Evaluation language

1. Introduction

In accordance with the communication science, evaluation has to be called “the blurred genre”. This means that evaluation is a heterogeneous phenomenon with no distinct borders, created as a result of infiltration of various life spheres. The hybrid character of evaluation may to some extent underlay the situation described by K. Olejniczak. On the one hand, Polish evaluation research is being dynamically developed both in terms of number and quality. On the other hand, “it is addressed to the small public, its results are published in media and do not become the subject of public debate, and the conclusions are poorly used.”

The author quoted above also described the complex reasons for the unproductiveness of evaluation research. At present, we are interested in the last link of this complicated chain – communication on research. The hypothesis of this text is as follows:

the improper way of writing about evaluation research hampers the use of its results and conveying the conclusions to the public.

Hence the paper discussed the communication ineffectiveness of evaluators and institutions commissioning the research. It is possible that the ineffectiveness is the result of the above-mentioned “blurring”. In this case, communication problems may result from the disorientation of researchers-evaluators performing several social roles at a time, who are forced to use various types of language.

It should be noted that the basic domain of evaluators is science. Their typical roles are an expert and a teacher while the dominant styles are – scientific and popular scientific. The commissioning institutions, however, act in formal and legal context. Therefore, their typical roles cover the role of an official and a contractor (styles: official and legal). There are also other reasons for the unclear interpretation of evaluation research, especially: power and political context (relation: government – citizen, directive and propaganda style), economic context (employer – employee) and media context (experts – journalists).

The described communication problem may consist in the fact that scientists, performing all these roles, not always know how to adjust their language to the present context. As a result, the recognised
researchers do not completely find themselves in the role of evaluators. Their troubles, however, are not connected to content-related or methodological issues, but to the communication ones.

One of the basic skills of a good evaluator is the ability to communicate effectively with the varied audience from a non-scientific background. There are two particularly significant groups of recipients. The first one covers high-level officials and politicians (decision-makers) who are supposed to make specific decisions on the basis of the results of evaluation research. The other one is the group of expert (e.g. economic and political) journalists reporting the results of evaluation research to the rest of the society.

To put it simple, it may be assumed that journalists and decision-makers are the model recipients of evaluation reports. What is more, although representatives of both groups speak different languages (styles) and perform different social functions, they have more in common than differences. Both journalists and decision-makers:

- have little time to read reports,
- need the same most important information on the research (goals, conclusions and recommendations),
- are not scientists,
- have similar education and language skills.

Both groups (decision-makers and journalists) have significant influence on the usefulness and effectiveness of evaluation. The research results will not be disseminated or translated into the specific measures without the appropriate communication strategy since it will not be possible for the assumed recipients to acquire them (due to the lack of time and specialist knowledge). Therefore, it is necessary to adopt an effective and communicative writing style tailored to the requirements set by decision-makers and journalists. This style should be above all characterised by simple, fast and compact messaging of the most important information on the conducted research.

Of course it is possible to empirically verify the above hypothesis on the uncommunicative character of the evaluation language. Research covering ca. 300 Polish evaluation reports of 2002-2010 (3/4 of all texts) was conducted. One general research question was formed: what is the level of communicability of these documents? The following issues were the subject of interest:

1. Is the language of the reports adjusted to the level of non-expert recipients’ competences (mostly decision-makers and journalists)?
2. Does the structure of the reports make it easier to acquire the results and make decisions?

2. Description of research

Corpus methods41 and textometric tools42 were used in the research on the communicability of the reports. The collection of the reports was divided into three groups. The first one consisted of research initial summaries (SUMMARIES), the second one – all analytical chapters (ANALYSES), and the third one – conclusions and recommendations (RECOMMENDATIONS). The forth sub-corpus was formed of separate summary leaflets (LEAFLETS)43 based on the reports. Such division enabled to compare the

43 Evaluation corpus (EW) consisted of over 7 million text words, including: ANALYSES – 6,482,006 text words; SUMMARIES – 367,092, RECOMMENDATIONS – 439,603, LEAFLETS – 11,237 text words.
The communicability of different parts of the reports. Because it was assumed that the language of summaries, conclusions, recommendations and leaflets should be much more intelligible than the scientific parts – i.e. analyses (see Fig. 1).

