The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation Vol. 23 No. 1 Pages 141–177
ISSN 0834-1516

PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY OF EVALUATORS IN ISRAEL

Miri Levin-Rozalis
Efrat Shochot-Reich
Ben-Gurion University of Negev

Abstract: Professional identity is a precondition for the establishment of a profession. This examines the professional identity of program evaluators in Israel. The field of evaluation in Israel has developed differently than in most Western countries—from the ground and with minimal governmental interference—and thus it is an interesting case study. In spite of the diversity of the backgrounds of evaluators, there is a strong agreement among them on the core of evaluation as an interdisciplinary profession whose aim is mainly as an advisory tool that serves for learning. They also strongly agree that the borders and essence of evaluation are not clear to evaluators, evaluees, and the public. While half of the respondents practicing evaluation do not identify themselves as evaluators, a professional community is important to them. Evaluators in Israel are not well connected to professional activities and developments outside of the country. They do not participate in international conferences and do not publish in scientific journals, yet they are very active in professional activities in Israel. The context of Israeli society is analyzed for a better understanding of these findings.

Résumé : L'identité professionnelle est une condition préalable à l'établissement d'une profession. Le présent article examine l'identité professionnelle des évaluateurs de programme en Israël. Le domaine israélien de l'évaluation s'est développé différemment de celui de la plupart des pays occidentaux, soit sur le terrain et avec une intervention minimale du gouvernement. Par conséquent, il constitue un cas intéressant à étudier. Malgré la diversité de leurs antécédents, les évaluateurs s'entendent majoritairement sur la caractéristique fondamentale de l'évaluation, qu'ils définissent comme une profession interdisciplinaire, dont l'objectif consiste principalement à servir d'outil de consultation destiné à l'apprentissage. En outre, ils s'entendent majoritairement sur le fait que les limites et l'essence de l'évaluation ne sont pas claires aux yeux des évaluateurs, ni des évalués, ni du public. Bien que la moitié des répondants qui pratiquent l'évaluation ne s'identi-

Corresponding author: Miri Levin-Rozalis, Ben-Gurion University of Negev, Dept Education, P.O.B 653 Beer-Sheva, Israel 84105; <rozalis@internet-zahav.net>

fient pas comme des évaluateurs, ils accordent de l'importance à l'existence d'un milieu professionnel. En Israël, les évaluateurs ne se tiennent pas adéquatement au fait des activités et des développements professionnels qui ont lieu à l'extérieur de leur pays. Ils ne participent pas aux congrès internationaux et ne publient pas dans les revues scientifiques. Toutefois, ils prennent très activement part aux activités professionnelles organisées en Israël. À ce titre, le contexte de la société israélienne fait l'objet d'une analyse qui facilitera la compréhension de ces constatations.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this article is to trace the characteristics and history of the evaluation scene in Israel, the evaluators' professional identity, and the connections between them in order to better understand the conditions that influence the development of evaluation as a profession.

The large allocation of resources for rehabilitation and rebuilding, which increased dramatically after World War II, led to a desire to examine the results of these activities and resulted in the vast spreading of evaluation as a distinct area (House, 1993; Rossi, Freeman, & Wright, 1979; Shadish, Cook, & Leviton, 1991) that as a field, fights for a clear identity (Levin-Rozalis, 2003).

In recent years, perceptual changes in the importance of evaluation led to what appears to be evaluation becoming an integral part of life. It expanded to many countries that set evaluation of educational and social programs as a precondition for allocation of resources for their operation in various spheres of life. Since 1995, as reported by Love and Russon (2000), the number of evaluation associations and evaluation networks has increased dramatically, and efforts are being made to build an international evaluation community (e.g., the International Organization for Evaluation Cooperation and the International Development Evaluation Association) (Cousins & Aubry, 2006; Nevo, 1989, 2001; Love & Russon, 2000). As part of the field's expansion, the most powerful funding bodies in the world—such as the World Bank, the United Nations and its various agencies, the European Union, the United States federal government, the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development and others—invest considerable sums of money and energy in the promotion of evaluation, and encourage the training of evaluators and the establishment of national organizations for program and project evaluation (Chianca, 2004; Cousins & Aubry, 2006; Datta, 2003; Gussman, 2005; Segsworth, 2005).

Being a relatively new profession with its roots in different research fields and professions (Alkin, 2004), evaluation lacks a solid historical occupational heritage. Moreover, the rich and varied character of evaluation that enables its adaptation to a wide variety of subjects, programs, and projects in different spheres creates at the same time a lack of clarity regarding the nature of evaluation, its aims, roles, modi operandi, and professional standards. These traits contribute to a lack of coherence in evaluation as a profession. In addition, it should be borne in mind that while evaluation is a profession on the rise worldwide, the pace and directions of development of this profession differ from place to place. It would be only natural to assume that different surroundings would have different influences on the definition of the profession and the professional identity of those engaged in it.

Professional identity is important because it is one of the driving forces and explanations of the pace and directions of the development and establishment of a profession. Exploring the development of program evaluators' professional identity is important for several reasons. First, it advances the field and profession of evaluation by taking stock of current practice, including perceptions of those working in the field, especially given the paucity of published empirical research in the field. Second, it provides a valuable insight into understanding the factors that help to shape and form it. Although the development of the field of evaluation in Israel has unique features, an analysis of the state of the professional identity of Israeli evaluators not only demonstrates an interesting case study in its own right, but also indicates ways of enhancing evaluators' professional identity; thus it is beneficial to the field of program evaluation at large. By providing a current portrait of program evaluators in Israel and a profile of their work and work environments, we seek to deepen knowledge of the subject and allow for a comparative outlook.

Beginning with a brief explanation of professional identity, we will present several theories regarding the construction of professional identity, focusing especially on Kirpal's (2004) framework, which will be used in discussing the findings. Next we will describe the evolution of the field of evaluation in Israel, emphasizing the structural-historical dimension, which is vital for the analysis and understanding of our findings. Then we will present the study methods followed by the findings. A discussion of the results will conclude this study, in which we will attempt to disperse the fog hanging over the field of evaluation in Israel by explaining the results, following in the footsteps of Kirpal's multi-dimensional model together with findings of various studies worldwide, including Israel.

PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY

Professional identity (as opposed to "profession") is one of numerous identities constructed by individuals in their lifetime with the help of socialization processes, which combine their "self" and self-perception (Beijaard, Verloop, & Vermunt, 2000; Erikson, 1968; Wah Tan, 1997). Identity in general, and professional identity in particular, is an elusive concept. Current approaches to studying identity speak of it as something multifaceted and changing that develops over a lifetime and experience—in fact as the story people tell about themselves (Abbas & McLean, 2001; Czarniawska & Czarniawska, 1994; Downey & Lucena, 2004; Johnson, 2000; Maalouf, 1998; Price, 2000; Sachs, 2001; Vandenbroeck, 1999).

The construction of workers' professional identity began at the end of the 18th century as part of the development of professions and professionalization (Avieli-Tabibian, 2003; Eisenstadt, 1966). In the past, professional identity was based mainly upon objective expertise and personal characteristics. Professional identity today is based on the field's professional framework, which is usually characterized by well-grounded, tested, and developing theoretical and practical knowledge acquired through study and training, and is thus enhanced. Furthermore, the framework sets out basic principles, reflecting the values of the profession, and professional-ethical norms of conduct derived from these principles (Sheffler, 2005). The development of a professional identity is also influenced by social processes that characterize entry into the profession and work in it. Professional training, the social perception of the field, acceptance by experienced experts, and similarity of unique qualities between the individual and the others (such as dress code, and language and behavioral norms) are but a few examples of the complexity of this range of factors (Hall, as cited in Kaiser, 2002; House, 1993; McGowen & Hart, 1990). An essential part of maintaining this identity is personal and collective identification with the professional code of ethics that constitutes the broad foundations upon which the profession itself, the professionals, and the various professional organizations are based (Abbas & McLean, 2001; Downey & Lucena, 2004; Johnson, 2000; Price, 2000; Sachs, 2001; Sheffler, 2005).

In addition to professional identity, work provides individuals with a path to organizing their lives and developing and creating personal, physical, and economic security (House, 1993; Sheffler, 2005). Therefore, the definition accorded to one's professional identity is important for developing a sense of belonging to a community and

also for formulating self-perception and self-esteem (Goffman, as cited in Kirpal, 2004; Olesen, 2001).

