Excessive Evaluation Anxiety (XEA): The Last 2 Decades

Nia S. Kang
University of Ottawa

Katherine A. Moreau
University of Ottawa

Background: Excessive evaluation anxiety (XEA) refers to disproportionate or increased evaluation anxiety among those affected by evaluation (e.g., stakeholders), characterized by its causing negative consequences for the evaluation. It can compromise evaluator–stakeholder relationships, presenting a barrier for program evaluation. Moreover, XEA can both cause and be caused by resistance to evaluation, which is an interrelated topic that shares many common causes, characteristics, and mitigation strategies. The participatory and interactive nature of modern evaluation approaches can exacerbate the presence of XEA and resistance. However, researchers have not explored the current state of literature on XEA and resistance in program evaluation.

Purpose: To explore the current state of the literature on XEA and resistance over the past 20 years.

Setting: Not applicable.

Intervention: Not applicable.

Research Design: Literature Review

Data Collection and Analysis: We conducted a literature search of Academic Search Complete, Web of Science, and Scopus. We complemented the database search with journal searches of the *American Journal of Evaluation*, *Evaluation*, *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, *Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation*, and *Evaluation and Program Planning*. We then conducted a thematic analysis of the articles that met the inclusion criteria.

Findings: Upon review of the articles, we identified four main themes in the literature related to XEA and resistance. Specifically, XEA and resistance lead to poor evaluator–stakeholder relationships; are influenced by cultural factors; can be mitigated through the development of interpersonal skills; and can be mitigated through a systematic and evidence-based approach to evaluation.

Introduction

Excessive evaluation anxiety (XEA) refers to disproportionate or increased evaluation-induced anxiety demonstrated by individuals affected by evaluation—namely stakeholders—throughout the evaluation process (Donaldson et al., 2002; Taut & Brauns, 2003). Donaldson et al. (2002) first introduced the concept of XEA and broadly defined evaluation anxiety as a "set of (primarily) affective, and also cognitive and behavioral responses that accompany concern over possible negative consequences contingent upon performance in an evaluative situation," (p. 262). While some degree of evaluation anxiety can be beneficial, motivating performance, Donaldson et al. (2002) coined "XEA" specifically to describe evaluation-induced anxiety beyond that deemed normal for a given situation. This distinction is important, as high levels of anxiety are not excessive in all instances. Indeed, XEA is characterized as causing *only* negative consequences, as opposed to "normal" evaluation anxiety, which can have both positive and negative impacts on program evaluation (Bechar & Mero-Jaffe, 2013). Generally, dramatic emotional and defensive responses fueled solely by the prospect of evaluation can be indicative of XEA (Donaldson et al., 2002). These responses often take the form of conflict, withdrawal, resistance, shame, or anger and can arise from both dispositional (i.e., lack of experience and negative experiences) and situational (i.e., social norms and role ambiguity) factors.

Some negative impacts of XEA include difficulty in gaining access to key stakeholders and compromised data collection, which present barriers for rigorous program evaluation (Donaldson, 2002). Overall, the presence of XEA can reduce the credibility of the evaluators as well as the validity of evaluation findings (Bechar & Mero-Jaffe, 2013). Such tendencies can lead to resistance to evaluation, a topic that shares many common causes, characteristics, and mitigation strategies with XEA (Donaldson et al., 2002). More specifically, XEA can both cause and be caused by resistance to evaluation. Although not a novel phenomenon, XEA has also become an apparent problem in evaluator–stakeholder relationships over recent years due to the participatory and interactive nature of modern evaluation approaches (Donaldson et al., 2002). Similarly, it has also been suggested that XEA deteriorates the quality and success of program evaluation for all parties involved in the process (Donaldson et al., 2002). To make matters worse, the increase in interaction between evaluators and stakeholders provides ample opportunity for XEA to accumulate and emerge in greater frequency. Yet nearly 20 years after the recognition of the problem, there is a paucity of information on the current state of the XEA literature. Although authors often imply problems pertaining to XEA, they rarely directly address the issues surrounding it. Considering the negative impacts of XEA on program evaluation, it is necessary to understand the current literature on XEA and its potential impact on current evaluation practice. Furthermore, given the interrelatedness of XEA and resistance to evaluation, it may be helpful to explore how the two topics have been discussed. Thus, this paper aims to explore the current state of the literature on XEA over the past 20 years.