The model was adopted as a result of realistic estimate of the situation. Decision-makers (officials, politicians) and journalists have no time (and often also competences) to read the whole evaluation report. They usually confine themselves to reading the information leaflet and summary of the report. Thus stakeholders are indirectly informed about evaluation – not on the basis of the whole reports but their summaries. This adopted indirect communication model including experts and specialists has been functioning for a long time in large companies and corporations. Lately, it has also been used in public administration, media and foreign evaluation research. Summaries written specially for decision-makers are called executive summaries. They are mainly aimed at providing the most important information crucial for making fast decisions (Fig. 2), and not full and chronological content of the report.

Reports prepared by evaluators were compared with other corpora of public texts (selected in accordance with special criteria) in terms of language intelligibility. These were (the abbreviated name of the corpus is given in parentheses):

- corpus of texts on European Funds [EF] prepared on commission of the managing authorities, similar to evaluation reports in terms of content,

Fig. 1. The accessibility of language of different parts of the report (perfect model)

Fig. 2. Information flow after evaluation research

44 See M.C. Alkin, op. cit.; L. Whittaker, About Executive Summaries; Writing Guide: Executive Summaries.
• corpus of scientific texts [SS&H] in disciplines characteristic to evaluators,
• corpus of press text on evaluation [PRESS-EV] written by journalists on the basis of the studied reports,
• corpus of elite press texts – “Rzeczpospolita” daily and “Newsweek” weekly, representative for opinion-forming press [ELITE PRESS],
• corpus of tabloid texts, representative for popular press [TABLOID],
• corpus of texts presenting everyday Polish language (spoken by a typical Pole) [EVERYDAY POLISH].

Thanks to the additional corpora, language of the reports was in the network of points of reference and, thereby, accurate comparative research was enabled. The particular subject of interest was whether the level of communicability of the reports has impact on: EU grant discourse and administration language, scientific style and style of newspapers articles (Fig. 3).

Fig. 3. Evaluation reports in the comparative corpora network

3. Communication challenges

One may ask: what does it mean “to speak/write in a communicative way”?

Intelligibility of public statements and documents is one of the greatest challenges to be faced by public speakers. It is worth to emphasize that the present global approach to this issue is changing. More and more often the social elite comes to a conclusion that educational activities should be accompanied by a change of public language with the view to make it clearer for each and every citizen. Such action often becomes an institutional and systemic issue, i.e. the simplified language is introduced via appropriate social campaigns or even legal regulations. What is worth to be emphasised, is the fact that

---

they are aimed at significant simplification of the level of text difficulty and at development of techniques of providing information in a fast and effective manner to all citizens — regardless of their education and communication skills.

At present, there are two global trends in public sphere supporting this objective.

The first one is the need for preparing and disseminating the simplified version of a national language, i.e. Plain Language standard, in public communication.

The other one, is the need for searching for new, more effective and simpler forms of providing visual information.

Both these strategies — i.e. plain language and information visualisation — are aimed at increasing the rage of recipients of mass contents and including each citizen to the public sphere.

For the above-mentioned reasons, a demand for language simplification and introduction of the principles of effective visualisation applies also to evaluation research. Of course, this article does not discuss the issue of data visualisation. However, let us take a closer look at matter of communicability of various types of public sphere statements.46

4. Communication – adjustment to the recipient

One of the most important and basic techniques facilitating intelligibility is the adjustment of a text to the recipient’s discourse. At the level of an individual statement this phenomenon is manifested as a stylistic feature called readability. A readable statement is the one that does not focus reader’s attention at a perceptive (sensory) and formal level and enables fast and smooth transition to the semantic level (creating sentences, paragraphs and global meaning).

There are many factors of text readability. The following parameters were selected for the research of evaluation reports:

1. Length of paragraphs – a surface topographical feature measured with the average number of words in a paragraph.
2. Vagueness of a text — measured by the Gunning FOG index.47 This index estimates the years of formal education needed to understand the statement. The Gunning formula includes the following detailed variables:
   1. length (difficulty) of the sentences – measured with the number of lexemes in a sentence,
   2. general number of words in a text,
   3. number of difficult (long) words.
3. Lexical similarity — means the degree to which the word set of a text is similar to the vocabulary of any comparative text (corpus).
4. Verbal/nominal style index — expressed in the ratio of nouns to verbs.

