THE RESEARCH-POLICY NEXUS

This bibliography provides an overview of the relevant reference literature on research-policy linkages published in English from the 1970s up to 2006. It is organized alphabetically and contains over 750 entries, of which 258 are annotated with an excerpt or summary. To that extent, it remains a partially annotated bibliography that is descriptive rather than analytical. This survey brings together – but extends beyond – references from UNESCO's bibliography (2007)[1] and ODI's annotated bibliography (2002), thus broadening the scope of research utilization literature to include references on social psychology, market communication, and media studies. Main ideas from UNESCO's conferences, and MOST's literature production were also included, but are not all-inclusive. Review content has been bolded to enable a quicker read, while excerpt sources and key themes have been included for annotated entries.

The main authors and reports are Caplan, Carden, Chunharas, Court and Young, Davies H. et al, Davies P., Head, Gagnon, Landry et al, Lengyel, Londquist, Meier, Packwood, Sabatier, Saywell & Cotton, Scott A., Stone, Squire, Young and Grayson, Wagner, Wittrock, Weiss; ODI (2004), NAO (2003) and COHRED (2000 & 2001). This bibliography adds to a number of existing overviews of literature on the research-policy nexus: Keeley and Scoones (1999), Lindquist (2003), Neilson (2001), Nutley, Walter and Davies (2002), Stone, Maxwell and Keating (2001), Sutton (1999).

OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this review are twofold:

1) To provide a one-stop shop for anyone new to the research-policy nexus. Instead of trying to touch on all of the topics studied by the variety of researchers, the survey and references present the body of work that is relevant to the nexus in order to guide one's research and facilitate one's grasp of the entries' content.

2) To serve as a starting point to develop a conceptual matrix, breaking down major areas of contact and exchanges linking research and policy. In that sense it should enable some perspective on the topic at hand and steer reflection on the approaches and tools that can help with the uptake of UNESCO/MOST research into policy-making with regards to the vast field of social transformations.

---

[1] UNESCO (2007) 'Research-Policy Link(age)s': http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001832/183298e.pdf

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

KEY THEMES AND HEADINGS

Given the vast scale of potentially relevant studies published in English, we have intuitively defined broad subject headings to categorize the annotated references. The headings remain broad nonetheless; hence the reader should not interpret the categories literally but should see them as a facilitative arrangement to capture key themes of the references.

- Set of actors / Inter-organizational linkages / Network of actors, co-producers of public policy (The various constituents of public action, whether single actors or networks of actors. Insight can be gained by examining their distinct rationalities, temporalities, as well as their structural asymmetries (in terms of resources, organization and implementation capacities.))

- Knowledge utilization / Dissemination of UNESCO/MOST research / Research relevance (Looking at different models of knowledge utilization suggests varying strategies for making research matter in policy; inhibitive factors to knowledge utilization…)

- Knowledge management (Focused on developing robust systems for storing and communicating knowledge.)

- Knowledge production / The new production of knowledge / Research funding systems / Current policy discourse and information age (Institutional conditions under which research is produced, organizational and financial structures that allow research to take place, postmodern performative production of knowledge.)

- Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity (Repackaging and appropriation of scientific discourses and their subsequent politicization. Also examines what is at play when expertise, as a commissioned activity, is mobilized and what it tells us about political and social legitimization strategies.)

- State and bureaucratic cultures / Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and advocacy / Organizational management, learning and change (Concerned with institutional architecture, political culture, diversity in administrative governance and policy-makers' cognition. Also concerned with understanding and managing change at individual, group and organizational level. Concerned with the way organizations build and organize knowledge and routines.)

- Policy process / Public policies / Potential access points (Concerned with the analysis of public policy. Looks at theoretical approaches to public policy but also identifies different types of public policy.)

- Evidence-based policy / New modes of governance (Policy designed by reference not to 'common sense' or to ideological preconceptions but to prior practical experience.)

- Dissemination strategies / Marketing and research communication / Media communication and IT (Looks at the processes of sharing information and knowledge. The challenge of dissemination is to improve the accessibility of research findings to inform policy-makers and other stakeholders.)

- Research impact assessment / Policy evaluation (Methods for estimating the impact of research and policy.)

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

FINAL INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

- Understanding what constitutes 'use' is still a highly problematic issue.
- The theoretical underpinnings of knowledge production and its uptake by policy-makers are context sensitive: developing world and western concepts and experience are not often explored in the literature. Institutional theory could help in this matter.
- Some related and relevant entries – though less concerned with direct research-policy links – were not considered. These concern the sociology of knowledge, policy implementation, social returns to society and quality certifying mechanisms for research.
- This overview remains a work in progress.

UNESCO

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

RELEVANT REFERENCE LITERATURE ON RESEARCH-POLICY LINK(AGE)S

- **AARON, H.** (1978.) *Politics and the Professors*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- **ABELSON, D.** (2000.) "Do think tanks matter? Opportunities, constraints and incentives for think tanks in Canada and the United States". *Global Society,* 14 (No. 2, 2000) 213-36

- **ABERBACH JOEL D., HANS-ULRICH DERLIEN, RENATE MAYNTZ AND BERT A. ROCKMAN** (1990.) 'American and German federal executives – technocratic and political attitudes', pp. 3-19. In International Social Science Journal : "Policy actors: Bureaucrats, politicians and intellectuals." February 1990, no. 123.

  This article aims to compare two sets of national administrative elites (American and those of the Federal Republic of Germany) from the perspective of one critical element of their role understandings – the **extent to which technocratic values appear to override political ones**. According to the findings, in 1987 the US executive seemed to be more technocratic than the German. Opposition (social)-democrats in both countries were less technocratic. **Social service departments in both countries were staffed with less technocratic officials.** Training in natural sciences and in agriculture predisposed towards more technocratic attitudes. Social scientists were less technocratic. The classical German training of the executive elite in law did not produce unusually high technocratism.

  Excerpt source: Georgios Papanagnou (review)
  Key theme: 1) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 2) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **ADAMO, ABRO** (2003.) "Influencing Public Policy through IDRC-Supported Research: Synthesis of Document Reviews" Final report, prepared for the Evaluation Unit, IDRC, January 2003.

  Supporting research that influences public policy in the developing world is a central goal in IDRC's current Corporate Strategy Performance Framework. Over its many years of supporting research to inform policy IDRC has gained considerable experience in fostering links between research and policy. Nevertheless, **IDRC has not yet clearly articulated what it means by 'policy influence' or 'policy impact'; nor has it developed a systematic corporate understanding of its successes, limitations and the factors that facilitate or inhibit policy influence**. Although IDRC programs and projects have identified policy influence as a research priority to varying degrees over time, the ways in which IDRC-supported research looks to influence policy processes and contribute to policy change are not well understood. **To address this gap, IDRC's Evaluation Unit is undertaking a strategic evaluation that will examine three key questions**: (1) **what constitutes policy influence in IDRC's experience**; (2) **to what degree and in what ways has Centre-supported research influenced public policy**; and (3) **what factors and conditions have facilitated and/or inhibited the policy influence potential of IDRC-supported research projects**. This study will serve two main purposes: (1) to **provide learning at the program level which can enhance the design of projects** and programs to increase policy influence where that is a key objective; and (2) to **create an opportunity for corporate level learning** which will provide **input into strategic planning processes** as well as feedback on performance (Neilson 2001). The strategic evaluation is comprised of three parts: (1) **reviews of IDRC documentation** to see what can be learned from what is already documented about IDRC's experience with respect to policy influence, (2) **case studies** exploring the experience of IDRC-supported projects from each region with respect to influencing policy; and (3) **workshops** in which IDRC staff and partners analyze and bring their experience to the findings from the first two parts. The synthesis of the document reviews is part of the first activity. **This report provides a synthesis of three document reviews meant to help IDRC gain a deeper understanding of how the Centre contributes to public policy processes within the context of development research**. The three document reviews examine different types of IDRC program and project documentation including program planning documents and prospectuses (Gillespie 2002), the objectives of IDRC-supported projects (ibid), project completion reports (PCRs) (Edwards 2001), and IDRC program and project evaluation reports

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

(Adamo 2002). Through an analysis of this documentation, the **three reviews sought to address the strategic questions outlined above.** These and the synthesis paper are meant to provide background information on IDRC's experience with policy influence in the research it supports and to contextualize the regional case studies to be undertaken as part of the larger study. Several findings have come out of the document reviews and are summarized in the report. The table of content suggest various subject headings. **1) Methodological Observations 2) Intent to Influence Policy in IDRC Programs** (Social and Economic Equity, Environment and Natural Resources Management, Information and Communication Technologies for Development **3) Program and Geographical Dimensions of Intent to Influence Policy** (Magnitude and Intensity of Policy Focus Across Program Areas, Regional Dimensions of Policy Influence, Level of Intended Policy Influence **4) Mechanisms of Policy Influence in IDRC-Supported Research** (Producing Policy Relevant Research: a) Participation of policy stakeholders in research, Capacity Building: a) Researchers, b) Policymakers, c) Civil Society, Dissemination of Research to Policy Stakeholders, Networks and Policy Dialogue : a) Network projects, b) Policy dialogue among stakeholders, Development of Technology to Improve Policymakers' Access to Information, Policy Development and/or Implementation, Evaluation **5) Policy Influence in IDRC-Supported Projects** (Contributing to the advance of policy relevant knowledge, Strengthened research capacity, Strengthened capacity of civil society to participate in policy processes, Greater interaction and dialogue among policy stakeholders, Changes in attitudes and approaches of policy/decision-makers, Utilization of research results by policymakers**,** Development of technology to aid in policy formulation, Contributing to policy formulation **6) Factors Contributing to Policy Influence** Involvement of policy stakeholders in the project, Relevance and quality of research outputs, Appropriateness of the approach used, Reputation and Positioning of Researchers/Institutions in Policy Circles, Sustained Support of the Project by IDRC, Involvement of IDRC Programs with Political Influence, Supportive Policy Environment.
7) Factors Inhibiting Policy Influence (Poor relevance, and therefore usefulness, of research to policy processes**,** The project's approach**,** Poorly targeted and structured project activities, Difficulties with dissemination, Insufficient funding, Resistance of powerful interest groups to policy reforms, Unsupportive policy environment / weak governance, Policy-making processes are slow, complex, and political in nature.

Excerpt source: Adamo (executive summary, table of content)
Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy. 3) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 4) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 5)

- **ADAMS, D., HWA KEE, G. & LIN, L**. (2001.) "Linking research, policy, and strategic planning to education development in Lao People's Democratic Republic". *Comparative Education Review*, 45 (2): p. 220-241 ((May 2001)

- **AGRAWAL, A** (1995) 'Dismantling the Divide Between Indigenous and Scientific Knowledge'. *Development and Change* 26(3): 413–439.

