Patton, M. Q. (2017). Pedagogical principles of evaluation: Interpreting Freire. In M. Q. Patton (Ed.), *Pedagogy of Evaluation. New Directions for Evaluation*, *155*, 49–77.

3

Pedagogical Principles of Evaluation: Interpreting Freire

Michael Quinn Patton

Abstract

Pedagogy of evaluation entails examining how and what evaluation teaches. Embedded in different evaluation approaches are varying assumptions, values, premises, priorities, sense-making processes, and principles. Elucidating and illuminating principles is fundamental to identifying and understanding a pedagogy of evaluation. Ten pedagogical principles from Paulo Freire's writings are identified and explained. Each principle is then examined for its relevance to a critical pedagogy of evaluation for evaluation theory and practice today and looking forward. Freire understood and taught us that all interactions between and among people are pedagogical, something is always being taught, conveyed, and proselytized. Extending this insight to evaluation, Freire's work reminds us that all evaluation approaches constitute a pedagogy of some kind. What any particular evaluation teaches and how it is taught varies, but evaluation is inherently and predominantly a pedagogical interaction. This leads to the concluding question: What is your pedagogy of evaluation? © 2017 Wiley Periodicals, Inc., and the American Evaluation Association.

A Principles-Focused Pedagogy of Evaluation

Pedagogy of evaluation entails examining how and what evaluation teaches. Embedded in different evaluation approaches are varying assumptions, values, premises, priorities, sense-making processes, and

principles. I'm going to focus on principles as fundamental to a pedagogy of evaluation. Those who participate in an evaluation are experiencing sometimes explicit, more often implicit and tacit, *pedagogical principles*. Principles inform and guide decision making. They do so by telling us where to focus our attention and how to act. For example, goal-based evaluation is derived from the principle that setting goals increases effectiveness, which tells us to focus on and measure goal attainment. Theory-driven evaluation is based on the principle that interventions are more likely to be effective if based on a theory of change and thereby tells us to focus on and assess program theory. Utilization-focused evaluation is based on the principle that identifying and working with intended users on intended uses will enhance use. Developmental evaluation is grounded in complexity theory, which focuses our attention on the principle of emergence which directs us to be open and agile in capturing emergent outcomes in complex dynamic situations. This chapter will identify and elucidate the pedagogical principles of Paulo Freire and examine their implications for evaluation thereby illuminating a Freirean pedagogy of evaluation. This is a form of *principles-focused evaluation* (Patton, 2017).

Principles-focused evaluation examines (a) whether principles are clear, meaningful, and actionable, and if so (b) whether they are actually being followed and, if so (c) whether they are leading to desired results. Principles are derived from experience, expertise, values, and research. They operate at different levels. They can guide individual, program, policy, organizational, and community choices and actions. There are design principles, relationship principles, principles of professional practice, philanthropic principles, accountability principles, policy-making principles, sustainability principles, research principles, and so forth and so on, because every arena of human endeavor has generated guiding principles. By identifying Freirean pedagogical principles and evaluating their relevance and applicability to evaluation, I hope to illustrate how principles make explicit the pedagogy embedded in a particular evaluation approach. That process can then be used to illuminate the pedagogy of any evaluation.

Principles-focused evaluation informs choices about which principles are appropriate for what purposes in which contexts, helping to navigate the treacherous terrain of conflicting guidance and competing advice. What principles work for what situations with what results is an evaluation question. Thus, from an evaluation perspective, principles are hypotheses, not truths. They may or may not work. They may or may not be followed. They may or may not lead to desired outcomes. Whether they work, whether they are followed, and whether they yield desired outcomes are subject to evaluation.

I've extracted 10 pedagogical principles from Freire's writings. I'll explain each principle and its relevance for a critical pedagogy of evaluation. I'll begin by summarizing an evaluation scenario from *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* and then extract Freire's principles from that example and examine

their relevance for evaluation today and looking forward. I will quote extensively from Freire to provide a sense of his language and perspective. The scenario and all quotations are from *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (Freire, 1970) unless otherwise noted.

Freire's Evaluation Engagement Process

What follows is Freire's example of his pedagogy of the oppressed undergirded by critical evaluative thinking. Here's the scenario: A plan is to be developed and implemented for adult education in a peasant area with high illiteracy. The process begins with a participatory situation analysis facilitated by "investigators." The investigators hold an informal meeting in the area where the literacy campaign is to take place. During this initial meeting with local people they explain what they propose to do and that "the investigation will be impossible without a relation of mutual understanding and trust" (p. 110). Volunteers are recruited at this meeting to serve as assistants in gathering data about the life of the area. Together the investigators and volunteers develop "a critical perception of the world, which implies a correct method of approaching reality in order to unveil it. And critical perception cannot be imposed. Thus, from the very beginning, thematic investigation is expressed as an educational pursuit, as cultural action" (p. 111):

> The inquiry observes people living life and engages in informal conversations with them. They register everything in their notebooks, including apparently unimportant items: the way the people talk, their style of life, their behavior at church and at work. They record the idioms of the people: their expressions, their vocabulary, and their syntax (not their incorrect pronunciation, but rather the way they construct their thought).
>
> It is essential that the investigators observe the area under varying circumstances: labor in the fields, meetings of a local association (noting the behavior of the participants, the language used, and the relations between the officers and the members), the role played by women and by young people, leisure hours, games and sports, conversations with people in their homes (noting examples of husband–wife and parent–child relationships). No activity must escape the attention of the investigators during the initial survey of the area. (pp. 111–112)

The process then moves from data to interpretation, which means engaging in evaluation.

> After each observation visit, the investigator should draw up a brief report to be discussed by the entire team, in order to evaluate the preliminary findings of both the professional investigators and the local assistants. To facilitate the participation of the assistants, the evaluation meetings should be held in the area itself. (p. 112)

During these "evaluation meetings" each person reports "how he perceived or felt a certain occurrence or situation." In so doing, Freire explains, participants in the inquiry challenge each other "by re-presenting to them the same reality upon which they have themselves been intent. At this moment they 're-consider,' through the 'considerations' of others, their own previous 'consideration.'" Thus "the analysis of reality" made by each individual "sends them all back, dialogically, to the disjoined whole which once more becomes a totality evoking a new analysis by the investigators, following which a new evaluative and critical meeting will be held. Representatives of the inhabitants participate in all activities as members of the investigating team" (p. 112).

The initial investigation focuses on uncovering and understanding contradictions of consciousness among the people being studied. However, Freire cautions: "the fact that the investigators may in the first stage of the investigation approximately apprehend the complex of contradictions does not authorize them to begin to structure the program content of educational action. This perception of reality is still their own, not that of the people" (p. 114). Instead, a second stage of inquiry is initiated to further investigate these contradictions, "always acting as a team." The contradictions identified must be familiar to the participants in the inquiry. "It is inadmissible . . . to present pictures of reality unfamiliar to the participants" because the purpose is for "individuals analyzing their own reality to become aware of their prior, distorted perceptions and thereby to have a new perception of that reality." Through this inquiry the participants "make explicit their 'real consciousness' of the world. As they do this, they begin to see how they themselves acted while actually experiencing the situation they are now analyzing, and thus reach a 'perception of their previous perception'" (p. 114).

> By achieving this awareness, they come to perceive reality differently; by broadening the horizon of their perception, they discover more easily in their "background awareness" the dialectical relations between the two dimensions of reality.
>
> By stimulating "perception of the previous perception" and "knowledge of the previous knowledge," decoding stimulates the appearance of a new perception and the development of new knowledge. The new perception and knowledge are systematically continued with the inauguration of the educational plan, which transforms the untested feasibility into testing action, as potential consciousness supersedes real consciousness." (p. 115)

Freire reports having learned with colleagues that the people in communities only become deeply interested and engaged when the inquiry related "directly to their felt needs. Any deviation . . . produced silence and indifference" (p. 116). With further work, Freire and colleagues developed a pedagogy of critical consciousness that moved beyond mere needs

identification to perceiving the *causes* of their needs. Therein lies the emergence of critical consciousness.

