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Introduction
The search for evaluation models continues with Cronbach (1963) identification of scientific approaches to evaluation as opposite extremes on an evaluation continuum. Advocates of the scientific evaluation favour clinical or objective experiments. Advocates of humanistic approaches consider experiments mis-informative. Cronbach presented the scientific person as a believer in true experiment. Proponents in this camp tend to concentrate their efforts on the learners and data frequently, in the form of text scores which are employed to compare students’ achievement in different situations. Information collected is quantitative data which can be analysed statistically. In spite of the fact that traditional evaluation methods still dominate in school practice, there has been a growing interest from the last three decades in what Cronbach categorised as humanistic approach to curriculum evaluation.

People are beginning to realize that to obtain more complete picture of curricula, educators need to explore and utilize alternative to traditional evaluation procedures. These include the humanistic approaches to curriculum. Some theorists are firmly rooted in the
quantitative camp, others’ in the qualitative, while some others attest to the fact that quantitative and qualitative methods are complementary.

**Quantitative Scientific Positivistic Evaluation Provus discrepancy evaluation model (1969)** is a good example of a Scientific-Positivistic Approach to evaluation. It consists of four components and five stages of evaluation. The four components include:

- a) Determining programme standards
- b) Determining programme performance
- c) Comparing performance with standards
- d) Determining whether or not a discrepancy exists between performance and standards.

Discrepancy information is reported to decision makers who in turn must make a decision (or act at each stage). The five stages are as follows:

**Design:** This focuses on the comparison of the programme design with prescribed standard of criteria. The programme is examined if it is internally sound (adequacy of process, personnel, resources, materials, etc) and comparison with similar programme that seems to work.

**Installation:** This refers to the characteristics of the programme evaluated including facilities, media, methods, student abilities, and staff qualifications. Discrepancies between programme installation and installation criteria (fidelity) were noted and reported to the decision maker for appropriate action.

**Process:** This involves evaluation of specific process of student and staff activities, functions and communications. If the processes are inadequate they are reported to decision makers for adjustment.

**Products:** The effect of the whole programme is evaluated in terms of the original goals. The product may include students and staff products, as well as products related to the school and community. This information will assist the decision makers on the worthwhile-ness of the programme, whether it should be continued, modified or terminated.
Cost: Programme is evaluated in terms of cost benefit. The programme products are compared with products of similar programmes.

Stake Congruence Contingency Evaluation Model (1988) made a clear distinction between formal and informal evaluation procedures. He argues that educational evaluation continues to depend on casual judgment, implicit goals, intuitive norms and subjective judgment. His contention is that educators should strive to establish more formal evaluation procedures. Formal evaluations are objective rather than subjective. Objectivity is very important in any educational discourse. It aims at providing data for description and judgment on the programme being evaluated. Stake’s model for planning evaluation study provides an organizational framework that highlights data to be considered and contrasts what is planned and what has occurred. The model focuses antecedents, transactions and outcomes (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1998 p.329).

Antecedents refer to conditions that exist prior to teaching and learning that may influence outcomes which include characteristics of the students prior to their lesson, their aptitudes, previous achievement scores, psychological profile scores, grades, discipline, attendance, etc. Antecedents also includes: teachers characteristics, such as years of experience, type of education, teachers behaviour ratings, entry behaviour etc.

Transaction is concerned with interactions the students have with certain curriculum materials and classroom environment. It deals with interactions between students, teachers and resource persons, time allocation, space arrangement and communication flow. Transactions comprise what is known as the “process” of teaching and instruction. The outcomes are the product of learning. It is the result of the antecedents and transactions. Contingencies are concerned with the relationship among antecedents, transactions and outcomes. The challenge is that the evaluator should identify the contingencies and congruencies among these indices – antecedents, transactions and outcomes. It is important that the evaluator attends to such outcomes as impact of a new programme on the teachers’ perception of their competence, influence of a programme’s outcome on the actions of the administrators, action that is not directly evident at the conclusion of the programme and they should also attend to long range effects too. Stakes argues that outcomes are the consequences of education-
immediate, long range, cognitive, affective, personal and community wide.

**Stufflebeam’s Context, Input, Process Product (CIPP) Model (1971)** is another form of scientific positivistic evaluation model. The CIPP model is a decision making-oriented approach to educational evaluation. This comprehensive evaluation model considers evaluation to be a continuing process which provides management with the necessary information for decision making. Basically, CIPP model comprises three steps namely, delineating the information necessary for collection, obtaining the information and providing the information to interested parties.