This article discusses the current focus – especially within 'people-centred' development – on the **use of indigenous knowledge as a significant resource**. Although Agrawal recognises that the challenge to the monopoly enjoyed by 'Western' (scientific) knowledge is long overdue, he **criticises** the **assumption implicit in the new indigenous knowledge discourse that there is a clear divide between indigenous and Western knowledge**. This **dichotomous classification of knowledge** is bound to fail for two reasons. Firstly, each body of knowledge is so heterogeneous that it cannot be clearly separated from the other. Secondly, the **indigenous versus Western classification assumes that knowledge is a fixed system** (in time, space and content). Instead, Agrawal argues that **knowledge creation is a fluid process** that evolves in close interaction with the changing (political, institutional, cultural, economic) context. Moreover, **knowledge changes depending on the interests it serves** and the purposes for which it is used. Therefore, **different strategies for systematising and disseminating knowledge will not be 'neutral'**, but will benefit different social groups.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography ; Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young.
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 3) Knowledge Management 4) Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity

- **ALBAEK, E.** (1995.) "Between knowledge and power: utilization of social science in public policy making". *Policy Sciences*, 28: 79-100
- **ALLEN, P., PECKHAM, S., ANDERSON, S. & GOODWIN, N.** (2007.) "Commissioning research that is used: the experience of the NHS Service Delivery and Organisation Research and Development Programme". *Evidence & Policy: A Journal of Research, Debate and Practice*, Volume 3, Number 1, January 2007, pp. 119-134 (16)
- **ALLIANCE FOR HEALTH POLICY AND SYSTEMS RESEARCH.** (2004.) *Getting research into policy and practice*, In: *Strengthening health systems: the role and promise of policy and systems research.* Geneva, Alliance for Health Policy and Systems Research, Global Forum for Health Research. 20 p.

- **ALLOR, M** (1995) 'Relocating the Site of the Audience' in Boyd-Barrett, O and Newbold, C (eds.) *Approaches to Media, A Reader*. London: Arnold.

  Several theoretical approaches have been critical of the 'passive recipient audience' that is implied by a **linear approach to media communication**. These critical approaches all analyse **how the original meaning of the message is changed in the process of communicating it** to an audience. As the audience engages with the message, they mould it and fill in gaps, so that **the message in the end acquires specific but widely different meanings**. 1. **Political economy** shifts **attention** away from the purely personal level and onto a social level, **viewing communication as something that circulates within (and serves to sustain) social structures**. In engaging with the circulating communication, audiences simultaneously create meanings on two planes: meanings for themselves, and meaning for capital. 2. **Post-structuralist/psychoanalytic theory focuses on the way that communication is a process of subject formation**. When an audience is presented with a text, the process of reading is a process of identifying and investing in certain identities. 3. **Feminist criticism** has developed reader-response theory, which starts from the observation that 'the reader' is not an ideal type; readers are different in terms of gender as well as a range of other variables. Therefore, **a communicative text will evoke widely different and unpredictable responses from the various readers**. Reader-response theory **claims that the text has no stable meaning in itself**, but instead is given different meanings in the interaction with the reader. 4. **Cultural studies** examine the **production of dominant representations in the media** (the process of encoding), and the **audience's response to these representations** (the process of decoding). Rather than assuming that the audience passively accepts the dominant representations, cultural studies posits that the audience actively interprets them through different responses, ranging from adoption to questioning or resistance. The **responses are determined at several levels by the audience's cultural meanings, sub-cultures, social location, social practices, individual identities, and fantasies**.

  Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  Key theme: Dissemination Strategies / Marketing Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **ALMEIDA, C. & BASCOLO, E.** (2006.) "Use of research results in policy decision-making, formulation, and implementation: a review of the literature". *Cadernos Saúde Pública*, 2006, vol. 22 suppl, p. S7-S19
- **ALTER CHEN, M., VANEK, J. & CARR, M.** (2004.) *Mainstreaming informal employment and gender in poverty reduction. A handbook for policy-makers and other stakeholders.* Commonwealth Secretariat/IDRC
- **ALWANG JEFFREY, PUHAZHENDHI V.** (2002.) The impact of the international food policy research institutes research program on rural finance policies for food security for the poor. Impact assessment discussion paper no.16. Washington, International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI.)

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

This **study examines the contributions of the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) between 1993 and 2001 to analysis, outreach, capacity building, and training related to the role of rural finance in poverty reduction.** The IFPRI multi-country research project on Rural Finance Policies for Food Security for the Poor (known internally as MP5) involved **data-intensive research by more than 14 research fellows on the impacts of access to rural financial services in countries**. This **report examines the contribution of the program within four countries** where microfinance research and outreach activities were conducted and its contribution to global knowledge about rural finance and food security. The **study involved interviews with more than 80 policymakers, donor representatives, microfinance practitioners, and academics/researchers**. The research project was global in scope, providing information from a variety of institutional environments, but the **focus was on micro-level outcomes** associated with diverse rural financial structures. It addressed issues of critical importance: (1) **does microfinance have an impact on the poor**, and is this impact achieved through better risk management as well as increased income generation?, (2) **does the structure of financial service providers matter in supporting this impact**?, and (3) **how can the microfinance industry be made more sustainable**? The research provided answers to these questions and thus represents a huge contribution to knowledge about the industry. **The IFPRI research used solid and consistent empirical methods.** The research design, data collection, and econometric techniques were all first class. Several respondents noted that IFPRI is unique in that it has the reputation and intellectual resources to meet such a daunting challenge. The study of impacts of microcredit on welfare enhancement and food security through pathways such as risk management and income enhancement exploited strong capacity within the Food Consumption and Nutrition Division (FCND) in Washington. **The academic research community, in particular, recognized that IFPRI filled a major research gap by engaging in these impact studies.** The institutional focus of the IFPRI Research Program on Rural Finance Policies for Food Security of the Poor (IRFPP) work—on **how and under what circumstances microfinance institutions (MFIs) worked best**—diverged from typical IFPRI products that examine how micro-level actors respond to policy change. The IRFPP focus is more in line with FCND work examining risk-management institutions and their performance in varied environments.

IMPACTS OF IRFPP RESEARCH. The evaluation team identified and **attempted to measure the strength of two distinct pathways of IRFPP impact**. The **first is a global one**: through the **creation of knowledge useful to the academic research audience and global policymakers**. Academics and academic representatives of the industry and donors were universally flattering about the conduct and findings of the IFPRI studies. Prior to the IFPRI work, doubt existed in the academic research community about the effectiveness of microfinancial services in generating incomes, smoothing consumption, and empowering clients. Industry representatives often took these findings as a given, but donors and many in the academic community were skeptical. **Most agree that the IFPRI studies provide strong evidence of benefits from program participation. IFPRI made important methodological contributions to the accurate measurement of such benefits when program participation and access to credit were endogenous**. IFPRI findings of positive social net benefits from improved credit access have **bolstered donor support** of such institutions**, resulting in increased credit access** in rural areas in many parts of the world. **Some of the IFPRI findings related to institutional structure and its impact on sustainability are slowly being accepted by practitioners**. For instance, several MFIs are abandoning strict reliance on group liability and experimenting with individual lending models. A decade ago, the group model was firmly ensconced in the industry's psyche; **evidence is slowly encouraging departures from conventional wisdom.** Some of this evidence comes from individual MFI experiences; some is garnered through studies such as IRFPP. **The second major pathway of impact is a local one**: through information provided to partner MFIs. As shown in the case studies, w**hen research was conducted with the approval and interest of local MFIs**, **the resulting message was most likely to be heard and adopted.** In many cases, the IFPRI research provided hard information on something the MFIs already suspected; the **evidence from the study helped support change**. The ultimate impacts (on clients and institutions) of such changes are impossible to measure, given available data, but improved financial viability of partner MFIs was documented. The **degree of attribution of such change to the IRFPP research is also difficult to measure**. In the case, however, of non- participating MFIs, the in-country impacts are minimal.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ENHANCED RESEARCH IMPACTS. The microfinance research fell outside of many of the traditional IFPRI research thrusts and the project struggled to gain recognition by industry practitioners outside of partner MFIs. This report concludes with recommendations on how impact might be enhanced under such circumstances. **1) Understanding the audience***:* The **impact of the research would be enhanced if the researchers better understood two things**: the needs **of the stakeholders and the means by which stakeholders acquire information**. If IRFPP was viewed as an attempt to deliver a message to an academic research audience, then the research was right on target. Similarly, **global policymakers had access to the message**. However, **many practitioners and policymakers expressed the viewpoint that the research objectives really did not meet their needs**. This finding is partly a result of the global public-good objectives of the IFPRI research. In

addition, if the research was designed to have an impact on MFI operations within countries, then the researchers **should have spent more time understanding how the intended audience receives its information**. As noted, MFIs receive most of their information through established paths such as best practices messages, consultant advice, and so on. **Researchers who wish to have an impact on MFIs must ensure that their message becomes mainstreamed into this path**.

2) Delivering the message: **Dissemination efforts for this project were inadequate**, partly as a result of IRFPP funding mechanisms. **Several improvements are suggested**. First, since MFIs themselves tend to form regional groupings, **a series of regional workshops would facilitate effective dissemination of research findings.** Such workshops and the interactions they facilitate might **help identify region-specific research programs to sharpen the focus to meet regional needs**. An example of a region-specific need is the issue of optimal regulatory frameworks in Sub-Saharan Africa. Second, the **time lag between the study and publication of reports needs to be reduced**. Effective follow-up for early dissemination of the research findings must be given top priority. Third, **cost-effective dissemination tools other than the Internet should be explored**. Distribution of hard copies of study reports might be increased, especially in developing countries where Internet access is costly and time-consuming. Developing country audiences perceive electronic copies to be poor substitutes for professionally produced hard copies. **IFPRI might explore obtaining a web domain within the IFPRI domain that is specifically microfinance-oriented**. **Linking such a domain to other microfinance sites will enhance spread of the research message**. Fourth, **impacts within a country will be enhanced if research reports and presentation of results are better focused on the needs of specific groups, such as different reports for practitioners and policymakers**.

3) Achieving sustainability of policy impact: The IFPRI studies provide strong evidence that access to financial services improves the standard of living of poor people in rural areas and helps ensure food security. Since these two outcomes form a core of the IFPRI mandate, addressing them as a part of a multi-country research program made eminent sense. **IFPRI must decide whether continued work in this area is needed**. If the major questions of concern to the institution have been answered, then movement into a new area of research is appropriate. However, if IFPRI were to abandon this line of research, its credibility in the rural finance area would be reduced, and the future impact of past research would suffer.