Olesen (2001) views the development of professional identity as a process that takes place throughout one's life; he asserts that it comprises two objective elements: belonging to a professional body and practical work that includes interaction with others, tasks, and changes that challenge the professional. Glaser (as cited in Bain, 2005) takes this line of thinking further and contends that in addition to work itself, work culture also influences an individual's identity, hence the construction of a professional identity can be accomplished in one of five ways: through work activities, their end product, the work's prestige, the prestige of the social context in which it occurs, and its status vis-à-vis other work.

Kirpal (2004) asserts that professional identity is constructed through interaction with society and she proposes a model of a multidimensional phenomenon, with structural, social, and individual-psychological components that are independent, mutually influencing dimensions, which construct a worker's professional identity. The *structural* dimension relates to the cultural and historical context in which society perceives its concept of work and commitment to it, the development of the labour market, its links with it, and interpersonal relations at work. In the *social* dimension the individual's work interactions with individuals, groups, and various institutions take place, in which the influence of work communities and mutual learning is exerted on individuals' approach to the organization. An attitude toward the organization that is also perceived as a collective identity creating a distinction between "us" and "them" is likely to create unity and progress, but also "closed-ness" and absence of openness to change. The *individual-psychological* dimension relates to both one's professional history and one's perception of the concept of work in private life. Kirpal adds that in the development of a professional identity, great importance is accorded to specialization, fieldwork with the target audience, the professional association, and the profession's status.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE FIELD OF EVALUATION IN ISRAEL

Direction of Growth and Its Implications

Similarly to professional identity, evaluation flourished in the wake of the Industrial Revolution and the rise of capitalism, which called for a conceptual change in all walks of life, including allocation of

government resources and decision-making in a changing society (House, 1993).

In Israel, too, the field of evaluation has expanded over the years. The Israeli Association for Program Evaluation (IAPE) was founded in 1998 and has since been very active, with a yearly conference and many study days, workshops, and seminars. A survey conducted by IAPE among its members in 2002 found that program evaluations are conducted in numerous disciplines such as welfare, society, services, immigrant absorption, health, and even politics, policy, and municipal activities (IAPE, 2002).

A structural-historical examination shows that the background to the growth of the evaluation field in Israel is different from that in other countries such as the United States, Canada, and many parts of Europe. In these countries the field of evaluation grew in response to political and policy changes. Only the need to disseminate it and accord it scientific validity caused it to expand to encompass academe and private bodies (Chianca, 2004; Guba, 1978; House, 2003; Karlsson, 2003; Kfir & Golan-Kook, 2000; Levin-Rozalis, 2000; Nevo, 1989, 2001; Renzuli, 1975), while evaluation in Israel grew in response to needs on the ground.

In the United States, for example, evaluation was initially backed by the government, which funded extensive evaluation activities following multi-billion-dollar investments in post-Sputnik science and technology education. This led to the establishment of several university-based centres of evaluation and the significant influence of social sciences theory and methods in evaluation (Cousins & Aubry, 2006; Rossi et al., 2004). More recently the U.S. federal government, through legislation since 1992, has mandated evaluation of every government-funded project (Chianca, 2004; House, 1993; Patton, 1997; Shadish, Cook, & Leviton, 1991). In Canada, federal evaluation policy was first formulated in 1977, and evaluation policy and character have been comparatively dominated by government demands and needs (Cousins & Aubry, 2006; Segsworth, 2005). A recent survey of Canadian evaluators revealed that the majority of them (51%) work in government bodies (32% in federal public services and 19% in provincial governments) (Borys, Gauthier, Kishchuk, & Roy, 2005). These data mirror earlier findings of Shadish and Epstein (1987) in the US. On the other hand, the requirement of the U.S. Department of Education for randomized control trials creates intervention that dictates professional work methods. There is a similar situation in the United Kingdom where government pressure for evidence-based data

also dictates work methods, albeit there this pressure brought in its wake further professionalization of U.K. evaluators (Gussman, 2005).

The direction taken by the growth of evaluation in Israel was quite distinct from that taken in most other places. Israeli evaluation's growth was mainly from within private bodies and less from among academics, while almost totally following the requirements of private, mainly foreign, foundations. Only in recent years has evaluation gained partial adoption by various government agencies (recommendations of the Committee for Integration of Internal Evaluation in Schools, 2004; Schwartz, 1998). Perhaps because of the distinct direction taken by the field in its development, the penetration of evaluation into public consciousness was relatively slow. Thirty years ago, when evaluation policy was first formulated in Canada, very few people in Israel knew what evaluation was. The first Israeli university courses in evaluation were held in 1979. After nine years of operation, IAPE has only about 80 active members, and its mailing list contains a little over 200 evaluators (the list contains all known evaluators in Israel).[1]

One of the implications of the slow introduction of evaluation into Israel is the profession's difficulty with disseminating the advantages of evaluation to the public and positioning itself as central and significant to academe and the establishment, both as an independent field and relative to other fields (Committee for Measurement and Evaluation in Education, 2004; Schwartz, 1998). Some of the causes are the paucity of funding for evaluation, the lack of academic recognition of the field, the lack of organized training, and the absence of standards.

In a survey conducted among its members by the IAPE (2002), 70.83% of the respondents complained of low remuneration relative to their educational level and their investment in various practical evaluation activities. More than half (54.16%) reported only average satisfaction with the portion of the overall project budget allocated to evaluation.

There was, in fact, an experimental greenhouse in Israel for the slow and somewhat soft cultivation of the field. The detachment from government institutions caused evaluation in Israel to be closely connected with work on the ground, it was very sensitive toward it and mainly served for learning by the programs and projects themselves. Israeli evaluators used "culture-sensitive," "context-sensitive," "participatory," and "empowering" evaluation from its very beginning in the late 1970s (without consciously conceptualizing their work as

such). This was Israeli evaluation's great relative advantage. But what had facilitated this advantage also created the great disadvantages of evaluation in Israel. The greenhouse was created not only as a result of detachment from the decision-making institutions, but also due to detachment from professionals and what was happening in the field globally. The fact that it was people from Israel who conceptualized accepted work methods in their own country is but a symptom of a situation in which the field of evaluation in Israel is detached and closed within itself.

Current Developments within the Governmental Sphere

In Israel the only field in which there is a relationship between evaluation and the political establishment is education. The Ministry of Education evaluates itself through calls by the Chief Scientist, both in light of the profusion of interventions in education that are accompanied by evaluation and through the evaluation department. Following the ordinances legislated by the Ministry of Education in the wake of activities of the National Task Force for Reform in Education (known as the Dovrat Commission) in 2004, the evaluation department became a statutory body responsible for both evaluation and training evaluators in the education system, as the National Authority for Measurement and Evaluation (NAME).

The Committee for Measurement and Evaluation in Education of the Dovrat Commission also recommended incorporation of an evaluator into every school in Israel. On the recommendation of the Committee for Integration of Internal Evaluation in Schools (2004), the application and implications of having a professional evaluator in every school, the local authorities, and the districts were discussed. The aim was to train professionals who already had academic training, similar to the educational counsellors (which in Israel require an M.A. degree). As this comprised thousands of professionals, dozens of various bodies jumped onto the bandwagon and began training evaluators for the education field. Most of the training programs are short-term and provide only general and superficial knowledge.

In the wake of the Dovrat Commission's recommendations, evaluation in Israel changed. Its influence is mainly felt in the education field, but there is a great likelihood that what happens in education will strongly affect other fields of evaluation. However, it is still too early to tell if this change is temporary or long-term, what the nature of its influence will be (e.g., rapid and superficial training may in all

likelihood diminish the professional status of the field), and if and when it will lead to the development of a significant labour market and a heightening of the prestige of the field and the status of those engaged in it.

The public debate on evaluation in education caused by the Dovrat Commission is very broad, and various bodies are involved in it, including the Israeli National Academy of Sciences and the Council for Higher Education. Conferences and seminars on evaluation and related subjects are being held by various institutions. The volume of "evaluation" in the current Israeli discourse has become prominent.

The Question of Evaluator Training and Certification

The question of evaluator training and certification is currently at the centre of attention in Israel, and the problem is a global one (Cousins & Aubry, 2006; Jones & Worthen, 1999).[2] The many and varied types of evaluation and the absence of a clearly defined framework for the field underscore the existing ambiguity regarding the place of evaluators and the knowledge and skills they need in their work (Altschuld, 2005; Altschuld et al., 1994; Cousins & Aubry, 2006; Shadish & Epstein, 1987). With regard to the absence of focus on evaluators and their work, it appears that even today there is no binding definition of the level of studies and training an individual should undergo in order to become an evaluator. Thus, in a study sponsored by the Canadian Evaluation Society (CES) in 2002, an evaluator is defined as an individual who conducts evaluation even if this is not his or her principal occupation (Zorzi, McGuire, & Perrin, 2002). Accordingly, evaluators' professional training can range from no training in evaluation at all to academic degrees in the field.