> In one of the thematic investigations carried out in Santiago, a group of tenement residents discussed a scene showing a drunken man walking on the street and three young men conversing on the corner. The group participants commented that "the only one there who is productive and useful to his country is the spouse who is returning home after working all day for low wages and who is worried about his family because he can't take care of their needs. He is the only worker. He is a decent worker and a souse like us." . . . [I]n their comments on the codification of an existential situation they could recognize, and in which they could recognize themselves, they said what they really felt . . . .
>
> In contrast, imagine the failure of a moralistic educator sermonizing against alcoholism and presenting as an example of virtue something which for these men is not a manifestation of virtue. In this and in other cases, the only sound procedure is the *conscientizaciio* of the situation, which should be attempted from the start of the thematic investigation. (pp. 118–119)

Freire provides much more detail about how to move from inquiry to reflection to action while evaluating each step along the way and using what is learned in each action step to frame the next inquiry cycle, thereby deepening critical consciousness of the local people involved throughout the ongoing pedagogical journey.

Keep in mind that in this scenario Freire is describing his pedagogical approach of working with nonliterate poor people before evaluation had emerged as a formal field of professional practice.

Freirean Principles

There is no definitive list of Freirean principles. Different analysts, including the authors in this volume, drawing on and influenced by Freire's works emphasize different elements and articulate principles in varying ways. Thus, what follows are my interpretation of his principles with an eye toward particular influences on and relevance for evaluation.

Principle 1. Use Evaluative Thinking to Open Up, Develop, and Nurture *Critical Consciousness*

> The conviction of the oppressed that they must fight for their liberation is not a gift bestowed by the revolutionary leadership, but the result of their own *conscientizaciio.* (Freire, 1970, p. 67)

Critical consciousness, or *conscientização* (Portuguese), refers to attaining a deep, meaningful, realistic, and reality-based understanding of

one's world. This includes becoming aware of how one has been indoctrinated and conditioned to think in particular ways by those with power and wealth who control traditional educational outlets including schools, governmental agencies, media outlets, and the business world. Freire (1970) introduced the idea of *conscientização* in his book *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* to emphasize that ordinary people, especially the poor, are oppressed by false consciousness, having internalized the message that they are inferior, without value, incapable, and useless. A pedagogy of the oppressed raises consciousness about the nature, sources, and implications of oppression, which include dominant and domineering myths so as to escape control by those in power and come to act with freedom and consciousness as a self-determining and thoughtful human being. This realization empowers the oppressed to take action.

> The best starting point for such reflections is the unfinishedness of our human condition. It is in this consciousness that the very possibility of learning, of being educated, resides. It is our immersion in this consciousness that gives rise to a permanent movement of searching, of curious interrogation that leads us not only to an awareness of the world but also to a thorough, scientific knowledge of it. This permanent movement of searching creates a capacity for learning not only in order to adapt to the world, but especially to intervene, to re-create, and to transform it. All of this is evidence of our capacity for learning, for completing our incompleteness in a distinct way from that characteristic of other mammals or of plants. (Freire, 2001, pp. 66–67)

Evaluation relevance today

> We are distressed by underprivilege. We see gaps among privileged patrons and managers and staff and underprivileged participants and communities . . . . We are advocates of a democratic society. (Stake, 2004, pp. 103–107)

Pioneering evaluator Robert Stake's quote reeks of values. Pioneering evaluator Michael Scriven (2015) considers the transition from value-free social science to values-based evaluation the first great revolution in the transdiscipline of evaluation. Incorporating and judging value is the major purpose of evaluation, but evaluators have long struggled with how to do so. Schwandt has summarized the challenges succinctly and astutely.

> Debates have centered on how explicit an evaluator must be about the criteria employed for judgment . . . . Controversy is associated with the extent to which and the manner in which stakeholders (and which ones—managers, commissioners, beneficiaries?) are to be involved in determining criteria . . . and whether the evaluator per se is the person ultimately responsible for the judgment. Disagreement surrounds whether there ought to be a universal set of criteria (e.g. the OECD/DAC criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability for evaluating development assistance),

> whether a particular criterion or set of criteria are always paramount (e.g. cultural responsiveness, gender-responsiveness, equity-focus), or whether criteria are always matters to be negotiated in particular settings. Equally troublesome is the fact of considerable disagreement on how best to deal with multiple criteria, the so-called aggregation or synthesis problem. And, finally, disputes surround both the applicability and the justification of various methods for valuing (e.g. determining impact via experiments; judging efficiency by means of cost-benefit techniques) in specific contexts. (Schwandt, 2015, p. 463–464)

Freire unequivocally believed that the criteria of the poor and oppressed should be ascendant, but for that to occur they would need to develop critical consciousness. Today, Freire's pedagogical influence is manifest in and is represented by two major and intersecting evaluation pedagogies: critical systems heuristics as a way of operationalizing critical consciousness and evaluative thinking as a core capacity to be developed in the process of conducting evaluations. Critical systems heuristics in evaluation design and implementation emphasizes explicit attention to power dynamics, taking into account diverse perspectives representing diverse values, and being explicit about critical boundary decisions.

> Every evaluative inquiry is 'bounded' in the sense that particular facts and values bearing on determining the value of the intervention under consideration are either included or excluded from analysis. Certain criteria of performance, for example, are considered more or less relevant, and certain kinds of evidence of performance are considered more or less important. These boundaries or choices are not naturally given (e.g. as features of the context) but social (and personal) constructions that define what is to be taken as germane to the analysis of value. (Schwandt, 2015, p. 464)

Evaluative thinking as a form of critical consciousness is fundamental to House's (1977) conceptualization of evaluation dialogue involving argumentative interaction between the evaluator and stakeholders, "a dialogue in which they are free to employ their reasoning" (p. 48). It is by challenging evaluative premises the evaluator puts forth that "the nature of the evaluation as argumentation becomes apparent" (House, 1977, p. 8). Democratic deliberative evaluation (House, 2014; House & Howe, 2000) both requires critical consciousness and enhances the capacity to think critically.

Principle 2. Consciousness Resides in Communities of People, Not Just Individuals

> When they [the oppressed] discover within themselves the yearning to be free, they perceive that this yearning can be transformed into reality only when the same yearning is aroused in their comrades. (p. 47)

The emergence and nurturing of critical consciousness is both a cultural and political activity and is therefore inherently a collective activity: *inquiry together.* Freire's pedagogy involves people together examining issues that are important to them and their situation, what he calls "thematics."

> [T]he investigation of thematics involves the investigation of the people's thinking —thinking which occurs only in and among people together seeking out reality. I cannot think *for others* or *without others,* nor can others think *for me*. Even if the people's thinking is superstitious or naive, it is only as they rethink their assumptions in action that they can change. (Freire, 1970, p. 108).

Evaluation relevance today

> In the long history of humankind (and animal kind, too) those who learned to collaborate and improvise most effectively have prevailed. Charles Darwin (1809–1882)

Participatory evaluation has become a major distinct approach to evaluation. The first participatory evaluation guidebooks were written by and for community development workers in Latin America and Africa. A collaborative group called Private Agencies Collaborating Together (1986) published one of the first guides to *Participatory Evaluation*, as well as a more general *Evaluation Sourcebook* (Pietro, 1983). Both remain relevant today. The guides include techniques for actively involving nonliterate people as active participants in evaluating the development efforts they experience. Those works acknowledge the influence of Freire.

Participatory, community-focused evaluation has been used with great success as part of international and community development efforts by a number of nongovernmental groups and private voluntary organizations in the Global South. International studies of development have demonstrated how participatory research can be a means of understanding and bridging diverse perspectives for responsive development (Better Evaluation, 2014; Mansuri & Vijayendra, 2012; Salmen & Kane, 2006). The processes of participation and collaboration have an impact on participants and collaborators quite beyond whatever findings or report they may produce by working together. In the process of participating in evaluation, participants are exposed to and have the opportunity to learn the logic of evidence-based inquiry and the discipline of evidentiary reasoning. Skills are acquired in problem identification, criteria specification, and data collection, analysis, and interpretation. Through acquisition of inquiry skills and ways of thinking, a collaborative inquiry process can have an impact beyond the findings generated from a particular study.