![Figure 1: Stufflebeam’s CIPP Model (1971)](image)

**Context Evaluation** involves studying the environment of the programme. It is otherwise known as situation analysis; it focuses on unmet needs, missed opportunities and diagnoses the reason for unmet needs. It is not baseline information regarding the operations and accomplishments of the total system. It addresses such issues as values, goals and beliefs derived from the curriculum, obtains the reading of community, noting key players, history of past curricular activity, physical facilities, judge the pressure for action both for and against generated from within and without the community and school district, determines budget needed and the budget allocated, determines performance outcomes that are important for the school and community. Precisely, context evaluation centres on the general situations that relates to curriculum which makes it clear to be understood.

**Input Evaluation** is designed to provide information and determine how to utilize resources to meet programme goals in terms of energy, time and money.

**Process Evaluation** addresses curriculum implementation of decisions that are central and measure the methods employed to determine the congruence between the planned and actual activities. It serves the
purposes of detecting and predicts defects in the procedural design or its implementation stage by providing information for decision making and maintaining a record of procedures as they occur. 

**Product Evaluation** gathers data to determine whether or not the final curriculum product now in use is accomplishing what it is intended to accomplish. It answers the question to what extent are the objectives created being attained? Product evaluation provides management with information that will enable them decide whether to continue, terminate or abandon the new curriculum.

**Judicial Approach to Evaluation (Adversary Evaluation Approach)** advocates that the evaluator should judge in an impartial and non-value-laden manner. However, even within the scientific camp, individuals are coming to realize that evaluations are made by human beings that have values. This procedure encompasses numerous evaluation activities in which time is scheduled for opposing points of view to be heard. One evaluator or a team member serves as the programme advocate and presents the positive view of the programme. Another evaluator or a team member plays an adversarial role, emphasising problems in the programme. The encounter is very much like a court trial. People to be affected by the new programme have their day in the court. By allowing individuals to present both sides, or opposing view of the new programme, a more accurate view of the new programme is attained. The programme stands or falls on the weight of the evidence furnished.

**Qualitative/naturalistic/humanistic evaluation model**
The five (5) major approaches identified in the qualitative evaluation are interpretive, artistic, systematic, theory driven and critical emancipatory approaches.

**The Interpretive Approach** requires that the evaluators consider the educational scene somewhat as a play with various actors. The evaluator must interpret the meaning and significance of the actor’s actions. The social context of the play should also be taken into account. Apart from interpreting the player’s actions, the actors within the educational drama are also socially constructing and subjectively, interpreting meaning.
Artistic Approach. A key advocate for this approach is Eisner (1975, 2004). The evaluation method is a static inquiry. Much as a connoisseur of fine wine tastes and observes, the individual observes and announces publicly what is good or fine about the curriculum. The evaluators’ attention is focused on the qualities of the relationships between teachers and students. The evaluator in essence is a participant observer and very much involved in the evaluation process.

Systematic Approach seems the most familiar as individuals appear to be as objective as possible in their disposition and base their judgments and evaluation on facts. These individuals more often than not employ descriptions and logical analysis of phenomena observed rather than relying primarily on statistical techniques the hallmark of the scientific positivistic approach.

Theory Driven approach states that the evaluation of curricula is based on a theoretical or philosophical framework. Some individuals judge the quality of school programmes by employing particular theories while others base their judgment on various social theories about class structure, social structures and forces. Social structures and forces are considered as key influencing factors in the action of individuals, curriculum developers, teachers and students. This is in line with the view of Bernstein (1971) who argue that the selection, classification, dissemination and evaluation of educational knowledge which the society considers to the public reflect dominant social values and power structure which control it (Pring, 1975 p.85).

Critical Emancipatory is closely related to theory driven approach. Advocates of this approach to education are usually the radical curricularists. Those individuals judge the quality and effectiveness by how well it rids individuals of these societal forces that constrain their development and fulfilment. These curricularists draw heavily from the work of Habermas (1971) that deals with the construction of knowledge and meaning and critical theory much of which has the imprint of Karl Marx. Habermas (1971) advises that educators should not tie themselves to any of these five major approaches as there are other ways to identify approaches to evaluation as evaluation can be classified as utilitarian or intuitionist.
Utilitarian is closely linked to the scientific approach while intuitionist is tied to the humanistic approach. The utilitarian evaluation operates under the premise that the greatest good is that which will benefit the greatest number of the individuals. This approach of curriculum looks at the large groups such as an entire school or school district. Attention is on total group performance programmes. This will be judged effectively by considering how they affect the larger school and student population. The programmes that allow the greatest number of students to attain the objectives will be judged worthy and appropriate to continue.