The situation of evaluators with differing professional training is also evident in Israel. Since 1979, when a master's track in research methods, measurement, and evaluation was opened at Tel Aviv University, no further degrees have been added in the evaluation field. Only recently, in March 2006, did Ben-Gurion University open a track in evaluation and measurement in education systems for M.A. and Ph.D. students, while the rest of the universities offer courses on the subject only as part of other degree courses (Committee for Measurement and Evaluation in Education, 2004). At Ben-Gurion University, for instance, various courses on evaluation are offered in the Departments of Education, Social Work, Economics, the Faculty of Health Sciences and the School of Management. The situation is

similar in other universities that offer courses in evaluation in various departments and in a variety of fields.

In Israel (as in other countries) there are no clear standards for people entering the field. Evaluation in Israel does not mandate any basic professional training for either those seeking to engage in the field or those already active in it. Israel also does not mandate participation in professional forums or an existing professional association. Accordingly, anyone seeking to evaluate a program or project is under no obligation to undergo specific training or be familiar with a defined knowledge base. Evaluation is perceived as a field concomitant with disciplines that should be taught as part of other degree courses and not in its own right (IAPE, 2002; Committee for Measurement and Evaluation in Education, 2004). In a survey conducted among its members by IAPE, it was found that the standard and quantity of the preliminary formal evaluation learning of evaluators in Israel is varied but low: only one fifth of the respondents studied evaluation for a degree (M.A. or Ph.D.), fewer than one eighth took a single academic course, while approximately half of the respondents learned how to evaluate from their work on the ground (IAPE, 2002).

In the wake of increasing interest in evaluation, the question of training is being raised in various forums. The Israeli National Academy for Sciences discussed this issue and in 2005 published "What Evaluators Should Know: A Proposal for a Syllabus Framework and Professional Development—Measurement and Evaluation in Education." The document defined the fields of knowledge required by the evaluator while emphasizing measuring skills and psychometrics in the field of education, and called upon the Council for Higher Education to support the opening of advanced degree courses in evaluation.

In addition, some of the academic teacher training colleges requested the Council for Higher Education to approve their awarding a M.Ed. degree in evaluation. This request, too, led to a tremendous increase in the evaluation profession and the training of evaluators by both private bodies and more formal ones, such as the academic colleges for teacher training.

Finally, NAME published its own "Specifications for Training in Evaluation" (Ganor, Rom, & Shilton, 2007), which forms the outline plan for trainers in evaluation. NAME has the power to enforce its standards on school and educational evaluators, but it does not have the solution for the thousands of evaluators needed.

Having reviewed the context for evaluation and evaluators in Israel, we now turn to our study of evaluator professional identity. We wanted to better understand Israeli evaluator professional identity and how it relates to the conditions and contextual factors that underpin evaluation in the country.

METHODOLOGY

Research Logic

The present study was exploratory and was conducted in accordance with abductive research logic (Peirce, 1955a, 1955b). The choice of abductive research logic for the study is a consequence of the paucity of research-based knowledge on evaluation in Israel in general, and the professional identity of evaluators in that country in particular, as well as of the desire to reveal and examine professional identity in evaluators in Israel for the first time. Abductive research logic, first defined by Peirce at the beginning of the 20th century, presents a process of explorative searching for explanations of facts in the field without prior knowledge or hypotheses. Peirce formulated the research logic he called "abduction," which was different from the well-known *deduction* and *induction*, and which aimed to cover what he called "the logic of discovery" (Rescher, 1978; Rosental, 1993). According to Peirce, in a process of discovery we confront a new or surprising fact (a problem), decide how to address it, and create an explanation. According to this research logic, we do not cling to our first interpretation of a new or surprising fact, but rather convert the explanation into a "hypothesis on probation" and test it against all our observations and facts, to see if it stands. In so doing and by continuing the process of examining our hypotheses against additional information gathered from the studied field and against logical criteria that corroborate the interpretive process, we have to explore farther into a wider scope of data. In each such cycle our explanations become broader, more general, and more abstract. With this logic Peirce created an inseparable link between new facts that we face in the "real world" (as it is perceived in our minds), their explanation, and their conceptualization (Levin Rozalis, 2000; Peirce 1955a, 1955b; Yu, 1994). A hypothesis on probation is said to meet the logical criteria not if it corresponds with a conception of external reality or theory, but rather only if it resolves the dilemma, problem, or difficulty for which it was formulated (Josephson & Josephson, 1996; Levin-Rozalis, 2004).

Course of the Study

The study was conducted in two stages. (a) In order to have some preliminary data, an open interview was administered to a representative sample of seven salient evaluators. (b) Relying on analysis of the interviews, a closed questionnaire was constructed and distributed to all known evaluators, to which more than one third (80 evaluators) responded. In order to better understand our findings, we subsequently discuss them in terms of the wider context of evaluation in Israel.

Interview

In the first stage, seven noted Israeli evaluators (five women and two men) participated in an interview whose aim was to air central themes regarding how Israeli evaluators perceive evaluation, its characteristics as a profession, and their own professional identity. The interviewees came from a variety of fields of knowledge that included welfare, education, psychology, sociology, and organizational consultancy; some were academics and others self-employed; some had studied evaluation formally, while others had learned on the ground; there were both internal and external evaluators, and interviewees who defined themselves as evaluators as opposed to others who did not. Furthermore, there was variance in the number of years and the types of evaluation in which the interviewees were engaged, from policy evaluation or organizational consultancy, to ex-ante, participatory, or formative evaluation. This choice of interviewees was an attempt to build as broad a representative sample as possible in order to cover as wide a scope of opinion as could be achieved.

Following abductive research logic, we had no preliminary assumptions or knowledge, so there was no interview protocol but rather an open-ended discussion with the interviewees. The opening question of each interview was "Tell me about your work as an evaluator," and this developed into a conversation in which the researcher attempted to obtain from the interviewee as many explanations and stories as possible on the work process, his or her concept, definitions, and the place of evaluation in his or her professional identity. The aim of the interviews was to reveal the many existing variables in this world of content, in order to use them to frame the questionnaire.

The interviews were processed using Facet Analysis, creating a mapping sentence (Guttman & Greenbaum, 1998; Levy & Guttman, 1985; Shye, 1998). Facet analysis was developed by Gutman in the mid-20th century as a technique to create a classification scheme

for non-theoretical (not theory-driven) data in a logical and coherent structure, and without reduction of a complex phenomenon or concept into narrow measurable definitions. He suggests presenting the entire domain of a phenomenon and its possible components (qualitative and quantitative) in a given context as a facet. Each facet has to be clearly defined, mutually exclusive, and collectively exhaustive in presenting aspects, properties, or characteristics of a class or specific subject. Thus we organized the data from the interviews into 18 facets, including field of knowledge, professional development in evaluation, participation in professional forums, the role of evaluation as perceived by evaluators, the evaluator's sphere of responsibility, evaluee's perception of evaluation, and ethical problems of evaluation. The facets are then organized into a mapping sentence: an intrinsic data analysis that indicates the relationships between the facets and their changing range in a quasi-theoretical way. The mapping sentence can then be processed statistically using SSA (Small Space Analysis). However, we used this technique as a means to an end (a questionnaire) and not as an end in itself. An example of facets organized in a mapping sentence is presented in the Appendix.

Questionnaire

The facets of the mapping sentence were used to construct a closed questionnaire. Some of the questionnaire statements were taken literally from the interviews, while others were formulated in accordance with the mapping sentence. The main issues of the questionnaire as derived from the mapping sentence relate to the evaluator's background, his/her connection with and perception of the community of evaluators, perception of evaluation, ways of work, and relationships with evaluees.

The questionnaire was sent via e-mail to all the evaluators on the IAPE mailing list (about 240 people),[3] which includes both IAPE members and anyone who had attended an IAPE conference, seminar, study day, or other activity. In the end, 80 people responded to the questionnaire.

Participants

As this was pioneering research, we had very limited information concerning the evaluators in Israel. This means that the specific demographic and characteristics of the sample, presented in Table 1, are in essence research findings.