Excerpt source: Alwang et al (abstract) impact studies.
Key themes: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy 2) Knowledge Management 3) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT 4) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 5) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **AMARA, N., LANDRY, R. & LAMARI, M.** (1999.) *Climbing the ladder of research utilization: evidence from social science research*. Groupe de recherche sur les interventions gouvernementales, Université Laval, 30 p.
- **AMARA, N., LANDRY, R. & LAMARY, M**. (1998.) *Utilization of social science research knowledge in Canada.* Groupe de recherche sur les interventions gouvernementales (GRIG), Université Laval, Canada, 29 p.
- **AMARA, N., OUIMET, M. & LANDRY, R.** (2004.) "New evidence on instrumental, conceptual and symbolic utilization of university research in government agencies". *Science Communication,* 26 (1): 75-107
- **AMARA, N., OUIMET, M. & R. LANDRY.** (2002.) *L'utilisation de la recherche universitaire dans l'administration publique au Canada : une analyse comparée exploratoire.* Communication présentée au Colloque *Analyse des politiques : le Québec comparé*, organisé dans le cadre du 70ème Congrès de l'ACFAS, Université Laval, 14 mai 2002
- **ANDERSON, L.** (2003.) *Pursuing truth, exercising power: social science and public policy in the twenty-first century*. University Seminars/Leonard Hastings Schoff Memorial Lectures. Columbia University Press
- **ANGELESCU, R. & SQUIRE, L.** (2005.) *Capacity building & policy impact: the experience of the global development network*. World Bank and CEU Conference, Budapest, June 2005, 33 p.

- **ANHEIMER, H, GLASIUS, M AND KALDOR, M** (2001) 'Introducing Global Civil Society' in Anheimer, H,Glasius, M and Kaldor, M (eds.) *Global Civil Society 2001*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

  The **authors argue that global civil society both feeds on** and **reacts to globalisation**. Like global civil society, **'globalisation' is also a new concept with different meanings**. In every day usage it tends to refer to the spread of global capitalism. In the **social science literature it is usually defined as growing interconnectedness in political, social, and cultural spheres as well as the economy**, something which has been greatly facilitated by travel and communication. It is also sometimes used to refer to **growing global consciousness**, the **sense of a common community of mankind**. On the one hand, globalisation provides the bedrock for global civil society, the supply side of the phenomenon that pushes it on. There does seem to be a strong and positive correlation between what one might describe as 'clusters of globalisation' or areas of what Held et al., call 'thick globalisation' and clusters **of global civil society**. On the other hand **global civil society is also a reaction to globalisation**, particularly to the consequences of the spread of global capitalism and interconnectedness. **Globalisation is an uneven process** which has brought benefits to many but which has also excluded many. It is those who are denied access to the benefits of global capitalism and who remain outside the charmed circle of information and communication technology who are the victims of the process and who organise in reaction: the demand pull of global civil society. They are now also linking up with those in the North who form a new kind of solidarity movement. This new form of activism takes place against the background of the 'development industry' and the spread of INGOs in the South for service delivery and development assistance. But it is not only the range and density of INGO networks that matter in relationship to globalisation. **Our studies of specific global issues show that global civil society is best categorised not in terms of types of actors but in terms of positions in relation to globalisation.** All three of the issue chapters in the Yearbook adopt a similar categorisation of global civil society actors, as shown in the Table 1.4. One way of defining or understanding global civil society is as a debate about the future direction of globalisation and perhaps humankind itself.

  Excerpt source: Excerpt taken from the Centre for Civil Society webpage www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/ccs/)
  Key themes: Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **ANSOLEAGA MORENO, M. E.** (2005.) *Investigación y políticas públicas, una necesidad urgente para Chile: el fondo para el estudio de las políticas públicas como instrumento de gestión de proyectos*. Estudio de caso no. 84, 57 p.

- **ARCI, Comité d'Orientation** (1991.) Dynamique culturelle et changement social. Troisième partie : De la théorie à l'action. Montrouge, Pp.57-88.

- **ARQUIT NIEDERBERGER, A.** (2005.) "Science for climate change policy-making: applying theory to practice to enhance effectiveness". *Science and Public Policy*, Volume 32, Number 1, 1 February 2005, pp. 2-16 (15)

- **ARROW K. J., C. C. ABT, & S. J. FITZSIMMONS** (1979.) *Applied Research for Social Policy* : The United States and The Federal Republic of Germany Compared. (eds), Cambridge, MA: Abt Books, p 322

  This **book is an edited collection of papers** (there are 26 essays counting the chapter introductions) focused on the **use and misuse of social science data and statistical methods by public institutions**. The collection is of interest to the practicing statistician for the perspective it provides on the **application of both descriptive and inferential statistical methods in formulating social policy and analysing its impact**. The Arrow et al. volume specifically **compares the American and West German experiences with social policy programs in five pivotal subject areas**: education, housing, employment, health and energy and environment. The use of adequate and appropriate test programs and of carefully constructed experimental designs is emphasized. **Several important summary points do emerge:** One common message is the **near-helplessness of the statistician or the social scientist, in attempting to influence policy options when the analyst confronts the entrenched political power of policy makers, pressure group, and public opinion**. A second, seemingly contradictory but in fact complementary, theme is **the occasional effectiveness in the policy making process of well designed and carefully executed social experiments**. Various

authors discuss studies of the unemployment insurance system, evaluation of the effect of Social Security payments on retirement decisions, and the impact of employment training and retraining programs on earnings potential. The reader is left with the clear impression of the unavailability of adequate current German data and the paucity of recent meaningful social research in West Germany, apparently as a consequence of the shattered post-Third Reich state of German social science, generally **unreceptive government officials, and ossified traditional decision-making structures**. As this seems to be an important point, it might have been useful to have included in the book a more detailed direct analysis of the consequences of this imbalance. **A final common point** emerging from the Seeheim proceedings relates more directly to **the role of the statistician in effective applied social policy research**. Several critical research needs are emphasized as essential **antecedents for as successful impact on policy-making** : developing clearly defined models of social behaviour, ensuring that adequate and consistent application of treatments to the study groups is undertaken at the relevant program sites, examining a sufficient number of properly selected sites for precise replication studies, developing effective pre-experimental pilot studies, allowing for careful experimentation preceding rather than simply following policy decisions, providing for precise follow-up studies for program evaluation, **making allowance for a feedback learning process in the field implementation of experiments, operating with a broad focus of study to permit corrections in potentially flawed research designs**, executing the social experiment in conjunction with appropriate (and cheaper) simulation models, providing a clear assessment of the patterns of program cause and effect, relying on a strong prior theory to guide treatments and research strategies assuring more accurate data collection procedures, **and making careful international comparisons in order to attain comparability of cross national policy findings**. Given a propitious political environment, attention to these points about experimentation **should result in a greater impact on the formulation, implementation and evaluation of social policy programs.**

Excerpt source: Mack Shelley (review)
Key themes: 1) Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity 2) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT 3) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance

- **ARUNDEL, A. & GEUNA, A.** (2001.) *Does proximity matter for knowledge transfer from public institutes and universities to firms?* MERIT, University of Maastricht, SPRU

- **ASKEW, I., MATTHEWS, Z. & PARTRIDGE, R.** (2002.) *Going Beyond Research. A key issues paper raising discussion points related to dissemination, utilisation and impact of reproductive and sexual health research*. Population Council, 20 p.

- **AURIAT, NADIA** (1998.) An essay on the interplay between social science research and policy. Las políticas sociales y la investigación social: reapertura del debate. International Social Science Journal « Las transformaciones sociales: sociedades multiculturales y multiétnicas » N°156

- **AURIAT, NADIA** (1998.) Politique sociale et recherche en sciences sociales : pour une reprise du débat in Revue Internationale des Sciences sociales N°156, Pp307-321

- **AUSTRALIAN CENTER FOR INNOVATION.** (2002.) *Best practice processes for university research commercialisation. Final report*. Australian Centre for Innovation, 72 p. http://www.dest.gov.au/NR/rdonlyres/636E6F5F-6517-49AA-96C2-5B2C8768BAD6/1423/bestpractice.pdf

- **AYUK, E. & MAROUANI, M. A.** (2007.) *The policy paradox in Africa: strengthening links between economic research and policymaking*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.

- **BACKER, T.** (1991.) "Knowledge utilization: the third wave". *Knowledge,* 12 (3): 225-240

- **BANTING, K.** (1979.) *Poverty, Politics and Policy.* Londres: Macmillan.

- **BARDACH, E.** (1984.) "The dissemination of policy research to policymakers". *Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization*, 6: 125-144

- **BASCOLO, E., YAVICH, N. & SANCHEZ DE LEON, A.** (2006.) "El proceso de interacción investigadores y tomadores de decisiones: un estudio de caso". *Cadernos Saúde Pública*, 2006, vol. 22 suppl, p. S47-S56

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **BAYART, J. F.** (1989.) "A quoi servent les chercheurs en sciences sociales?". *Publications du CERI* (eds), 98: 77-87

- **BAZZANI, R., LEVCOVITZ, E., URRUTIA, S. & ZAROWSKY, C.** (2006.) "Construyendo puentes entre investigación y políticas para la extensión de la protección social en salud en América Latina y el Caribe: una estrategia de cooperación conjunta". *Cadernos Saúde Pública*, 2006, vol. 22 suppl, p. S109-S112

- **BEACH, L R** (1997) *The Psychology of Decision-Making: People in Organisations*. London: Sage.

  The book presents an **overview of the psychology of decision-making**. The author broadly characterises decision making as a **sequence of events**: **diagnosis, action selection, and implementation**. The book **describes a number of different naturalistic models** that have emerged: • **Recognition models** (the role of situation recognition and policy in guiding behaviour). • **Narrative models** (the roles of scenarios, stories, and arguments for understanding the past and present, forecasting the future and justifying decision making). • **Incremental models** (emphasis on remedying what is wrong with the present situation and incremental implementation, with its focus on decision cycles driven by feedback about progress). • **Moral or ethical models** (the role of morals and ethics in both proscribing unacceptable courses of action and in prescribing actions that the decision maker is obliged or committed to undertake). **The author also presents a theory – image theory – that seeks to capture the four naturalistic models** together with some additional issues from previous theories. The image theory a**ssumes that decision makers come to the decision with a store of knowledge that conveniently can be divided into three categories**, the three images. These are 1) **knowledge about what truly matters (beliefs and values)**, 2) **what constitutes a desirable future (goals)**, and 3) **how to go about securing the future (plans)**. One of the themes of the book is the **importance of framing**, which serves to tie an event to the decision maker's ongoing experience, thereby endowing the event with meaning. Because every decision is seen ultimately as a social decision, people make efforts to understand others' frames. When they perceive differences between those frames and their own, they make efforts to align the frame, through discussion and persuasion. The author further argues that **when people have a history of shared experience, they tend to frame situations similarly in the first place**. In the same way, **organisations' cultures, the beliefs and values shared, can promote similar frames** and **therefore contribute to coordinated decision making**. The author describes the organisational version of the image theory as similar to that of the individual. Thus, **knowledge about the organisation's culture is part of the individual's value image**, knowledge about the organisation's vision is part of the individual's trajectory image, and knowledge about the organisation's strategic plan is part of the individual's strategic image. **When making decisions for and about the organisation, the framing assures that these organisationally relevant parts of the individual's knowledge contribute to the decision process**.

  Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  Key themes: State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **BEACHAM, B., KALUCY, L. & al.** (2005.) "Understanding and measuring research impact". *Focus on…*, Issue 2, December 2005, 12 p.

- **BEDIMO, A L, PINKERTON, S D, COHEN, D A, GRAY, B AND FARLEY, T A** (2002) 'Condom Distribution: A cost-utility analysis'. *International Journal of STD and AIDS* 13(6): 384–392.

  Objective: To explore the **cost-effectiveness of a condom distribution programme**. Methods: We conducted a **cost-utility analysis of a social marketing campaign** in which over 33 million condoms were made freely available throughout Louisiana. Surveys among 275,000 African Americans showed that condom use increased by 30%. Based on the estimated cost of the intervention and costs of HIV/AIDS-associated medical treatment, we **estimated the quality-adjusted life years (QALYs) saved, and number of HIV infections averted by the programme**. Results: The programme was estimated to prevent 170 HIV infections and save 1909 QALYs. Over $33 million in medical care costs were estimated to be averted, resulting in cost savings. Sensitivity analyses showed that these results were quite stable over a range of estimates for the main parameters. Condom increases as small as 2.7% were still cost-

saving. Conclusion: Condom distribution is a community-level HIV prevention intervention that has the potential to reach large segments of the general population, thereby averting significant numbers of HIV infections and associated medical costs. **The intervention is easy to scale up to large populations or down to small populations. The financial and health benefits of condom social marketing support making it a routine component of HIV prevention services nationally**.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: Dissemination Strategies / Marketing Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **BERKOUT, F AND SCOONES, I** (1999) 'Knowing how to change, Environmental policy learning and transfer' *Development Research Insights*, 30: 1–2, June 1999. Science and Technology Policy Research (STPR).

  New knowledge, changing expectations and practical experience are being applied by policy actors at many different levels, in a process of '**adaptive social learning'**. Yet **learning runs into numerous obstacles and blockages**. Knowledge is seen as a key ingredient of learning and shifts in understanding may arise from multiple sites, resulting in either more fundamental reframing of policy problems, sometimes challenging **long-held conventional wisdoms**, or more **incremental changes focused on more marginal instrumental changes**. Whatever its source, **new knowledge and the prospect of change that it brings, frequently threatens existing policy relationships and structures of power**. Responses to scientific and practical knowledge are highly differentiated. Stephens identifies two processes which she names '**snowballs'** (the accumulation of research impacts within policy elites) and '**whispers'** (the reinterpretation of research findings in broader constituencies). Environmental **policy learning** is most effectively achieved by **adopting a more flexible and iterative model of the policy process**.

  Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  Key themes: 1) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 2) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **BERO, L. A., GRILLI, R., GRIMSHAW, J. M., HARVEY, E., OXMAN, A. D., & THOMSON, M. A.** (1998.) "Getting research findings into practice: closing the gap between research and practice: an overview of systematic reviews of interventions to promote the implementation of research findings". *British Medical Journal*, 15 Aug 1998 317 (7156): 465-468

- **BESSANT, J. & WATKINSON, A.** (2006.) "Principles for developing Indigenous policy-making". *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 65 (1): 100-12

- **BHORAT, H.** (2001.) *Labour markets and poverty: the link between research and policy-making in South Africa*. All Africa Day Conference. School for Advanced International Studies. Johns Hopkins University. April 2001. Washington D.C.

- **BIDDLE, B. J. & SAHA, L. J.** (2005.) *The untested accusation: principals, research knowledge, and policy making in schools. Contemporary studies in social and policy issues in education*. Lanham, Md: ScarecrowEducation

- **BILSON, A.** (2005.) *Evidence-based practice in social work*. London: Whiting & Birch

- **BIRDSALL, W. F. et al.** (2005.) "Public policy and the dissemination of academic research" (Chapter 1, Part I) In *Towards an integrated Knowledge Ecosystem: a Canadian Research Strategy*

- **BIRNBAUM, R.** (2000.) "Policy scholars are from Venus; Policy makers are from Mars". *The Review of Higher Education*, 23 (2), 199-132

- **BLACK, N.** (2001.) "Evidence based policy: proceed with care". *British Medical Journal*, 323, pp. 275–279.

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **BLACKMORE JILL** (2002.) "Is it only `What works' that `Counts' in New Knowledge Economies? Evidence-based Practice, Educational Research and Teacher Education in Australia" Social Policy & Society 1:3, 257±266; Cambridge University Press. Centre for Education and Change, Deakin University, Victoria.

  Recent texts on globalisation and education policy refer to the rapid flow of education policy texts producing or responding to common trends across nation states with the emergence of new knowledge economies. These **educational policies are shaping what counts as research and the dynamics between research, policy, and practice in schools,** creating new types of relationships between universities, the public, the professions, government, and industry. The **trend to evidence-based policy and practice in Australian schools is used to identify key issues within wider debates** about the `usefulness' of educational research and the role of universities and university-based research in education in new knowledge economies.
  In the past decade the `modern' university has once again been re-invented. **Information has become a core product of commercial exchange, and management of information a key occupational sector**. This paper situates the trend towards evidence-based practice in the Australian teacher education `policyscape' within national and international **epistemological and political debates about the knowledge economy**, the impact of educational research on policy and practice, and teacher professional development. **I argue that evidence-based practice does not fully capture the complexity of the theory-practice dynamic and relationships between education policy, research and practice**.

  Excerpt source: Blackmore (abstracts) ; focus on education
  Key themes: 1) Evidence-based Policy / New Modes of Governance 2) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 3) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 4) Knowledge Management

- **BLOOM, G. & KNOWLES, C.** (eds). (2005.) *Mobilising social science research to improve health*. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies

- **BLUNKETT, D.** (2000.) *Influence or irrelevance: can social science improve government?*. Secretary of State's ESRC Lecture Speech, 2nd February. London: Department for Education and Employment

- **BOAZ, A. & HAYDEN, C.** (2002.) "Pro-active evaluators: enabling research to be useful, usable and used". *Evaluation,* 8 (4): 440-453

- **BOEHM, V. R.** (1980.) "Research In the real world – a conceptual model". *Personnel Psychology,* 33: 495-503

- **BOGENSCHNEIDER, K., OLSON, J. R., LINNEY, K. D. & MILLS, J**. (2000.) "Connecting research and policymaking: implications for theory and practice from the family impact seminar". *Family Relations*, 49: 327-339

  This paper addresses a conundrum that merits scholarly attention-**why social scientists' ability to generate high quality research has outpaced their ability to disseminate research** into the policymaking process. The paper describes **Family Impact Seminars**, a series of seminars, briefing reports, and follow-up activities that provide up-to-date, **solution-oriented information to state policymakers**. In support of the proposed **"three-communities" theory**, the **utilization of research in policy making appears to depend upon several pragmatic practices and procedures**, ten which are detailed in the paper.

  Excerpt source: Bogenschneider et al (abstract) focus on family as a unit of policy analysis.
  Key themes: Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance

- **BONNER L.** (2003.) "Using theory-based evaluation to build evidence-based health and social care policy and practice". *Critical Public Health,* Volume 13, Number 1, 2003 , pp. 77-92 (16)

UNESCO

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **BOOTH, C.,** (1897.) *Life and Labour of the People of London*. 9 vols. Londres: Macmillan.
- **BOOTH, T.** (1990.) "Researching policy research". *Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization*, 12: 80-100
- **BOURDIEU, P** (1991) *On Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press in association with Basil Blackwell.

Bourdieu has had a **significant impact on media studies** because of **his argument** that **relations of communication are always, inseparably, power relations**. The **agents or institutions involved in communication have** different degrees of 'symbolic power', i.e. the power to make people see and believe certain visions of the world** rather than others. Those with relatively high symbolic power are able to present visions that people will conform to, or are even able to transform visions. **The symbols used (the cultural codes, the buzzwords, the presentation, etc) serve the function of creating consensus** and 'glueing' society together. However, the **symbols will always serve the interests of some groups rather than others**, thus anyone who is able to launch or control symbols will also have (political) power. The result is that any communication is closely linked to the relative symbolic power that the communicator has to '**construct visions of reality'**.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 2) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **BOURDIEU, P.** (2002.) "Science, politique et sciences sociales" Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales, Année 2002, Volume 141, Numéro 1. p. 9 – 12

On peut, pour les besoins de la compréhension, opposer deux `**types idéaux**` obtenus par un passage à la limite : d'un côté la forme la plus purement politique du **champ politique** où la **force des idées dépendrait essentiellement de la force des groupes qui les reconnaissent** parce qu'ils s'y reconnaissent, qui les acceptent pour vraies parce qu'ils y croient et qui y croient parce que **leur existence et leurs intérêts économiques et sociaux en dépendent** ; **de l'autre**, la frome la plus purement scientifique des **champs scientifiques** où la **force des idées dépendrait pour l'essentiel `de leur force intrinsèque',** comme disait Spinoza, c'est-à-dire de la **conformité des propositions ou des procédures aux règles de la cohérence logique** et de la compatibilité avec les faits. Dans la réalité historique, **il n'est pas de champ scientifique si `pur'** soit-il, q**ui ne comporte une dimension 'politique', pas de champs politique qui ne fasse de place à des enjeux de vérité**. Cela dit, tandis que dans les champs scientifiques on ne tranche pas un débat par un affrontement physique ou par un vote, dans les champs politiques, et en particulier dans ceux qui sont soumis aux règles démocratiques, ce qui triomphe, ce sont les propositions qu'Aristote appelle 'endoxiques', c'est-à-dire celles avec lesquelles on est obligé de compter parce que les gens qui comptent aimeraient qu'elles soient vraies et aussi parce que, participant de la doxa, de la vision ordinaire, qui est aussi la plus répandue et la plus largement partagée, elles sont propres à recevoir l'approbation et l'applaudissement du plus grand nombre. Il s'ensuit que le **champ politique est dans une position ambiguë** : lieu d'une concurrence **pour la vérité** (notamment sur le monde social) il est **aussi le lieu d'une concurrence pour le pouvoir** (notamment sur l'État, et les ressources dont il contrôle l'accumulation et la redistribution) **pouvoir que donne l'art de produire ou de mobiliser des idées-forces**, enfermant une force de mobilisation, notamment en tant que prédictions ou prévisions, vraies ou capables de se rendre vraies, du fait de leur force intrinsèque de vérité ou de la f**orce sociale que leurs 'porteurs' sont en mesure de mobiliser, soit en vertu de leur capital symbolique propre** (leur charisme), **soit par la médiation d'un groupe organisé,** d'un parti. Bref, les choses ne sont pas simples et les luttes politiques font toujours une place à la fois à la logique de la **'vérification' quasi scientifique par l'argumentation et à la logique de la 'ratification' proprement politique par le plébiscite**. Les **sciences sociales sont dans une position particulièrement difficile** du fait qu'elles ont pour **objet le monde social** et qu'elles **prétendent à en produire une représentation scientifique**. Chacun des spécialistes y est en **concurrence** non seulement **avec les autres chercheurs**, mais aussi **avec les autres professionnels**