Intuitionist education emphasises that data is collected to make judgment on the impact of the programme on each individual or small group. Each person is the best judge of the quality of the programme he experiences. This approach mirrors those advocated by supports of humanistic qualitative evaluation.

**Eisner’s Connoisseurship Evaluation Model**

Eisner (2004) has recommended a process called educational criticism and connoisseurship that will supposedly produce more than hard data and outcome. It will furnish qualitative description of educational life as a consequence of new programmes. Eisner notes that to employ the procedure of educational criticism, evaluators should ask such questions as what has occurred during the school year at a particular school as a result of the new programme. What were the key events? How did such events arise? How did students and teachers participate in these events? What were the reactions of the participants to these events? And not what do the students learn from experiencing the new programme?

These questions focus on process, on school life and on school quality. They differ in kind from questions raised in the quantitative camp. Eisner’s case for educational criticism and connoisseurship draws heavily from the arts. If an individual is to be an illuminating critic of painting, opera theatre, film or even wine, he or she must first be a connoisseur – that is, he or she must possess knowledge about the experience with the type of phenomenon he or she is to criticize. A good critic has awareness and appreciation of the subtle qualities of the situation. He or she can detect and write about the nuances of the situation in ways that help others to become more aware of phenomenon under consideration.
Eisner points out that educational connoisseurship is the art of appreciating the educationally significant. But such appreciation is made public through criticism by emphasising the description, interrelation, and assessment of the situation. In discussing his approach to evaluation, Eisner relies on personal observations, expert’s opinion, and group collaboration instead of scientific validity. Eisner would have the evaluators engage in such qualitative activities as being participant in classroom observe and ask many questions about the quality of the school and the curriculum. An evaluator following Eisner’s model would also engage in a detailed analysis of pupils’ works. He or she would use films, videotapes, photographs, and audio tapes of both teachers and students in action. The person would also take cognizance of what is done, what is said, and perhaps more importantly, what is not done and not said. The evaluator would strive to scribble the tone of the curriculum in action.

Additionally, an evaluator with this orientation might as well employ evaluation by using portfolio analysis. Portfolios are collections of the students’ works that exhibit their progress and achievement in one or more areas. The collection first includes student’s participation in selecting students’ activities and the criteria for judging merit. Portfolios allow people to supply what they think is important for others to judge in order to make an evaluation as to the nature and degree of learning. They allow an educator to picture students in a broader context. In effect help to get a more complete view about what to reflect and evaluate. Eisner makes the point that evaluation should allow for some form of communication to some public school board, local or state government about what has been and is occurring in school. The evaluator presents or describes the educational scene. To some extent, such evaluation takes on a subjective and aesthetic approach. For this reason, it is considered controversial by those who believe in objective and scientific evaluation. Finally, the connoisseurship model has many characteristics of what is sometimes described as responsive evaluation.

Stake's Responsive Evaluation Model (1988) is more concerned with evaluating curriculum or programme activities and processes than intents or outcomes. It relies more on informal and natural communication than formal and standard communication. Like Eisner’s evaluation model, the responsive approach is more concerned with the
portrayed approach of the programme than standardized data, test scores, and goals which some people might label as methodological or objective data. Responsive evaluation requires planning and development, but it relies less on formal statements and research-oriented information than do technical-scientific models of evaluation. Using the responsive approach, the evaluator tells the story of the programme, parents its features, describes the clients and personnel, identifies major issues and problems and reports the accomplishments. The evaluator assumes the posture of a critic reviewing a play or a painter depicting a landscape scene.

To conduct responsive evaluation, Stake (1988) maintains that the evaluator should develop a plan that deals with the scope and activities of the programme. He or she must arrange for individual to make observations, prepare narratives and portrayals, and provide product displays. Because all of us have particular biases, the various audiences of the report must be identified; their feelings and expressions of what is worthwhile and important should be considered. The data reported must be analysed in terms of the audience’s biases (as well as personnel of the programme). They must have a chance to react to the findings. To perform this task, the evaluator will probe and ask questions. Various participants and audiences may become defensive and seek to avoid or confront the evaluator. However, important questions about quality must be examined and processed. Stake (1988) outlines ten steps of responsive evaluation as applied to evaluating a curriculum.