Table 1
Distribution of Principal Evaluation Fields by Evaluation Frameworks (Percentage)

	Education	Welfare	Health	Society	Services	Immigration absorption	Policy
Private framework	42.6 (*n* = 29)	57.8 (*n* = 11)	40 (*n* = 4)	57.1 (*n* = 12)	66.7 (*n* = 12)	57.1 (*n* = 8)	60 (*n* = 3)
University/ college	36.7 (*n* = 25)	31.6 (*n* = 6)	50 (*n* = 5)	33.3 (*n* = 7)	16.7 (*n* = 3)	35.7 (*n* = 5)	20 (*n* = 1)
Government bodies	20.6 (*n* = 14)	10.5 (*n* = 2)	10 (*n* = 1)	9.5 (*n* = 2)	16.7 (*n* = 3)	7.1 (*n* = 1)	20 (*n* = 1)
Total	100 (*n* = 68)	100 (*n* = 19)	100 (*n* = 10)	100 (*n* = 21)	100 (*n* = 18)	100 (*n* = 14)	100 (*n* = 5)

* Note: More than one framework could be chosen.

Given the number of members in IAPE and the number of known evaluators in Israel, a sample of 80 respondents represents a large portion (33%) of Israeli evaluators. Nevertheless, because the sample is self-selected, there is still uncertainty as to the level of coverage of the target population, and this impedes certainty with regard to the representativeness of this sample.

Instruments, Scales, and Analysis Procedures

The questionnaire consists of several parts. The informative items asking about the evaluators' background, education, affiliation, field of work, and so on took the form of a nominal scale. The sections asking the evaluators' opinions were mainly in Likert-type format (Likert, 1932). We asked about the level of agreement with the statements on a five-degree scale from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. We used the Semantic Differential (Osgood, Suci, & Tennenbaum, 1957) to understand complex concepts such as the essence and role of evaluation.

FINDINGS

Who are the Evaluators?

Academic Affiliation and Gender

All the affiliated evaluators who answered the questionnaire hold an academic degree. Nine out of ten respondents come from the social sciences and humanities, while the remainder classify themselves

as coming from the "exact" or natural sciences. Most evaluators are engaged in evaluation with private or academic bodies. The vast majority of respondents (81.3%) are women.

Contexts of Work and Fields in Which Evaluations Are Conducted

Forty percent of the respondents work mainly in various private contexts (in a private company or are self-employed), 35% work in academic settings, universities or colleges; only 17.5% work in various government or municipal agencies (the remainder did not answer this question). Although slightly more than one third of the respondents stated that they work in academic contexts, only 17.5% of all respondents stated that they publish in scientific journals.

Table 1 shows that the main body of evaluation is conducted in education, but we also find evaluators working in fields such as society, services and welfare, different medical settings, economics, and management. An interesting observation is that all the respondents working in government settings (government or local authorities) evaluate the education field.

Respondents' Professional Education in Evaluation

The findings show that only 19% of the respondents hold a degree in evaluation (M.A. or Ph.D.), 40% took a single academic course, and only a few took various professional courses. This finding leaves about one third of the evaluators without any formalized training in evaluation. Two thirds of the respondents state that they learned their work on the ground (either in addition to formal training or instead of it). It is interesting to note that the percentage of evaluators active in various academic contexts is 35%, almost twice that of evaluators holding a degree in evaluation (19%).

Furthermore, analysis of the findings shows that the respondents felt that the most required field of knowledge in the evaluators' work, and in which they should be trained, is research and evaluation methods. This field, which includes qualitative and quantitative research methods and different approaches to evaluation, was ranked as important to a "great or very high degree" by at least two thirds of the respondents to the questionnaire. This finding is crucial, mainly for evaluators whose training was on the ground—9 out of 10 reported that they strongly agree that studies of research methods should be included in evaluator training.

What Do Evaluators Do?

We used principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation to identify dimensions of evaluators' work. The results revealed several interpretable factors or dimensions of interest. The first extracted was *summative evaluation*. Some two thirds of the sample participants are involved with this type of evaluation (more than one type could be chosen) to an average or high degree, including a majority of evaluators who work in a government. Second, *structured evaluation* is a factor comprising advisory work, participatory evaluation, learning from success and empowering evaluation, and was also observed to be very common—approximately half of the respondents ranked it as central to their work to an average or high degree. Furthermore, 45.1% reported on the use of advisory work and participatory evaluation to an average to high degree, while the remainder of the factor element items—learning from success and empowering evaluation – were reported as being central for only 28.8% and 35.1%, respectively. This evaluation work dimension is common to a similar degree among evaluators working in the various settings.

Formative processes were also one of the main modes of work, as more than two thirds of the respondents to the questionnaire (67.5%) tend to employ these processes to an average to high degree.

There was a wide gap between the abovementioned factors and the two additional evaluation dimensions. The first, *organizational-formal evaluation*, which includes organizational learning, policy evaluation, and performance and staff evaluation, constitutes the principal style for 29% of the evaluators. This evaluation dimension is twice as common among evaluators working in government frameworks as in other frameworks.

The second, *ex-ante* evaluation (evaluating the planning phase and the feasibility of an initiative, project, or program), is central for one fifth of the evaluators to an average to high degree, and is common mainly among those holding a degree in evaluation and those working in government.

Following this, most of the evaluators think that the aim of evaluation is to advise the evaluee and it would appear that the prevailing trend is to do so while working in conjunction with members of the program community. This finding is corroborated by the preliminary interviews in which it was suggested that in order to fully absorb the findings, both evaluator and evaluated body must formulate the

questions together and write interim reports before submitting the final report, and that joint work and an interactive process are both vital and positive for the evaluation to be connected with the context and relevant to the stakeholders.

This finding is somewhat reinforced with regard to an additional finding showing that half of the evaluators feel that the evaluator is not "the state comptroller," an external agent whose role is not to level criticism but rather to work together with the evaluee. However, with regard to the benefit accruing to the evaluee as a result of evaluation, the situation is less clear. On the one hand, the majority of evaluators view evaluation as an opportunity for evaluee learning and thinking, while on the other only one third of the respondents reported that they agree with another statement, according to which evaluation indeed serves an evaluee's learning and development. Moreover, the responses of the study's participants show there is a belief that not all the consumers of evaluation know how to use this tool called "evaluation" and that they sometimes view it as "a mirror the evaluee chooses either to look into, cover up, or take down from the wall."

Difficulties and Problems

Regarding questions of difficulties and problems encountered by the evaluators, it appears that the most common complaint is with regard to the evaluation's low *budget*. Half of the respondents reported that they encounter this problem to a high or very high degree, and those with degrees in evaluation encounter it the most. One of the interviewees commented that constructing an evaluation in the harsh reality of a minimal evaluation budget for a large evaluation project is a professional challenge.

Difficulties deriving from *ambiguity of the evaluation situation and its limits* are also encountered by 6 out of 10 evaluators. This group of difficulties, which includes (a) evaluators seeking to attain objectives other than those defined by the evaluated body and (b) evaluated bodies that try to attain objectives other than those defined, highlights the need for clearer definition of the scope of the evaluation or at least an evaluation contract between evaluator and evaluee.

Some 30% of the respondents reported on problems deriving from *the character of the evaluee*. This group of problems includes lack of professional recognition of the field of evaluation, situations in which the evaluee does not know how to utilize evaluation, and politics that

hinder the evaluation process. Fewer than one third of the evaluators encounter these problems to a high or very high degree, which indicates that the field of evaluation is relatively recognized and that the majority of evaluees know how to utilize it, without or despite the interference of politics and power struggles.

This finding is connected with a fourth group of problems, *difficulty in defining the place of the evaluator* in both the evaluation and the evaluated body in which he or she is working. These problems are an absence of an agreed contract between evaluator and evaluated body, the latter's intervention in the professional considerations of the former, and the number of interested parties contesting contacts with the evaluator. Beyond the evaluator's type of training and attitudes toward it, 9 out of 10 evaluators feel that there should be greater exposure of the field of evaluation to decision-makers and the general public; more than half of them feel there is ignorance in Israel regarding the profession of evaluation. These findings might be surprising in light of the fact that evaluation exists in so many spheres.

Positions Regarding the Professional Community

More than half of the evaluators think it important that there be a professional community of evaluators but only one quarter of them feel that such a community currently exists in Israel; more than 40% think that, despite such a community not yet existing, they are seeing the first signs of its development. Another group of evaluators claims that as far as they are concerned there is no such community but only personal and professional contacts with other evaluators.

Participation in Conferences in Israel and Abroad/Professional Networks/ Publishing Papers

More than half of the respondents to the questionnaire are IAPE members and more than half of the IAPE respondents believe it is important to have a professional association of evaluators in Israel, despite the fact that over half of them do not consider evaluation as their main occupation.

It appears that membership in international evaluation organizations is not a common pattern among evaluators in Israel (only 13.8% of the respondents to the questionnaire reported on such membership), and the same is true of writing for non-refereed professional journals (11.3%) and refereed scientific journals (17.5%).

