) the institutional design was of little or no relevance; and (iv) unanticipated blends of purpose and utilization existed.

In the second article—*Utilizing Evaluation Evidence to Enhance Professional Practice*—Helen Simons criticizes the current politically favored approach to evaluation, namely evidence-based evaluation. She states that this approach to elucidating evidence “fails to recognize the holistic nature of professional practice and disregards the complexity of professional decision making and action” (p.410). Qualitative forms of knowledge generation for evaluative purposes would enhance the quality of evaluation and increase the utilization of evaluation findings.

In *The Meaning Assigned to Evaluation by Project Staff: Analysis from the Project-management Perspective in the Field of Social Welfare and Healthcare in Finland*, Seppänen-Järvelä examines how evaluation is understood by project staff and management and how it influences the work environment. Seppänen-Järvelä concludes that there is a need to update the current knowledge of project staff and management about evaluation and to promote and enforce evaluation culture and capacity building within organizations in the Social Welfare and Healthcare sector in Finland.

Oakley, Strange, Stephenson, Forrest, and Monteiro’s article—*Evaluating Processes: A Case Study of a Randomized Controlled Trial of Sex Education*—exemplifies the application of RCTs to evaluate how processes and outcomes are interrelated. The authors conclude that ultimately the choice of design and quantitative or qualitative approaches is context-dependent and related to the questions asked.

Following is McNamara and O’Hara’s article *Trusting the Teacher: Evaluating Educational Innovation*, in which the authors claim that the role of the external evaluator should be switched to that of the educating consultant for the teacher. The case for self-evaluation of the practitioner is supported by the argument that external evaluation would often fail to support improvement of the evaluand. To support “sound educational values,” (p. 472) evaluators should function as

ISSN 1556-8180

facilitators and consultants in conducting the research and enhance the credibility of self-evaluation by meta-evaluating the internal self-evaluation processes.

The last article, authored by Hanberger and Schild, discusses *Strategies to Evaluate a University-Industry Knowledge-exchange Programme*. The authors consider two management-oriented approaches to program evaluation (program theory evaluation and outcome analysis) and two non-management oriented approaches (policy discourse analysis and qualitative network analysis). They conclude that different evaluation methods stress the values of different stakeholder groups. An integration of various methods is necessary, reduces the bias toward one stakeholder group, and increases the validity in contexts where multiple stakeholder groups are present. In situations with only one target group and few stakeholders, a combination of various evaluation approaches would not be as essential.

In *A Visit to the World of Practice*, Farrall and Gadd address *Evaluating Crime Fears: A Research Note on a Pilot Study to Improve the Measurement of the 'Fear of Crime' as a Performance Indicator.* Instruments intended to assess fear of crime are criticized for their poor design and neglect of crucial research concerns such as frequency and intensity. The authors suggest survey questions to be incorporated to improve instruments measuring fear of crime.

In *News from the Community*, Nicoletta Stame, President of the EES, reports on the 6th EES conference entitled *Governance, Democracy and Evaluation*. These issues include: (i) evaluation as a tool for democratic government, (ii) the question of an European evaluation identity, (iii) European standards for evaluation, (iv) relationships among evaluation networks and associations, and (v) training, education, and professional development of evaluation in Europe. For example, the

ISSN 1556-8180

EES considers the establishment of European evaluation standards but does not want to conflict or overthrow features unique to individual national characteristics.

The journal concludes with translations of the article's abstracts into French and an *Annual Index* of articles.

ISSN 1556-8180