

# Stakeholder Involvement in Evaluation: Three Decades of the American Journal of Evaluation

Liliana Rodríguez-Campos  
*University of South Florida*

**Background:** Stakeholder involvement in various phases of evaluation has received increasing attention over the past three decades. Indeed, the *American Journal of Evaluation* (AJE) has reflected this overall philosophy and strategy through a number of publications about several theoretical frameworks and practical applications. Those AJE articles outline the primary assumptions of the stakeholder approaches to evaluation, their practical applications, constraints, and benefits for providing a new direction in evaluation.

**Purpose:** What lessons are there for our field concerning the way that stakeholder involvement has been conceptualized and applied in AJE? This article focuses on the ways in which AJE authors have approached the notion of stakeholder involvement over the past three decades, drawing on key articles from scholarship on this topic.

**Setting:** Not applicable.

**Intervention:** Not applicable.

**Research Design:** Not applicable.

**Data Collection and Analysis:** Desk review.

**Findings:** This review shows how AJE has enhanced our understanding of the evolution of these approaches to evaluation, from a global perspective to differentiated approaches with a shared theme.

**Keywords:** collaborative evaluation; participatory evaluation; empowerment evaluation; stakeholder approaches to evaluation; stakeholder involvement

When I started to write this article, I was very aware of the interesting and challenging task ahead of me. I selected the *American Journal of Evaluation* (AJE) as the source of the publications to be reviewed because of its history and reputation in the field of evaluation. It is always a tremendous responsibility to write about other people's work, so I thoroughly studied every possible article on stakeholder approaches to evaluation since AJE's inception in 1981; of course, taking into consideration that many of today's

stakeholder approaches have evolved from work prior to AJE's time (e.g., Stake 1969, 1975, 1980; Guba 1969, 1978; Lincoln & Guba, 1980). It quickly became clear that, due to space limitations, I was not going to be able to summarize here all the articles on this topic. Thus, this compilation is necessarily selective; I cover well-known AJE articles from 1981 through December 2010, including additional sources when necessary to enhance our understanding by tracing the evolution of these approaches. Specifically, the purpose of this article is

to present key points throughout the evolution of stakeholder approaches to evaluation where there have been important attempts to unify ideas and clarify misunderstandings; contribute to the development of several conceptual frameworks; demystify ambiguities among certain approaches; and elucidate issues not addressed by previous evaluation approaches, thus influencing and shaping the evaluation field.

Because stakeholder approaches to evaluation have generated some controversy over the course of their history, it is important to begin with a common understanding of the concept of *stakeholder*. In the *Evaluation Thesaurus*, Scriven (1991) defines stakeholder as "One who has substantial ego, credibility, power, futures, or other capital invested in the program, and thus can be held to be to some degree at risk with it. This includes program staff and many who are not actively involved in the day-to-day operations." (p. 334). Also, in the *Encyclopedia of Evaluation*, Greene (2005) defines stakeholders as people who have a stake or a vested interest in the program, policy, or product evaluated and therefore also have a stake in the evaluation.

Stakeholder approaches to evaluation typically imply the incorporation of stakeholders in one or more components of the evaluation, with the goal of increasing utilization and/or promoting evaluation development. Indeed, one of the fundamental assumptions of these approaches to evaluation is the involvement of stakeholders (e.g., in evaluation design, data collection, interpreting evaluation results). Another typical assumption is that the more stakeholders are involved (based on resources available), the greater sense of ownership stakeholders will have in the

evaluation, thus increasing the likelihood of the use of evaluation results.

Stakeholder approaches to evaluation have received increasing attention in recent decades, as shown by the development of theoretical frameworks and practical applications. Publications on stakeholder forms of evaluation date back to the late 1940s, but the quantity of this type of evaluation has increased at a great pace since the mid-1970s. Examples include publications on: Stake's countenance framework and responsive evaluation (e.g., 1967, 1973, 1975, 1991a, 1991b, 2003); democratic evaluation (e.g., MacDonald, 1974, 1976; House, 1980; House & Howe, 1999; Ryan, 2004); utilization-focused evaluation (e.g., Patton, 1978, 1986, 1996, 2008); participatory evaluation (e.g., Brunner & Guzman, 1989; Cousins & Earl, 1992, 1995; Flores, 2008; Smits and Champagne, 2008; Wandersman, 2009); empowerment evaluation (e.g., Fetterman, 1994, 1995, 2001a, 2005; Fetterman, Kaftarian, & Wandersman, 1996; Fetterman & Wandersman, 2005, 2007; Suárez-Balcázar & Harper, 2004; Wandersman & Snell-Johns, 2005); and collaborative evaluation (e.g., Cousins & Shulha, 2008; O'Sullivan, 2004; Rodríguez-Campos, 2005, 2008).

Theory and practice are still evolving and even today some proponents of specific stakeholder approaches to evaluation are not able to reach full consensus about the distinctions among them. That is why, instead of simply presenting an analytical synthesis of the past three decades of AJE scholarship, I provide a historical chronology of relevant articles from AJE. There were years in which the amount of publications was noticeably greater, mostly due to the theoretical development of specific approaches; however, there were other

years with fewer AJE articles. Apparently, during these years our colleagues chose to write books, including several texts that also have contributed to the substantial maturation of these approaches.

## A History of Stakeholder Approaches to Evaluation in AJE

Many of today's stakeholder approaches to evaluation have evolved from Stake; one of AJE's pioneers, contributing in the first year of the journal's publication (i.e., Stake, 1981). His countenance framework and responsive evaluation have grown into strands with their own proponents and unique relationship to the evaluation field. Stake's work altered dramatically the perception of evaluation, by acknowledging a program's multiple realities as seen by different stakeholders. There are many other publications that followed in Stake's AJE footsteps, which contributed to the theory development of these approaches.

Since early in AJE's history, the use of evaluation has been one of the hallmarks of the stakeholder approaches to evaluation. In 1982, Pechman wrote on the topic of optimizing evaluation use, "A necessary condition for use is the conscious employment of results by a decision-maker for whatever purpose" (p. 65). The "use" hallmark is noticeable throughout the evolution of these approaches. In fact, from a broad perspective, some of the proponents (e.g., Patton, Fetterman, Cousins) belong to the use branch of the evaluation theory tree described by Alkin and Christie in *Evaluation Roots* (2004), which was concerned with enhancing evaluation use through stakeholder involvement.

During the 1980s, the work of Guba and Lincoln had a great influence on evaluation in general (e.g., *Naturalistic Inquiry*, 1985; *Fourth Generation Evaluation*, 1989), and stakeholder approaches in particular. They argued for a more active role for stakeholders in the evaluation. Specifically, in 1987's article, "What Have We Learned about Naturalistic Evaluation?" Guba presented the evaluation process as fundamentally one of negotiation with and among stakeholders to inform each other and determine steps toward action. In addition, Guba reflected on the varied definitions of the terms "evaluation" and "naturalistic", and although he had his own definition of these terms, he acknowledged other possibilities. Guba (1987) wrote,

Yvonna Lincoln and I have been musing lately about the implications of all this metaphoric mumbo-jumbo for the day-to-day practice of evaluation. We believe the implications to be so strong that the kind of evaluation that takes proper account of them deserves a very different name from that of the past. We have ourselves been referring to this new evaluation as fourth generation evaluation. (p. 39)

During this same decade, the importance of evaluation use and involving stakeholders appeared in other AJE publications. For example, Smith and Young (1987) reviewed the second edition of Michael Patton's book *Utilization-Focused Evaluation*, since Patton's approach had become prominent for many evaluators concerned with use (e.g., Patton, 1978, 1986, 1988). In the same year, North accentuated the importance of collaborative evaluation saying, "But we, in our own work, are putting a lot more emphasis on what we call 'collaborative evaluation'... That trend is evident among

all the donors, and becoming more feasible because of the developing countries' growing interest in evaluation work" (Hendricks, 1987, p. 58).