This model assumes that texts about evaluation research (reports, leaflets, etc.) should be sufficiently readable in order to be read effortlessly, i.e. adjusted to skills of decision-makers and journalists, and preferably — typical Poles, in terms of the above-mentioned parameters.

46 The basic problem to be dealt with in Poland while developing the Plain Language standard is the adaptation of its rules to the specifics of Polish language. This text will focus on one of the parameters of communicability — intelligibility. High intelligibility of a text is an initial condition for effective communication and, thereby, development of a simplified language.

5. Are evaluation reports readable? – Evaluation discourse against public communication

Paragraphs length

The first feature determining the level of text readability is the length of paragraphs. Evaluation texts should be similar in this matter to texts read/written by the presumed recipients. In this case evaluation reports are well-assessed. Paragraph length (measured with the number of words) is almost the same as in newspaper texts on evaluation. Therefore, as for the surface level one may say that evaluation reports are edited in a readable manner, i.e. they consist of short paragraphs, many lists and specifications and, thus, do not resemble scientific texts.

![Mean paragraph length chart](image)

Fig. 4. Paragraph length in evaluation reports and comparative corpora. EF = European Funds, EV = evaluations, PRESS-EV = articles about evaluation, SS&H = social sciences and humanities, RP = „Rzeczpospolita” (ELITE PRESS), TABLOID = „Fakt”

Lexical similarity

Next parameter determining text readability is the similarity of vocabulary used therein to that known and used by recipients. In this case there are two extreme points of reference. One is the commonly known general Polish vocabulary, the second one – specialist and complicated scientific vocabulary. According to the lexical similarity analysis, evaluation reports’ vocabulary is equally unlike the scientific style vocabulary and general vocabulary. Evaluation texts lexis is close to the vocabulary of texts on European Funds at the lexical similarity chart (see Fig). How this fact should be explained? – In terms of words, evaluation discourse is identical to grant discourse, i.e. style of texts on European Funds. There are no visible impacts of either general Polish language or scientific style. These results prove – at least at the lexical level – the phenomenon often referred to as eurojargon. In accordance with the chart below, journalists writing about evaluation (PRASA-EW) know how to avoid the eurojargon and they come close to the general newspaper style in terms of vocabulary.
Vagueness of a text – FOG index

One of the most important indices of text readability is the level of vagueness (FOG index). It is significant for several reasons. First of all – the FOG index is a comprehensive index, i.e. it includes both lexical (vocabulary difficulty) and syntactic (sentence difficulty) features. Secondly, thanks to the Gunning formula one may predict reading skills of the text recipient (determined by the years of education).\footnote{Measures of text difficulty based on the sentence length and ratio of difficult words were criticised as oversimplified and naive. See A. Bailin, A. Grafstein, \textit{The linguistic assumptions underlying readability formulae: a critique}, [in:] \textit{Language and Communication}, 21, 2001, pp. 292–299. Despite that, they are still considered as useful to estimate the real text difficulty. See A. Davies, A. Irvine, \textit{Comparing text difficulty and text readability in the evaluation of an extensive reading programme}, [in:] M. Milanovic, N. Saville (Ed.), \textit{Performance Testing, Cognition and Assessment}, CUP, Cambridge 1996, p. 170. These refer to the idea of the average recipient, and enable the definition of text readability without the need to perform expensive experiments See G. Fulcher, \textit{Text difficulty and accessibility: reading formulae and expert judgement}, \textit{“System”} 25/4, 1997, p. 501. It seems that lately – in accordance with neuropsychological research – FOG and related formulae should be rehabilitated: long sentences and long or rare words extend the process of understanding a text. See O. Hauk, F. Pulvermüller, \textit{Effects of word length and frequency on the human event-related potential}, \textit{“Clinical Neurophysiology”} 115, 2004, pp. 1090–1103; H.J. Haarmann, K.A. Cameron, \textit{Active maintenance of sentence meaning in working memory: Evidence from EEG coherences}, \textit{“International Journal of Psychophysiology”} 97, 2005, pp. 115–128; B. Penolazzi, O. Hauk, F. Pulvermüller, \textit{Early semantic context integration and lexical access as revealed by event-related brain potentials}, \textit{“Biological Psychology”} 74, 2007, pp. 374–388.}