Methods

We conducted a literature review in Academic Search Complete, Web of Science, and Scopus, using the respective search strings listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Search Strings Used in Database Search

Database	Search string
Academic Search Complete	TI("evaluation anxiety" OR (resisten* N3 evaluat*)) OR AB("evaluation anxiety" OR (resisten* N3 evaluat*))
Web of Science	TS=("evaluation anxiety" OR (resisten* NEAR/3 evaluat*))
Scopus	TITLE-ABS-KEY("evaluation anxiety" OR (resisten* W/3 evaluat*)) AND PUBYEAR > 2000 AND (LIMIT-TO(LANGUAGE, "English")) AND (EXCLUDE(PUBYEAR, 2021))

To account for articles that may not have been included in the database search, we completed an additional journal search of the *American Journal of Evaluation, Evaluation, Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation, Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation*, and *Evaluation and Program Planning* using the following search string: "excessive evaluation anxiety" OR "resistance to evaluation." For the search, we used filters for peer-reviewed sources, the English language, and publication years between 2000 and 2020. We limited the year of publication to the last 20 years to observe the progress made in evaluation research regarding XEA or related resistance to evaluation following its recognition by Donaldson et al. (2002). The inclusion and exclusion criteria of the literature search are as listed in Table 2.

Table 2. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria Used in Literature Search

	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
Language	English	All other languages
Year	2000–2020	Prior to 2000 or after 2020
Type of study	All	—
Scope of study	XEA or resistance situated within the program evaluation context.	XEA or resistance situated within student or skills assessment.
		Aspects of program evaluation unrelated to XEA or resistance.

The two of us independently reviewed the study titles and abstracts to remove duplicates and to identify those that were potentially eligible for inclusion. Next, we each read the full article texts to confirm eligibility and, when applicable, documented reasons for ineligibility. We then compared our lists of eligible articles and discussed articles whose status we disagreed about, then made final decisions about inclusion.

To enhance the trustworthiness of the analyses, the two of us then independently extracted data from the included articles. We extracted the following information: publication year, originating country, study setting, type of study (i.e., empirical or theoretical), study design, themes presented, and definition(s) for XEA and resistance. We then compared extractions and resolved differences through discussion. Given the small number of articles available for review, we considered the elements of articles, rather than entire articles. Each element that could be attributed to an emergent theme was coded for reference in the writing process.

Findings and Discussion

Our literature search yielded 276 results, of which 114 were duplicates, leaving 162 for screening. We excluded studies that focused on aspects of program evaluation unrelated to XEA or resistance, as well as those that examined XEA or resistance in the context of student or skills assessment. In total, 35 articles met the inclusion criteria.

We organized the literature on XEA and resistance in Tables 3 and 4. We found less empirical than theoretical evaluation literature on XEA and resistance. Furthermore, resistance to evaluation is rarely clearly defined in literature. While the limited available literature on XEA provides some definition, almost all definitions are in reference to the initial study identifying XEA by Donaldson et al. (2002).

Upon review of the articles, we identified four main themes in the literature related to XEA and resistance. Specifically, XEA and resistance lead to poor evaluator–stakeholder relationships; are influenced by cultural factors; can be mitigated through the development of interpersonal skills; and can be mitigated through a systematic and evidence-based approach to evaluation. These themes are interrelated, and in naming them, we intend to provide an organized overview of any

progress made in the understanding XEA over the past 20 years.