In a 1990 article, Gill and Zimmerman made a connection between involvement and use, writing that "In a stakeholder-focused evaluation, the recognition, legitimatization, and involvement of a stakeholder group is critical to insuring the collection of high-quality data and the utilization of findings" (p. 104). Reineke made the same argument in 1991 naming the quality of stakeholder involvement as a crucial concern in the evaluation that may lead to an improved use of findings. In the same AJE issue, a variety of topics on stakeholder approaches to evaluation emerged, setting up discussions that continued throughout that decade. For instance, McTaggart (1991) wrote about democratic evaluation and explained that the general difficulty is what makes evaluation democratic: "Democratic approaches to evaluation can be seen as an important advance over other forms of evaluation because they attempt to take people's views seriously and to protect people from unwarranted exposure" (p. 20). Also in this issue Stake (1991b) brought the focus back to fundamentals, pointing out that responsive evaluation is based on what people do naturally to evaluate things: they observe and react. He wrote:

To be of service and to emphasize evaluation issues that are important for each particular program, I recommend the *responsive evaluation* approach. It is an approach that sacrifices some precision in measurement, hopefully to increase the usefulness of the findings to persons in and around the program. (p. 64)

As we continue on this journey through the history of AJE, we see the

threads of stakeholder approaches and evaluation use are closely tied together; particularly, how different authors coincided in the importance of using the evaluation findings as part of these approaches. This AJE scholarship brings awareness to the importance of evaluation use as a fundamental element that can strengthen learning and improvement.

The term "empowerment evaluation" first appeared in AJE publications and gained currency when David Fetterman became President of the American Evaluation Association (AEA) and made it the theme of the AEA's 1993 National Conference. In his article, "Theme for 1993 Annual Meeting: Empowerment Evaluation," Fetterman (1993) defined empowerment evaluation as "the use of evaluation concepts and techniques to foster self-determination. The focus is on helping people help themselves. This evaluation approach is problem-focused, collaborative, and requires both qualitative and quantitative methodologies" (p. 115). The following year, Fetterman (1994) acknowledged, "Empowerment evaluation is not a panacea.... As with the exploration and development of any new frontier, this approach requires adaptations, alterations, and innovations" (p. 10).

Regarding this new evaluation approach, Stufflebeam (1994) argued that Fetterman (1994) said little about how well empowerment evaluation met any external standards. Fetterman's definition of empowerment evaluation, Stufflebeam stated, "is grounded firmly in a key logical flaw that Dr. Scriven warned against in his 1967 article. This is the flaw of confusing the various potential roles of an evaluation with its essential nonvariant goal of determining something's value" (pp. 323-324). Fetterman responded to these concerns by applying the evaluation

standards to empowerment evaluation and explaining how the focus is on the group conducting the evaluation (Fetterman, 1995, pp. 181, 191-196; 2001a, pp. 87-99).

During this same year, Wallerstein and Martinez (1994) took up empowerment evaluation, calling attention to the importance of long-term involvement in building trust and documenting changes over time. In addition, Patton (1994) articulated his view that developmental evaluation is a type, or an option, in a utilization-focused process. According to Patton, "Developmental evaluation isn't a model. It's a relationship founded on a shared purpose: development" (p. 313).

In 1995, the spate of articles expressing concern regarding empowerment evaluation continued. Fetterman (1995) wrote, "Empowerment evaluation does not simply determine merit and worth at a given point in time (a significant task in its own right); it also takes part in the process of program improvement" (p. 184). He went on to say that, "participation, collaboration, and empowerment are becoming requirements in many community-based evaluations, not recommendations" (p. 190). Also in this year, Perry and Backus (1995) described three characteristics of empowered individuals. Such individuals, they noted, had a degree of ownership in the process; had the ability to change the process; and felt a degree of responsibility for the process. They claimed that "empowerment is not a static, quantifiable construct, but rather it is dynamic and often context-specific" (p. 38). This was just the beginning of many points of discussion that helped further develop and transform this evaluation approach. At this time in AJE's history, there was no clarity on the conceptual differences among collaborative, participatory, and

empowerment evaluation as we know them today. There was some degree of uncertainty and skepticism about emerging approaches that broke away from more traditional options. This led to the need to clarify differences in order to adjust our thinking on the ways in which evaluations could be conducted; much of that clarification occurred over the next decade in the pages of AJE.

In 1996 the focus of many of the AJE articles shifted from empowerment evaluation to collaborative evaluation. In "Collaborative Evaluation in North America: Evaluators' Self-Reported Opinions, Practices, and Consequences," Cousins, Donohue, and Bloom (1996) wrote:

Despite growing interest in collaborative approaches to evaluation, not all theorists agree about the appropriateness of proposals for specific variants of collaborative evaluation. Disagreements between Stufflebeam (1994) and Fetterman (1994, 1995) about the merits of empowerment evaluation provide a highly visible example. (p. 209)

In this article, the authors attempted to delineate perceptions about collaborative evaluation held by practicing evaluators. They noted, "...the focus for the study is collaborative evaluation, an umbrella term used by different people in different ways." (p. 221). The term collaborative evaluation was defined in this AJE publication by Cousins, Donohue, and Bloom (1996) as "any evaluation in which there is a significant degree of collaboration or cooperation between evaluators and stakeholders in planning and/or conducting the evaluation" (p. 210). Three primary dimensions, arising from prior work (i.e., Cousins & Earl, 1992, 1995), were used: (a) stakeholder selection for participation;

(b) control of the evaluation technical decision making; and (c) depth of participation. Also in 1996, Green, Mulvey, Fisher, and Woratschek contributed to the development of collaborative evaluation theory, highlighting that possibly a key barrier to successful partnerships in a collaborative evaluation is “the need for various stakeholder groups to share control, especially control over the evaluation decisions and over programmatic issues” (p. 269). They went on to say, “Clearly, our approach requires a close relationship with stakeholders. We would argue, however, that this is [a] strength, rather than a weakness, especially within the context of a formative evaluation” (p.270).

In 1997, the articles published emphasized, once again, evaluation use and empowerment evaluation. In their 1997 article, “Evaluation Use: Theory, Research, and Practice since 1986,” Shulha and Cousins undertook an extensive review and synthesis of the literature in evaluation use, and summarized contemporary issues for evaluation practice. They noted, “What is clear is that the evaluation practice community needs to be versatile in order to be responsive to the needs of its clientele” (p. 205). Lackey, Moberg, and Balistreri (1997) returned to empowerment evaluation, explaining that this approach sought to place evaluators and stakeholders on an even level. They wrote, “By empowering someone other than ourselves to make important evaluation decisions, there is the opportunity to observe the implications of relative standards and at the same time assess our own assumptions on proper evaluation practices” (p. 145).