Three quarters of the respondents reported participation in IAPE conferences and other activities, and half of them even reported making presentations at these conferences. However, 10% of the participants in them reported that their association is from their other professional field, not from the field of evaluation.

Some 30% of the respondents participate in or present papers at international conferences abroad (not only in evaluation). Approximately 30% are members of Internet networks of evaluators from all over the world, and 12.5% reported that they take no part in the activities of professional forums. The number of respondents participating in and presenting at forums in Israel is far higher than those participating in international forums. The majority of the participants in these conferences hold doctoral degrees, and many of them are academic faculty members.

Attitudes and Opinions About the Profession

Respondents shared their views about a variety of issues associated with the concept of evaluation as a profession. First, three quarters of the respondents think that the existing community possesses a uniform corpus of knowledge familiar to all its members, while half believe that the corpus is unique for evaluation and independent of other fields. Only one quarter of the evaluators think that evaluation does not possess a uniform corpus of knowledge familiar to all. Next, at least two thirds of the respondents support the compilation of a code of ethics for evaluators in Israel. Finally, some 70% agree on the need for professional definition of the members in the field and for setting clear standards for the persons entering into it. About 60% encounter difficulties deriving from the ambiguity of the evaluation situation and its limits, which shows a need for a clearer definition of the field of evaluation or more elaborated contracts between evaluator and evaluee.

Perceptions Pertaining to Professional Identity

Only half of the evaluators perceive evaluation as their main occupation, with the others perceiving it to be secondary, a pattern that did not differentiate between male and female respondents. This balance is not seen for evaluators who work for government bodies, with three quarters of them perceiving evaluation as their main occupation. Two thirds of the evaluators who are in academic settings (university or college) perceive evaluation to be a secondary occupation.

Perceptions of the Nature of the Profession

An examination of the evaluators' perceptions of the nature of the profession shows that, despite the great differences between the evaluators, the majority agree that the aim of evaluation is to advise the evaluee by reflecting its situation while cooperating with its staff. This perception, which views the way in which the evaluation is conducted as no less important than its objectives (King & Stevahn, 2002; Levin-Rozalis & Rosenstein, 2003; Shadish & Epstein, 1987), is compatible with the perception of evaluation's primary role as examining a project's implementation processes and results in order to either improve it or make decisions regarding it (Weiss, 1998).

A further expression of the perception deriving from the objectives of evaluation can be seen in the agreement of numerous evaluators (73.4%) that it is important for evaluators to learn interpersonal skills as part of their training. This knowledge is necessary for the success of an evaluation conducted in collaboration with the evaluee's personnel, as it mandates attentiveness to the evaluee and the atmosphere in which the evaluation takes place in order to build a suitable evaluation process. Furthermore, the need for learning interpersonal skills is also seen through the evaluators' perception that the evaluator must provide information on the evaluation to all levels of the evaluee, and that the evaluator is not only an external factor that levels criticism, but also one that works with the evaluee.

The majority of the respondents believe that working collaboratively with the evaluee, which can facilitate evaluation, in turn, enables the evaluators to learn and develop.

Table 2 shows that the majority of evaluators view the varied knowledge mandated by evaluation as a learning opportunity. They believe that the field must continue being interdisciplinary, and that as evaluators they must aspire to this.

DISCUSSION

The answer to the question of whether evaluators in Israel have a common and discrete identity is complex. There is great diversity in the evaluators who participated in the study with regard to their background, professional training, work contexts, and how they perceive the field and themselves in it. Despite that, there is strong agreement on the essence of evaluation as an advisory participatory process directed toward learning. The participants also strongly agree

that evaluation, its role, and the role of the evaluator are ambiguous and that the borders are not clear. In short, they experience high levels of uncertainty. The result is in our view the principal finding in this context: only half of the respondents think of their occupation in evaluation as their main occupation. We believe we can assume that this is the situation among evaluators in Israel. This finding is similar to the results of a survey of evaluation practice that was conducted in Canada in 2005 (Borys et al., 2005), but it is significantly higher than that in the data published by Shadish and Epstein in their study conducted in the United States in 1987, in which only 31% of those engaged in the field defined themselves as evaluators. Morell (1990) also found that for many evaluators, evaluation is considered a secondary discipline. House (1993) thinks that the high percentage of those engaged in evaluation who do not define themselves as "evaluators" derives from the innovativeness of the field and the disciplinary structure of academia that does not enable relating to evaluation as a discipline in its own right. He claims that evaluation is likely to be perceived as such in the future, too.

Table 2
Evaluators' Positions on the Field of Evaluation (some examples)

Field	Statement	Number and percentage of agreements ($N = 80$)
The field of evaluation	The diversity of the field of evaluation enables a great deal of learning	88.8 ($n = 71$)
	Evaluators must aspire to various fields of knowledge	75 ($n = 60$)
	The field of evaluation must be interdisciplinary	58.75 ($n = 47$)
	Evaluation is a decentralized field that cannot be delineated	13.8 ($n = 11$)
The evaluator's skills and knowledge	In evaluation the most important thing is the evaluator's general evaluation skills	25 ($n = 20$)
	The evaluator must come from the evaluee's field of content	23.8 ($n = 19$)
Theory vs. practice of the field	Evaluation must develop practical knowledge	34 ($n = 27$)
	Evaluation must develop theoretical knowledge	3.8 ($n = 3$)
Theory vs. practice regarding evaluators	The evaluator must be familiar with contents and theories	11.3 ($n = 9$)
	The evaluator must specialize in evaluation techniques and research	11.3 ($n = 9$)

Curiously, while more than half of the IAPE respondents do not view evaluation as their main occupation, the majority of evaluators that do not participate in any activities or professional forums do view evaluation as their main occupation. It seems as if doubts and ambiguity are part of the definition of being an evaluator and that these doubts prevent evaluators from identifying with evaluation as their main profession on one hand, and motivate evaluators to learn more through different professional activities, conferences, and membership in professional association on the other. However, one group does not experience this uncertainty; they identify with this profession and do not feel the need to learn more.

Examination of the additional findings shows contradictory trends that make defining the components of a common professional identity of Israeli evaluators, or even the claim that there is no such identity, difficult. Thus, for instance, while three quarters of the respondents think that evaluation possesses an agreed corpus of knowledge familiar to all its members, some 70% of them agree that the professional definition of the field and its professional standards are ambiguous, and some 90% lament the lack of a code of ethics in the field and think that such a code should be developed.

Why has a clear and discrete professional identity not been formed for Israeli evaluators? The possible explanations are bound up in a number of interconnected factors, of which the four principal ones are structural-historical processes; lack of prestige; the character of professional training; and lack of clear practices and an unclear definition of the role.

Structural-Historical Processes

Several researchers (Bergmann, as cited in House, 1993; Kirpal, 2004) accord great importance to the cultural and historical context in which the professional field is perceived in society. The process of developing the field of program and project evaluation in Israel created a situation whereby it is outside the field of vision of government and academia alike. In addition, the lack of contact between Israeli evaluators and evaluation associations worldwide has held back the structuring and conceptualization of the knowledge created in Israel, thus reinforcing the field's positioning as something slightly detached, ambiguous, and lacking a clear professional identity.

According to Schwartz's (1998) study there exists a lack of clear recognition of evaluation on the part of the establishment. This trend may

also be true for academia, according to the Committee for Measurement and Evaluation in Education (2004): Members of the academic sector find it difficult to relate to evaluation as an academic field in its own right, both because it lacks uniform knowledge and also because evaluation has a distinctly practical rather than theoretical orientation. Such lack of recognition may imply that the Israeli public is generally unfamiliar with the field of evaluation. This visibility problem may be compounded by the very small and diverse professional community of evaluators in Israel.

The field of evaluation in Israel is currently undergoing accelerated change due to a variety of forces and influences such as the release of the Dovrat Commission report, the establishment of NAME, the opening of the track in evaluation and measurement at Ben-Gurion University, the establishment of a two-year specialization course in evaluation for teacher education instructors at the Mofet Institute, and innumerable training courses for evaluators in the field. Taken as a whole, these influences will doubtless create change and even reinforce the structuring of the field. However, at this point in time the turmoil only contributes to the lack of clarity with regard to the field's development direction and the professional identity of those engaged in it.

Lack of Prestige

Glaeser (as cited in Bain, 2005) attributes great importance to the prestige and status of a professional field in relation to other professions and the prestige of the social context in which it is active in the construction of professional identity. We think that evaluation's low prestige leads to a low social context and a perception of the field as inferior to scientific research (Levin-Rozalis, 2003; Patton, 1997; Schwartz, 1998), and thus we foresee that evaluators will find difficulty in developing a professional identity.