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

et la **production symbolique**, et en particulier les **journalistes et les hommes politiques** et, plus largement, avec **tous ceux qui travaillent à imposer leur vision du monde social**, avec des forces symboliques et des succès très inégaux. Et cela, qu'il le sache ou non, qu'il le veuille ou non, et lors même qu'il choisit de s'enfermer dans la tour d'ivoire d'une pratique scientifique qui serait à elle-même sa fin, dans un rêve de pureté (et d'équanimité) qui est nécessairement voué à l'échec parce **que la politique est présente dans le champ lui-même à travers les effets des pouvoirs temporels qui continuent à peser sur la cité scientifique.** Des **propositions inconsistantes ou incompatibles avec les faits ont infiniment plus de chances de s'y perpétuer et même d'y prospérer que dans les champs scientifiques les plus autonomes,** pourvu qu'elles soient dotées, à l'intérieur du champ, et aussi à l'extérieur, d'un poids social propre à en compenser l'insignifiance et l'insuffisance en leur assurant des soutiens matériels et institutionnels (crédits, subventions, postes etc..) Et inversement. En fait, les **spécialistes des sciences sociales peuvent,** *sans contradiction,* **lutter, à l'intérieur de leur sphère propre, pour renforcer l'autonomie du champ scientifique** et le débarrasser de tout ce qui peut rester en lui de politique et, **à l'extérieur, dans le champ politique même, pour tenter d'imposer la vérité scientifique sur le monde social, sans pouvoir recourir à d'autre armes que celles de la vérité**. Et ils peuvent même, pour donner plus de force à leurs faibles armes, faire jouer au champ scientifique le rôle d'une utopie réalisée du champ politique ou, mieux, celui d'une idée régulatrice permettant à la fois **d'orienter les pratiques politiques et de les soumettre à une interrogation méthodique.** La **confrontation entre le champ scientifique, dans ses différents états, et le champ politique a pour vertu majeure de faire surgir, à propos de deux champs, un très grand nombre de questions qu'il faut convertir en problèmes scientifiques propres à recevoir des réponses empiriques** ; et surtout d'empêcher d'oublier, contre l'illusion, typiquement scolastique, de la toute-puissance des idées, **tout ce qui sépare le monde de la science du monde de la politique, la conscience et la connaissance de cette différence devant en tout cas orienter le travail proprement scientifique et l'effort pour tenter d'en communiquer les résultats dans le monde politique.**

Excerpt source: Bourdieu (Text)
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 2) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 3) Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity

- **BOURDIEU PIERRE, OLIVIER CHRISTIN, PIERRE-ETIENNE WILL** (2000.) "Sur la science de l'État" Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales, Année 2000, Volume 133, Numéro 1. p. 3 – 11

L'article passe en revue les grandes perspectives qui ont analysé le processus de formation, de légitimation ainsi que le fonctionnement des bureaucraties étatiques. Il examine de façon critique la conception téléologique qui fait de la construction de l'État un processus ininterrompu et inéluctable de modernisation c'est-à-dire de rationalisation et de sécularisation. **Il critique la vision néolibérale qui envisage l'État comme un agrégat instable fruit de stratégies et d'intérêt individuels divergents**. **Celle-ci oublie que ceux qui se servent et qui servent l'État répondent à des valeurs et à des intérêts communs**. Il rappelle que la perspective confucéenne conçoit l'économie sous un angle moral : celle-ci doit œuvrer au bien-être. Elle met au premier plan un éthos qui valorise le dévouement et le désintéressement. La sécurité économique garantit le progrès moral du peuple et sa loyauté envers le souverain. **L'article compare le processus de développement de l'État en Europe au 17e siècle et en Chine au 11e siècle**. Il considère que **le développement de l'État bureaucratique a pour corollaire l'élaboration d'un** *jus publicum* **et la constitution d'une catégorie de penseurs et de technocrates au service du pouvoir du prince**. Pour garantir on bon fonctionnement l'État doit prévenir la corruption de son personnel et donc se contrôler lui-même.

Excerpt source: CNRS (abstract)
Key themes: 1) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 2) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy

- **BOVENBERG, L.** (2000.) "On the cutting edge between policy and academia: challenges for public economists". *De Economist*, Leiden: 148 (3): 295 (September 2000).

  In **surveying the literature on privatization and social insurance**, this paper identifies two major trade-offs. The first trade-off, which applies mainly to **the choice between private and public governance**, is flexibility versus commitment. The other trade-off, which bedevils the design of social insurance, is that of **moral hazard versus adverse selection**. After stressing the **relevance of bounded rationality for understanding actual public policymaking**, the paper **turns to the importance of non-government, non commercial institutions in facilitating social coordination**. Finally, the paper addresses the **role of economists in formulating public policy.**

  Excerpt source: Bovenberg (summary)
  Key themes: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy 2) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 3) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **BOX, L. & ENGELHARD, R.** (2006.) *Science and technology policy for development. Dialogues at the interface*. Anthem Press

- **BOZEMAN, B.** (2000.) "Technology transfer and public policy: a review of research and theory". *Research Policy,* 29: 627–655.

  My purpose is to review, synthesize and criticize the voluminous, multidisciplinary literature on technology transfer. To reduce the literature to manageable proportions, I focus chiefly –not exclusively on *recent literature on domestic technology transfer from universities and government laboratories*. I begin by examining a **set of fundamental conceptual issues**, especially the ways in which the **analytical ambiguities surrounding technology transfer concepts affect research and theory**. My literature review follows and I emphasize technology transfer's impact and effectiveness. I employ a ''Contingent Effectiveness Model of Technology Transfer'' to organize the literature. As the model's name implies, it assumes that **technology effectiveness can take a variety of forms.** In addition to examining the more traditional effectiveness criteria those rooted in market impacts- the model considers a number of alternative effectiveness criteria, including political effectiveness, capacity-building.

  Excerpt source: Bozeman (abstract)
  Key themes: 1) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT 2) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **BRANS, M., JACOBS, D., MARTINIELLO, M., REA, A., SWYNGEDOUW, M., ADAM, I., BALANCIER, P., FLORENCE, E. & VAN DER STRAETEN, T.** (2004.) *Recherche et politiques publiques: le cas de l'immigration en Belgique*. Ghent, Belgium: Academia Press
- **BREHAUT, J. D. & JUZWISHIN, D.** (2005.) *Bridging the gap: the use of research evidence in policy development*. Edmonton, Alberta: Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research
- **BREWER, G. D. & STERN, P. C.** (2005.) *Decision making for the environment: social and behavioral science research priorities*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press
- **BRONFMAN, M. N., LANGER, A. & TROSTLE, J**. (2002.) *De la investigación en Salud a la política: la difícil traducción*. México City: Instituto Nacional de Salud Pública/Editorial Manual Moderno

- **BROOKS, S. & GAGNON, A**. (eds). (1990.) *Social Scientists, Policy, and the State*. Praeger Publishers

If the title of this book brings to mind several distinct but complementary possibilities for the focus of the book's contents - perhaps the **growth and decline of the policy sciences**, perhaps the **influence of social scientists in public policy**, perhaps a **broader view of related trends in state and social science development** over the last century - then you have just grasped the essence of the volume. The essays here are in general stimulating, in some cases outstandingly so, and they are diverse, almost beyond the edge of coherence. In Leslie Pal's words, the essays are exploratory, "s**earching for promising paths around or through the rubble of the collapsed traditional paradigm" that links social science to the state**. **Several of the essays provide overview and background readings**. The introduction by **Gagnon places the essays in a postmodernist phase of thinking about the relationship between social science and policy**, making no assumptions about either the truth of social science knowledge or a privileged position for it in public discourse. A closing chapter by Conway links this theme to the demise of the ideal of the policy sciences. **Carol Weiss provides an easy-reading treatment of current thinking among enlightened policy researchers who understand that their influence is indirect but nonetheless still believe that they have light to shed.** Two cbapters represent case studies of the **interrelation of economic knowledge and political decision**, an area (as Evert Lindquist points out in this book) that has been neglected in previous theorizing. **Stephen Brooks writes on supply and demand for information relevant to the issue of free trade in Canada** in the 1980s**. Peter Hall's discussion of macroeconomic policy-making in Britain** through the early 1980s is a particularly striking case in **which dissension among intellectuals was resolved in practice through action by government decision makers**. The book reaches a climax in the last chapters of part 3. **Bjom Wittrock and Peter Wagner** provide a masterful and sweeping, if skimpily footnoted, **account of the response of social science knowledge to broad social and political issues over the last century in Europe and the U.S. Under the liberal state, the early welfare state, and the full-blown interventionist welfare state, the social sciences have adopted different approaches**. Local opposition within the academy determined different responses to similar problems in Europe and the U.S. **Development and change in the social sciences occurred through an interactive process, shaped both by the state and by larger social forces**, which Wittrock and Wagner term *discourse structuration*. Leslie **Pal** provides a related view by **treating social science knowledge as inseparable from power, using Foucault's familiar twin concept knowledge/power**. When we adopt Foucault's view that p**ower is not concentrated in a state but rather spread discontinuously through society, including in nodes of resistance, then we develop a more differentiated view of the power centers around which social science knowledge grows**. The older concentration on influencing policy through government fades away. Reading these essays as a sociologist of science, I was jealous. The sophistication of analysis that appears, particularly in the Wittrock-Wagner and Pal essays, is unmatched in the critique of any other body of "scientific" knowledge. I longed for a presentation of the development of physics or ecology that could show the parallels between the broad needs of power and the contents of the science as Wittrock and Wagner have done for the social sciences. The reason for the lack of such analysis is clear. Those who have the conceptual tools to produce it lack the technical understanding of the other fields necessary to carry off the analysis. Collaborative efforts will be needed. In the meantime, however, the body of work on social science and the state to which this book contributes comes across, to someone familiar with other sciences, as vaguely narcissistic and myopic. **The analysts involved should be aware that by limiting their sophisticated analysis of politics and knowledge to the social sciences, they unwittingly reinforce the notion that other sciences are immune from politics because they are "objective" - certainly not a claim any of these authors would want to endorse.**

Excerpt source: Susan E. Cozzens (review)
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **BROWN, D L** (1995) 'Managing Conflict Among Groups' in Kolb, D A, Osland, J and Rubin, I M (eds.) *The Organisational Behavior Reader* 6th Edition. Prentice-Hall International.