Despite growing interest in empowerment evaluation, some authors had different viewpoints about its

qualities (i.e., Patton, 1997a, 1997b; Scriven, 1997a, 1997b) in such a way that this approach was the focus of more discussions about its perceived faults or shortcomings. Patton (1997a) pointed to an overlap among empowerment, participatory, collaborative, stakeholder-involving, and utilization-focused approaches to evaluation concerning such issues as ownership, relevance, understandability, access, involvement, and improvement. However, he also noted that the conceptual ambiguities that he identified reflected the fact that empowerment evaluation was still in the early stage of development. Scriven (1997a) also argued in this regard that there were serious problems with defining the concept, its underlying assumptions, and its proposed justification.

Fetterman (1997) took up these issues in “Empowerment Evaluation: A Response to Patton and Scriven” welcoming the comments as “valuable contributions to the development of empowerment evaluation.... Embracing critique is in the true spirit of a self-reflective and growing evaluative community of learners” (p. 254). Although there was still much work to be done, Fetterman cautioned that

...the effort to create greater conceptual clarity between similar approaches (which is appropriate and needed) should not be used to divide and weaken strong bonds and relationships. There is an overlap between collaborative, participatory, and empowerment approaches in practice. Synergistic strength is a function of overlapping, interrelated, and reinforcing characteristics and features. (p. 255)

Patton (1997b) in “Of Vacuum Cleaners and Toolboxes: A Response to Fetterman’s Response” and Scriven (1997b) in “Comments on Fetterman’s

Response” responded to Fetterman’s response. For example, Patton wrote, “The question of how these concepts and techniques would be implemented in an evaluation process in ways that distinguish them as empowering, as opposed to good, solid group facilitation to enhance use, remains unanswered” (Patton, 1997b, p. 270). In addition, Scriven noted, “In general, then, I think that empowerment evaluation still needs to be clear that its approach entails risks of error, and that these need to be countered by using ‘the old ways’” (Scriven, 1997b, p. 272). Obviously, 1997 was a very important year for empowerment evaluation; encountering contention and generating dialogue that helped identify areas in which the concept of empowerment evaluation needed to be strengthened, contributing to further the development of this approach.

In the following year, the emphasis on evaluation use reemerged along with other new topics. In 1998’s article, “Have We Learned Anything New about the Use of Evaluation?” Weiss argued that although it is not possible to control all aspects of the evaluation, it is important to think about which elements of the evaluation should be used. In another 1998 article, House and Howe, in what they called the deliberative democratic approach, suggested three criteria for evaluations to be properly balanced in terms of values, stakeholders, and politics; this approach was described later as “one kind of participatory conception” in an article by Howe and Ashcraft (2005, p. 2275).

In 1998, there was much AJE discourse regarding stakeholder approaches to evaluation and their implementation. Ryan, Greene, Lincoln, Mathison, and Mertens defended the idea that “inclusive evaluation approaches that

emphasize a participatory, collaborative approach to evaluation are grounded in important notions, worthy of dialogue and debate within the confines of the academy and professional societies” (p. 102). These authors advanced discussions about stakeholder approaches (including challenges and advantages from a practical perspective), and how these discussions changed the way of thinking about the manner in which evaluation is conducted. Also in 1998, Brandon showed how four studies bridged the gap between collaborative and non-collaborative evaluations and drew out the implications of these studies for both approaches. Furthermore, Johnson, Willeke, and Steiner (1998) noted that “collaborative, participatory, and empowerment forms of evaluation advocate the inclusion of stakeholders in decision-making roles in the evaluation process; however, little in the literature describes the involvement of stakeholders in the design and implementation of evaluative tools for data collection” (p. 339). In their case study, these authors made a contribution to our understanding by describing the collaborative process and the lessons learned when an evaluator collaborated with the staff of a family literacy program to design and implement a portfolio assessment.

Demonstrating the continuing popularity of Michael Patton’s approach, in 1999, both Reed and Horton wrote positive reviews of the third edition of Patton’s *Utilization-Focused Evaluation*. Also in 1999, Smith reviewed Cousins and Earl’s book, *Participatory Evaluation in Education: Studies in Evaluation Use and Organizational Learning*. In response to Smith’s review, “Participatory Evaluation: Not Working or Not Tested?” Cousins and Earl (1999) noted:

The genre of collaborative evaluation that provided the focus for our book we are now calling *practical* participatory evaluation. The reason for the adjustment is because there exists considerable confusion in the field about the specific meaning of participatory evaluation. The term is used quite differently by different people. While we were aware of such confusion when we compiled the book, our choice at that time was to be clear as to how we were using the term. (p. 312)

In 2000, a new trend in stakeholder approaches emerged in AJE when Yeh published two articles on planned variation evaluation (2000a, 2000b). This author defined planned variation evaluation as “a collaboration between an evaluator and one or more program operators to design, implement, and evaluate the effectiveness of two or more promising variations of an educational or social program” (2000b, p. 171). This same year, Bamberger wrote an article regarding how participatory evaluation was enhanced in international development programs. This author stated, “There is increased concern about giving voice to the poor and other groups affected by development programs and policies. This had led to the widespread use of participatory evaluation methods” (p. 97). Empowerment evaluation was represented in 2000 as well, with Schnoes, Murphy-Berman, and Chambers applying and examining the approach in a case study of three comprehensive community initiatives.

During 2001, AJE published a few articles on the future of evaluation and, a decade later, it is important to acknowledge the accuracy of some of those remarks, given the theoretical development and refinement that has occurred as displayed by AJE authors. In “The Transformation of Evaluation into a Collaboration: A Vision of Evaluation in

the 21st Century,” Fetterman (2001b) predicted that “the future of evaluation will be characterized by critical and collaborative relationships. Evaluation will be a collaboration” (p. 381). In another article from 2001, “Evaluation’s Future: Furor, Futile, or Fertile?” Mark pointed to the increased focus on stakeholder participation as “one of the larger recent trends in evaluation theory and practice” (p. 462). Mathison (2001) emphasized that “Participatory, deliberative forms of evaluation have great potential to create and sustain a community that values certain principles, activities, and actions” (p. 33). All support the need and usefulness of the stakeholder approaches, showing how relevant these contributions have been and are to the field of evaluation.

Different approaches and perspectives on stakeholder involvement continued to appear the following year. MacNeil (2002) reviewed the deliberative forum as one evaluation methodology for bringing the theory of deliberative democratic evaluation into practice by enhancing the possibilities for continued feedback with all stakeholders involved. Also in 2002, Morabito explored various evaluator roles and strategies for expanding evaluation process influence. He pointed out that “a collaborative approach to evaluation fosters personal, team, and organizational learning and is perhaps a model of evaluation that has the potential to embrace an evaluator who takes on a counseling role” (p. 327). Donaldson and Gooler’s 2002 article illustrated how participatory theory-driven evaluation could be used to improve and evaluate the impact of programs delivered in communities, a wide variety of organizations, and typical “real world” evaluation settings.



A new trend in discourse on stakeholder approaches was apparent in AJE during 2003. Youth participation emerged as a means of involving youth throughout the phases of the evaluation process. This youth participation trend is another way to show the potential of new contributions that these approaches can bring to the evaluation field. For example, in their 2003 article, Checkoway and Richards-Schuster drew on the available literature, including their own participatory evaluation of a project intended to increase youth participation in organizational development and community change.