XEA and Resistance Lead to Poor Evaluator–Stakeholder Relationships

The first theme pertaining to XEA or resistance in the literature is the evident divide between evaluators and stakeholders. It appears that poor evaluator–stakeholder relationships can be both a cause (Donaldson, 2002) and a consequence of XEA and resistance. Although in theory evaluators and stakeholders would find a way to accommodate their necessarily differing perspectives, they are often far from doing so (Levin, 2003). For instance, organizational resistance to program evaluation is often fueled by evaluators' negative views of stakeholders who are seemingly uncooperative, which can lead to unproductive cycles of accusations and may ultimately further weaken the evaluator–stakeholder relationship (Leviton, 2013). This is supported by Whitehall et al. (2012), whose findings suggest that evaluators often assume stakeholders hold more negative views of evaluators evaluating their programs than they actually do. Such assumptions can lead to preconceived notions that evaluations will inevitably lead to stakeholder resistance, which can itself undermine the evaluator–stakeholder relationship. In like manner, stakeholders' major complaints regarding evaluation include evaluator incompetence, while evaluators report challenges in working with stakeholders who have negative perceptions of evaluation (Taut & Alkin, 2003). Such accusatory tendencies imply that poor evaluator–stakeholder relationships continue to be a challenge in program evaluation. And, according to Donaldson et al. (2002), poor evaluator–stakeholder relationships are characteristic manifestations of XEA and resistance, which suggests that the issues XEA and resistance are also persistent.

XEA and Resistance Are Influenced by Cultural Factors

The literature often refers to cultural factors influencing evaluator–stakeholder relationships; it even directly attributes XEA to those factors. One cultural factor frequently observed is the political nature of evaluations. In the United Kingdom, for example, researchers reported tension between government stakeholders and external evaluators from the National Audit Office (NAO; Lonsdale, 2008). Likewise, Persaud and Dagher (2019) described the political nature of evaluations as one of the main problems faced by evaluators in the English-speaking Commonwealth Caribbean region, fueled by a lack of trust among stakeholders toward international evaluators due to a history of colonialism and a fear of being identified with (negative) evaluation outcomes. In Canada, some government stakeholders demonstrated a tendency to resist evaluations out of uneasiness about being judged and potentially having errors or inadequacies of political decisions revealed (Seasons, 2002). Political factors can both overlap with and exacerbate the symptoms of XEA, which may fuel resistance toward evaluation and both directly and indirectly impact the quality of evaluation.

Another cultural factor that may impact evaluator–stakeholder relationships is the perception of hierarchy. Patton (2002) described the "status associated with research expertise and an elitist or patronizing attitude toward non-researchers," as an antecedent to stakeholder resistance in the United States (p. 137). In Romania, on the other hand, where organizational culture is often hierarchical and apathetic toward change, stakeholders are reportedly skeptical toward the non-hierarchical nature of evaluation (Mihalache, 2010). These observations suggest that the culture of evaluation varies by region and can be contextualized based on existing ideologies, tradition, practices, and relationships between interest groups (McNamara et al., 2009, as cited in Mihalache, 2010). Organizational tendency against change is also prevalent in the United States, leading to difficulties designing appropriate evaluations, lack of clarity regarding goals and funding, and lack of evaluation proficiency (Chaudhary et al., 2020). Furthermore, a lack of a culture of evaluation at the organizational level can translate into a lack of attention paid toward evaluation from the program planning stage, which challenges the successful implementation of evaluation capacity building practices and thus worsens institutional resistance to evaluation (Carleton-Hug & Hug, 2010; Chaudhary et al., 2020). This calls for reflexivity when dealing with factors (i.e., cultural factors) that could impact evaluator–stakeholder relationships and thus influence the prevalence of XEA and resistance to evaluation in a community.