The importance of **effective conflict management in organisations is increasing**, symptomatic of global trends. **Relations among groups in organisations** can be characterised by too much or too little conflict, depending on their task, the nature of their differences, and the degree to which they are independent. This proposition suggests that conflict managers should strive to maintain some appropriate

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

level of conflict, rather than automatically trying to reduce or resolve all disagreements. **Power differences between groups promote fear and ignorance that result in reduced exchange of information between groups**, and the potential for explosive outbursts, escalating conflict, or escalating oppression. Evening the odds, at least in psychological terms, may be a prerequisite to effective intervention in such a situation. **Managers must cope with fear, ignorance, and their consequences to effectively manage conflicts between unequal groups.** Societal differences institutionalised in the larger society may further complicate relations among groups in organisations by introducing environmental events and long histories of tension. Managing such differences may require invocation of environmental pressures and the **development of counter institutions** that help the organisation deal with the effects of systemic discrimination in the larger society. **Environmental developments produce the seeds for organisational conflicts, but they also offer clues to their management.**

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key themes: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy 2) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **BRYMAN, A** (2001) *Social Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

  Bryman's comprehensive discussion of **different research methods covers both quantitative and qualitative approaches,** as well as issues raised by attempts to break down the divide between the two. In his **chapter on qualitative research**, he **suggests several criteria for evaluating the findings**. The **traditional criteria**, borrowed from quantitative approaches, are *reliability and validity*:
  • 1) **RELIABILITY**: The degree to which a study can be replicated (external reliability), and the **degree of** consensus among the research team (internal reliability).   • 2) **VALIDITY**: The degree to which findings can be generalised (external validity), and the degree of congruence between the researcher's observations and theoretical ideas (internal validity). **Alternative criteria**, developed specifically for qualitative research, are *trustworthiness and authenticity*. **Each of these has several sub-criteria**.
  3) **TRUSTWORTHINESS:** • **Credibility**: The research has taken multiple accounts of social reality into consideration, for example through triangulation (using more than one research method, source of data, and theoretical perspective). • **Transferability**: Qualitative studies are not expected to be generalisable in the same way that quantitative studies are. However, qualitative studies should provide readers with the possibility of transferring findings where appropriate. This can be done through producing 'thick descriptions' (following Geertz) that take into account the details that surround an event and the several layers of understanding. • **Dependability**: The degree to which all stages of the research process (problem formulation, selection of participants, fieldwork notes, data analysis decisions, etc) are transparent and open to questioning. This is facilitated by researchers keeping complete and accessible records. 4) **AUTHENTICITY**: • **Fairness**: The degree to which the research fairly represents different viewpoints from the social setting under research. • **Ontological authenticity**: The degree to which the research helps members of a social setting to better understand their own environment. • **Educative authenticity**: The degree to which the research helps members to understand the perspectives of other members. • **Catalytic authenticity**: The degree to which the research acts as impetus for social action. The authenticity criteria have on the whole not been influential. They can be associated with action research.

  Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young

  Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Knowledge Management 3) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **BUCHBERGER, B.** (1998.) "University research vitalization and social contribution". *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 57 (3): 211-215 (March 1997)

- **BUENAVISTA, G.** (2003.) *Integrating research and policy for natural resource management: lessons learned in the Philippines*. SANREM CRSP (Sustainable Agriculture & Natural Resource Management Collaborative Research Support Program) Research Brief, No. 14, 5 p.

- **BULMER, M**. (1978.) "Social science research and policy-making in Britain" In *Social Policy Research*, M. BULMER (ed.), London: The Macmillan Press

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **BULMER, M.** (1982.) *The uses of social research. Social investigation in public policy-making.* London: George Allen and Unwin, 184 p.
- **BULMER, M.** (1986.) *Social science and social policy*. London School of Economics and Political Science; London: Allen & Unwin Publishers, London.

- **BURNHAM, J. B.** (1997.) "Evaluating industry/ university research linkages". *Research-Technology Management*, 40 (1): 52-55. (January-February 1997)

Joint **industry-university research activity** is an increasingly common form of conducting both basic and applied research. However, successfully selecting partners and designing structures for **mutually productive relationships** takes considerably more care than is the case with intra-industry linkages. Interviews with industry R&D managers and bench scientists, as well as extensive literature search, led to insights, about **how successful relationships are established**. Key questions that parties on both sides should ask of each other (and themselves) provide checklists of issues to identify and resolve extensive commitments are made.

Excerpt source: Burham (abstract)
Key themes: 1) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing Communication / Media Communication and IT 2) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **BUTTERILL, D., GOERING, P., JACOBSON, N. & STURTEVANT, D.** (2003.) "Linkage and exchange at the organizational level: a model of collaboration between research and policy". *Journal of Health Services Research and Policy* (Royal Society of Medicine Press), 8 (Supplement 2, no. 4): 14-19

- **BUURMA, H** (2001) 'Public Policy Marketing: Marketing exchange in the public sector'. *European Journal of Marketing* 35(11): 1287–1302.

Customer-oriented governments may **use marketing tools to match their policy 'products' with citizens' requirements.** However, these tools are not based on exchanges since governments, apart from cost recovery, do not demand any reciprocation for their products. **The concept of public policy marketing could enable governments to 'sell' their policies to citizens**, based on **non-commercial marketing exchanges specific to the context of public administration.** Then, social behaviour should be considered citizens' reciprocation contributing to social effects the government has aimed for. Thus **public policy marketing**, though not yet tested in practice, **can be expected to improve the implementation of those governmental policies in which citizen conduct is critical to success**.

Excerpt source: ODI: Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: 1) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing Communication / Media Communication and IT 2) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **CAMPBELL, H.** (2002.) "Evidence based policy: the continuing search for effective policy processes". *Planning Theory & Practice*, 3 (1): 89-90 (April 2002)
- **CAMPBELL, S., BENITA, S., COATES, E., DAVIES, P. & PENN, G.** (2007.) *Analysis for policy: evidence-based policy in practice*. London: Government Social Research Unit, 40 p. http://www.gsr.gov.uk/downloads/resources/pu256_160407.pdf
- **CANADIAN HEALTH SERVICES RESEARCH FOUNDATION.** (1999.) *Issues in linkage and exchange between researchers and decision makers: summary of a*

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

workshop convened by the Canadian Health Services Research Foundation. Canadian Health Services Research Foundation, 25 p.

- **CANNON, J. S. & KILBURN, R. M.** (2003.) "Meeting decision makers' needs for evidence-based information on child and family policy". *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 22 (4), 665-669

- **CAPLAN, N.** (1974.) *The use of social science information by federal executives*. Presented at the OECD Conference on Social Research and Public Policies, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire. Published in G. M. LYONS (ed.) (1975) *Social Research and Public Policies*, Hanover, NH, Dartmouth Press

- **CAPLAN, N.** (1975.) "The use of social science information by federal executives" In *Social Science and Public Policies*, G.M. LYONS (ed.), Hanover, NH, Dartmouth Press, pp. 47-67

- **CAPLAN, N.** (1976.) "Social research and national policy: who uses what, for what purposes and with what effects?" *International Journal of Social Science*, 28 (1): 187-194

- **CAPLAN, N.** (1979.) "The two-communities theory and knowledge utilization". *American Behavioral Scientist*, 22 (3): 459-470

Even though the amount of empirical data on social science utilization in policy formulation is limited, the literature abounds with social scientists speculation about why the information they produce has little impact on policy matters. Either explicitly or implicitly, the most prevalent theory found in this literature may be characterized as the **"two-communities" theory**. Authors who hold this view attempt to explain non-utilization in terms of the relationship of the researcher and the research system to the policy maker and the policy making system. They argue that social scientists and policy makers live in separate worlds with **different and often conflicting values, different reward systems, and different languages.** The social scientist is concerned with "pure" science and esoteric issues. By contrast, government policy-makers are action-oriented, practical persons concerned with obvious and immediate issues. **Some argue that the gap between the knowledge producer and the policy maker needs to be bridged through personal relationships involving trust, confidence, and empathy.** Others see this gap as something apart from cultural differences. They **stress conflict over who determines the ends of policy as an important factor that keeps the social scientists and policy makers apart**. Some feel that the **spectre of knowledge misuse by political power** tends to widen the gap. Still others particularly those who argue the need for "linking" mechanisms, see **the gap as a communication failure or a lack of organized effort to systematically introduce social science knowledge in usable form into the policy-making process** at the key points where it will most likely be used. The general argument is similar in many ways to C.P Snow's position in the Two Cultures, in which he examines the gap between those in humanities and those in the hard sciences. It is **my purpose to examine the relevance of the practices associated with the Two-communities position and to the problem of increasing the utility of social science knowledge in policy-related issues among federal executives.**

Excerpt source: Caplan (introduction)
Key themes: 1) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 2) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 3) Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity

- **CAPLAN, N. et al**. (1975.) *The use of social science knowledge in policy decisions at the national level*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Institute for Social Research

- **CAPLAN, N. Y S. D. NELSON** (1973.) "On Being Useful: The Nature and Consequences of Psychological Research on Social Problems," *American Psychologist,* 28, 3:199-211.