Moreover, people who participate in creating something tend to feel more ownership of what they have created and make more use of it.

Active participants in evaluation, therefore, are more likely to feel ownership not only of their findings but also of the inquiry process itself. Properly, sensitively, and authentically done, it becomes their process. Participants and collaborators can be community members, villagers, organizational workers, program staff, and/or program participants (e.g., clients, students, farmers). Sometimes administrators, funders, and others also participate, but the usual connotation is that the primary participants are "lower down" in the hierarchy—Freire's people. Participatory evaluation is bottom-up. The trick is to make sure that participation is genuine and authentic, not just token or rhetorical, especially in participative evaluation, where differing political agendas often compete.

There are four distinct purposes for participatory evaluation: (a) the pragmatic purpose of increasing use of findings by those involved (Patton 2008); (b) the philosophical or methodological purpose of grounding data in participants' perspectives; (c) the political purpose of mobilizing for social action, for example, empowerment evaluation (see Chapter 6 in this volume), or what is sometimes called "emancipatory" evaluation research (Cousins & Earl, 1995, p. 10); and (d) teaching inquiry logic and skills (Patton, 2015, p. 222). To achieve these evaluative purposes requires people in a community to inquire together actively. One community participant in such a process once told me: "We don't feel that we know something until we know it together." That is the essence of Freire's principle that *consciousness resides in communities of people, not just individuals.*

Principle 3. Critical Consciousness Pedagogy Must Be Interactive and Dialogical

Freire provides an extensive critique of what he calls the "banking" concept of education, in which teachers "deposit" information into students (Freire, 1970, p. 73). In contrast, the pedagogy of the oppressed must be interactive and dialogical.

> Those truly committed to liberation must reject the banking concept in its entirety, adopting instead a concept of women and men as conscious beings, and consciousness as consciousness intent upon the world. They must abandon the educational goal of deposit-making and replace it with the posing of the problems of human beings in their relations with the world... .
>
> Liberating education consists in acts of cognition, not transferrals of information... . Dialogical relations indispensable to the capacity of cognitive actors to cooperate in perceiving the same cognizable object—are otherwise impossible ...Through dialogue, the teacher-of-the-students and the students-of-the-teacher cease to exist and a new term emerges: teacher–student with students–teachers. The teacher is no longer merely the-one-who-teaches, but one who is himself taught in dialogue with the students, who in turn while being taught also teach. They become jointly responsible

> for a process in which all grow . . . Here, no one teaches another, nor is anyone self-taught. People teach each other, mediated by the world, by the cognizable objects, which in banking education are "owned" by the teacher. (Freire, 1970, pp. 79–80)

Evaluation relevance today

> To be human is to engage in interpersonal dynamics.
>
> Inter: between.
>
> Personal: people.
>
> Dynamics: forces that produce activity and change.
>
> Combining these definitions, interpersonal dynamics are the forces between people that lead to activity and change. Whenever and wherever people interact, these dynamics are at work. (King & Stevahn, 2013, p. 2)

This defining quotation from *Interactive Evaluation Practice* (King & Stevahn, 2013) makes explicit the connection between interactive evaluation approaches and social change. Likewise, democratic dialogic evaluation (House & Howe, 2000) presents both a rationale and a set of processes and methods to make dialogue among people with different perspectives and interests the cornerstone of evaluation in support of democracy. They have articulated three requirements for evaluation done in a way that supports democracy: inclusion, dialogue, and deliberation. They worry about the power that derives from access to evaluation and the implications for society if only the powerful have such access.

> We believe that the background conditions for evaluation should be explicitly democratic so that evaluation is tied to larger society by democratic principles argued, debated, and accepted by the evaluation community. Evaluation is too important to society to be purchased by the highest bidder or appropriated by the most powerful interest. Evaluators should be self-conscious and deliberate about such matters . . . .
>
> If we look beyond the conduct of individual studies by individual evaluators, we can see the outlines of evaluation as an influential societal institution, one that can be vital to the realization of democratic societies. Amid the claims and counterclaims of the mass media, amid public relations and advertising, amid the legions of those in our society who represent particular interests for pay, evaluation can be an institution that stands apart, reliable in the accuracy and integrity of its claims. But it needs a set of explicit democratic principles to guide its practices and test its intuitions. (House & Howe, 2000, p. 4)

Barry MacDonald (1987), influenced and inspired in part by Freire, was an early advocate of the democratic evaluation model. He argued that "the democratic evaluator" recognizes and supports value pluralism, with

the consequence that the evaluator seeks to represent the full range of interests in the course of designing an evaluation. In this way, an evaluator can support an informed citizenry, the sine qua non of a strong democracy, by acting as an information broker between groups that want and need knowledge of one another. The democratic evaluator must make the methods and techniques of evaluation accessible to nonspecialists—that is, the general citizenry. MacDonald's democratic evaluator seeks to survey a range of interests by assuring confidentiality to sources, engaging in negotiation between interest groups, and making evaluation findings widely accessible. The guiding ethic is the public's right to know.

Saville Kushner (2000, 2016) has carried forward, deepened, and updated MacDonald's democratic evaluation model. He sees evaluation as a form of personal expression and political action, with a special obligation to be critics of those in power. He places at the center of evaluation the experiences of people in programs, the supposed beneficiaries, where, for Kushner, we will find the intersection of Politics (big P—Policy) and politics (small p—people). He uses case studies to capture the perspectives of real people—children and teachers and parents—and the realities of their lives in program settings as they experience those realities. He feels a special obligation to focus on, capture, report, and, therefore, honor the views of marginalized peoples. He calls this "personalizing evaluation," but the larger agenda is strengthening democracy. Consider these reflections on the need for evaluators and evaluations to address questions of social justice and the democratic contract:

> Where each social and educational program can be seen as a reaffirmation of the broad social contract (that is, are-confirmation of the bases of power, authority, social structure, etc.), each program evaluation is an opportunity to review its assumptions and consequences. This is commonly what we do at some level or another. All programs expose democracy and its failings; each program evaluation is an assessment of the effectiveness of democracy in tackling issues in the distribution of wealth and power and social goods [italics added]. Within the terms of the evaluation agreement, taking this level of analysis into some account, that is, renewing part of the social contract, is to act more authentically; to set aside the opportunity is to act more inauthentically, that is, to accept the fictions. (Kushner, 2000, pp. 32–33)

Writings on evaluation's role in supporting democratic processes reflect a significant shift in the nature of evaluation's real and potential contribution to strengthening democracy. A decade ago, the emphasis was all on increasing use of findings for enhanced decision making and program improvement and, therefore, making sure that findings reflected the diverse perspectives of multiple stakeholders, including the less powerful, through "inclusive evaluation" (Mertens, 1998, 1999) and genuinely engaging participants in programs, instead of just staff, administrators, and funders.

Although this thrust remains important, a parallel and reinforcing use of evaluation focuses on helping people learn to think and reason evaluatively and on how rendering such help can contribute to strengthening democracy over the long term, a Freirean vision that deserves elaboration.

Start with the premise that a healthy and strong democracy depends on an informed citizenry. A central contribution of policy research and evaluation, then, is to help ensure an informed electorate as well by disseminating findings, as well as to help the citizenry weigh evidence and think evaluatively. This involves thinking processes that must be learned. It is not enough to have trustworthy and accurate information (the informed part of the informed citizenry). People must also know how to use the information, that is, to weigh evidence, consider the inevitable contradictions and inconsistencies, articulate values, interpret findings, deal with complexity, and examine assumptions, to note but a few of the things meant by "thinking evaluatively." Moreover, in-depth democratic thinking includes political sophistication about the origins and implications of the categories, constructs, and concepts that shape what we experience as information and "knowledge" (Minnich, 2004), a core issue for Freire encompassed in his focus on critical consciousness.