XEA and Resistance Can Be Mitigated Through Interpersonal Skills

The themes discussed in the preceding sections rely (at least partially) on interpersonal skills, such as communication skills. Many of the problems encountered in the evaluation process, including XEA and resistance to evaluation, can be attributed to misunderstandings and communication problems (Patton, 1997, as cited in Taut & Alkin, 2003). Understanding the benefits of evaluation and being able to situate the need for evaluation within a personal context may increase stakeholder engagement and decrease resistance at both the individual (Miller et al., 2016) and organizational (Schwandt & Dahler-Larsen, 2006) level. On the other hand, negligent communication may have detrimental effects, emphasizing the need for evaluators to be attentive and sincere when communicating with stakeholders during the evaluation process (Patton, 2015). Lack of transparency in the evaluation process may also have lasting impacts on stakeholders' trust in evaluation, far beyond the program in question (Schewarz & Struhkamp, 2007), as may forcefully imposing evaluations beyond what is needed (Perrin, 2001). Accordingly, literature suggests the need for greater insight into evaluators' interpersonal skills to clarify evaluator–client expectations and improve stakeholder satisfaction (Galport & Azzam, 2016). In fact, Donaldson and Gooler (2003) proposed, as part of their strategy to manage XEA, expecting and accepting XEA "as a natural component of the interaction with stakeholders" (p. 362). In addition, approaches to reframe the role of the evaluator from providing expert judgment to facilitating informed dialogue on all aspects of evaluation has been proposed as a means to help strengthen the evaluator–stakeholder relationship (Patton, 2002). Indeed, educational communication between evaluators and stakeholders may promote a sense of mutual responsibility and increase the use of program evaluation (Hanberger, 2011). Even in communities with high levels of distrust and XEA pertaining to program evaluation, the demystification of the practice and the role of the evaluator through open communication has been suggested as a strategy to mitigate XEA and resistance and gain the trust of stakeholders (Persaud & Dagher, 2019). Meanwhile, Le Menestrel et al. (2013) proposed a partnership model for evaluation, suggesting that engaging both internal and external evaluators (i.e., a collaborative effort between an external, third-party evaluation firm and a team of internal evaluators and stakeholders) can create a sense of allyship and overcome potential resistance to evaluation. Ideally, such collaborative efforts will foster a transparent and trusting relationship between the evaluators and stakeholders, improve the quality of the evaluation, and consequently help to alleviate XEA and resistance to evaluation.

XEA and Resistance Can Be Mitigated Through a Systematic and Evidence-Based Approach to Evaluation

Accounts of XEA and stakeholder resistance to evaluation over the years have unveiled the need for a better understanding of evaluation across all parties involved in the evaluation process, including both evaluators and stakeholders. The call for a systematic and evidence-based approach to evaluation is not new. Rather, researchers have advocated for such an approach since the beginning of the discussion surrounding XEA and resistance to evaluation (Donaldson et al., 2002; Donaldson & Gooler, 2003; Scriven, 2016). Such an approach to evaluation involves prioritizing evaluation questions and the generation of methodology that would yield outcomes that satisfy both intrinsic merit and reliability (Mermet et al., 2010). Given the interpersonal nature of program evaluation, literature suggests that evaluators should be trained to incorporate theory-based frameworks and models to designing evaluation methods for their practice (Abma & Widdershoven, 2008; Carleton-Hug & Hug, 2010; Davy, 2016; Trevisan, 2002). Not only may this enable evaluators to optimize the design of the evaluation based on needs (Abma & Widdershoven, 2008), but it may also minimize stakeholder resistance stemming from poor design (Taut & Brauns, 2003). Examples of the use of theory-driven evaluation models to improve the efficacy and quality of program evaluation are presented by Wasserman (2010), who examined the use of a systems orientation and foundational theory to enhance the evaluation of human service program systems and suggested that theory-based human service program evaluations can, in practice, enhance both evaluations' designs and their conclusions. Moreover, in a survey of practicing evaluators registered as members in the American Evaluation Association, evaluators recognized the need for additional professional training in professional practice, systematic inquiry, and interpersonal competence (Galport and Azzam, 2016). This implies that ensuring evaluators are equipped with the skills—both technical and "soft"—can be one way to reduce the prevalence of XEA and resistance among stakeholders. Moving forward, the proper

integration of evaluation into the processes of policymaking, program design, and project implementation—and an understanding among stakeholders regarding the need for such integration—may be critical (Andrews, 2004; Raimondo, 2018). This process may be facilitated by educating stakeholders on the fundamentals of evaluation (Chaudhary et al., 2020; Galport & Azzam, 2016; Hanberger, 2011; Trevisan, 2002) and by ensuring that evaluation frameworks consider not only rational decision-making but also institutional norms, traditions, and belief systems to allow for a smooth integration (Raimondo, 2018).