In 2003, a number of case studies and models were published in AJE as well. Christie and Alkin (2003) presented a case study of the process of developing a program theory within a user-oriented evaluation as an illustration of how two distinct theories, utilization-focused and theory-driven evaluation can be implemented to meet the particular needs of evaluation clients. Sullins (2003) presented a case example demonstrating that the conceptualization of empowerment evaluation could be adapted to make it more relevant to a broader range of evaluands. In another article from 2003, Lawrenz and Huffman proposed a model for implementing multi-site, participatory evaluation, arguing that new evaluation models need to be developed to help meet the evaluation requirements while incorporating local evaluation efforts. Also in 2003, there was another important contribution which stressed the value that these approaches add to the many conceptual tools existing in the evaluation field. In this regard, Preskill, Zuckerman, and Matthews (2003) wrote:

We believe that such approaches (collaborative, participatory, empowerment and/or learning-oriented approaches) will: (a) contribute to participants' sense of ownership of, and commitment to, the evaluation, (b) provide participants with opportunities for learning about effective evaluation practice, (c) result in more useful recommendations, and (d) enhance the use of evaluation findings. (p. 424)

Over the next few years, publications describing different democratic evaluation approaches appeared, capturing how their authors' best understood the application of those approaches. In 2004, Ryan examined three democratic evaluation approaches (i.e., democratic evaluation, deliberative democratic evaluation, and communicative evaluation) to see how they might contribute to making educational accountability more democratic. Kushner (2005) also wrote about democratic evaluation indicating, "The approach I promote here is derived from democratic evaluation (MacDonald, 1976) and is distinct from deliberative democratic evaluation (House & Howe, 1999) in that democratic procedures are built into the action from its earliest stages, in access and design negotiations" (p. 581).

During 2004 and 2005, collaborative evaluation gained more structure with books and AJE articles proposing specific frameworks. These publications represent a growth of the theory and practice of collaborative evaluation making an important contribution to the development of this approach. The books were reviewed in AJE in subsequent years, which I discuss later in this article.

In "Utilizing Collaboration Theory to Evaluate Strategic Alliances," Gajda (2004) described the principles of collaboration theory and the corresponding assessment processes that

can be used by evaluators of large- or small-scale initiatives seeking to capitalize on the synergistic power of the collaborative effort. In “A Conversation with Russ Conner, the Colorado Trust Community-Based Collaborative Evaluation,” Christie (2005) showed how Conner used a collaborative, community-based framework to guide his evaluation. She wrote, “This evaluation approach allowed him to be responsive to the complexities of the evaluation as a result of the features of the program and provided him with the flexibility necessary for examining program processes at both the community and initiative levels” (p. 376).

Empowerment evaluation emerged yet again as a focus of commentary from multiple perspectives in 2005. Patton (2005) and Scriven (2005) both reviewed Fetterman and Wandersman’s 2005 book, *Empowerment Evaluation Principles in Practice*. In response to those reviews, Fetterman (2005) acknowledged that Patton’s and Scriven’s ideas, as well as those of Brad Cousins, would lead to positive developments in empowerment evaluation. However, in this response, Fetterman also addressed what he believed to be misstatements of fact regarding the book and identified directions that future dialogue might take. Of this response, Wandersman and Snell-Johns (2005) wrote, “Fetterman (2005) does a masterful job of systematically responding to Patton’s (2005) and Scriven’s (2005) book reviews by providing clarification and addressing misinterpretations” (p. 421). They went on to say, “Given the needs of our society to obtain meaningful outcomes, we will work to clarify, dialogue, and grow EE [empowerment evaluation] to achieve its aim of helping programs, organizations, and communities achieve results” (p.

427). Obviously, empowerment evaluation has been the approach to evaluation that has generated most discussions since its inception and throughout the decades.

In the last five years of AJE, authors have offered a variety of contributions to the ongoing discussion of stakeholder approaches to evaluation. In “The Practice and Politics of Responsive Evaluation,” Abma (2006) showed that the practice of evaluation is surrounded by politics but that evaluation is in itself also politically laden and normative. This same year, King (2006) reviewed the book *Practicing Evaluation: A Collaborative Approach*, and noted that “its content could be valuable to those O’Sullivan calls emerging evaluators or to program staff members who find themselves charged with conducting studies despite limited training” (p. 277). Also in 2006, Arnold outlined a framework for building evaluation capacity based on four strategic methods for teaching evaluation, including facilitating small-team collaborative evaluations.

While empowerment evaluation has promoted practice in the evaluation field, it has not been free from controversy, as this review of the history of AJE has shown. Taking an empirical rather than ideological approach in “Taking Stock of Empowerment Evaluation: An Empirical Review,” Miller and Campbell (2006) systematically examined 47 case examples of empowerment evaluation published between 1994 through 2005. They concluded that “the field of empowerment evaluation has considerable work to do to align practice and its conceptual framework” (p. 316). In response to Miller and Campbell (2006), Fetterman and Wandersman (2007) provided numerous examples of empowerment evaluation applications in real-world settings to show how theory and practice are aligned.

Miller and Campbell (2007) then concurred that “recent cases of empowerment evaluation embody more principles, on the average, than earlier cases” (p. 580). Nevertheless, they maintained that their study, and Fetterman and Wandersman’s response “illustrate the critical need for the evaluation profession to gain a better understanding about the requirements needed to sample, operationalize, measure, and test the effects of evaluation frameworks and procedures empirically” (p. 581). Following the tendency of 2006, Smith (2007) stated that empowerment evaluation could be viewed as an ideology that promotes a particular set of social and professional values.

O’Sullivan (2007) reviewed my 2005 book and wrote, “*Collaborative Evaluations: A Step-by-Step Model for the Evaluator* makes a valuable contribution to the field, adding new dimensions to the practice of collaborative, participatory, and empowerment evaluation” (p. 382). Another trend of stakeholder approaches emerged in AJE during 2007. Thiele, Devour, Velasco, and Horton conducted a *horizontal* evaluation, which combined self-assessment and external evaluation by peers, and explained how this type of evaluation is related to other types of participatory evaluation. They referred to this type of evaluation as “horizontal evaluation” because “it is based on a ‘horizontal’ and reciprocal relationship between the members of a project team whose work is being evaluated and colleagues from other organizations in the network who participate in the evaluation process as external peers” (p. 494).

Throughout 2007 and 2008, there was, once again, some emphasis in youth involvement and participatory evaluation. For example, Cooksy (2007) reviewed

articles written by Walker (2007) and Gong and Wright (2007), noting that “Both describe the value of including youth in evaluation, connecting their inclusion to the Guiding Principles of respect for people and responsibilities for general and public welfare” (p. 319). The following year, in her book review of *Youth Participatory Evaluation: Strategies for Engaging Young People*, Martens (2008) said that she “would recommend it not only to those pursuing positive youth development, but as a good read for any evaluator who believes he or she can find value in the process of enhancing participation—by youth and adults alike—in evaluation” (p. 591).

A number of 2008 publications addressed models and methods of the stakeholder approaches to evaluation. Adding to previous contributions, Huffman, Thomas, and Lawrenz (2008) described a new collaborative immersion approach to evaluation capacity building, placing this approach on a continuum of existing capacity-building methods. Also in 2008, Campbell, Adams, and Patterson integrated elements of responsive evaluation and participatory evaluation to address the methodological challenges of collecting evaluation data from traumatized clients/consumers. Another contribution during 2008 included the article of Smits and Champagne assessing the theoretical underpinnings of practical participatory evaluation. In this article, the authors attempted to partially remedy the gaps in the understanding of practical participatory evaluation by creating a representative model. Also, Trochim, Marcus, Mâsse, Moser, and Weld (2008) discussed several important lessons and recommendations that emerged from their work using a participatory integrative mixed-methods approach.