Philosopher Hannah Arendt, also a contemporary of Freire, was especially attuned to this foundation of democracy. Having experienced Nazi totalitarianism, then having fled it, she devoted much of her life to studying it and its opposite, democracy. She believed that thinking thoughtfully in public deliberations and acting democratically were intertwined. Totalitarianism is built on and sustained by deceit and thought control. To resist efforts by the powerful to deceive and control thinking, Arendt (1968) believed that people needed to practice thinking. Toward that end, she developed "eight exercises in political thought." She wrote that "experience in thinking ... can be won, like all experience in doing something, only through practice, through exercises" (p. 4). From this point of view, might we consider every participatory research and evaluation inquiry as an opportunity for those involved to practice critical thinking and to increase critical consciousness? In this regard, we might aspire to have policy research, action research, participatory research, and collaborative evaluation do what Arendt hoped her exercises in political thought would do, namely, help us "to gain experience in how to think." Her exercises "do not contain prescriptions on what to think or which truths to hold" but, rather, on the act and process of thinking. For example, Arendt thought it important to help people think conceptually:

> to discover the real origins of original concepts in order to distill from them anew their original spirit which has so sadly evaporated from the very keywords of political language—such as freedom and justice, authority and reason, responsibility and virtue, power and glory—leaving behind empty shells. (Arendt, 1968, pp. 14–15)

Principle 4. Integrate Reflection and Action

Freire is strongly and eloquently critical of the juxtaposition of reflection and action as separate and distinct arenas of human experience. For him, reflection is aimed at action and action is the content of reflection. *Critical dialogue presupposes action.*

At all stages of their liberation, the oppressed must see themselves as women and men engaged in the ontological and historical vocation of becoming more fully human. Reflection and action become imperative when one does not erroneously attempt to dichotomize the content of humanity from its historical forms.

The insistence that the oppressed engage in reflection on their concrete situation is not a call to armchair revolution. On the contrary, reflection—true reflection—leads to action. On the other hand, when the situation calls for action, that action will constitute an authentic praxis only if its consequences become the object of critical reflection (Freire, 1970, pp. 65–66).

Evaluation relevance today. *Reflective practice* has become a mainstay of professional development, action research, and learning organizations (Patton, 2008, 2011, 2015). Donald Schon (1983, 1987) popularized the concept of the reflective practitioner. What sets Freire apart was his pioneering and radical assertion that uneducated and nonliterate people could engage in, benefit from, become enlightened through, and bring about change as a result of reflection used to inform action. Social change toward social justice is the evidence that reflection-based inquiry has led to critical consciousness and that consciousness has informed action. Social justice evaluation, then, must examine both the quality of the community reflection process and the results of that process. This is the essence of *evaluating evaluation*, in this case, evaluating the extent to which social justice evaluation leads to greater social justice.

Principle 5. Value and Integrate the Objective and Subjective

Critical consciousness, reflection, and action must be grounded in objective reality that is subjectively experienced and understood.

> [T]he radical is never a subjectivist. For this individual the subjective aspect exists only in relation to the objective aspect (the concrete reality, which is the object of analysis). Subjectivity and objectivity thus join in a dialectical unity producing knowledge in solidarity with action, and vice versa. (Freire, 1970, p. 38)

At the core of critical consciousness is the "capacity to apprehend reality" (Freire, 1970/2000, p. 66). For Freire, poverty is a verifiable reality. Oppression is also a verifiable reality, not merely perception. Freire goes on at length to distinguish both intellectual and academic objectivism and subjectivism from commonsense objectivity and subjectivity as understood and

experienced by ordinary people. Moreover, Freire asserts that any hoped for, alleged, or asserted transformation from oppression to liberation must be "objectively verified" (p. 50). Here are some illustrative and illuminative quotations.

> [O]ne cannot conceive of objectivity without subjectivity. Neither can exist without the other, nor can they be dichotomized. The separation of objectivity from subjectivity, the denial of the latter when analyzing reality or acting upon it, is objectivism. On the other hand, the denial of objectivity in analysis or action, resulting in a subjectivism which leads to solipsistic positions, denies action itself by denying objective reality. Neither objectivism nor subjectivism, nor yet psychologism is propounded here, but rather subjectivity and objectivity in constant dialectical relationship. (Freire, 2000, p. 50)

> Just as objective social reality exists not by chance, but as the product of human action, so it is not transformed by chance. If humankind produce social reality . . . , then transforming that reality is an historical task, a task for humanity. (Freire, 2000, p. 51)

> There would be no human action if there were no objective reality, no world to be the "not I" of the person and to challenge them; just as there would be no human action if humankind were not a "project," if he or she were not able to transcend himself or herself, if one were not able to perceive reality and understand it in order to transform it. (Freire, 2000, p. 53)

Evaluation relevance today. French philosopher Jean-Paul Sartre once observed that "words are loaded pistols." The words "objectivity" and "subjectivity" are bullets people arguing fire at each other. It's true that objectivity is held in high esteem. Science aspires to objectivity, and a primary reason why decision makers commission an evaluation is to get objective data from an independent source external to the program being evaluated. Yet, philosophers of science now typically doubt the possibility of anyone or any method being totally "objective." But subjectivity fares even worse. Even if acknowledged as inevitable, or valuable as a tool to understanding, subjectivity carries such negative connotations at such a deep level and for so many people that the very term can be an impediment to mutual understanding. Debate focused on objectivity versus subjectivity continues in evaluation and throughout science, but Freire offered an understanding of their connection and interdependence, a theme explored and enhanced by anthropologist and policy evaluator Michael Agar.

> "Subjective" versus "objective" no longer makes sense, since everyone involved is a subject . . . Human Social Research is intersubjective . . . built from encounters among subjects, including researchers who, like it or not, are also subjects. (Agar, 2013, pp. 108–109)

Eschewing both objectivity and subjectivity, intersubjectivity focuses on knowledge as socially constructed in human interactions. Evaluation and other forms of inquiry require "human social relationships in order to happen at all. They are intersubjective sciences. They require social relationships with those who support the science, those who do it, those who serve as subjects of it, and those who consume it" (Agar, 2013, p. 215).

> The difficult judgment call for the researcher is this: To some extent he or she should translate his or her own framework and jointly build a framework for communication with subjects of all those different types ... The bedrock of intersubjective research isn't to preach or to lecture, but rather to learn and to communicate the results, though not at the price of abandoning the core principles of the science. The pressure always exists to achieve a balance, and a researcher always has to make the call of how much and in whatway to handle it.
>
> This fact has to be part of the science, not to mention a central part of training for human social researchers. How to navigate this ambiguous territory with professional integrity and product quality is a neglected topic ... . In my view, taking human social research out into the world makes it more difficult, more interesting, more intellectually challenging, and of higher moral value than it has ever been. (Agar, 2013, pp. 215–216)

Principle 6. Integrate Thinking and Emotion

Freire articulated a holistic and humanistic approach to dialogue that valued and integrated reason and emotions, especially in his last book, *Pedagogia da Autonomia: Saberes Necessários à Prática Educativa* [*Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy and Civic Courage*] (Freire, 1997/2000). Freire insisted on connecting our emotions with our reason. In Chapter 1 of this volume, Moacir Gadotti, a long-time colleague of Freire's, emphasizes this point. Freire, he recounts, spoke of a "reason soaked with emotion."