Table 3. Evaluation Literature on XEA

Author(s)	Year	Country	Setting	Empirical / theoretical	Study design	Theme(s)	Definitions
Bechar, S., Mero-Jaffe, I.	2013	Israel	Academic institution	Empirical	Observational	N/A	Extreme, disproportionate anxiety that can appear at various stages of the evaluation process. In contrast to "normal" anxiety, which can be both negative and positive, XEA is always negative.
Donaldson, S. I., Gooler, L. E.	2003	USA	California Wellness Foundation (statewide)	Empirical	Observational	XEA can be mitigated through a systematic and evidence-based approach to evaluation; XEA can be mitigated through the development of interpersonal skills	High levels of anxiety among stakeholders, "particularly those not confident about their performance" due to "fear of a negative evaluation on a regular basis" (p. 362).
Galport, N., Azzam, T.	2016	USA	Online	Empirical	Survey	XEA can be mitigated through the development of interpersonal skills; XEA can be mitigated through a systematic and evidence-based approach to evaluation	N/A; evaluator competencies
Persaud, N., Daugher, R.	2019	Barbados	English-speaking Commonwealth Caribbean (ESCC) region	Empirical	Mixed methods	XEA is influenced by cultural factors; XEA can be mitigated through the development of interpersonal skills	Manifestations include cooperation problems with critical stakeholders, blocking access to important information/documents, compliance problems, misleading or false reporting, and little/no use of evaluation findings.
Schewarz, C., Struhkamp, G.	2007	Germany	Virtual university	Empirical	Observational	XEA can be mitigated through the development of interpersonal skills	N/A
Donaldson, S. I.	2002	USA	N/A	Theoretical	N/A	XEA leads to poor evaluator–stakeholder relationships	N/A; dysfunctional levels of evaluation anxiety.
Donaldson, S. I., Gooler,	2002	USA	N/A	Theoretical	Literature review	XEA leads to poor evaluator–stakeholder	Disproportionate or excessive evaluation-induced anxiety. Those who are

						relationships; XEA can be mitigated through a systematic and evidence-based approach to evaluation	experiencing XEA in the program evaluation context are "very upset by, and sometimes rendered virtually dysfunctional by, any prospect of evaluation, or who attack evaluation without regards to how well conceived it might be," (p. 262).
L. E., Scriven, M.							
Scriven, M.	2016	USA	N/A	Theoretical	Literature review	XEA can be mitigated through a systematic and evidence-based approach to evaluation	An irrational level of evaluation apprehension that presents itself in various ways, such as refusal to participate in an evaluation without having serious reason, hiding or falsifying data, and inventing or propagating lies about the evaluator.
Wasserman, D. L.	2010	USA	N/A	Theoretical	N/A	XEA can be mitigated through a systematic and evidence-based approach to evaluation	N/A; evaluation anxiety