As a result of comparing the level of vagueness of various corpora one may state that the Polish evaluators address their reports to their own scientific community. High FOG index (17) proves that the model recipient of these texts is a person whose education lasted 17 years. At the same time, it may seem that the non-readability of evaluation texts is not dependent on the difficulty of subject thereof. It is rather the matter of one of the manners of scientific style – artificial intellectualisation and language complication (according to the principle “the more complicated, the smarter”). This thesis is confirmed by the comparison of evaluation reports and articles about evaluation written by journalists. Conclusions are interesting: journalists – while writing their articles on the basis of the reports – know how to “render” them into the simple everyday newspaper language. As a result, the FOG index is significantly lower (12).
Unfortunately, one may suppose that the adjustment of difficult information from the reports to readers’ language (non-experts) takes a lot of time.

It is worth to review the two components of the FOG index more closely: length of sentences and ratio of long (difficult) words.

Fig. 6. Vagueness of language of reports and comparative corpora. EVERYDAY POLISH = Corpus of Frequency Polish Dictionary

Fig. 7. Fraction of difficult words in dependence of FOG and mean sentence length (in white – verbal style, in black – nominal style; fraction of difficult words – in percentages)

In accordance with data presented at the chart, vocabulary of evaluation texts is even insignificantly more difficult than scientific vocabulary (22.7% and 19.6% respectively) and resembles texts about European Funds (the vocabulary of which is the most difficult of all our corpora! – 23.7%). However,
as far as sentence length is considered, evaluation texts are typical for scientific texts (22 and 23 words respectively in the average sentence). What is significant about texts of the highest FOG index (FOG above 15) is their nominal style (see below). Clearer texts (FOG below 15) are characterised by verbal style.

**Nominality of style**

The last parameter determining text readability is the so-called nominality of style. It is specified on the basis of the ratio of two parts of speech: verb and noun. In everyday communication, spoken language, the balance is maintained: one noun per one verb. In written texts, there are more nouns. In difficult texts – written in nominal style – the ratio is significantly disturbed: there are 4 to 7 times more nouns than verbs.

![Diagram showing the ratio of nouns to verbs in different types of texts](image)

Fig. 8. Nominal and verbal styles of comparative corpora

---

49 In spoken conversation Polish language verb slightly predominates over noun (N/V = 0.80), while there is more nouns in Polish telephone dialogue language (N/V = 1.40). In Polish drama and radio plays, i.e. in written Polish close to the spoken language, ratio of verbs to nouns is almost perfectly balanced (N/V = 1.01). See J. Ożdżyński, Mówione warianty wypowiedzi w środowisku sportowym [Spoken variants of utterances in sport environment], Ossolineum, Wrocław 1979, p. 61; I. Kamińska-Szmaj, Różnice leksykalne między stylami funkcjonalnymi polszczyzny pisanej analiza statystyczna na materiale słownika frekwencyjnego [Lexical differences between functional styles of written Polish language. Statistical analysis on the basis of frequency dictionary], University of Wrocław, Wrocław 1990, pp. 136–137; M. Marciniak (ed.), Anotowany korpus dialogów telefonicznych [Annotated corpus of telephone conversations], EXIT, Warsaw 2010, p. 67.

As one can see, all journalistic texts are written in communicative verbal style, while texts on European Funds and, to a lesser degree, scientific texts are written in difficult and unclear nominal style. Unfortunately, in this case evaluation reports are again most similar to texts on EF and, thus they are unreadable for an average reader.

**Diversity of evaluation language**

As stated above, decision-makers and journalists are not able to insightfully read an entire evaluation report under the contemporary model of evaluation. This means that the burden of information about research and results thereof (including recommendations) falls on the executive summaries. This concerns, first of all, summaries, conclusions and recommendations, as well as information brochures that, due to their executive function, should be written in a simple and communicative, yet precise language.

How does it look like in the Polish evaluation research? Are the mentioned strategic genres actually written in a simpler and more communicative language?