The emphasis on stakeholder approaches to evaluation continued during 2009. Botcheva, Shih, and Huffman (2009) described a process-oriented approach to cultural competence in evaluation, affirming that “to truly become collaborators in the evaluation process, we should train service providers in the basics of evaluation” (p. 185). This same year, Daigneault and Jacob (2009) published the article “Toward Accurate Measurement of Participation: Rethinking the Conceptualization and Operationalization of Participatory Evaluation” They assessed current conceptualizations of participatory evaluation and proposed an amended version of the framework developed by Cousins and Whitmore in 1998. These authors claimed that the concept of participatory evaluation is ambiguous and, as an original effort, they suggested an alternative that could contribute to the empirical knowledge of participatory evaluation.

The popularity of Michael Patton’s approach has been noticeable, and in 2010, the fourth edition of Patton’s *Utilization-Focused Evaluation* was positively reviewed, this time by Kirkhart. Also, during 2010 there was an emphasis in publications regarding stakeholders. For example, in “Evaluator Responsiveness to Stakeholders,” Azzam (2010) examined the way evaluators responded to stakeholders with varying levels of influence and power. Hansen and Vedung (2010) introduced a new approach to program theory evaluation called “theory-based stakeholder evaluation.” Moreover, several authors wrote about how stakeholder engagement can yield important benefits (Rogers, Ahmed, Hamdallah, & Little, 2010) and the importance of exploring stakeholder

values and interests in the evaluation (Orr, 2010).

It is important to notice that the AJE history on stakeholder approaches to evaluation that started three decades ago, showing stakeholder involvement as a central characteristic, continues in a similar fashion today. This sustains the assumption mentioned at the beginning of this article that stakeholder involvement is the backbone that supports the evolution of these approaches to evaluation.

## Conclusion

The growing interest in and use of the stakeholder approaches to evaluation is appreciable as we move throughout the history of the AJE publications. These approaches have been used as part of a wide variety of efforts, including multiple-site and multi-year evaluations, as well as at the national and international level. Furthermore, they have been used for both formative and summative purposes. Thus, they have great potential for being used in virtually every area of society as needed. These approaches are expected to become even more popular and credible in the near future, as further metaevaluations are performed to establish their value.

This popularity has grown among practitioners beyond the pages of AJE. Since AEA created the Collaborative, Participatory, and Empowerment Evaluation Topical Interest Group (CPE TIG) in 1995, the attention has been evident in the increasing number of presentations within this group. In 2010, the CPE TIG ranked fourth in the number of proposals it was asked to review (Kistler, 2010). Also, the CPE TIG membership grew by 30% between 2003

(871 members) and 2010 (1,130 members). In addition, approximately 20% of the AEA membership is currently affiliated with this TIG. In response to the needs of this group of evaluators, the CPE TIG recently created an interactive blog, Google collaborative web page, and Facebook page, which provide further opportunities to enhance dialogue regarding the practice of evaluation using these approaches.

Evaluators sharing a common interest on the CPE TIG have been expanding current thinking of these approaches and formalizing their components. In an attempt to clarify any confusion regarding the similarities and differences among these various approaches to evaluation, the CPE TIG has sponsored yearly presentations and provided a forum for an exchange of experiences (including theoretical and practical applications) about the many ways in which these approaches can be used. For instance, at the 2010 AEA annual conference, some of the founders or major proponents of the collaborative (Rodríguez-Campos & O'Sullivan, 2010), participatory (Shulha, 2010), and empowerment (Fetterman & Wandersman, 2010) approaches to evaluation highlighted the features of each approach, along the following dimensions: control of the evaluation process, stakeholder selection for participation, and depth of participation (Cousins & Whitmore, 1998).

A comparison of the essentials of collaborative, participatory, and empowerment evaluation (as a result of the CPE TIG discussions) has helped further clarify the similarities and differences of these approaches in an attempt to reach consensus. For example, each approach is designed to enhance evaluation use and organizational learning capacity; however, they differ in

the way they pursue these goals. Thus, definitions have been cautiously developed after a thorough examination by the proponents of those approaches and taking into account the audience's feedback at several AEA meetings. Specifically, (a) *collaborative evaluators* are in charge of the evaluation, but they create an ongoing engagement between evaluators and stakeholders, contributing to stronger evaluation designs, enhanced data collection and analysis, and results that stakeholders understand and use (Rodríguez-Campos & O'Sullivan, 2010); (b) *participatory evaluators* view control of the evaluation as jointly shared by evaluators and program staff; participants are involved in defining the evaluation, developing instruments, collecting and analyzing data, and reporting and disseminating results (Shulha, 2010); and (c) *empowerment evaluators* view program staff and participants as in control of the evaluation; empowerment evaluators are critical friends providing advice and guidance to maintain rigor and keep the evaluation on target (Fetterman & Wandersman, 2010).

As seen throughout this article, several conceptual frameworks have been developed so that evaluators are able to make an informed choice regarding the usability of the approaches in a specific situation. Even though these stakeholder forms of evaluation may be distinguished by their different key processes and goals, they also share clear similarities. Obviously, all these approaches involve stakeholders, but there are many other issues to consider when conducting these types of evaluation. For example, information has been developed to suggest which stakeholders are important depending on the situation, how they can be included, and the various roles of the evaluators and stakeholders. In order to

optimally use these approaches to evaluation, it is essential to be aware of their strengths and weaknesses, their proponents and detractors, and any potential opportunities and threats that may arise during implementation. In other words, there needs to be clear expectations of the advantages and disadvantages of undertaking a particular stakeholder approach to evaluation (or any other approach) based on the specific situation.

While stakeholder approaches to evaluation attempt to concentrate on issues not addressed by previous evaluation approaches, they also have their own difficulties, including: (a) issues of objectivity; (b) issues of resource feasibility (e.g., time, money, people); and (c) issues concerning the quality of involvement (e.g., competence to perform different evaluation roles). In particular, the objectivity of these approaches has occasionally been questioned, because evaluators and stakeholders bring their own experiences and views, which may affect the evaluation, and because some individuals could potentially bias findings in order to secure positive (or negative) evaluation results. In order to protect the credibility of the evaluation, care must be taken when determining what role everyone will play in the effort. In any case, the benefits gained by adopting a stakeholder approach to evaluation should outweigh the potential difficulties that may ensue.

These stakeholder approaches have brought awareness of the importance of involving stakeholders and the use of evaluation results. Also, it is clear from this work that these approaches to evaluation share, among others, many advantages in terms of the importance of understanding, involvement, ownership, access, development, implementation,

and improvement. Some examples include: (a) evaluators learn about the evaluand and its context to better understand them and provide useful information; (b) stakeholders feel confident to use their knowledge and perspectives (which evaluators may not have) resulting in increased trust in the evaluation and the decisions resulting from it; and (c) stakeholders' questioning of core assumptions, understanding, ownership, and use of the evaluation may lead to organizational learning and improvement. In addition, these approaches have increasingly brought together evaluators and stakeholders from different sectors, disciplines, and cultures to exchange knowledge on ways stakeholder involvement can be used as a strategic tool for fostering and strengthening the evaluation practice.

The stakeholder approaches to evaluation summarized in this article provide many options for stakeholder involvement, but also raise many questions concerning their application. Each approach provides unique ideas for evaluators to consider, as they decide which of them best fits their evaluand. While stakeholder approaches have influenced and shaped the evaluation field, these approaches are not the answer for every evaluation. Garaway (1995) emphasized that an evaluator who wishes to use these types of evaluation approaches should be flexible and tolerant of contextual difficulties and variations in stakeholders' willingness to participate.