Table 4. Evaluation Literature on Resistance to Evaluation

Author(s)	Year	Country	Setting	Empirical / theoretical	Study Design	Theme(s)	Definitions
Andrews, A. B.	2004	USA	Community-based organizations	Empirical	Observational	XEA can be mitigated through a systematic and evidence-based approach to evaluation	N/A
Chaudhary, A. K., Diaz, J., Jayaratne, K. S. U., Assan, E.	2020	USA	Nonformal educational organizations	Empirical	Delphi study	XEA is influenced by cultural factors; XEA can be mitigated through a systematic and evidence-based approach to evaluation	N/A
Le Menestrel, S. N., Walahoski, J. S., Milke, M. B.	2013	USA	Public-private organization	Empirical	Observational	XEA can be mitigated through the development of interpersonal skills	N/A
Lonsdale, J.	2008	UK	State audit institution	Empirical	Observational	XEA is influenced by cultural factors	N/A
Seasons, M.	2002	Canada	Municipal planning departments	Empirical	Observational	XEA is influenced by cultural factors	N/A; resistance
Taut, S. M., Alkin, M. C.	2003	USA	University outreach program	Empirical	Qualitative	XEA leads to poor evaluator–stakeholder relationships; XEA can be mitigated through the development of interpersonal skills	N/A; resistance
Whitehall, A. K., Hill, L. G., Koehler, C. R.	2012	USA	Multisite 7-week family strengthening program.	Empirical	Observational	XEA leads to poor evaluator–stakeholder relationships	N/A
Abma, T. A., Widdershoven, G. A. M.	2008	The Netherlands	N/A	Theoretical	Literature review	XEA can be mitigated through a systematic and evidence-based approach to evaluation	N/A; resistance

Carleton-Hug, A., Hug, J. W.	2010	USA	N/A	Theoretical	Literature review	XEA is influenced by cultural factors; XEA can be mitigated through a systematic and evidence-based approach to evaluation	N/A
Conner, R.	2010	USA	N/A	Theoretical	N/A	N/A	N/A; resistance
Davy, D.	2016	Thailand	N/A	Theoretical	Literature review	XEA can be mitigated through a systematic and evidence-based approach to evaluation	N/A; resistance
Hanberger, A.	2011	Sweden	N/A	Theoretical	Literature review	XEA can be mitigated through the development of interpersonal skills; XEA can be mitigated through a systematic and evidence-based approach to evaluation	N/A; understanding of evaluation
Levin, G.	2003	USA	N/A	Theoretical	N/A	XEA leads to poor evaluator–stakeholder relationships	N/A
Leviton, L. C.	2013	USA	N/A	Theoretical	N/A	XEA leads to poor evaluator–stakeholder relationships	N/A
Mermet, L., Billé, R., Leroy, M.	2010	France	N/A	Theoretical	Literature review	XEA can be mitigated through a systematic and evidence-based approach to evaluation	N/A; resistance
Mihalache, R.	2009	Romania	N/A	Theoretical	Mixed methods	N/A	N/A; resistance
Mihalache, R.	2010	Romania	N/A	Theoretical	Mixed methods	XEA is influenced by cultural factors	N/A
Miller, R. L., McNall, M. A., The Oral History Project Team	2016	USA	N/A	Theoretical	Qualitative	XEA can be mitigated through the development of interpersonal skills	N/A

Patton, M. Q.	2002	USA	N/A	Theoretical	Literature review	XEA can be mitigated through the development of interpersonal skills	N/A; resistance to participatory evaluation derives from the status associated with research expertise and an elitist or patronizing attitude toward non-researchers.
Patton, M. Q.	2015	USA	N/A	Theoretical	Observational	XEA can be mitigated through the development of interpersonal skills	N/A
Perrin, B.	2001	N/A	N/A	Theoretical	N/A	XEA can be mitigated through the development of interpersonal skills	N/A
Petrosino, A.	2000	USA	N/A	Theoretical	N/A	N/A	N/A
Raimondo, E.	2018	USA	N/A	Theoretical	Literature review	XEA can be mitigated through a systematic and evidence-based approach to evaluation	N/A
Schwandt, T., Dahler-Larsen, P.	2006	USA, Denmark	N/A	Theoretical	N/A	XEA can be mitigated through the development of interpersonal skills	N/A
Taut, S., Brauns, D.	2003	USA	N/A	Theoretical	Mixed methods	XEA can be mitigated through a systematic and evidence-based approach to evaluation	Resistance: human behavior aiming to maintain the status quo in the face of some form of real or perceived pressure.
Trevisan, M. S.	2002	USA	N/A	Theoretical	Literature review	XEA can be mitigated through a systematic and evidence-based approach to evaluation	N/A; resistance