UNESCO

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **CARDEN, F.** (2004.) "Issues in assessing the policy influence of research". *International Social Science Journal*, 56 (179): 135-151 (March 2004)

  The use of research, whether in technological application or in decision making and policy, is a goal for many researchers, who wish the knowledge they generate to be useful to their societies and used by them to improve conditions. Some researchers hope for very immediate use and focus their research on issues of direct relevance in their societies; others focus on issues they as researchers consider important and do not think directly about application. They leave that for others; but nevertheless they do hope that the research gets used and that their ideas and technologies are adopted in some way. **The search for understanding about how knowledge is used, in what is largely seen as a political process of public policy making, is an exploration into the relationships between ideas and decisions, between researchers and policy makers**. It is an attempt to understand whether or not there are some **specific strategies that could be adopted to increase the potential for influence.** Further, it is an attempt to **articulate the subtleties of the policy process in ways that make it more meaningful to researchers** – as many researchers pointed out in the workshops documented later in this report, they were trained to carry out research, not to transmit it or engage in implementation of results. **Now that they are increasingly expected to engage in these activities as part of the research itself, they need new tools and skills**. As one researcher put it, "I mean, you have to be like Erin Brockovitch, no? You have to have the legs, you have to have the looks, you have to be smart, you have to do the research dissemination work, publication work…I said, come on, I'm a researcher." (IDRC 2003c: 51). The **first part of this paper will explore the origins of the study, explore the gaps in evaluation methods** relevant for such a study, and **outline the process behind the design of this evaluation**. It will **explore the problems of attribution and time** as they influence evaluation conduct and findings, as well as the tensions between striving for a generalizable science and the **context dependent nature of much social science evaluation**. The **second part of the paper outlines how we dealt with these issues in the design of the study** and the rationale for the approach used. It will go into considerable methodological detail: the intent here is to **make the method available to others** and to contribute to the growing interest in this domain of work. **The third part of the paper will explore what happened as the study was carried out.** It was conducted as a single, strategic evaluation by the Centre, but it is intended to guide future studies on policy influence and, further**, provide guidance to IDRC programme officers and partners on the factors which need to be considered in the use of research to influence policy.** The Centre is also encouraged to consider a follow-up study (Weiss 2003: 8).

  Excerpt source: Carden (introduction)
  Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **CARDEN, F.** (2005.) *Making the most of research: The influence of IDRC-supported research on policy processes*. Paper for the International conference "African Economic Research Institutions and Policy Development: Opportunities and Challenges" Dakar, January 28-29, 2005 organized by the Secretariat for Institutional Support for Economic Research in Africa (SISERA) Dakar, January 2005

  To better understand the role of research and its influence on public policy, the International Development Research Centre (Canada) undertook a **study of the influence of IDRC-supported research on public policy.** Through a series of document studies and **22 case studies** of IDRC-supported research, the project explored the **nature of policy influence**, its **key characteristics** and the contexts **in which influence occurs.** The intent of the study was a) to **define what IDRC means by policy influence**, b) to **identify cases where policy influence has taken place** and c) to **articulate the factors that support, and those that inhibit, policy influence**.

  Excerpt source: Carden (abstract)
  Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **CARDEN, F. NEILSON, S.** (2005.) "Confluence and influence: Building policy capacities in research networks" In *Global Knowledge Networks and International Development: Bridges across boundaries*, D. Stone & S. Maxwell (eds), London and New York

- **CARDEN, F., DEBY, D., EARL, S., GILLESPIE, B., NEILSON, S. & SMUTYLO, T**. (2002.) *IDRC-supported research in the public policy process: a strategic evaluation of the influence of research on public policy. Working document*. Evaluation Unit, IDRC, 26 October 2001, Revised 10 July 2002, 13 p.

- **CARR, A** (1998) 'Identity, Compliance and Dissent in Organizations: A Psychoanalytical Perspective'. *Organization* 5(1): 81–99.

  Much of the literature in **organisation theory** has yielded an image of the individual which could be called 'skilfully partial'. **The viewpoints talk 'about' human agency without having a view 'of' human agency, turning what is a 'process' into an 'object'**. Other viewpoints raise the same dichotomy, without an underlying theoretic about the dynamic between the two. An example of this difficulty is apparent in the literature that seeks to address the issues of compliance and dissent in organisations. There is little in the way of explanation of the psychodynamics that are involved. **This paper puts forward an explanation of compliance and dissent in organisations and explains how these issues are very much intertwined** with **the dynamic processes involved in the construction of individual identity**. This explanation recognises the **importance of individual experiential histories**, including those that are specifically institutionally fashioned, such as gender and the primacy of work. **Drawing upon psychoanalytical theory** (with some of its Frankfurt School and other variants), an essential lens is provided through which the issues of compliance and dissent can readily be viewed and understood. Results from recent studies are used to illustrate this different perspective, and the psychodynamics that are put forward are discussed in terms of further implications for the field.

  <u>Excerpt source</u>: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  <u>Key theme</u>: State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **CARTER, B. & NEW, C.** (2004.) *Making realism work: realist social theory and empirical research*. New York: Routledge

- **CASTELLS, M** (1993) 'The Informational Economy and the New International Division of Labour' in Carnoy, M, Castells, M, Cohen, S S and Cardoso, F H (eds.) *The New Global Economy in the Information Age*. London: Macmillan.

  Globalisation has been seen as an expansionary and inclusionary process. **Castells argues that it is now becoming an exclusionary process**, due to the nature of the emerging global **informational economy**. The highest value-added links in the chain of **global production** are concentrated in **core areas**, along with the **highest value production of information**. These core areas cut across the traditional First/Second/Third World divide, as the information age has made it possible to link core areas in the 'First World' with metropolitan core areas in the 'Third World'. The reason that this is now an exclusionary process is because **other areas**, which might previously have been exploited by the international division of labour, **are now becoming irrelevant in the dynamics of the informational economy.** Castells **calls these irrelevant areas the 'Fourth World'**, and argues that they **can be found both in the 'First' and in the 'Third World'**.

  <u>Excerpt source</u>: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  <u>Key themes</u>: Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **CASWILL, C. & WENSLEY, R.** (2007.) "Doors and boundaries: a recent history of the relationship between research and practice in UK organizational and management research". *Business History,* Liverpool: May 2007. Vol. 49, Issue 3; p. 293

- **CERNADA, G. P.** (1982.) "Closing the Gap Between Research and Program Action" In *Knowledge into Action*, New-York: Baywood Publishing Company, pp. 11-20

- **CERNADA, G. P.** (1982.) *Knowledge into action*. New-York: Baywood Publishing Company
- **CHALMERS, I.** (2003.) "Trying to do more good than harm in policy and practice: the role of rigorous, transparent, up-to-date evaluations". *Annals of the American Academy of Political, and Social Science*, vol 589, pp 22-40
- **CHALMERS, I.** (2005.) "If evidence-informed policy works in practice, does it matter if it doesn't work in theory?" *Evidence & Policy: A Journal of Research, Debate and Practice*, Volume 1, Number 2, May 2005 , pp. 227-242 (16)
- **CHANKOVA, S.** (2006.) *Rising to the challenges of human resources for health in Kenya : developing empirical evidence for policy making*. Bethesda, Md.: Partners for Health Reformplus: Abt Associates, 24 p.
- **CHAPMAN JENNIFER AND WAMEYO AMBOKA** (2001.) Monitoring and Evaluating Advocacy: A Scoping Study. Actionaid 54p.

- **CHAPMAN, J AND FISHER, T** (1999) *Effective Campaigning*. London: New Economics Foundation.

  International non-governmental organisations are devoting **more energy to policy influence** work **without knowing much about what makes a campaign effective**. Based on research conducted by the new Economics Foundation, and focusing on case studies of child labour in India and the promotion of breast feeding in Ghana, they recommend: (i) **effective campaigns require a long-term commitment** and **take place at many different levels**: **international, national/regional, and grassroots**. To achieve the reach and mix of skills required, collaboration is essential while i**ndividuals (or champions) with drive and commitment are also key**; (ii) **campaigns are not enough on their own**; implementation and change at the grassroots should never be assumed and require additional activity; (iii) a narrow focus can be effective in getting an issue formulated but problems caused by poverty are more complex; **if the campaign is not widened out at a later stage it is unlikely to achieve effective change**; (iv) **effectiveness is an art not a science**: but **organisations can learn from past and present experience using frameworks and other evaluative processes**. In evaluating different structures for collaboration, they **identify three types**: '**pyramid**' (quick, helps get access to top level of policy, but can ignore grassroots), **'wheel'** (slow but good for information exchange and development of centres of specialisation), '**web'** (like a wheel but with no focal NGO, could be too slow for campaigning).

  Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  Key theme: 1) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing Communication / Media Communication and IT 2) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy.

- **CHASS** (Council for the Humanities, A. S. S.). (2005.) *Measures of quality and impact of publicly funded research in the humanities, arts and social sciences*. CHASS Occasional Papers 2, 120 p. http://www.chass.org.au/op2.pdf
- **CHELIMSKY, E.** (1991.) "On the social science contribution to governmental decision-making". *Sciences,* 254: 226-231
- **CHERNS, A.** (1979.) *Using the social sciences.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul
- **CHERNS, A.** (1986.) "Policy research under scrutiny" In *The Use and Abuse of Social Science*, F. HELLER (ed), London: Sage Publications
- **CHERNS, A. B.** (1970.) "Relations between research institutions and users of research". *International Social Science Journal,* 22: 226-242
- **CHERNS, A. B.** (1972.) "Models for the use of research". *Human Relations,* 25: 25-33
- **CHERNS, A. B.** (1975.) "Social engineering in Britain: the use of social sciences in social policy". *Current Sociology,* 23: 99-127

- **CHICHILINSKY, G., GALLOPIN, G. C., HARDOY, J. E., HERRERA, A. O., MOSOVICH, D., OTEIZA, E., ROMERO, G. L. de, SCOLNICK, H. D., SUAREZ, C. E., TALAVERA, L. & IIED-AL/IDRC.** (2004.) *¿Catástrofe o nueva sociedad? Modelo mundial latinoamericano 30 años después* (segunda edición)
- **CHILDS, S. & DOBBINS, S.** (2003.) "The research-practice spiral". *VINE*, 33 (2): 51-64 (14) (November 2003)
- **CHODOROW, N** (1999) *The Power of Feelings: Personal Meaning in Psychoanalysis, Gender, and Culture*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Psychoanalytic theories about how we communicate take as their starting point the different ways in which we create 'personal meaning' when dealing with events. Humans have the **need to gain a sense of meaning** and to manage new experiences that may be threatening. This is done through drawing on our inner world, which harbours an array of **possible reactions built on past experiences and emotions**. This inner reality is brought into interpersonal communication through transference and projection. First, **transference** can be described as 'the private language of the self', meaning that **every person imbues present relationships with feelings and reactions from past relationships.** Second, **projection** is the process whereby a **person projects her/his own emotions or beliefs into the other person**. This is also called projective identification, as it **makes it easier for us to identify with the other person**, thus **facilitating communication for us**. However, **projection also serves to confuse communication**, since the other person is not always aware of which emotions or beliefs are attributed to them, and in turn they engage in their own process of projection. In sum, **all people use transference and projection in order to create personal meaning when communicating** with someone else. An awareness of these processes may throw light on why people experience relationships and messages so differently. It also highlights the **importance of attempting to understand the 'private language' of the person one is communicating with**.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: 1) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **CHOMBART DE LAUWE, PH** (1975.) La culture et le pouvoir. Paris : Stock, 385p.
- **CHOMBART DE LAUWE, PH** (1981.) L'enjeu des sciences humaines dans la recherche et la société. Communication au colloque "Recherche et Technologie". Paris.