These three decades of AJE have been very fruitful for the advancement of the stakeholder approaches to evaluation, both the theoretical development and practical application. Specifically, evaluators may look back on the first decade of this century and note that "these years marked an important

evolutionary stage in the evaluation profession's history. They might observe that it was during this time that participatory, collaborative, and stakeholder forms of evaluation became commonplace" (Preskill & Boyle, 2008 p. 443).

The future looks promising, as there are an increasing number of evaluators and clients interested in these types of approaches. Hence, where are these past decades of evolution on the stakeholder approaches to evaluation taking us? They are guiding us to a better understanding of the contributions of these approaches to the field of evaluation. These past decades have provided new knowledge to strengthen theories and contribute to the development of several conceptual frameworks. They have helped main proponents to get together and take action in an attempt to unify ideas and clarify long time misunderstandings, including the similarities and differences of the collaborative, participatory, and empowerment evaluation approaches. These past decades have been useful in showing us what needs to be done and where gaps still exist, elucidating issues not previously addressed, and contributing to the growth of the evaluation field.

The effectiveness of an evaluation is increased when the knowledge, responsibility, and action required to meet its goals become unified. Through stakeholder involvement at different stages in the evaluation, it is possible to achieve a holistic learning environment by understanding and creating productive opportunities. In such an environment, stakeholders better understand the evaluation process and are therefore more likely to use its findings. This article illustrates the interesting potential of stakeholder approaches to evaluation and

the manifold opportunities of achieving new insights. There is continuous possibility for improvement, as these approaches develop over time. For this reason, I encourage readers to share their experiences and feedback in order to enhance our understanding of the stakeholder approaches to evaluation.

## References

- Abma, T. A. (2006). The practice and politics of responsive evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 27(1), 31-43.
- Alkin, M. C. (Ed.). (2004). *Evaluation roots: Tracing theorists' views and influences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Alkin, M. C. (2005). Utilization of evaluation. In S. Mathison (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Altschuld, J. W., Yoon, J. S., & Cullen, C. (1993). The utilization of needs assessment results. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 16, 279-285.
- Azzam, T. (2010). Evaluator responsiveness to stakeholders. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 31(1), 45-65.
- Arnold, M. E. (2006). Developing evaluation capacity in extension 4-H field faculty: A framework for success. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 27(2), 257-269.
- Bamberger, M. (2000). The evaluation of international development programs: A view from the front. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 21(1), 95-102.
- Bledsoe, K. L., & Graham, J. A. (2005). The use of multiple evaluation approaches in program evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 26(3), 302-319.

- Botcheva, L., Shih, J., & Huffman, L. C. (2009). Emphasizing cultural competence in evaluation: A process-oriented approach. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 30(2), 176-188.
- Brandon, P. R. (1998). Stakeholder participation for the purpose of helping ensure evaluation validity: Bridging the gap between collaborative and non-collaborative evaluations. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 19(3), 325-337.
- Brunner, I., & Guzman, A. (1989). Participatory evaluation: A tool to assess projects and empower people. *New Directions for Program Evaluation*, 42, 9-17.
- Bryk, A. (Ed.). (1983). Stakeholder-based evaluation. *New Directions for Program Evaluation*, 17.
- Campbell, R., Adams, A. E., & Patterson, D. (2008). Methodological challenges of collecting evaluation data from traumatized clients/consumers: A comparison of three methods. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 29(3), 369-381.
- Cartland, J., Ruch-Ross, H. S., Mason, M., & Donohue, W. (2008). Role sharing between evaluators and stakeholders in practice. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 29(4), 460-477.
- Checkoway, B., & Richards-Schuster, K. (2003). Youth participation in community evaluation research. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 24(1), 21-33.
- Christie, C. A. (2005). A conversation with Russ Conner, the Colorado Trust community-based collaborative evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 26(3), 369-377.
- Christie, C. A., & Alkin, M. C. (2003). The user-oriented evaluator's role in formulating a program theory: Using a theory-driven approach. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 24(3), 373-385.
- Cooksy, L. J. (2007). Ethical challenges scenario: Youth involvement in evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 28(3), 318-320.
- Cousins, J. B., Donohue, J. J., & Bloom, G. A. (1996). Collaborative evaluation in North America: Evaluators' self-reported opinions, practices and consequences. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 17(3), 207-226.
- Cousins, J. B., & Earl, L. M. (1992). The case for participatory evaluation. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 14(4), 397-418.
- Cousins, J. B., & Earl, L. M. (1995). *Participatory evaluation in education: Studies of evaluation use and organizational learning*. London: Falmer.
- Cousins, J. B., & Earl, L. M. (1999). When the boat gets missed: Response to M.F. Smith. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 20(2), 309-317.
- Cousins, J. B., & Shulha, L. M. (2008). Complexities in setting program standards in collaborative evaluation. In N. Smith & P. R. Brandon (Eds.), *Fundamental issues in evaluation*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Cousins, J. B., & Whitmore, E. (1998). Framing participatory evaluation. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 80, 5-23.
- Daigneault, P-M., & Jacob, S. (2009). Toward accurate measurement of participation: Rethinking the conceptualization and operationalization of participatory evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 30(3), 330-348.
- Donaldson, S. I., & Gooler, L. E. (2002). Theory-driven evaluation of the work and health initiative: A focus on winning new jobs. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 23(3), 341-346.



- Fetterman, D. M. (1993). Theme for 1993 annual meeting: Empowerment evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 14(1), 115-117.
- Fetterman, D. M. (1994). Empowerment evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 15(1), 1-15.
- Fetterman, D. M. (1995). In response to Dr. Daniel Stufflebeam's empowerment evaluation, objectivist evaluation, and evaluation standards: Where the future of evaluation should not go and where it needs to go. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 16(2), 179-199.
- Fetterman, D. (1997). Empowerment Evaluation: A Response to Patton and Scriven. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 18(3), 253-266.
- Fetterman, D. M. (2001a). *Foundations of empowerment evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fetterman, D. M. (2001b). The transformation of evaluation into a collaboration: A vision of evaluation in the 21st century. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 22(3), 381-385.
- Fetterman, D. M. (2005). In response to Drs. Patton and Scriven. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 26(3), 418-420.
- Fetterman, D. M., Kaftarian, S., & Wandersman, A. (Eds.). (1996). *Empowerment evaluation: Knowledge and tools for self-assessment and accountability*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fetterman, D. M., & Wandersman, A. (Eds.). (2005). *Empowerment evaluation principles in practice*. New York, NY: Guilford.
- Fetterman, D. M., & Wandersman, A. (2007). Empowerment evaluation: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 28(2), 179-198.
- Fetterman, D. M., & Wandersman, A. (2010, November). *Empowerment Evaluation Essentials: Highlighting the Essential Features of Empowerment Evaluation*. Paper presented at the American Evaluation Association Conference, San Antonio, Texas.
- Flores, K. S. (2008). *Youth participatory evaluation: Strategies for engaging young people*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gajda, R. (2004). Utilizing collaboration theory to evaluate strategic alliances. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 25(1), 65-77.
- Garaway, G. B. (1995). Participatory evaluation. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 21, 85-102.
- Gill, S. J., & Zimmerman, N. R. (1990). Racial/ethnic and gender bias in the courts: A stakeholder-focused evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 11(2), 103-108.
- Gong, J., & Wright, D. (2007). The context of power: Young people as evaluators. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 28(3), 327-333.
- Greene, J. C. (1988). Stakeholder participation and utilization in program evaluation. *Evaluation Review*, 12, 91-116.
- Greene, J. C. (2005). Stakeholder. In S. Mathison (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Green, B. L., Mulvey, L., Fisher, H. A., & Woratschek, F. (1996). Integrating program and evaluation values: A family support approach to program evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 17(3), 261-272.
- Guba, E. G. (1969). The failure of educational evaluation. *Educational Technology*, 9, 29-38.