To answer this question, we have divided the main corpus into 4 independent sub-corpora. Let us recall: the first one comprised of report summaries, the second – analyses, the third – conclusions and recommendations, the fourth – information brochures. Comparison of the language used in these fragments allows for an assertion that evaluators, when writing a report, do not change the language, meaning that they edit it at a constant (high) level of difficulty (see Fig. 9). This means that both summaries and brochures, as well as recommendations are not adjusted to perception capabilities of assumed recipients (decision-makers and journalists). What is more, a trend is even noticeable towards insignificant increase in text difficulty as regards the synthetic and consolidated parts (just like in the case of summaries or recommendations).

![Fig. 9. Comparison of the level of vagueness of various report parts and comparative corpora](image-url)
Summary

Detailed comparative research confirms the hypothesis about the hybrid nature of evaluation research. So far, Polish evaluators have not adjusted their style to the level of recipients. Few positive solutions are only superficial (they apply to the division of the text into paragraphs). In terms of syntax (structure of sentences), they do not differ from scientific texts, and as regards vocabulary they resemble difficult texts on European Funds (written in the so-called eurojargon). A typical recipient of this type of messages is a person with scientific competences (FOG > 17). This condition is fulfilled by the researchers themselves and – due to vocabulary – officials specialising in the issues of EU subsidies. Two representative examples are as follows. In the first one, the sentence is too extensive (43 words!). In the other, the sentence is unnecessarily broken by digressions and subordinate clauses.

At the same time, it should be concluded that most of these indicators are not directly connected with the indicator system for individual Operational Programmes that should be structured in a manner allowing for their full operationalisation and use thereof in current monitoring and during evaluation research already at the evaluation and mid-term stage.

It seems important for the monitoring of programme’s implementation to cover, beside the values, also the level of total investment expenditure, including the level per employee, and/or the absorption level for EU funds as regards individual priorities and individual years.

Another disturbing trend is also noticeable in Polish evaluation texts. The authors of reports do not make the language easier at places decisive as it comes to the efficient use of research results. The language used in summaries, recommendations and information brochures is as complicated and unreadable as the one used in the analytical part. The failure to use simple language, and what is more important, the inability to write clear and synthetic summaries and recommendations in such a style can cause inefficiency of Polish evaluation research. This problem is illustrated by another example. This is a prolix beginning of a certain summary:

A research project has been designed as a research in the scope of applied social science. This means that data and information collected and processed as a result of project implementation were and will be a starting point for the formulation of multidimensional diagnosis of functioning of Intermediate Body in the scope under examination and for the formulation of recommendations oriented at improvement and optimisation of its measures in the future.

Both the journalists and official decision-makers expect brief, condensed, yet transparent information about the research and recommendations. It should be also pointed out that the journalists themselves write about evaluation very well (in a communicative manner) – they can significantly simplify the language of reports that they use.
6. Main language mannerism of reports – prolixity of the writing style

Evaluation reports are written by experts and hence they reflect stylistic features of specialist (scientific) utterances. This does not mean, however, that they can be successfully used to convey knowledge about evaluation to both target groups. These texts are difficult to perceive at the first reading, and they require repeated analysis of the information included therein. The main factor hindering the perception of reports by non-experts (e.g. journalists or decision-makers) is scientific formulation of the writing style (syntactic form and text organisation). Difficulty in perception is deepened by the knowledge about the world included in scientific reports, and thus financial and administrative EF issues found in documents submitted for expert’s elaboration. Therefore, the difficult report language results from the combination of the form of scientific text (e.g. abstract reasoning, message based on evidence and circumstances, utterances reflecting analytical reasoning, valuation of phenomena in question, precise classification of data, etc.) with the knowledge on EU and EF (scientific and legal terminology, administrative terminology, patterns typical for official expressions, tendency to use precise administrative terms, etc.). Complex message style is not beneficial for conveying the knowledge and hence presenting the phenomena assessed by experts in the form of specific hints, instructions, advice and practical information. In these texts, two style mannerisms collide that limit the transparency of language and disturb the effectiveness of expression (adjustment thereof to communication competences and demand of recipients). Without dwelling on the details, they include: the features of scientific style (i.e. formal formulation of reports) and paraphrase of formal administrative EU language (terminology, linguistic template and expressions typical for texts about EF written by administrative employees). Communicative relations are illustrated by the following chart:

![Diagram](attachment:chart.png)

Fig. 10. Impact of scientific style and official jargon of the EU administration on the style of evaluation reports

---

The language of evaluation reports contains a lot of difficult vocabulary, yet in terms of semantics it does not differ when compared to other scientific genres. The aspect that is most difficult in perception turns out to be the structure (form) of words and the method of combining them (in single word combinations and longer utterances). Should these combinations be unclear, such a feature is called **style nominalisation**. It consists in using lexical forms with preference of nouns over verbs in texts (as described previously). It is one of the features of these utterances in which the attitude of scientific writing about the world is reflected (intellectualisation of thinking about the world) and abstract expression. At the vocabulary level, they are usually expressed by:

- abstract nouns (e.g. findings, evaluation, increase in something, articulation, specifics, field, transposition, issue, process, strategy, competitiveness, demarcation, etc.);
- adjectives with quite general and unclear meaning (e.g. specific, strong, individual, precise, development-oriented, innovative, operational, necessary, broad, exact, diagnostic, etc.);
- deverbal and verbal nouns (e.g. achieving, planning, adjusting, accepting, monitoring, reviewing, applying, functioning, endangering, entering, etc.);
- participles (e.g. manifested, achieved, balanced, etc.);
- comparative expressions and extended adverbs (e.g. of nature, in a manner, with a view to, at the level of, in the field of, due to, completely, of a type, of characters, in the scope, by way of, etc.);
- scientific terminological and semantic neologisms (allocation, diversification, extrapolation, extensive accumulation and others).

The indicated lexical types make the sentences extremely extensive. In addition, they are characterised by abstract meaning and reduction in the role of personal verb forms (expressing specific actions, activities and measures). Therefore, the utterances become prolix (more difficult to perceive), and semantic fields included therein refer to data, facts, details and subtle properties of phenomena under discussion, decreasing the importance of specific hints, recommendations and advice.

Examples of the difference between the nominal (prolix) and the verbal style (recommended by linguists) are presented in the sentence below with changed structure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not readable sentence</th>
<th>Readable sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only comprehensive approach to analysis gives a guarantee of clearly increased effectiveness.</td>
<td>Only full analysis guarantees effectiveness [of something]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The importance of scientific message in this case was not reduced, instead the point of view desirable for evaluation reports has changed: the recipient’s perspective came to the foreground (information on the impact of analysis) instead of the author’s perspective (abstract analysis description). A lot of abstract opinions can be simplified by changing dysfunctional linguistic structures, constituted mainly by **periphrastic expressions** (meaning complex strings of lexemes detailing or multiplying meanings of simpler expressions). They consist mainly of **analytical structures** (approach to analysis = analysis, give guarantee = guarantee) or **redundant structures – pleonasms and tautologies** (clearly increased effectiveness = increased effectiveness). These linguistic structures usually lead to long syntactic units and focus the attention of recipients on details weakening the importance of indications, recommendations, information about specific activities. There are quite a lot of them in evaluation reports.

Analytical structures are typical for official messages, including scientific and administrative style. They feature primarily complex (and hence prolix) wording structure and superiority of a component
that could be omitted without (major) modification in meaning (e.g. the fact that (superordinate)… + impact (subordinate) = the impact// to influence)\textsuperscript{52}. Analytisms mainly introduce abstract reasoning to the text, and hence increase details of description, differences between subject of description and expose the categories of quoted terms (quantitative, qualitative, spatial, temporary, genre-related, etc.). In other words, recipients focus their attention not on “what and how it works// what is it”, but on “what is what// what are its features”.

Another linguistic means extending the structure of utterances is constituted by periphrastic combinations doubling the meaning of the words that have already been used in the text. This collection consists of redundant structures\textsuperscript{53} containing pleonasm\textsuperscript{s} (expressions whose subordinate element repeats the meaning of the superordinate element, e.g. completely (subordinate) + eradicate (superordinate) = eradicate) and tautologies (coordinate combinations of semantically equivalent words, e.g. scarce and concise). Redundant structures are dysfunctional because of at least two reasons: they usually cause a lot of logical mistakes in the utterances, besides they do not contribute any new information to the text and only deepen the emotionality of message and valuation of description. Currently, they are used most frequently as wide-spread expressions common in colloquial style (e.g. to descend down) or in the journalist style (e.g. urban agglomeration, water reservoir).