One force that can harm the image and prestige of evaluation is the attitude of academia toward the field. Evaluation is perceived as a field that does not meet research criteria and as such does not gain the appropriate reward and prestige (Levin-Rozalis, 2003; Patton, 1997; Schwartz, 1998). As a result, and perhaps given the incentive structures of universities, evaluators who are academic faculty members avoid defining themselves as evaluators.

Professions that are recognized as feminine usually suffer from status decline. The majority of evaluators in Israel are women who come

from the fields of social sciences and the humanities, particularly the behavioural sciences and education disciplines, and who focus on evaluation of programs in the fields of education, society, and human services. This situation, which is not unique to Israel, has been identified by Bergmann as having an adverse effect on the status of the field (Bergmann, as cited in House, 1993).

Lack of prestige contributes to the profession's low status, which may impede the development of professional identity, according to Kirpal (2004).

The Character of Professional Training

In Israel there is no requirement for any basic professional training whatsoever for those seeking to engage in the field or those already active in it (Committee for Measurement and Evaluation in Education, 2005). Indeed, the professional training of the majority of evaluators in research, as shown in a recent IAPE survey of the membership (2002), is partial and random.

Evaluators may avoid defining themselves as such for two apparently contradictory reasons: high qualifications on the one hand and inadequate training on the other. The low prestige of the field coupled with the lack of recognition cause the highly trained professionals and academics to identify themselves with different areas and to declare evaluation as a second trade or not at all. On the other hand, we also see the reluctance of significantly undertrained evaluators to define themselves as such. In our view, these two reasons are actually both sides of the same coin: the lack of training and standards leads to ambiguity about the evaluator's role and therefore impedes identity development.

The ambiguity of evaluation's situation is one of the common problems reported by the evaluators. It seems that the desire of evaluators to overcome evaluation's various problems should be understood against this backdrop by the compilation of a code of ethics for evaluation, the setting of clear standards for membership in the profession, and the development of a professional definition for evaluators (Dorros, 1968; Ingersoll, 2001; Kfir et al., 1997; Metzger, 1987). As Kirpal (2004) accords great importance to specialization in the process of developing a professional identity, one might expect that by doing so the field's specialization will be enhanced, and consequently a clearer professional identity will be formed for Israeli evaluators.

Lack of Clear Practices

The lack of theoretical and practical consistency in the field of evaluation and the profusion of approaches to evaluation and its roles may also impair the ability of evaluators to develop a professional identity. According to Sheffler (2005), Israeli evaluators have difficulty in developing a professional identity because the professional framework, upon which this identity should be built, is wide open and ambiguous. This situation is exacerbated by the great lack of evaluation literature in Hebrew, the paucity of reviews of the knowledge base in literature in Israel (Committee for Measurement and Evaluation in Education, 2005), and the fact that too many evaluators do not read professional literature in English (Diaz-Puente, Cazorla, & Dorrego, 2007). Poor attendance at international conferences also contributes to the difficulty in disseminating and constructing a defined, clear, and common body of knowledge for the evaluation community. It seems reasonable that the two main reasons for poor attendance at international conferences are the language barrier and the high cost of participation in conferences in other countries as compared with local ones.

Evaluators employed in academia have a budget for participation in conferences, since the need for contact—exchange of ideas and mutual enrichment with professionals the world over—is understood. Academics are also given credit for presentations at conferences, and the recognition of colleagues in them and their work is important to them. However, for the rest of the evaluators, traveling to a conference is likely to be at the expense of other activities and will only happen when absolutely necessary.

With regard to language, it is entirely possible that many evaluators, particularly those who are not academics, have difficulty with English, which creates an obstacle to participation in conferences in general, and presentation at them in particular. Support for these two explanations is apparent in the fact that the majority of the participants in these conferences hold doctoral degrees and are academic faculty members.

The First Signs of Professional Identity

According to Olesen's theory of identity structure (2001), it appears that building an inclusive professional identity for evaluators in Israel will be difficult. One of the essential elements, in his view—belonging

to a recognized and authoritative professional body—does not really happen, for the IAPE (the present professional society) is based entirely on volunteers, has limited financial resources, is insufficiently recognized, is not accepted by all evaluators, and has no official status; only half of its members perceive themselves as evaluators. The lack of prior basic professional training, together with the absence of a code of ethics and standards of conduct (House, 1993; Hall, as cited in Kaiser, 2002; Sheffler, 2005), causes a blurred distinction between those who are evaluators and those who are not, and it is difficult to form a collective professional identity that will encourage mutual commitment to the development and advancement of the field.

Despite the lack of a clear professional identity today, and despite the difficulties presented here, the study's findings indicate the likelihood that a professional identity of evaluators in Israel is beginning to come about, based on Kirpal (2004), who asserts that a professional identity is built on interaction with surrounding society on the one hand (the structural dimension), and with colleagues on the other (the social dimension). In Israel's structural dimension today, changes are taking place that are linked to the positioning of evaluation and may ultimately put the field "on the map." While structural reform may lead to change, the type and direction of change remain unclear.

From the standpoint of the social dimension, the study's findings indicate that the field is relatively well developed in Israel, albeit not yet complete. More than half of the evaluators view the formation of a professional community as important, an assumption that is also supported by the desire to support collegial learning for the exchange of information and experience (Davidson, 2005; IAPE, 2002; Mertens, 1994). The majority of evaluators work in teams, and the independent character of the work enables collegial learning between evaluators together with interaction with people from different fields and contexts. Furthermore, the evaluators who participated in our study report their desire for greater collegial learning. This is also manifested in their contacts with other evaluators in Israel, apart from their lively participation in IAPE conferences and activities: three quarters of the evaluators who participated in the study reported participating in IAPE conferences and seminars and half reported presenting at these conferences, observations that indicate involvement and the need for exchange of knowledge. In addition to their declaration on the importance of a professional association, the evaluators who participated in the study feel that despite their differences, they share a clear and discrete corpus of knowledge.

According to Kirpal's three-dimension model (2004), the development of a strong and positive professional identity is conditionally possible if several changes take place: the establishment of a professional association that will impose limits on its members, uniform basic professional training, long-term specialization and development, and meeting the requirements of a code of ethics or various professional standards (House, 1993; Hall, as cited in Kaiser, 2002; Olesen, 2001; Sheffler, 2005). Should this take place, the building of a professional identity for evaluators in Israel will be more attainable than in the past. The first signs of these conditions can be seen in the attitude of various bodies such as the National Academy of Sciences, the NAME, the Ministry of Education Chief Scientist, and various academic bodies toward the issue of evaluator training, role definition, and required knowledge.

On the individual-psychological dimension, too, despite the refusal of approximately half of those engaged in evaluation to define themselves as evaluators, this group of people is a very active group, and the involvement of most of them and their active participation in activities related to evaluation is very high. The individual-psychological dimension addresses individuals' perception of the context of their work and the importance they ascribe to it. One important aspect is the perceptions of the evaluator's role. Patton (1997) defined 10 different roles for an evaluator, which vary in accordance with either the interest holders' characteristics or the type of evaluation in which they are interested. In contrast to the assumption that lack of training will lead to the formation of different perceptions of the evaluator's role, our findings show that even though the respondents' professional education was diverse and only one fifth hold a degree in evaluation (while about one third received no training in this field), the similarities in the perception of evaluation among the respondents outweigh the differences between them. In general terms, it appears that this dimension is heavily dependent on the other two: (a) the change that will take place in the structural dimension that will bring about the perception of the field as both requisite and prestigious, and (b) the success of the evaluators in establishing and maintaining a meaningful professional association, one whose foundations—and part of the walls—already exist.

NOTES

1. Compare the Canadian Evaluation Society's membership of approximately 1,700 in a country of 35 million to IAPE's membership among the Israeli population of 7 million.

2. See also the CES website <www.evaluationcanada.ca> for recent developments on the professional designation front.

3. It is important to note that in Israel the people dealing with educational measurement are usually not called evaluators and are not part of IAPE.

4. More than one possibility could be noted.

REFERENCES

Abbas, A., & McLean, M. (2001). Becoming sociologists: Professional identity for part-time teachers of university sociology. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 22*(3), 339–352.

Alkin, M. C., (2004) *Evaluation roots: Tracing theorists' views and influences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Altschuld, J.W. (2005). Certification, credentialing, licensure, competencies, and the like: Issues confronting the field of evaluation. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation, 20*(2), 157–168.