- Guba, E. G. (1978). *Toward a methodology of naturalistic inquiry in educational evaluation*. CSE Monograph 8. Los Angeles, CA: University of California, Center for the Study of Evaluation.
- Guba, E. G. (1987). What have we learned about naturalistic evaluation? *American Journal of Evaluation*, 8(1), 23-43.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). *Effective evaluation: Improving the usefulness of evaluation results through responsive and naturalistic approaches*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hansen, M. B., & Vedung, E. (2010). Theory-based stakeholder evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 31(3), 295-313.
- Hendricks, M. (1987). A conversation with W. Haven North, Director, Center for Developmental Information and Evaluation, U.S. Agency for International Development. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 8(1), 55-63.
- Horton, D. (1999). Utilization-Focused Evaluation (Third Edition), by Michael Q. Patton. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 20(2), 399-401.
- House, E. R. (1980). *Evaluating with validity*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- House, E. R., & Howe, K. R. (1998). The issue of advocacy in evaluations. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 19(2), 233-236.
- House, E. R., & Howe, K. R. (1999). *Values in evaluation and social research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Howe, K. R., & Ashcraft, C. (2005). Deliberative democratic evaluation: Successes and limitations of an evaluation of school choice. *Teachers College Record*, 107(10), 2274-2297.
- Huffman, D., Thomas, K., & Lawrenz, F. (2008). A collaborative immersion approach to evaluation capacity building. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 29(3), 358-368.
- Johnson, R. B. (1995). Estimating an evaluation utilization model using conjoint measurement and analysis. *Evaluation Review*, 19(3), 313-338.
- Johnson, R. L., Willeke, M. J., & Steiner, D. J. (1998). Stakeholder collaboration in the design and implementation of a family literacy portfolio assessment. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 19(3), 339-353.
- Kistler, S. (2010). *TIG membership and proposal submission background information*. American Evaluation Association report.
- King, J. A. (2006) Practicing evaluation: A collaborative approach. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 27(2), 277-278.
- Kirkhart, K. E. (2010). Utilization-Focused Evaluation (2008), by Michael Quinn Patton. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 31(4), 588-596.
- Kushner, S. (2005). Democratic theorizing: From noun to participle. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 26(4), 579-581.
- Lackey, J. F., Moberg, D. P., & Balistrieri, M. (1997). By whose standards? Reflections on empowerment evaluation and grassroots groups. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 18(2), 137-146.
- Lawrenz, F., & Huffman, D. (2003). How can multi-site evaluations be participatory? *American Journal of Evaluation*, 24(4), 471-482.
- Lehtonen, M. (2006). Deliberative democracy, participation, and OECD peer reviews of environmental

- policies. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 27(2), 185-200.
- Leviton, L. C., & Hughes, E. F. X. (1981). Research on the utilization of evaluations: A review and synthesis. *Evaluation Review*, 5, 524-548.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1980). The distinction between merit and worth in evaluation. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 2(4), 61-71.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage
- MacDonald, B. (1974). Evaluation and the control of education. In B. MacDonald & R. Walker (Eds.), *Innovation, evaluation, research, and the problem of control*. (SAFARI ONE). Norwich, UK: Centre for Applied Research in Education, University of East Anglia.
- MacDonald, B. (1976). Evaluation and the control of education. In D. Tawney (Ed.), *Curriculum evaluation today: Trends and implications*. Schools Council Research Studies Series. London: Macmillan.
- MacNeil, C. (2002). Evaluator as steward of citizen deliberation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 23(1), 45-54.
- Mark, M. M. (2001). Evaluation's future: Furor, futile, or fertile? *American Journal of Evaluation*, 22(3), 457-479.
- Mark, M. M., & Shotland, R. L. (1985). Stakeholder-based evaluation and value judgments: The role of perceived power and legitimacy in the selection of stakeholder groups. *Evaluation Review*, 9, 605-626.
- Martens, K. (2008). Youth Participatory Evaluation: Strategies for Engaging Young People, by K. S. Flores. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 29(4), 590-591.
- Mathison, S. (2001). What's it like when the participatory evaluator is a "genuine" stakeholder? *American Journal of Evaluation*, 22(1), 29-35.
- McTaggart, R. (1991). When democratic evaluation doesn't seem democratic. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 12(1), 9-21.
- Miller, R. L., & Campbell, R. (2006). Taking stock of empowerment evaluation: An empirical review. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 27(3), 296-319.
- Miller, R. L., & Campbell, R. (2007). Taking stock again results in the same conclusions: A reply to Fetterman and Wandersman's defense of empowerment evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 28(4), 579-581.
- Morabito, S. M. (2002). Evaluator roles and strategies for expanding evaluation process influence. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 23(3), 321-330.
- Orr, S. K. (2010). Exploring stakeholder values and interests in evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 31(4), 557-569.
- O'Sullivan, R. G. (2004). *Practicing evaluation: A collaborative approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- O'Sullivan, R. (2007). Collaborative Evaluations: A Step-by-Step Model for the Evaluator, by Liliana Rodríguez-Campos. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 28(3), 381-382.
- O'Sullivan, R. G., & D'Agostino, A. (2002). Promoting evaluation through collaboration: Findings from community-based programs for young children and their families. *Evaluation*, 8(3), 372-387.
- Patton, M. Q. (1978) *Utilization-focused evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Patton, M. Q. (1986) *Utilization-focused evaluation*. (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Patton, M. Q. (1988). Reports on topic areas: The evaluator's responsibility for utilization. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 9(2), 5-24.
- Patton, M. Q. (1994). Developmental evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 15(3), 311- 319.
- Patton, M. Q. (1996) *Utilization-focused evaluation: The new century text*. (3rd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Patton, M. Q. (1997a). Toward distinguishing empowerment evaluation and placing it in a larger context. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 18(2), 147-163.
- Patton, M. Q. (1997b). Of vacuum cleaners and toolboxes: A response to Fetterman's response. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 18(3), 267-270.
- Patton, M. Q. (2005). Toward distinguishing empowerment evaluation and placing it in a larger context: Take two. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 26(3), 408-414.
- Patton, M. Q. (2008) *Utilization-focused evaluation*. (4th ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Patton, M. Q. (2010). *Developmental evaluation: Applying complexity concepts to enhance innovations and use*. New York, NY: Guilford.
- Pechman, E. M. (1982). Optimizing evaluation use. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 3(4), 64-67.
- Perry, P. D., & Backus, C. A. (1995). A different perspective on empowerment in evaluation: benefits and risks to the evaluation process. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 16(1), 37-46.
- Preskill, H., & Boyle, S. (2008). A multidisciplinary model of evaluation capacity building. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 29(4), 443-459.
- Preskill, H., & Torres, R. T. (1999). Building capacity for organizational learning through evaluative inquiry. *Evaluation*, 5, 42-60.
- Preskill, H., Zuckerman, B., & Matthews, B. (2003). An exploratory study of process use: Findings and implications for future research. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 24(4), 423-442.
- Reed, M. C. (1999). Utilization-focused Evaluation: The new century text (3rd ed.), by Michael Quinn Patton. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 20(1), 151-153.
- Reineke, R. A. (1991). Stakeholder involvement in evaluation: Suggestions for practice. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 12(1), 39-44.
- Rodríguez-Campos, L. (2005). *Collaborative evaluations: A step-by-step model for the evaluator*. Tamarac, FL: Llumina Press.
- Rodríguez-Campos, L. (2008). *Evaluaciones colaborativas: Un modelo paso a paso para el evaluador* [Collaborative evaluations: A step-by-step model for the evaluator]. Tamarac, FL: Llumina Press.
- Rodríguez-Campos, L., & O'Sullivan, R. (2010, November). *Collaborative Evaluation Essentials: Highlighting the Essential Features of Collaborative Evaluation*. Paper presented at the American Evaluation Association Conference, San Antonio, Texas.
- Rogers, S. J., Ahmed, M., Hamdallah, M., & Little, S. (2010). Garnering grantee buy-in on a national cross-site evaluation: The case of connect HIV. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 31(4), 447-462.
- Ryan, K. E. (2004). Serving public interests in educational accountability: Alternative approaches to democratic evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 25(4), 443-460