> He [Freire] was very insistent on this point. Education accounts for the creation of the freedom of every self-aware, perceptive, and responsible being, in which reason and emotion are in constant equilibrium and interaction. In the world of life the symbolic knowledge and the perceptive knowledge constantly interact. Knowledge is produced by human beings, beings of rationality and affection. Neither of these characteristics is superior to the other. It is always the subject who constructs categories of thought through her or his experiences with another person, in a given context, at a given moment. The affective aspect, in this construction, always remains. Omnipotent reason generates a bureaucratic and rationalist school, unable to understand the world of life and the human being in its entirety. It is a dogmatic and dormant school and not a living organism. We must understand the cognitive processes as vital processes insofar as the intellect and sensitivity are inseparable. (Gadotti, this volume)

Evaluation relevance today

> Persons are moved by emotion ... People are their emotions. To understand who a person is, it is necessary to understand emotion ... . Emotions cut to the core of people. Within and through emotion people come to define the surface and essential, or core, meanings of who they are. Emotions and moods are ways of disclosing the world for the person. (Denzin, 2009, pp. 1–2)

When we engage with each other as whole human beings, both thinking and feeling come into play. We think about things and we care about things. Ideally, we think about the things we care about and care about the things we think about. Research in brain science, decision sciences, and behavioral economics (Patton, 2014), to name but a few examples, has revealed the deep interconnections between thought and feeling, cognition and emotion. Understanding and appreciating these interconnections are manifest in approaches to evaluation that incorporate visualizations, videos, art, and photography. Artistic and evocative approaches to evaluation want to bring forth our emotional selves and do so by integrating art and science. Science makes us think. Great art makes us feel. Great evaluations should evoke both understandings (cognition) and feelings (emotions). Certainly critical consciousness a la Freire has both cognitive and affection dimensions. His pedagogical insights provide inspiration about both why and how to integrate thinking and feeling in a pedagogy of evaluation, teaching those involved how to think evaluatively and acknowledge and express feelings about the process and results.

Principle 7. Critical Consciousness Pedagogy Is Co-Intentional Education Among Those Involved in Whatever Roles

> A revolutionary leadership must accordingly practice *co-inten-tional* education. Teachers and students (leadership and people), co-intent on reality, are both Subjects, not only in the task of unveiling that reality, and thereby coming to know it critically, but in the task of re-creating that knowledge. As they attain this knowledge of reality through common reflection and action, they discover themselves as its permanent re-creators. In this way, the presence of the oppressed in the struggle for their liberation will be what it should be: not pseudo-participation, but committed involvement. (Freire, 1970, p. 69)

Evaluation relevance today. Developmental evaluation (DE), as one example, is based on a *co-creation principle*: The innovation being evaluated and the evaluation develop together—interwoven, interdependent, iterative, and co-created – such that developmental evaluation becomes part of the change process (Patton, 2015). This principle calls on developmental evaluators to acknowledge, document, report, and reflect on the ways in which a developmental evaluation becomes part of the intervention. The

developmental evaluator gets close enough to the action to build a mutually trusting relationship with the social innovators. The quality of this collaboration derives in part from the capacity of the developmental evaluator to facilitate evaluative thinking, timely data-based feedback, and illuminative sense-making processes in support of innovation and adaptation. The developmental evaluator works *collaboratively* with social innovators to conceptualize, design, and test new approaches in an ongoing process of adaptation, intentional change, and *development*. DE is interactive—engaging social innovators, funders, supporters, and other core stakeholders to tailor and align the dynamics of innovation, development, adaptation, and evaluation. This dynamic amounts to the *co-creation* of both the unfolding innovation and the DE design (Lam & Shulha, 2015). The co-creation principle is a manifestation of a more general observation about collaborative processes of evaluation articulated by Cousins and Shulha (2006) in the *Handbook of Evaluation*: "Possibly the most significant development of the past decade in both research and evaluation communities has been a more general acceptance that *how* we work with clients and practitioners can be as meaningful and consequential as *what* we learn from our methods" (p. 277; emphasis in original).

The consequences of how evaluators work with participants in evaluation on the change process itself constitutes *process use* (Patton, 2008, 2012). Process use refers to the learning and behavior changes that occur among those involved in the evaluation from their involvement, for example, becoming more adept at evaluative questioning and thinking. Changes based on feedback of findings is *findings use*. Changes based on the processes of collaboration and co-creation constitute *process use*. For example, social innovators learning from a developmental evaluator how to articulate and use a complexity-based theory of change is process use. Participants in a social justice evaluation will learn how to analyze various inequities and injustices, and in that analysis the process of change has already been initiated.

Principle 8. Critical Consciousness Is Both Process and Outcome, Both Method and Result, Both Reflection and Action, Both Analytical and Change-Oriented

For Freire, the goal of critical consciousness as a pedagogy is "to be more fully human" (Freire, 1970, p. 55). He contrasts *being human* with the goal of having more wealth and possessions (p. 59). One doesn't attain critical consciousness as a fixed and defined outcome; rather it is an ever-emerging result of ongoing engagement and inquiry. He viewed critical pedagogy as both a method for making sense of the world and a new way of seeing and experiencing the world that yielded significant outcomes of new knowledge, new attitudes, new behaviors, and, ultimately, social change (p. 69). This is achieved through a process of sense-making that provides a new

understanding of the world, which constitutes, as an outcome, a different kind of knowledge, which leads to social change.

> As a process of search, of knowledge, and thus of creation, it requires the investigators to discover the interpenetration of problems, in the linking of meaningful themes. The investigation will be most educational when it is most critical, and most critical when it avoids the narrow outlines of partial or "focalized" views of reality, and sticks to the comprehension of *total* reality. Thus, the process of searching for the meaningful thematics should include a concern for the links between themes, a concern to pose these themes as problems, and a concern for their historical–cultural context.
>
> Just as the educator may not elaborate a program to present *to* the people, neither may the investigator elaborate "itineraries" for researching the thematic universe, starting from points which *he* has predetermined. Both education and the investigation designed to support it must be "sympathetic" activities, in the etymological sense of the word. That is, they must consist of communication and of the common experience of a reality perceived in the complexity of its constant "becoming." (p. 108)

Evaluation relevance today. Those engaged in evaluation through the lens of critical analysis aim to make the inquiry a mechanism for bringing about social, cultural, economic, and political change. Eschewing any pretense of objectivity, they take an activist stance. Critical change inquiry aims to critique existing conditions and through that critique bring about change. Critical change evaluation criteria are derived from critical theory, which frames and engages in evaluation, from a Freirean perspective, with an explicit agenda of elucidating power, economic, and social inequalities.

The "critical" nature of critical theory flows from a commitment to go beyond just evaluating, but rather to use evaluation to critique society, raise consciousness, and change the balance of power in favor of those less powerful. Influenced by Marxism and Freirean pedagogy, informed by the presumption of the centrality of class conflict in understanding community and societal structures, and updated in the radical struggles of the 1960s, critical theory provides both philosophy and methods for approaching research and evaluation as fundamental and explicit manifestations of political praxis (connecting theory and action), and as change-oriented forms of engagement.

Critical social science and critical social theory attempt to understand, analyze, criticize, and alter social, economic, cultural, technological, and psychological structures and phenomena that have features of oppression, domination, exploitation, injustice, and misery. They do so with a view to changing or eliminating these structures and phenomena and expanding the scope of freedom, justice, and happiness. The assumption is that this knowledge will be used in processes of social change by people to whom understanding their situation is crucial in changing it (Bentz & Shapiro,

1998, p. 146; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2011). Critical change evaluation has three interconnected elements: (a) inquiry into situations of social injustice, (b) interpretation of the findings as a critique of the existing situation, and (c) using the findings and critique to mobilize and inform change. Critical theory looks at, exposes, and questions hegemony—traditional power assumptions held about relationships, groups, communities, societies, and organizations—to promote social change. Critical theory questions the assumed power that researchers typically hold over the people they typically research. Thus, critical change evaluation is based on the assumption that society is essentially discriminatory but is capable of becoming less so through purposeful human action. Critical evaluation also assumes that the dominant forms of professional research are discriminatory and must be challenged. Critical change evaluation takes the concept of knowledge as power and equalizes the generation of, access to, and use of that knowledge. Critical change evaluation is an ethical choice that gives voice to, and shares power with, previously marginalized and muted people (Davis, 2008, p. 140; Given, 2008, pp. 139–179; Schwandt, 2007, pp. 50–55). Feminist evaluation typically includes an explicit agenda of bringing about social change (e.g., Benmayor, 1991; Brisolara, Seigart, & SenGupta, 2104; Hesse-Biber, 2013; Podems, 2014). Liberation research and empowerment evaluation derive, in part, from Paulo Freire's philosophy of praxis and liberation education, articulated in his classics *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970) and *Education for Critical Consciousness* (1973), still sources of influence and debate (e.g., Glass, 2001). Barone (2000) aspires to "emancipatory educational storysharing" (p. 247). Stephen Brookfield (2004) uses critical theory to illuminate adult education issues, trends, and inequities. Plummer (2011) integrates critical their and queer theory. Caruthers and Friend (2014) bring critical inquiry to online learning and engagement. Crave, Zaleski, and Trent (2014) emphasize the role of critical change in building a more equitable future through participatory program evaluation.