1) Negotiate a framework for evaluation with the sponsors.
2) Elicit topics, issues, and/or questions of concern from the sponsors.
3) Formulate questions for guiding the evaluation
4) Identify the scope and activities of the curriculum; identify the needs of clients and personnel.
5) Observe, interview, and prepare logs and case studies, and so on.
6) Document the information; identify the major issues or questions.
7) Present initial findings in a tentative report.
8) Analyze reactions and investigate predominant concerns more fully.
9) Look for conflicting evidence that would validate findings, as well as collaborative evidence that would support findings.

10) Report the results.

Many of these steps are related to goal-free evaluation, which is concerned with the biases of evaluation. In goal-free evaluation, the evaluator is expected to be objective, not influenced by the goals or objectives of the programme or the values of the programme developer or sponsors.

**Illuminative Evaluation Model**

Illuminative evaluation model propounded by Parlett and Hamilton (1972) is naturalistic approach to evaluation. It is sometimes called explication. It strives to furnish a complete picture of the educational programme. This model illuminates problems and significant features of an educational programme. The method allows the evaluator to discern the total programme and to gather data about the particular working of the programme. There are three steps to the model: observation, further inquiry and explanation.

- **Observation**: The first stage involves a general look at the programme to orient oneself to the programme and to describe the context within which the curriculum is being delivered. Attention is given to all factors that might influence the programme. Thus, data can be gathered on the arrangement of school subjects, the types of teaching and learning styles evident, the materials being used, and even the types of evaluation methods employed by the teacher.

- **Further Inquiry**: Here the evaluator brings to focus the evaluation, separating the significant from the trivial. During this second stage, the evaluator strives to get in touch with those affected by the programme to gain an understanding of how the programme works, but also why it works. Further inquiry or progressive focusing emerges out of continuously examining the programme in action. This means that, the evaluator spends extended time in the field. He or she also gathers data by examining school documents and portfolios of the students’
works’ and from interviews and questionnaires with members of staff and parents.

- **Explanation:** The evaluator using this model is not attempting to pass judgment on the programme, but rather to furnish data on what is happening with the programme and why. The evaluator’s explanations are presented to those affected by the programme. Upon receiving such information these people can then engage in decision making.

The illuminative model assumes an artistic perspective, insisting that education is a complex and dynamic set of interactions. These interactions are to be observed and evaluated holistically and subjectively because they cannot be broken down into artificial ways or discrete categories for objective measurement. Illumination deals with the unintended categories and parts. It deals with the subtle aspects of the environment especially the items that are often missed or discarded by the so-called objective observer. Illuminative evaluators try to avoid taking sides, that is, which perspective is correct. They accept the validity of both scientific and humanistic approaches to evaluation. They contend that there are weaknesses and strengths in both approaches. In effect, Humanistic/Naturalistic and Scientific Positivistic Evaluation Models are complementary.

Cronbach had identified the scientific and humanistic approaches to evaluation as opposite extreme on evaluation continuum. Advocates of the scientific approach favour clinical or objective experiments and advocates of humanistic approach consider experiments mis-informative. Cronbach had described these popular approach as based on an ideal that is very different from ideals that underline the scientific approach hence there is need to explore and utilize alternatives to traditional evaluation procedures. Those who approach evaluation from a humanistic or naturalistic posture analyse data collected in a way that differ significantly from that found in a scientific evaluation.

Further in clarifying the two model, House (2004) asserts that evaluation has moved from monolithic to pluralistic conceptions to multiple methods, multiple criteria perspective and multiple audiences and commented that qualitative methods are indeed appropriate means of collecting data rather than viewing the two basis in conflicting
with each other. Therefore, this gives the approaches in the qualitative evaluation to possess the features of interpreting the meaning and significance of the actors’ action, engaging in artistic inquiring, realistic epistemology that real world existed, theoretical and philosophical frame work, judging the Quality of effectiveness as a criterion employed to make judgment.

**Scientific Approach of Evaluation**

Scientific approach to curriculum evaluation favours clinical or objective experiment and a belief in the true experiment, and concentration of efforts on the learners in form of data collection through test scores. Information collected is quantitative and can be analysed statistically. It draws on methods that have been utilized by physical scientists and positivists in their orientation to the world. They possess different senses of reality and specialized in monolithic method of viewing the world.