- Ryan, K., Greene, J., Lincoln, Y., Mathison, S., & Mertens, D. M. (1998). Advantages and challenges of using inclusive evaluation approaches in evaluation practice. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 19(1), 101-122.
- Sanders, J. R. (2003). Mainstreaming evaluation. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 99, 3-6.
- Schnoes, C. J., Murphy-Berman, V., & Chambers, J. M. (2000). Empowerment evaluation applied: Experiences, analysis, and recommendations from a case study. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 21(1), 53-64.
- Scriven, M. (1991). *Evaluation thesaurus* (4th ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Scriven, M. (1997a). Empowerment evaluation examined. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 18(2), 165-175.
- Scriven, M. (1997b). Comments on Fettermans' response. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 18(3), 271-272.
- Scriven, M. (2005). Empowerment evaluation principles in practice. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 26(3), 415- 417.
- Shulha, L. (2010, November). *Participatory Evaluation Essentials: Highlighting the Essential Features of Participatory Evaluation*. Paper presented at the American Evaluation Association Conference, San Antonio, Texas.
- Shulha, L. M., & Cousins, J. B. (1997). Evaluation use: Theory, research, and practice since 1986. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 18(1), 195-208.
- Skolits, G. J., & Boser, J. A. (2008). Using an evaluation hotline to promote stakeholder involvement. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 29(1), 58-70.
- Smith, M. F. (1999). Participatory evaluation: not working or not tested? *American Journal of Evaluation*, 20(2), 295-308.
- Smith, N. L. (2007). Empowerment evaluation as evaluation ideology. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 28(2), 169-178.
- Smith, N. L., & Young, M. J. (1987). Utilization-focused evaluation, by Michael Q. Patton, 1986, (2nd ed.), *American Journal of Evaluation*, 8(1), 46-49.
- Smits, P. A., & Champagne, F. (2008). An assessment of the theoretical underpinnings of practical participatory evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 29(4), 427-442.
- Spiegel, A. N., Bruning, R. H., & Giddings, L. (1999). Using responsive evaluation to evaluate a professional conference. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 20(1), 57-67.
- Stake, B. (2004). How far dare an evaluator go toward saving the world? *American Journal of Evaluation*, 25(1), 103-107.
- Stake, R. E. (1967). The countenance of educational evaluation. *Teachers College Record*, 68, 523-540.
- Stake, R. E. (1969). Evaluation design, instrumentation, data collection, and analysis of data. In J. L. Davis (Ed.), *Educational evaluation*. Columbus, OH: State Superintended of Public Instruction.
- Stake, R. E. (1973). Program evaluation, particularly responsive evaluation. Keynote address at the conference "New Trends in Evaluation," Institute of Education, University of Goteborg, Sweden, Oct. 1973. In G. F. Madaus, M. S. Scriven, & D. L. Stufflebeam (Eds.), *Evaluation models: Viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation*. Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff, 1987.

- Stake, R. E. (1975). *Evaluating the arts in education: A responsive approach*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Stake, R. E. (1980). Program evaluation, particularly responsive evaluation. In W. B. Dockrell & D. Hamilton (Eds.), *Rethinking educational research*. London: Hodeder & Stoughton.
- Stake, R. E. (1981). Setting standards for educational evaluators. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 2(2), 148-152.
- Stake, R. E. (1991a). Retrospective on "The countenance of educational evaluation." In M. W. McLaughlin & D. C. Phillips (Eds.), *Evaluation and education: At quarter century*. Ninetieth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Stake, R. E. (1991b). Excerpts from: "Program evaluation, particularly responsive evaluation". *American Journal of Evaluation*, 12(1), 63-76.
- Stake, R. E. (2003). *Standard-based and responsive evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stake, R. E., & Schwandt, T. A. (2006). On discerning quality in evaluation. In I. F. Shaw, J. C. Greene, & M. M. Mark (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of evaluation*. Thousand Oak, CA: Sage.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (1994). Empowerment evaluation, objectivist evaluation, and evaluation standards: where the future of evaluation should not go and where it needs to go. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 15(3), 321-338.
- Suárez-Balcázar, Y., & Harper, G. (Eds.) (2004). *Empowerment and participatory evaluation of community interventions: Multiple benefits*. Binghamton, NY: The Haworth Press.
- Sullins, C. D., (2003). Adapting the empowerment evaluation model: A mental health drop-in center case example. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 24(3), 387-398.
- Taut, S. M., & Alkin, M. C. (2003). Program staff perceptions of barriers to evaluation implementation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 24(2), 213-226.
- Thiele, G., Devaux, A., Velasco, C., & Horton, D. (2007). Horizontal evaluation: Fostering knowledge sharing and program improvement within a network. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 28(4), 493-508.
- Toal, S. A. (2009). The validation of the evaluation involvement scale for use in multisite settings. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 30(3), 349-362.
- Trochim, W. M., Marcus, S. E., Mâsse, L. C., Moser, R. P., & Weld, P. C. (2008). The evaluation of large research initiatives: A participatory integrative mixed-methods approach. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 29(1), 8-28.
- Walker, K. (2007). Youth empowerment evaluation: Learning voice. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 28(3), 321-326.
- Wallerstein, N., & Martinez, L. (1994). Empowerment Evaluation: A case study of an adolescent substance abuse prevention program in New Mexico. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 15(2), 131-138.
- Wandersman, A. (2009). Four Keys to Success (Theory, Implementation, Evaluation, and Resource/System Support): High Hopes and Challenges in Participation. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 43(1-2), 3-21.
- Wandersman, A., & Snell-Johns, J. (2005). Empowerment evaluation: Clarity, dialogue, and growth. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 26(3), 421-428.

- Weiss, C. H. (1998). Have we learned anything new about the use of evaluation? *American Journal of Evaluation*, 19(1), 21-33.
- Yeh, S. S. (2000a). Building the knowledge base for improving educational and social programs through planned variation evaluations. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 21(1), 27-40.
- Yeh, S. S. (2000b). Improving educational and social programs: A planned variation cross-validation model. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 21(2), 171-184.