Conclusion and Future Directions

Overall, a review of the literature suggests that despite the absence of discussions regarding XEA, research has been ongoing on the interrelated topic of resistance to evaluation. Nevertheless, it is concerning that many of the discussions initiated by Donaldson et al. (2002) have only been repeated in more recent studies, with no real progress. This review demonstrated a need to strengthen evaluator–stakeholder relationships and the importance of interpersonal skills to combat XEA and resistance to evaluation. Evaluators are encouraged to approach stakeholders with genuine intentions to help and collaborate, and leave behind the traditional inclinations toward fancy, outcome-based evaluations. Good rapport between evaluators and stakeholders may alleviate the burdens of XEA and resistance, which have been suggested as factors that could undermine the evaluation process. For this, the need for additional support for the development of interpersonal skills of program evaluators seems to be a critical implication for evaluation practice. Research suggests that systematic, evidence-based approaches to evaluation using appropriate theoretical and methodological frameworks that involve stakeholders would also facilitate this process. Furthermore, some interesting cultural factors, namely political factors and the notion of hierarchy, also emerged as potential sources of XEA and resistance to evaluation among stakeholders. Meanwhile, empirical testing of the value of theoretical and methodological frameworks, as well as the proposed interpersonal skills training, remains as homework for the evaluation community in formulating a set of practical strategies to mitigate XEA.

Thus, future research on XEA and resistance in the field of program evaluation should explore the "what" and "how" of setting systematic standards of evaluation. Some questions that may be worth visiting in the future include: How effective, in practice, are current strategies and approaches to managing XEA? What kinds of professional standards are needed to prevent XEA in program evaluation? What are the psycho/emotional states experienced by stakeholders during the process of program evaluation? How can standards and systematic strategies to strengthen evaluator–stakeholder relations help alleviate the issue of XEA in practice?

References

Abma, T. A. & Widdershoven, G. A. M. (2008). Evaluation and/as social relation. *Evaluation*, *14*(2), 209–225. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356389007087540

Andrews, A. B. (2004). Start at the end: Empowerment evaluation product planning. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, *27*(3), 275–285. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2004.04.002

Bechar, S. & Mero-Jaffe, I. (2013). Who is afraid of evaluation? Ethics in evaluation research as a way to cope with excessive evaluation anxiety: Insights from a case study. *American Journal of Evaluation*, *35*(3), 364–376.

Carleton-Hug, A. & Hug, J. W. (2010). Challenges and opportunities for evaluating environmental education programs. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, *33*(2), 159–164. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2009.07.005

Chaudhary, A. K., Diaz, J., Jayaratne, K. S. U., & Assan, E. (2020). Evaluation capacity building in the nonformal education context: Challenges and strategies. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, *79*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2019.101768

Conner, R. (2010). Reflections over 25 years: Evaluation then, now and into the future. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, *25*(3), 125–136.

Davy, D. (2016). Anti-human trafficking interventions: How do we know if they are working? *American Journal of Evaluation*, *37*(4), 486–504. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214016630615

Donaldson, S. I. (2002). Theory-driven program evaluation in the new millennium. In S. I. Donaldson & M. Scriven (Eds.), *Evaluating social programs and problems: Visions for the new millennium* (1st ed., pp. 105–136). Routledge.

Donaldson, S. I., & Gooler, L. E. (2003). Theory-driven evaluation in action: Lessons from a $20 million statewide Work and Health Initiative. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, *26*(4), 355–366. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-7189(03)00052-1

Donaldson, S. I., Gooler, L. E., & Scriven, M. (2002). Strategies for managing evaluation anxiety: Toward a psychology of program

evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 23(3), 261–273.

Galport, N. & Azzam, T. (2016). Evaluator training needs and competencies: A gap analysis. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 38(1), 80–100.