Here are examples offered by Davis (2008, p. 141). Martin Diskin worked with policy makers and development agencies in Latin American to conduct what they called "power structure research," in which they exposed injustice as a strategy for building coalitions and motivating movements. Christine Davis's evaluation of a children's mental health treatment team was conducted in partnership with community agencies and included examining issues of power, marginalization, and control within these teams. The results suggested rejection of the traditional hierarchical medical model of care and instead treating the patients as unique valuable humans and as equal partners in treatment (Davis, 2008, p. 141).

Principle 9. All Pedagogy Is Political

> [L]earning between teachers and students is what gives educational practice its gnostic character. It is a practice that involves the use of methods,

> techniques, materials; in its directive character, it implies objectives, dreams, utopias, ideas. Hence we have the political nature of education and the capacity that all educational practices have in being political and never neutral. In being specifically human, education is gnostic and directive and for this reason, political. It is artistic and moral as it uses techniques as a means to facilitate teaching; it involves frustrations, fears, and desires. It requires of a teacher a general competence that involves knowledge of the nature of knowledge itself as well as the specific knowledges linked to one's field of specialization. (Freire, 2001, p. 67)

Evaluation relevance today

> The social sciences ... should be used to improve quality of life ... for the oppressed, marginalized, stigmatized and ignored ... and to bring about healing, reconciliation and restoration between the researcher and the researched. (Stanfield, 2006, p. 725)

> All inquiry is moral and political... . I want a discourse that troubles the world, understanding that inquiry can contribute to social justice. (Denzin, 2010, pp. 23–24)

A qualitative manifesto: A call to arms. Sociologist C. Wright Mills, a contemporary of Freire, also influenced by Marxism, wanted social science to make a difference in the lives of people. He challenged social scientists to help poor people take history into their own hands in order to "bend the structures of capitalism to the ideologies of radical democracy" (Denzin, 2010, pp. 23–24). Evaluation as a form of political activity can contribute to social justice in the following ways:

1. It can help identify different definitions of a problem and/or a situation that is being evaluated with some agreement that change is required. It can show, for example, how battered wives interpret the shelters, hotlines, and public services that are made available to them by social welfare agencies.
2. The assumptions, often belied by the facts of experience, that are held by various interested parties—policy makers, clients, welfare workers, online professionals—can be located and shown to be correct, or incorrect (Becker, 1967, p. 239).
3. Strategic points of intervention into social situations can be identified. Thus, the services of an agency and a program can be improved and evaluated.
4. It is possible to suggest "alternative moral points of view from which the problem, the policy and the program can be interpreted and assessed" (see Becker, 1967, pp. 239–240). Because of its emphasis on experience and its meanings, the interpretive method suggests that programs must always be judged by and from the point of view of the persons most directly affected (Denzin, 2010, pp. 24–25).

Principle 10. Critical Pedagogy Is Fundamentally and Continuously Evaluative

Critical consciousness involves ongoing evaluation. The development of a literacy campaign scenario presented earlier, which is the most extended example of Freire's approach in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed,* describes in depth and detail a participatory evaluation process. But critical pedagogy is not conceptualized as a project, and the purpose is not to produce a report. Critical pedagogy is an ongoing process that aims to bring about long-term and lasting change.

Triangulation

I derived these 10 pedagogical principles from Freire's writings. I did so without reading any of the chapters in this volume written by Brazilians who are Freirean experts and his colleagues. Having independently identified the principles, I examined the two chapters in Part 1 to find out if the principles were manifest and evident in those writings. Indeed, they were. Table 3.1 summarizes and gives examples of this triangulation.

Beyond the triangulation of principles in Table 3.1, Chapters 4 and 5 explicitly address and assess the Freirean pedagogical principles identified and explicated in this chapter.

Evaluation Relevance Today: Freire's Pedagogical Principles Connected to Evaluation Approaches

Table 3.2 summarizes some prominent and important developments in evaluation as they connect and relate to, and have been influenced by, Freire's principles.

A Holistic Freirean Evaluation Framework

Freire was philosophically grounded in Hegelian dialectics. What most strikes me about his pedagogy is his genius for synthesis. His capacity to transcend thesis and antithesis to generate integrated synthesis undergirds all 10 principles identified and discussed in this chapter. He emphasized throughout *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* that both the oppressors and the oppressed must achieve critical consciousness and do so for the advancement of each and both together (Principle 1). He connected the individual to community (Principle 2) and people to each other (Principle 3). He integrated reflection and action (Principle 4), objectivity and subjectivity (Principle 5), thinking and emotion (Principle 6), and evaluators and participants in evaluation (Principle 7). He emphasized the interconnection and interrelationship between process and outcome, methods and results, analysis and engagement, and understanding and social change (Principle 8).

Table 3.1. Triangulation of Perspectives. Supporting Evidence for and Interpretation of Freirean Pedagogical Principles from Brazilian Chapters 1 and 2

Freirean Pedagogical Principle	*Chapter 1, Gadotti*	*Chapter 2, Firme and Stone*
1. Use evaluative thinking to open up, develop, and nurture *critical consciousness.*	Emancipatory pedagogies, like the pedagogy of the oppressed, propose methods in which the teaching–learning process involve evaluation as part of developing critical thinking.	The intent is to highlight the validity of Freire's ideas for evaluative thinking in the context of street education. An overall *critical* structural approach, in tune with Freire's ideas and concerns, emerged to overcome the perverse cycle of institutionalization, deportation and imprisonment, and to promote and defend the human rights and citizenship of the children.
2. Consciousness resides in communities of people, not just individuals.	Pedagogical action through interdisciplinarity calls for building participatory learning communities.	Purpose: To promote shared learning from community experience and use collective knowledge to work more effectively with street children.
3. Critical consciousness pedagogy must be interactive and dialogical.	The principles and premises of popular education are the foundations of collaborative dialogical evaluation—an evaluation done *with* those who are learning, not *to* them,	Collectively, the programs were multidimensional in intent and methods. And their educational methods always preserved the liberty of the children, leaving them free to make all their own decisions. Dialogue and critical thinking marked the methods.
4. Integrate reflection and action.	Transforming praxis, grounded in reflection, leads to social and communicative action, and productive work.	The evaluation reflections and conclusions were *experientially-arrived-at*, based on participation and knowledge exchange in the context.
5. Value and integrate the objective and subjective.	Being and knowing are inextricably linked. Knowledge is a social construction.	The intent was to infuse enlightened subjectivity into the evaluative process in accordance with the Freirean principle of valuing and integrating the objective and subjective . . . The evaluators learned to

(*Continued*)