Altschuld, J.W., Engle, M., Cullen, C., Kim, I., & Macce, B.R. (1994). The 1994 directory of evaluation training programs. In J.W. Altschuld & M. Engle (Eds.), *New Directions in Program Evaluation: The preparation of professional evaluators—Issues, perspectives and programs, 62* (pp. 71–94). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Avieli-Tabibian, K. (2003). *A journey to the past: Birth of a modern word: The 19th century*. Tel-Aviv: Center for Educational Technology. (Hebrew).

Bain, A. (2005). Constructing an artistic identity. *Work, Employment and Society, 19*(1), 25–46.

Beijaard, D., Verloop, N., & Vermunt, J.D. (2000). Teachers' perception of professional identity: An exploratory study from a personal knowledge perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 16*, 749–764.

Borys, S., Gauthier, B., Kishchuk, N., & Roy, S.N. (2005, October). *Survey of evaluation practice and issues in Canada*. Paper presented at the Joint CES/AEA Conference, Toronto.

Chianca, T. (2004). *The Global Evaluation Community, the Brazilian Community, the Brazilian Evaluation Network and the Evaluation Net-*

work and the WMU Evaluation Center. Presentation at the Evaluation Café, The Evaluation Center, Western Michigan University.

Committee for Integration of Internal Evaluation in Schools. (2004). *Recommendations in the framework of the National Task Force for the Advancement of Education in Israel*. Jerusalem: Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport. (Hebrew)

Committee for Measurement and Evaluation in Education. (2005). *The National Task Force for Advancement of Education in Israel*. Jerusalem: Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport. (Hebrew).

Cousins, J.B., & Aubry, T. (2006). *Roles for government in evaluation quality assurance: Discussion paper*. Ottawa, ON: Centre of Excellence for Evaluation, Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat.

Czarniawska, B., & Czarniawska, J. (1994). *Narrating the organization: Drama of institutional identity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Datta, L.-E. (2003). The evaluation profession and the government. In T. Kellaghan & D.L. Stufflebeam (Eds.), *International handbook of educational evaluation* (pp. 345–360). Boston: Kluwer.

Davidson, E.J. (2005). Marketing evaluation as a profession and a discipline. *JMDE—Journal of Multidisciplinary Evaluation, 2*(1), 3–10.

Diaz-Puente, J.M., Cazorla, A., & Dorrego, A. (2007). Crossing national, continental, and linguistic boundaries: Toward a worldwide evaluation research community in journals of evaluation. *Evaluation, 28*(4), 399–415.

Dorros, S. (1968). *Teaching as a profession*. Ohio: Merrill.

Downey, G.L., & Lucena, J.C. (2004). Knowledge and professional identity in engineering: Code-switching and the metrics of progress. *History and Technology, 20*(4), 393–420.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1996). *An analysis of modernization processes*. Jerusalem: Academon. (Hebrew).

Erikson, E.H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: Norton.

Ganor, M., Rom, A., & Shilton, H. (2007). *Specifications for training in evaluation and measurement for professional development of educators*. Tel-Aviv: National Authority for Measurement and Evaluation.

Guba, E.G. (1978). *Toward a methodology of naturalistic inquiry in educational evaluation*. Los Angeles: University of California.

Gussman, T.K. (2005, May). *Improving the professionalism of evaluation*. Ottawa: Centre for Excellence in Evaluation, Treasury Board Secretariat of Canada.

Guttman, R., & Greenbaum, C.W. (1998). Facet theory: Its development and current status. *European Psychologist, 3*, 13–36.

House, E. (2003). Bush's neo-fundamentalism and the new politics of evaluation. *Studies in Educational Policy and Educational Philosophy*. E-tidskrift 2003:2. Retrieved March 6, 2009, from <http://www.upi.artisan.se/docs/doc187.pdf>

House, R.J. (1993). Evaluation as an institution and profession. In E. House (Ed.), *Professional evaluation: Social impact and political consequences* (pp. 12–31). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ingersoll, R.M. (2001). The status of teaching as a Profession. In J. Ballantine & J. Spade (Eds.), *School & society* (pp. 115–129). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Israeli Association of Program Evaluation. (2002). *Summary of a survey of members*. Israel: Authors. (Hebrew).

Johnson, L.S. (2000). Promoting professional identity in an era of educational reform. *Professional School Counseling, 4*(1), 31–40.

Jones, S.C., & Worthen, B.R. (1999). AEA members' opinions concerning evaluator certification. *American Journal of Evaluation, 20*(3), 495–506.

Josephson, J.R., & Josephson, S.G. (Eds.). (1996). *Abductive inference: Computation, philosophy, technology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kaiser, R. (2002). Fixing identity by denying uniqueness: An analysis of professional identity in medicine. *Journal of Medical Humanities, 23*(2), 95–105.

Karlsson, O. (2003). Evaluation politics in Europe: Trends and tendencies. *Studies in Educational Policy and Educational Philosophy, 1*. Retrieved March 6, 2009, from <http://www.upi.artisan.se/docs/doc171.pdf>

Kfir, D., Ariav, T., Feigin, N., & Liebman, Z. (1997). *The academization of the teaching profession and teacher education in Israel*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press.

Kfir, D., & Golan-Kook, P. (2000). *Integrating a permanent evaluation system into Ministry of Education SHAHAR programs*. Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem. (Hebrew).

King, J.A., & Stevahn, L. (2002). Three frameworks for considering evaluator role. In K.E. Ryan & T.A. Schwandt (Eds.), *Exploring evaluation role and identity* (pp. 1–16). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Kirpal, S. (2004). Work identities of nurses: Between caring and efficiency demand. *Emerald, 9*(3), 274–304.

Levin-Rozalis, M. (2000). Abduction: A logical criterion for programme and project evaluation. *Evaluation, 6*(4), 415–432.

Levin-Rozalis, M. (2003). Evaluation and research, differences and similarities. *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation, 18*(2), 1–31.

Levin-Rozalis, M. (2004). Revisited: A tracer study ten years later. Detective process. *Journal of Early Childhood Research, 2*(3), 271–296.

Levin-Rozalis, M., & Rosenstein, B. (2003). A mentoring approach to the one-year evaluation course. *American Journal of Evaluation, 24*(2), 245–259.

Levy, S., & Guttman, L. (1985). A faceted cross-cultural analysis of some core social values. In D. Canter (Ed.), *Facet theory: Approaches to social research* (pp. 205–221). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Likert, R.A. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archive of Psychology, 140*, 1–55.

Love, A.J., & Russon, C. (2000). Building a worldwide evaluation community: Past, present, and future. *Evaluation and Program Planning, 23*(4), 449–459.

Maalouf, A. (1998). *Les identitées meurtrières*. Paris: Bernard Grasset.

McGowen, K.R., & Hart, L.E. (1990). Still different after all these years: Gender differences in professional identity formation. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 21*, 118–123.

Mertens, D.M. (1994). Training evaluators: Unique skills and knowledge. In *New Directions for Program Evaluation, 62*, 17–27.

Metzger, W.P. (1987). A Spectre is haunting the American scholar: The spectre of professionalism. *Educational Researcher, 16*(1), 10–19.

Morell, J.A. (1990). Evaluation: Status of a loose coalition. *American Journal of Evaluation, 11*(3), 213–219.

Nevo, D. (1989). *Beneficial evaluation: Evaluation of educational and social projects*. Tel-Aviv: Givatayyim, Israel. (Hebrew).

Nevo, D. (2001). *School evaluation: A dialogue for enhancing the school*. Even-Yehuda, Rekhess Publishing House. (Hebrew).

Olesen, H.S. (2001). Professional identity as learning processes in life histories. *Journal of Workplace Learning, 13*(7–8), 290–297.

Osgood, C.E., Suci, G.J., & Tennenbaum, P.H. (1957). *The measurement of meaning*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Patton, M.Q. (1997). *Utilization-focused evaluation* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Peirce, C.S. (1955a) Abduction and induction. In J. Buchler (Ed.), *Philosophical writing of Peirce* (pp. 150–156). New York: Dover.

Peirce, C.S. (1955b). The criterion of validity in reasoning. In J. Buchler (Ed.) *Philosophical writing of Peirce* (pp. 120–128). New York: Dover.

Price, C.A. (2000). Women and retirement: Relinquishing professional identity. *Journal of Aging Studies, 14*(21), 81–101.

Renzulli, J.S. (1975). *A guidebook for evaluation programs for the gifted and talented*. Ventura, CA: Office of the Ventura County Superintendent of Schools.

Rescher, N. (1978). *Peirce's philosophy of science*. South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Rosental, S.B. (1993). Peirce's ultimate logical interpretant and dynamical object: A pragmatic perspective. *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society, 29*, 195–210.