The prolixity of evaluation reports is caused by syntactic and textual elements, in which the tendency of recipients to emphasise their own point of view, to extend the analysis is reflected, as well as tendency towards scientific narration and valuation of the description alone. Information and content of texts is unnecessarily obscured by numerous metatextual expressions, appositions and comments about the text. Notably when they contain secondary content weakening concrete opinions, e.g.:

\begin{quote}
Even in case of absence of experience in this respect, such a situation can be resolved in a very optimal manner in the expert's opinion through implementation of partner projects.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Too short time for development of competition documentation is counted from the moment of announcing the call for proposals until its closure.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Very often it is precisely the subjective feelings and moods that cause various responses of investors that are unexplainable and irrational in economic and measurable terms and under circumstances that can be subject to technical analysis.
\end{quote}

The prolixity of linguistic structures, abstract style reducing the importance of specific information, cause-and-effect reasoning are at variance with the purpose of evaluation reports, which should include research conclusion in the form of concise and simple expressions. The causes of such stylistic irregularities are included in the table below.

\textsuperscript{52} See J. Anusiewicz, \textit{Konstrukcje analityczne we współczesnym języku polskim} [Analytical structures in the contemporary Polish], Published by: UWr, Wrocław 1978.

Evaluation language

Structures that obstruct the understanding of the text

- **lexical**
  - complex word combinations
    - analytisms (without semantic overload)
    - redundant structures (with semantic overload)

- **syntactic and textual**
  - weakens the strength of assertions
    - something seems to be = something is
    - it is not possible to estimate = one cannot estimate
  - phrasematic expression of judgements and opinions
    - something allows for a conclusion to be made = it can be concluded...
    - there is a common opinion that... = it is commonly found that...
  - recommendations in conditional clauses
    - it should be considered whether the authors of analyses should...
      = authors of analyses should
  - unnecessary conjunctions
    - to sum up measurable as well as non-measurable benefits =
      to sum up measurable and non-measurable benefits
  - semantically empty participles
    - assessment conducted on the basis of something
      = assessment conducted on the basis of the above remarks
  - metaphorical expression of intensity
    - something especially dynamic reaches its climax
      = something especially dynamic reaches its climax somewhere/sometime

**nouns**
- the fact of existing of = something
- issue, matter, act of = something

**verbs**
- make efforts = to try
- carry out an analysis = to analyse
- make larger = to enlarge
- perform a division = to divide
- be in possession = to have

**adjectives and adverbs**
- on the national arena = in the country
- in the present moment = at present
- purely analytical categories = analytical categories

**prepositions**
- approval for something = to approve of something
- basis for research = research basis
- in reference to something = to something

**pleonasms** (superordinate and subordinate)
- good effectiveness
- through
- verification
- active vigilance
- significant barrier
- absolute sensation
- mutual complementarity
- clear logic
- completely
close
- and
- precisely
- efficiently
- and
- effectively
- little and scarce

**tautologies** (coordinate)
- closely and precisely
- efficiently
- and
effectively
- little and scarce

Fig. 11. Typology of structures that extend a sentence
Table 1. Reason for the emergence of prolix structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paralinguistic sources</th>
<th>Analytisms</th>
<th>Pleonasms and tautologies</th>
<th>Syntactic and textual tautologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• intellectualisation of utterance: structuring information into categories, typologising, comparing, valuation</td>
<td>• strengthening the description</td>
<td>• building cause-and-effect sequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• presentation of abstract information: assessments, values, results, causes, description categories, etc.</td>
<td>• gradation of information and assessments</td>
<td>• introduction of judgements amplifying or weakening the value of an utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• search for dependency between collected information and comparison of data</td>
<td>• detailing information</td>
<td>• protective attitude in case of judgements and assessments requiring additional research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• focus on description details</td>
<td></td>
<td>• emphasising the course of presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• distancing from the subject of the description</td>
<td></td>
<td>• introduction of additional comments about the text (and its individual parts, components, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• taking an expert’s position (examination and assessment of the EF-related issues)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• impersonal message</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causes and functions</th>
<th>Analytisms</th>
<th>Pleonasms and tautologies</th>
<th>Syntactic and textual tautologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• multiplication of information about description details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• prioritisation of data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• creation of categories, sorts, types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• creation of abstract relations between pieces of information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• using conventional official EF terminology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>• scientific style</td>
<td>• journalistic style</td>
<td>• scientific style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• official style</td>
<td>• colloquial style</td>
<td>• official style</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How to write about evaluation reports?