**Scientific – Positivistic Evaluation Model**

Scientific-positivistic evaluation models represent the beginnings of the modern era of programme evaluation. In this approach evaluation is organized in seven steps to serve the purpose of achieving the outcome of educational goals thus:

1. Focusing on the goals and objectives of the programme
2. Classifying objectives
3. Defining objectives in behavioural terms
4. Finding situation in which achievement can be shown
5. Developing or selecting measurement techniques
6. Collecting students performance data
7. Comparing data against objectives

Scientific-positivistic evaluative model, according to Cronbach (1963) in Orstein and Hunkins (1998) are classified into four main studies.

1. Provus’s discrepancy evaluation model
2. Stake’s congruence – contingency model
3. Stuffle beam’s context, input, process and product model

Provus’s discrepancy evaluation model is a good example of scientific-positivist approaches to evaluation which combines evaluation with
systems management theory. It consists of four (4) component and five (5) stages of evaluation.

1. Determining programme standard
2. Determining programme performance
3. Comparing performance with standard
4. Determining whether or not a discrepancy exists between performance and standards.

**Stages of Provus’s Discrepancy Evaluation Model**

1. **Design:** This entails a comparison of the programme design with prescribed standards or criteria. It is examined to determine if it is internally sound. i.e. adequacy of space, personnel, resources, materials e.t.c. Any discrepancy that exists between the programme design and design standard is reported to the decision maker who decides whether it should be rejected, modified or accepted.

2. **Installation:** The actual operation of the programme is compared with the installation standard or fidelity criteria. The characteristics of the programme are evaluated including everything e.g. facility, media students, staff qualification. If any discrepancies are noted they are reported to the decision maker for appropriate action.

3. **Process:** The processes are evaluated and if the processes are inadequate it should be reported to decision makers for appropriate action.

4. **Product:** The effect of the whole programme is evaluated in terms of the original goals. The information gained here will assist decision makers about whether the programme is worthwhile and should be continued or modified or terminated.

5. **Cost:** In this stage the programme is compared with products of similar programmes and is evaluated in terms of cost-benefits. If they are not clearly explained, one may ask whether or not the result are in line with the cost and not only in terms of money but morale and time taken.

**Stake’s Congruence – Contingency Model**

Stake (1988) distinguishes between formal evaluation procedures while recognizing that educational evaluation continues to depend on casual observation, implicit goals, intuitive norms and subjective judgment. It is noted that educators should strive to establish more formal
evaluation procedures. Formal procedures are objectives rather than subjective and aim at furnishing data so that descriptions can be made and judgment remembered regarding the programme that has been evaluated. In this trend, those involved in curriculum evaluation must make judgments in addition to reporting data. Stake opines that data must be organized into three body of information i.e Antecedents, transactions and outcomes.

1. Antecedent is any condition that exists prior to teaching and learning that may influence outcomes. It could be the characteristics of the students prior to their lessons, aptitude, psychological profile scores, grade, discipline and attendance as well as teachers characteristics such as years of experience, teacher’s behaviour rating and education, teaching aids etc.

2. Transactions occur between and among students and teachers as well as resource people. This deals with interaction about particular curriculum materials and classroom environments. It also considers time allocation because if any problem is noticed, students cannot learn well in the process of teaching and instruction. The main point in this approach concerns outcomes and products.

3. The outcomes are the result of antecedents and transactions which is the inter play between input and process. In dealing with outcome, one should match what is intended and what is observed.

**Judicial Approach to Evaluation: (Judge in taking decision)**

This approach believes that the evaluator should judge in an impartial and non-value laden manner. It is also called the adversary evaluation approach as it encompasses numerous procedures or activities in which time is scheduled for opposing point of view to be heard. One evaluating team member serves as the programme advocate representing the positive views of the programme while other plays an adversary role. The encounter is like a court trial. The programmes stand or fall on the basis of the weight of the evidence furnished. Adversary approach may serve not only judging the value and effectiveness of a programme but also give both the community within the school and outside the school a broad view of the programme and also the underlying rationale.
Humanistic or Naturalistic Evaluation Model

Humanistic or naturalistic approach of evaluation advocates humanistic qualitative approach to evaluation and considers experiments misinformative. It adopts naturalistic posture, analysed data collected qualitatively. The data collected rely more on impression or what is observed. Evaluated and analysed data gain from interviews and observations and proven to multiple criteria and multiple audiences. This evaluation model views has many realities and the evaluator are influenced by his or her own values. This approach argues for a more holistic engagement that presents much more details. We get portraits of the situation we are evaluating, it focuses more on human interactions than on outcomes and more on the quality than or the quantity of classroom or school life.