Table 3.1. Continued

Freirean Pedagogical Principle	*Chapter 1, Gadotti*	*Chapter 2, Firme and Stone*
		face the challenge of making human subjectivity an asset rather than a liability, by combining critical thinking with creativity for making enlightened choices.
6. Integrate thinking and emotion.	Lesson 1: Reason and emotion are interconnected.	For the evaluators, learning to be *human instruments* was crucial, which in the study context, meant practice of Freirean principles. Fundamentally it meant openness. On one level it required a certain "value reorientation" to be able to practice empathy and sensitivity in interactions with people. Curiously, this implied being nonjudgmental, which the evaluators found to be a parallel to the *neutral* posture in the scientific sense—however it meant to be "close and caring," not "cold and distant."
7. Critical consciousness pedagogy is co-intentional education among those involved in whatever roles.	Lesson 3: There is no teaching without learning, and no learning without teaching. Critical pedagogy is dialogic.	Freire maintained that *one cannot teach without learning, nor learn without teaching.* The two acts are simultaneous, and there is knowledge exchange.
8. Critical consciousness is both process and outcome, both method and result, and both analytical and change-oriented.	Lesson 4: Pedagogy involves both being and knowing. To educate is to read the world in order to be able to transform it. Paulo Freire was a man of praxis, both a thinker and a doer.	Freirean openness meant critical thinking. The evaluators learned to question their methodological choices every step of the way, devising context-appropriate methods and measures without compromising data quality, but in fact enhancing it through creativity ... Emergent from the

(*Continued*)

Table 3.1. Continued

Freirean Pedagogical Principle	*Chapter 1, Gadotti*	*Chapter 2, Firme and Stone*
		naturalistic–responsive evaluation process was also a methodology for collecting and compiling authentic and credible data for continuous program monitoring and improvement.
9. All pedagogy is political.	Freirean pedagogy is essentially about the construction of a fair, democratic society. All education and all evaluation presuppose a societal project, which makes both inherently political.	The needs of street children is not only a question of economic development but also very much a question of political will. Basing evaluation on Freirean pedagogy using naturalistic–responsive methods is both feasible and effective in an emotionally and politically sensitive context.
10. Critical pedagogy is fundamentally evaluative.	For Paulo Freire, the question of method is crucial in the educational act, as it is in the evaluative act: When we use a certain method, which is not neutral, we do it based on an ethical political and pedagogical choice. See also Gadotti (1994).	What did the evaluators teach? What knowledge did they impart? Perhaps the most valuable teaching, especially on the level of the program staff, as well as street children, was the knowledge that evaluation is a friend, not a foe; that evaluators can be trusted as human beings, and as professionals; that data serve a common cause, and not always used for individual exploitation.

He portrayed cultural patterns, social interactions, community relationships, economic dynamics, socio-psychological manifestations, knowledge, education, and learning manifestations as fundamentally political; he made sense of everything through the lens of political economy, and showed the oppressed how to understand their situations historically and currently through that lens; thus did he connect the past to the present and future pedagogically and paradigmatically (Principle 9). Finally, he brought what today we call evaluative thinking into his analysis, engagement process, and sense-making, facilitating the oppressed, nonliterate,

Table 3.2. Freire's Pedagogical Principles Connected to Evaluation Approaches

Freire's Pedagogical Principles	*Resonant Evaluation Approaches*
1. Use evaluative thinking to open up, develop, and nurture *critical consciousness.*	1. *Critical consciousness* is the foundation of evaluation undertaken from a social justice perspective (House, 1976, 1990, 2014, 2015; Kirkhart, 1994; Ryan & DeStefano, 2000). Methodologically, it includes attention to reflexivity and praxis (Patton, 2015). Evaluative thinking (in contrast to conducting evaluations) has emerged as an important result of stakeholder involvement in evaluation (Carden & Earl, 2007; Patton, 2008, 2012).
2. Consciousness resides in communities of people, not just individuals.	2. Community as a reservoir of knowledge is the foundation of participatory, collaborative, and empowerment evaluation (Cousins & Chouinard, 2012; Cousins & Earl, 1992, 1995; Cousins, Whitmore, & Shulha, 2014; Fetterman, Rodríguez-Campos, Wandersman, & O'Sullivan, 2014; Fetterman & Wandersman, 2005).
3. Critical consciousness pedagogy must be interactive and dialogical.	3. Democratic dialogic evaluation integrates social justice with interactive and dialogical processes (House & Howe, 2000).
4. Integrate reflection and action.	4. Reflective practice as a core evaluation practitioner competency (King & Podems, 2014; King & Stevahn, 2013; King, Stevahn, Ghere, & Minnema, 2001; Schon, 1983, 1987). Reflective practice includes attention to reflexivity and praxis (Patton, 2015).
5. Value and integrate the objective and subjective.	5. Responsive evaluation (Guba & Lincoln, 1981; Stake, 1975, 1978, 1996) and mixed methods (Greene, 2007).
6. Integrate thinking and emotion.	6. Evocative evaluation; multivocal evaluation (Patton, 2015).
7. Critical consciousness pedagogy is co-intentional education among those involved in whatever roles.	7. Co-evolution (Patton, 2011) and feminist evaluation (Podems, 2010, 2013).
8. Critical consciousness is both process and outcome, both method and result, and both analytical and change-oriented.	8. Developmental evaluation (Patton, 2011, 2015) and process use (Cousins, 2008; Patton, 2008, 2012).
9. All pedagogy is political.	9. All evaluation is political (House, 1973; Patton, 2008, 2012; Weiss, 1993).
10. Critical pedagogy is fundamentally evaluative.	10. Evaluative thinking embedded in evaluation processes and methods (Patton, 2008, 2012).

poor, and disadvantaged to describe, compare, analyze, reflect, and render judgments as the basis for bringing about change.

Pedagogy of Evaluation

There is no singular or monolithic pedagogy of evaluation. As I said in opening this chapter, embedded in different evaluation approaches are varying assumptions, values, premises, priorities, sense-making processes, and principles. Thus, those who participate in an evaluation are experiencing sometimes explicit, more often implicit and tacit, pedagogical principles. Evaluation invites those involved to see the world in a certain way, to make sense of it through a particular lens, to make judgments based on certain kinds of evidence and values. Those evaluation approaches that have been most influenced by Freirean pedagogy and share Freirean values, modes of engagement, and desired outcomes are social-justice–focused evaluations, democratic deliberative evaluation, empowerment evaluation, feminist evaluation, transformative evaluation, and critical systems evaluation. Other evaluation approaches value, teach, and strive for different results; that is, they are based on other pedagogical premises and principles.

The larger understanding that Freire's work reminds us of is that all evaluation approaches constitute a pedagogy of some kind. All evaluation teaches something. What is taught and how it is taught varies, but evaluation is inherently and predominantly a pedagogical interaction. Freire understood and taught us that all interactions between and among people are pedagogical, something is always being taught, conveyed, and proselytized. What is your pedagogy of evaluation?

References

Agar, M. (2013). *The lively science: Remodeling human social research*. Minneapolis, MN: Mill City Press.

Arendt, H.. (1968). *Between past and future: Eight exercises in political thought*. New York: Viking.

Barone, T. (2000). *Aesthetics, politics, and educational inquiry: Essays and examples*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Becker, H. S. (1967). Whose side are we on? *Social Problems*, *14*(3), n 239–247.

Benmayor, R. (1991). Testimony, action research, and empowerment: Puerto Rican women and popular education. In S. B. Gluck & D. Patai (Eds.), *Women's words: The feminist practice of oral history* (pp. 159–174). New York, NY: Routledge.

Bentz, V. M., & Shapiro, J. J. (1998). *Mindful inquiry in social research*. London: Sage Publications.

Better Evaluation. (2014). *Collaborative outcomes reporting*. Retrieved from http://betterevaluation.org/plan/approach/cort

Brisolara, S., Seigart, D., & SenGupta, S. (Eds.). (2014). *Feminist evaluation and research: Theory and practice*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Brookfield, S. D. (2004). Critical thinking techniques. In M. G. Galbraith (Ed.), *Adult learning methods: A guide for effective instruction* (3rd ed.; pp. 341–360). Malabar, FL: Krieger.

Carden, F., & Earl, S. (2007). Infusing evaluative thinking as process use: The case of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC). *New Directions for Evaluation*, *116*, 61–73.

Caruthers, L., & Friend, J. (2014). Critical pedagogy in online environments as thirdspace: A narrative analysis of voices of candidates in educational preparatory programs. *Educational Studies*, *50*(1), 8–35.

Cousins, J. B. (Ed.). (2008). *Process use in theory, research, and practice*. *New Directions for Evaluation*, *116*.