On the basis of conducted analyses, a list of the most important recommendations for authors of evaluation research has been prepared. These rules apply both to style and the structure of evaluation report, and compliance with them will assure that decision-makers and journalists will quickly acquire the most important information on research, e.g. conclusions and recommendations.

Selection of the method to present research results to the employer

1. Results of evaluation research should be presented in three stages:54
   • oral report (with a multimedia presentation) and negotiation of recommendations,
   • report on research in writing,
   • summary in the form of a separate brochure.

2. The mentioned genres have different recipients and perform various functions:
   • Oral presentation (with a multimedia presentation) is intended for employer institutions commissioning the research. This form assures constructive debate about the conclusions and joint development of recommendations.
   • The report is intended for specialists, and it constitutes the documentation of the research process.

54 Obviously, there are many ways of informing about evaluation research and promoting the results thereof (e.g. newsletter, sponsored article, multimedia broadcast, etc.). At this point, we focus solely on the reporting process, meaning the texts prepared directly after research by the evaluators themselves.
• The summary brochure is intended for decision-makers and journalists, so that they can get acquainted with extensive research documentation.

3. Presentation of research results should be divided into three stages:
• Interpretation of results (negotiated) – evaluators present the employers with an oral report on the research in the form of a multimedia presentation, and afterwards there is a discussion on the conclusions and recommendations;
• Acceptance of the final report – the evaluators present a detailed report with research conclusions in writing;
• Communication of evaluation results – decision-makers, journalists and public opinion obtain the most important information about evaluation results (in the form of summarising brochures, etc.).

Structure of evaluation report

In terms of genre, evaluation report is a separate type of scientific (research) report. However, the traditional structure should be modified. The scientists – in the ordinary reports – have to authenticate the research and concentrate on the chronology (and logic). The authors of evaluation reports have a different task. First of all, they have to effectively inform about research results and, at the same time, answer the questions WHAT RESULTS FROM THE EVALUATION?

Keeping the scientific structure of an evaluation report means restricting the group of potential recipients to the group of scientists. Such a report will not assure effective communication with decision-makers and journalists.

How to change a scientific report into an evaluation report?

These are effective modifications to a scientific report (optional):
• substituting the scientific summary with a correct executive summary,
• adding a chapter containing recommendations to the report,
• transferring the description of the methodology to annexes,
• transferring conclusions and recommendations to the beginning of the report,
• omitting the detailed description of research subject,
• adding an index of abbreviations and symbols,
• adding a description of specific cases, i.e. good practices.

Table 2. How to change a traditional scientific report into an evaluation report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCIENTIFIC REPORT</th>
<th>EVALUATION REPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Summary</td>
<td>1. Executive summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Introduction</td>
<td>2. Introduction (description of research)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Subject of research</td>
<td>3. Conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Purpose of research</td>
<td>4. Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Methodology</td>
<td>5. Presentation of results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Analysis / results</td>
<td>7. Annexes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Conclusions</td>
<td>8. Description of methodology (methodological note)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Bibliography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Annexes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most important report elements are the chapters that clearly and precisely inform about the evaluation research. This group includes: executive summary, conclusions and recommendations.

**Simplification of the language**

Reports have to be written using scientific language in the analytical and methodological part. However, the strategic fragments, that is summaries, conclusions and recommendations, should be written in a readable language. In order to achieve such simplicity, it will be necessary to:

- use short sentences – up to 15 components in a single sentence and up to three clauses in a compound sentence,
- avoid breaking the sentences with digressions and subordinate clauses,
- use short words (consisting of 1, 2 or 3 syllables),
- use commonly understood words,
- avoid scientific terminology,
- avoid sequences of nouns (the so-called noun plague),
- avoid nouns denoting activities and features (activity = verb),
- avoid prolix and multi-word forms,
- use frequent listings and bulleted.

---
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