Scientific approach may have revealed data that depicted what people did but naturalistic approaches while interested in that are also concerned about delivering into the why behind the what of performance. It stresses interpretative understanding rather than on objectives explanation. Situation where scientific evaluation might just ask what did students learn, but humanistic or naturalistic evaluators might query the actual value of the knowledge that is known or presented in the curriculum. Observed curriculum through political and social issues of the programme is not about the content alone but also about the social significance of the content. It is traditional in nature. Some of the major contributions to humanistic evaluation are Eisner’s Connoisseurship evaluation model, Stake’s responsive evaluation model, Illuminative evaluation model and Portraiture model.

Eisner in Ornstein and Hunkins (1998) recommended a process called educational criticism and connoisseurship where he advocates more hard data and outcomes which will furnishes a rich or qualitative description of educational enterprise as a consequence of new programmes. This model employs the procedure of evaluation criticism, evaluators ask question as to what has occurred during the school year at a particular school as a result of a new programme. What are the key events? How did such event arise? How did students and teachers participate in the event? And what are the reactions of the participants in these events? e.t.c Which focus on process, on school life and on school quality? The model further observed that if an individual is to be an illuminating critic of any art e.g painting, theatre, film etc he must first be a connoisseur, i.e. he or she must possess
knowledge about and experience with the type of phenomenon he or she is to criticize. Eisner opines that the educational connoisseurship is the art of appreciating the educationally significant and it is made in a public through criticism. The descriptions, interpretation and assessment of the situations rely on personal observations, expert opinion, and group corroboration instead of scientific validity, detailed analysis of pupils work e.g present film, video to ask question of what is done and describe the tone of curriculum in action. Portfolios analysis about students’ works to know their progress and success in one area or more would also be useful. Portfolio is used to allow people to supply what they think is important for others to judge so as to make an evaluation decision as to the nature and degree of learning. Through this evaluation, it allows for some forms of communication to those concerned about what has been occurring in the school. It has a characteristic of what is called responsive evaluation.

Stake’s in Orstein and Hunkins (1998) is more concerned with evaluating curriculum or programme activities and processes than intents or outcomes. He relies mostly on informal and natural communication than formal and standard communication. He gives concern to responsive approach with the portrayal of the programme than standard data, test scores and goals. This requires planning and development, and relies less on formal statements and research-oriented information than do scientific model of evaluation. He considers identification, feelings and expressions of what is worthwhile and is important; analysis of the data in terms of audience biases and creates time to react to the findings. To do this, the evaluator will probe and ask questions. It is a kind of goal-free evaluation in which the evaluator is expected to be objective.

Illuminative Evaluation Model focuses on a complete picture of the educational programme. Parlett and Harmilton (1972) developed this approach which allows the evaluator to discern the total programme and to gather data about the particular working of the programme. The three steps to the model when using them to explain issues are observation, further inquiry and explanation.

- **Observation**: A general look at the programme giving attention to all factors that might influence the programme, gather data on the arrangement of school subject, type and styles of teaching and learning that are evident, the material being used and the type of evaluation employed.
- **Further Inquiry:** This brings to focus the evaluation separating the significant from the trivial by getting the individual affected by the programme to gain an understanding and getting students and staff portfolios through data collection i.e interview and questionnaire.

- **Explanation:** There is need to furnish data on what is happening with the programme and why. The explanations are presented to those affected by the programme which after are engaged in decision making.

- **Illumination approach** assumes an artistic perspective, insisting that education is a complex and dynamic set of interactions. This interaction is to be observed holistically and subjectively since it cannot be broken down into artificial way of discrete data for objective measurement. Illumination deals with the untended category and parts; and also deals with the subtle aspect of the environment. It tries to avoid taking side on which to accept either scientific or humanistic approach to evaluation and contends that there are weaknesses and strengths in both approaches.

- **Portraiture Model:** This is not strictly an evaluation model. According to Lawrence-Lightfoot (2005), the model draws from the field of anthropology and states that an evaluator will go into a field or school and observe what is occurring regarding curriculum, conduct interview and questionnaire to create a strong description in form of narrative to record what happened after getting the necessary information.

**Conclusion**

Despite the very crucial roles of humanistic approach or study in evaluation, the two major studies or approaches to evaluation are very crucial in the field of education. To a large extent, the result will depend on the method an individual engages to attain his desirable goals in order to obtain an intended outcome or make decision about educational programme.
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