Cousins, J. B., & Chouinard, J. A. (2012). *Participatory evaluation up close: An integration of research-based knowledge*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

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 in evaluation use and organizational learning*. London, England: Falmer Press.

Cousins, J. B. & Shulha, L.M. (2006). A comparative analysis of evaluation utilization and its cognate fields of inquiry: current issues and trends." PP. 266–291 in I. F. Shaw, J. C. Greene, & M. M. Mark (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of evaluation: policies, programs and practices*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cousins, J. B., Whitmore, E., & Shulha, L. (2014). Let there be light. *American Journal of Evaluation*, *35*(1), 149–153.

Crave, M., Zaleski, K., & Trent, T. (2014). *Do your participatory methods contribute to an equitable future*? Retrieved from http://aea365.org/blog/pd-presenters-week-mary-crave-kerry-zaleski-and-tererai-trenton-do-your-participatory-methods-contribute-to-an-equitablefuture/?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+aea365+%28AEA365%29

Davis, C. S. (2008). Critical action research. In L. M. Given (Ed.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (Vol. 1, pp. 139–142). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N. K. (2009). *On understanding emotion*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Denzin, N. K. (2010). *The qualitative manifesto: A call to arms*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Fetterman, D. M., Rodríguez-Campos, L., Wandersman, A., & O'Sullivan, R. G. (2014). Collaborative, participatory, and empowerment evaluation: Building a strong conceptual foundation for stakeholder involvement approaches to evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, *35*(1), 144–148.

Fetterman, D. M., & Wandersman, A. (2005). *Empowerment evaluation principles and practice*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Freire, P. (1970/2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (Bloomsbury paperback edition). New York, NY: Bloomsbury.

Freire, P. (1973). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Freire, P. (1997/2001). *Pedagogy of the freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage*. Lantham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Gadotti, M. (1994). *Reading Paulo Freire. His life and work*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Given, L. M. (Ed.). (2008). *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Glass, R. (2001). On Paulo Freire's philosophy of praxis and themfoundations of liberation education. *Educational Researcher*, *30*(2), 15–25.

Greene, J. C. (2007). *Mixed methods in social inquiry*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). *Effective evaluation: Improving the usefulness of evaluation results through responsive and naturalistic approaches*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

House, E. R. (1973). *School evaluation: The politics and process*. New York, NY: McCutchan.

House, E. R. (1976). Justice in evaluation. *Evaluation Studies Review Annual*, *1*, 75–100.
House, E. R. (1977). *The logic of evaluative argument*. Los Angeles, CA: Center for the Study of Evaluation.
House, E. R. (1990). Methodology and justice. *New Directions for Evaluation*, *45*, 23–36.
House, E. R. (2014). *Evaluating: Values, biases, and practical wisdom*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
House, E. R. (2015, November 13). *Social justice, racism, and culturally responsive evaluation*. Plenary presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Evaluation Association, Chicago, IL.
House, E. R., & Howe, K. (2000). Deliberative democratic evaluation. *New Directions for Evaluation*, *85*, 3–12.
Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. (2011). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In J. L. Kincheloe, K. Hayes, S. R. Steinberg, & K. G. Tobin (Eds.), *Key works in critical pedagogy*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
King, J. A., & Podems, D. (Eds.). (2014). Professionalizing evaluation: A global perspective on evaluator competencies [Special issue]. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, *28*(3).
King, J. A., & Stevahn, L. (2013). *Interactive evaluation practice: Mastering the interpersonal dynamics of program evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
King, J. A., Stevahn, L., Ghere, G., & Minnema, J. (2001). Toward a taxonomy of essential evaluator competencies. *American Journal of Evaluation*, *22*(2), 229–247.
Kirkhart, K. (1994). *Presidential address on evaluation and social justice*. Annual Meeting of the American Evaluation Association, Boston, MA.
Kushner, S. (2000). *Personalizing evaluation*. London: Sage.
Kushner, S. (2016). *Evaluative research methods: Managing the complexities of judgment in the field*. New York: IAP.
Lam, C. Y., & Shulha, L. M. (2015). Insights on using developmental evaluation for innovating: A case study on the cocreation of an innovative program. *American Journal of Evaluation*, *36*(3), 358–374.
Mansuri, G., & Vijayendra, R. (2012). *Localizing development: Does participation work*? Washington, DC: World Bank.
MacDonald, B. (1987). Evaluation and the control of education. In R. Murphy & H. Torrance (Eds.), *Issues and methods in evaluation* (pp. 36–48). London: Paul Chapman.
Mertens, D. M. (1998). *Research methods in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Mertens, D. M. (1999). Inclusive evaluation: Implications of transformative theory for evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, *20*(1), 1–14.
Patton, M. Q. (2008). *Utilization-focused evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Patton, M. Q. (2011). *Developmental evaluation: Applying complexity concepts to enhance innovation and use*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
Patton, M. Q. (2012). *Essentials of utilization-focused evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Patton, M. Q. (2014). What brain sciences reveal about integrating theory and practice.*American Journal of Evaluation*, *35*(2), 237–244.
Patton, M. Q. (2015). The developmental evaluation mindset: Eight guiding principles. In M. Q. Patton, K. McKegg, & N. Wehipeihana (Eds.), *Developmental evaluation exemplars: Principles in practice* (Chapter 15). New York, NY: Guilford.
Patton, M. Q. (2017). *Principles-focused evaluation*. New York, NY: Guilford.
Pietro, D. S. (1983). *Evaluation sourcebook for private and voluntary organizations*. New York, NY: American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service.
Plummer, K. (2011). Critical humanism and queer theory. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed., pp. 195–207). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Podems, D. (2010). Feminist evaluation and gender approaches: There's a difference. *Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation*, *6*(14). Retrieved from file:///C:/Documents%20and%20Settings/quads/My%20Documents/199-943-1-PB.pdf
Podems, D. (2013, September 17). *Feminist evaluation for non-feminist evaluators* (AEA365 blog post). Retrieved from http://aea365.org/blog/fiemme-week-donna-podems-on-applying-feminist-evaluation-for-non-feminist-evaluators/
Podems, D. (2014). Feminist evaluation for nonfeminists. In S. Brisolara, D. Seigart, & S. SenGupta (Eds.), *Feminist evaluation and research: Theory and practice* (Chap. 5, pp. 113–142). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
Private Agencies Collaborating Together. (1986). *Participatory evaluation*. New York, NY: Author.
Ryan, K. E., & DeStefano, L. (Eds.). (2000). *Evaluation as a democratic process: promoting inclusion, dialogue, and deliberation. New Directions for Evaluation*, *85*.
Salmen, L. F., & Kane, E. (2006). *Bridging diversity: Participatory learning for responsive development*. Washington, DC: World Bank
Schon, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
Schon, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Schwandt, T. A. (2007). *The SAGE dictionary of qualitative inquiry* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Schwandt, T. (2015). Reconstructing professional ethics and responsibility: Implications of critical systems thinking. *Evaluation*, *21*(4), 462–466.
Scriven, M. (2015). Evaluation revolution. *Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation*, *11*(25), 14–21.
Stake, R. E. (1975). *Evaluating the arts in education: A responsive approach*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
Stake, R. E. (1978). The case study method in a social inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, *7*, 5–8.
Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Stake, R. E. (2004). How far dare an evaluator go toward saving themworld? Beyond neutrality: What evaluators care about. *American Journal of Evaluation*, *25*(1), 103–107.
Stanfield, J. H., II. (2006). The possible restorative justice functions of qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *19*(6), 723–727.
Weiss, C. H. (1993). Where politics and evaluation research meet. *American Journal of Evaluation*, *14*(1), 93–106.

MICHAEL QUINN PATTON, *founder and director of Utilization-Focused Evaluation, has over 45 years of experience as an independent evaluation consultant and is the author of several evaluation books including* Developmental Evaluation: Applying Complexity Concepts to Enhance Innovation and Use *and* Principles-Focused Evaluation.