Hanberger, A. (2011). The real functions of evaluation and response systems. *Evaluation*, 17(4), 327–349. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356389011421697

Le Menestrel, S. M., Walahoski, J. S., & Mielke, M. B. (2013). A partnership model for evaluation: Considering an alternate approach to the internal–external evaluation debate. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 35(1), 61–72. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214013506600

Levin, G. (2003). Commentary: Roles, rewards, research, and realistic expectations. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 24(3), 413–418. https://doi.org/10.1177/109821400302400311

Leviton, L. C. (2013). Some underexamined aspects of evaluation capacity building. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 35(1), 90–94. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214013502844

Lonsdale, J. (2008). Balancing independence and responsiveness: A practitioner perspective on the relationships shaping performance audit. *Evaluation*, 14(2), 227–248. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356389007087541

Mermet, L., Billé, R., & Leroy, M. (2010). Concern-focused evaluation for ambiguous and conflicting policies: An approach from the environmental field. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 31(2), 180–198. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214010366047

Mihalache, R. (2009). Evaluation networking in Romania. *Evaluation*, 15(4), 473–482. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356389009345447

Mihalache, R. (2010). A developing evaluation culture in Romania: Myths, gaps and triggers. *Evaluation*, 16(3), 323–332. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356389010373019

Miller, R. L., McNall, M. A., & The Oral History Project Team. (2016). The oral history of evaluation: The professional development of William D. Crano. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 39(4), 596–611. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214016673903

Patton, M. Q. (2002). A vision of evaluation that strengthens democracy. *Evaluation*, 8(1), 125–139. https://doi.org/10.1177/1358902002008001740

Patton, M. Q. (2015). Evaluation in the field: The need for site visit standards. *American*

Journal of Evaluation, 36(4), 444–460. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214015600785

Perrin, B. (2001). Commentary: Making yourself—and evaluation—useful. *The American Journal of Evaluation*, 22(2), 252–259. https://doi.org/10.1177/10982140010220020 9

Persaud, N. & Dagher, R. (2019). Evaluations in the English-speaking Commonwealth Caribbean region: Lessons from the field. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 41(2), 255–276.

Petrosino, A. (2000) Answering the why question in evaluation: The causal-model approach. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 15(1), 1–24. https://www.utpjournals.press/doi/pdf/10.31 38/cjpe.015.001

Raimondo, E. (2018). The power and dysfunctions of evaluation systems in international organizations. *Evaluation*, 24(1), 26–41. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356389017749068

Schewarz, C. & Struhkamp, G. (2007). Does evaluation build or destroy trust? Insights from case studies on evaluation in higher education reform. *Evaluation*, 13(3), 323–339. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356389007078625

Schwandt, T. & Dahler-Larsen, P. (2006). When evaluation meets the 'rough ground' in communities. *Evaluation*, 12(4), 496–505.

Scriven, M. (2016). Roadblocks to recognition and revolution. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 37(1), 27–44.

Seasons, M. (2002). Evaluation and municipal urban planning: Practice and prospects. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 17(1), 43–71. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/23 4741545_Evaluation_and_Municipal_Urban_ Planning_Practice_and_Prospects

Taut, S. M. & Alkin, M. C. (2003). Program staff perceptions of barriers to evaluation implementation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 24(2), 213–226.

Taut, S. & Brauns, D. (2003). Resistance to evaluation: A psychological perspective. *Evaluation*, 9(3), 247–264. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/24 9743683_Resistance_to_Evaluation_A_Psyc hological_Perspective

Trevisan, M. S. (2002). Evaluation capacity in K–12 school counseling programs. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 23(3), 291–305. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214002023003 05

Wasserman, D. L. (2010). Using a systems orientation and foundational theory to

enhance theory-driven human service
program evaluations. *Evaluation and
Program Planning*, *33*(2), 67–80.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2009.
06.005

Whitehall, A. K., Hill, L. G., & Koehler, C. R.
(2012). A comparison of participant and
practitioner beliefs about evaluation.
American Journal of Evaluation, *33*(2), 208–
220.
https://doi.org/10.1177%2F109821401142380
3