Rossi, P.H., Freeman, H.E., & Wright, S.R. (1979). *Evaluation: A systematic approach*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Rossi, P.H., Lipsey, M.W., & Freeman, H.E. (2004). Evaluation: A systematic approach. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Sachs, J. (2001). Teacher professional identity: Competing discourses, competing outcomes. *Journal of Education Policy, 16*(2), 149–161.

Schwartz, R. (1998). The politics of evaluation reconsidered. *Sega, 4*(3), 294–309.

Segsworth, R.V. (2005). Program evaluation in the Government of Canada: Plus ça change... *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation, 20*(3), 173–195.

Shadish, W.R., Cook, T.D., & Leviton, L.C. (1991). Foundations of program evaluation: Theories of practice. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Shadish, W.R., & Epstein, R. (1987). Patterns of program evaluation practice among members of the Evaluation Research Society and Evaluation Network. *Evaluation Review, 1*(5), 555–590.

Sheffler, G. (2005). An ethical perspective of psychology on the Internet. *Psychoactualia, Quarterly of the Psychological Association*. <www.hebpsy.net>. (Hebrew).

Shye, S. (1988) Inductive and deductive reasoning: A structural reanalysis of ability tests. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 73*, 308–311.

Vandenbroeck, M., (1999) *The view of the yeti*. The Hague: BvLF.

Wah Tan, T. (1997). *Professional development and perceptions of professional identity amongst some teachers in a school for mentally retarded children*. Paper presented at the 8th conference of the International Study Association on Teacher Thinking, Kiel, Germany.

Weiss, C.H. (1998). *Evaluation methods for studying programs and policies* (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Yu, C.H. (1994, April). *Abduction? Deduction? Induction? Is there a logic of exploratory data analysis?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Zorzi, R., McGuire, M., & Perrin, R. (2002). *Canadian evaluation society project in support of advocacy and professional development: Evaluation benefits, outputs, and knowledge*. <http://consultation.evaluationcanada.ca/results.htm>

Appendix
The Mapping Sentence That Came Out of the Interviews

Evaluator from the field of: { *Field of knowledge*
1. Social sciences
2. Humanities
3. Natural sciences
4. Technology & engineering
5. Medicine
6. Other }

and from the professions: { *Professions*
A combination of professions and fields of knowledge (self-determination) }

And whose professional development in evaluation is: { *Professional development in evaluation*
1. On the ground
2. Professional courses
3. BA course/s
4. MA course/s
5. MA degree
6. Evaluation doctoral student }

and is an { *Status in the evaluated organization/project*
1. Internal evaluator
2. External evaluator
3. Internal and external evaluator }

who usually applied { *Main methods of evaluation being used*
1. Formative processes
2. Summative evaluation
3. Consulting
4. Ex-ante evaluation
5. Participatory evaluation
6. Self-evaluation
7. Empowering evaluation
8. Other }

and whose professional activity { *Participating in professional forums*
1. Conferences abroad
2. Presentations at conferences abroad
3. Conferences at home
4. Presentations at conferences at home
5. Member of evaluators' network
6. Member of world evaluation org.
7. Member of IAPE
8. Publishes articles on evaluation in international journals
9. Publishes articles on evaluation at home }

And who perceives the profession as: { *Evaluator's perception of his/her profession*
1. A diverse field enabling learning
2. Enabling independent work
3. Emphasizing practical, less than theoretical knowledge
4. Must be interdisciplinary
5. A profession in the process of formation
6. Great ignorance regarding the field
7. On the borderline between evaluation and consulting }

Evaluator's perception of his/her profession

And who perceives the profession as:

1. A diverse field enabling learning
2. Enabling independent work
3. Emphasizing practical, less than theoretical knowledge
4. Must be interdisciplinary
5. A profession in the process of formation
6. Great ignorance regarding the field
7. On the borderline between evaluation and consulting

The role of evaluation as perceived by evaluators

Who perceives his/her role as mainly:

1. Vital to the organization's learning and development
2. Vital to the organization's decision-making
3. Supporting program operators
4. Providing information to the funders
5. Reflecting the existing situation for the organization's hierarchy

Evaluator responsibilities

And his/her sphere of responsibility as:

1. Creation of joint and participatory work
2. Reflecting the organization's situation
3. Providing an external audit
4. Actual responsibility for result implementation
5. Transfer of responsibility for result implementation to the organization
6. Transfer of authority for understanding of the results and holding a discussion to the organization
7. Intervention during programs/projects
8. Constructing an organizational learning process

Metaphors of evaluation

And who sees him-/herself in all the above as:

1. A tool that evaluation consumers must be taught how to use
2. An only king in his kingdom
3. The organization's 'bad guy'
4. Acting within limits
5. Influential in his own 'Little Acre '
6. Does not have to be a contents person
7. A mirror that can be used, but also covered or taken down
8. A side of the triangle – evaluation funder, evaluator, evaluatee
9. A person of compromise between desirable and available
10. Not the state comptroller

Evaluator's perception of his/her professional community

And feels that his/her professional community:

1. Is non-existent
2. Exists, but is irrelevant for him/her
3. Is comprised of people with backgrounds in different fields
4. Not convinced that such an interdisciplinary field needs a community
5. Is in the process of development
6. Represents the center, not the periphery
7. Is non-uniform in terms of the knowledge of all its members

Thinks that the field should:

Evaluator's perception of the needs of the evaluation field

1. Aspire towards becoming a profession
2. Develop an ethical and professional code
3. Establish clear-cut standards
4. Professionally define those engaged in it more clearly
5. Be as interdisciplinary as possible

And believes that evaluator training must include:

Evaluators' knowledge

1. Knowledge of the behavioral sciences
2. Knowledge of organizational behavior
3. Inter- and intra-organization relations
4. Qualitative and quantitative research methods
5. Information science
6. Different evaluation approaches
7. Strong practical emphasis
8. General BA in evaluation, MA in evaluation in a specific discipline
9. MA in evaluation as part of another department/faculty

And whose work is perceived by the evaluees as:

Evaluee's perception of evaluation

1. An opportunity for thinking and learning
2. Ferreting through the organization
3. Unnecessary as there is no need for further information
4. Something imposed upon them
5. Constructive yet threatening

And who him-/herself is perceived by them as:

Evaluee's perception of the evaluator

1. Having legitimacy to feedback what happens inside the organization
2. A mouthpiece for the evaluees vis-à-vis the organization's heads
3. A figure that explains things clearly
4. A tool for providing quantitative products to the stakeholders
5. Significant for a project that can be learned from
6. A figure liable to cause damage due to his/her lack of understanding
7. A threatening figure that impairs the ongoing functioning of the project and organization

And all of which create for the evaluator problems which touch upon the field of evaluation

Evaluation problems deriving from the field of evaluation

1. Lack of professional recognition
2. Absence of an agreed contract between evaluator and evaluee
3. Difficulty of an internal evaluator to define his/her place in the organization
4. The co-opting process of the external evaluator
5. Difficulty of being on the nexus between mirroring and intervention

Problems deriving from the organization's character:

Evaluation problems deriving from the organization

1. Provides too small a budget for evaluation
2. Does not know how to utilize the tool of evaluation
3. The number of stakeholders fighting to air their views to the evaluator harms his/her position
4. Politics that impair the information revealed to the evaluator
5. Striving to attain objectives different from those defined by the organization

Ethical problems of evaluation

And who sees ethical problems:

1. A request to expunge important information from the evaluation report on grounds of it being damaging
2. The evaluator being biased by the subject of the evaluated project
3. Pressure by the organization for the final report to present it in a positive light
4. Evaluating people personally

Is common among Israeli evaluators

from
'To a great extent'
to
'Not at all'

Miri Levin-Rozalis, Ph.D., is a sociologist, psychologist, and faculty member in the Department of Education at the Ben Gurion University, as well as the head of the track for education management and policy, and the head of the graduate and postgraduate program in evaluation. At the Moffet Inter-College Research and Develope Institute, she is the co-head of the qualification program in evaluation for teachers' trainers. Miri is the co-founder and former president of the Israeli Association for Program Evaluation. She has practiced evaluation for almost 30 years. Her current research interest is the sociology of evaluation in Israel and the world.

Efrat Shochot-Reich is currently a project manager in Tapuah, the Israeli Society for the Advancement of the Information Age (an NGO). She formerly worked as the regional manager in a project aimed to integrate special needs children into activities of the Israeli Scouts movement. Efrat holds an M.A. in educational management and a B.A. in human sciences and education, both from Ben-Gurion University. Her thesis, "Attempt to define whether the field of evaluation in Israel is a profession and to characterize the professional identity of the evaluators," was completed in 2006.