- **CHOMSKY, N** (1987) 'The Manufacture of Consent' in J. Peck (ed.) *The Chomsky Reader*, Serpent's Tail: London.

Chomsky argues that **US policies are shaped by and in turn shape a 'framework of possible thought'**. This framework consists of various **tacit doctrines,** (such as the idea underpinning US foreign policy that Nicaragua poses a threat to the US). These doctrines are all the more effective **in 'engineering consent' because they are not debatable**; **certain terms (e.g. 'peace', 'security')** seem so persuasive and self-evident that **opposition to them is unthinkable**. Chomsky claims that **dissident views are so easily relegated to the periphery** in US policy making precisely because **these views are not able to communicate with policy makers within the framework of possible thought**, and are **therefore dismissed as impossible or morally dubious** ('anti-peace', 'anti-security'). This highlights the necessity of **understanding the framework and terms within which policy is made thinkable**, if one is to challenge a policy consensus.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: 1) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 2) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **CHRISTIANSEN, K., HOVLAND, I. & ODI (OVERSEAS DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE).** (2003.) *The PRSP Initiative: multilateral policy change and the role of research*. London: ODI (Overseas Development Institute)

- **CHUNHARAS, S**. (2000.) "Research to action and policy: the need for a new concept" In *Lessons in Research to Action and Policy – Case Studies From Seven Countries* (Edited by: COHRED Working Group on Research to Action and Policy)*.* Geneva, The Council on Health Research for Development 2000, 1-8

"Linking Research to Policy and Action" Chunharas, Word Document (chapter 5): A key element in **ensuring that health research indeed becomes an "essential link to equity in development"** is creating a dynamic **link between research and policy**. In describing this challenge in 1990, the *Commission on Health Research for Development* outlined four pathways by which research can lead to health improvement: 1) identifying and setting priorities, 2) enhancing the efficiency and quality of health-care systems, 3) developing new technologies and interventions, and 4) advancing basic knowledge of human biology and behaviour. This **chapter analyzes** some of the **experiences of developing countries** in **strengthening this link** over the past 10 years. It begins by identifying the key components of effective research–policy linkages. These include the **dual processes of research and policy development, the context in which they both operate, the stakeholders involved, the products or outputs of both processes, and the critical role of mediators**. To begin, we must try to understand the attitudes of key stakeholders. **Researchers** typically feel they should remain "objective" in their work and are uncomfortable about close contacts with either decision-makers or the community. **Decision-makers** often regard researchers as too "academic," impractical, and slow, as the decision-makers work in an environment in which they must try to balance the demands of various pressure groups. **Members of the community**, an often forgotten stakeholder in the research process, may feel intimidated by both researchers and decision-makers, even though, given the opportunity, community members can have much to say about issues to investigate and the exact application of new knowledge. Much more attention should **focus on the social, political, and economic context of knowledge production and use**. This principle is particularly important if the goal is to conduct and apply research relevant to a country's needs. At one level, science and technology (S&T) cannot thrive when a country is involved in armed conflict or has a dictatorial regime. Indeed, there are some sad examples in which the squelching of processes to nurture and apply science actually contributed to reversing gains in the health and welfare of people. At the more local level, people have sometimes refused to use the fruits of S&T because researchers failed to study and understand their deep-seated practices and traditions. This chapter particularly emphasizes **the importance of mediators** in **bridging the two parallel processes of research and policy development.** It puts forward the proposal that various mediators can play distinctive and complementary roles in **achieving successful linkages** between research and action: 1) **Researchers themselves** can develop some skills of communication and advocacy. In particular they must understand how decision-makers make resource-allocation decisions and how policymakers develop, implement, and monitor policies. 2) This chapter makes a special plea for giving more **attention to the critical role of national health-research managers**, preferably within the context of an Essential National Health Research (ENHR) mechanism or system. These leaders can be the researchers themselves, research users, or funders. They require skills such as facilitating the process of **multistakeholder priority-setting**, **building coalitions to work on specific problems**, **seizing opportunities ("entry points")** to **identify relevant research questions** or ensure the use of available research, and nurturing future leadership for national health research and development (R&D). In particular, these leaders must learn to function as "knowledge managers" within the rapidly changing context of the global knowledge economy. 3) **National governments** also have an important role to play in improving both the technical and human infrastructure for social communication. Governments set the political climate by listening and responding to people's concerns, conducting the affairs of government openly and transparently, and asking for evidence to support decision-making. Political leaders must also understand that investing in S&T, both for short- and longer term purposes, is an investment in enhancing the well-being of people. 4) Finally, the **international research community** has a major responsibility to ensure stronger links between research and policy. International agencies should consider changing the ways in which they have traditionally operated, for example, by **aligning agency agendas with those of recipient countries**, **providing funding support directly to a multistakeholder** national research structure, **rethinking the function of technical assistance as a condition for funding**, making much **more use of national consultants** (who understand the local context), and using external experts only for carefully negotiated distinctive contributions.

Conclusion: In many countries, the focus of research for action has been on strengthening researchers' communication skills, but such initiatives rely on the **overly simplistic assumption that proper packaging ensures the best use of research.** To increase the likelihood of research leading to action,

we need to include many other factors in the equation. One is that the **research-planning process requires broader participation and a diversity of dynamics**. Another is that **researchers need to concern themselves with the decision-making process** and become involved in it, rather than paying attention solely to their research. They also need to **improve their communication of research results**, adopting more of a **social-marketing approach**. To enable such a holistic participatory approach to yield the best results, researchers and research users need to strengthen their capabilities. A **national mechanism with a dynamic, interactive, and inclusive process** would be **crucial to improving the chances of research linking successfully to action**. The research community, decision-makers, and research-funding agencies need leaders, or managers, who **understand the concepts and practices of knowledge management for change**. Government also has a critical role to play, especially in providing both physical and social infrastructure to facilitate or demand research for action. The international research community and funding agencies need to change many of their conventional attitudes and practices and look at research for action more from a country viewpoint and from that of longer term development goals.

Excerpt source: Chunharas (summary and conclusion) focus on public health
Key theme: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy. 2) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 3) Knowledge Management 4) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 5) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **CHURCH, C.** (2005.) *Mind the gap: policy development and research on conflict issues*. Research Impacting Policy Project (RIP), INCORE / Initiative on Conflict Resolution and Ethnicity (INCORE). International Centre of Excellence for Conflict and Peace Studies, 50 p. http://www.incore.ulster.ac.uk/policy/rip/RIP.pdf

Since the 1950's, a steadily increasing amount of research and scholarly attention has been paid to the resolution of violent conflict. Today this has become the foundation of a robust body of knowledge focusing on non-military approaches to preventing, managing and ending conflicts. Despite this, the public and political perception of force as the primary response to conflict remains. This research project examines the relationship between the research and policy worlds, attempting to ascertain if and then how research informs policy development. It also provides a series of tactics that policy oriented researchers can adopt to increase their influence. **FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH QUESTION**: The fundamental question addressed in this paper is: to what extent, if any, is research on conflict issues being used in the development of policy?
The Influence of Research on Policymaking Conflict-focused research's primary use is one of a *conceptual/enlightenment* function for policymakers. The research influences the context within which policy is developed by illuminating new trends, offering different paradigms, improving the understanding of a problem or coining new and improved terms. In a distant second place, research was found to perform a *symbolic/legitimative* role where it is used to confirm existing notions or to support a decision that has already been made. Finally, in the rarest of cases, research is used in an *instrumental/engineering* way, informing decisions and actions that would not have been taken without this input. Understanding what constitutes 'use' is still a highly problematic construct and for this study was defined in the broadest sense. Further it is important to acknowledge the methodological problems in proving or measuring cause and effect in research utilisation. **FINDINGS: a)** *Realities of the Policymakers World:* ⯀ **Expectations:** By and large, the working culture in which civil servants function does not expect them to stay current with the latest research. One source indicated that 'staying current' is more about the ability to 'get somebody who can talk to the minister about it' then being knowledgeable about the latest thinking individually. ⯀ **Catalysts**: Ironically one of the few catalysts indicated by policymakers to seeking out research is the need to develop policy. Research was seen to contribute in a few specific ways: through refining or furthering departmental thinking on an issue, by interpreting the relevancy and applicability of international approaches to local situations and by identifying relevant data and information. However, approximately half of the sources who indicated policy development as a catalyst for using research pointed out in the same breath that real strategic policy development through research was a rarity. ⯀ **Research Sources**: A clear hierarchy is evident, in order of preference; sources tend to be personal contacts, journals, events, the Internet and finally books.
⯀ **Reviewing Publications**: Where information is abundant, submissions are rarely read in full due to lack of time. A 'skim and dip' pattern emerged, where policymakers skim the executive summary looking for new stuff and then dip-in to the main report to find out more. ⯀ **Credibility**: The majority of interviewees stated that the researcher's track record is the most important determinant of that researchers' credibility. ⯀ **Neutrality**: Few researchers are deemed to be truly neutral and it would appear that assessments of neutrality are based on a mix of researcher reputation and the content of the

research output. **b)***The Impediments to Interaction and Influence:* **Differences:** There are a number of differences between the research and policy world that act as impediments to effective utilisation of research. Different concepts of acceptable timeframes, where the notion of short, medium and long term represent significantly shorter periods to the policy community, can minimise interaction. Contradictory values, differing approaches to conflict resolution and fear or perceptions of one's role also deter influence. **Inhibitors for Policymakers:** Policymakers have their own personal inhibitors that prevent them from initiating effective interactions with researchers. A sense of ownership of policies was deemed by a small proportion of the interviewees to cause a resistance to change. A lack of time further dictates policymakers' actions and limits willingness to cast a wide net in looking for relevant research. **Frustrations with Research:** Why is research not utilised once received? The four main complaints, in order of significance, as indicated by the frequency with which they were mentioned in the study, were lack of quality, poor presentation, timing problems and lack of contextual understanding. **c)** *Seven Tactics to Improve Research Utilisation:* 1. Select a strategy appropriate to the policy goal. 2. Design the research project with policy influence in mind. 3. Develop an understanding of the policymaker's working context. 4. Engage with potential users. 5. Develop an actionable option analysis. 6. Disseminate and present user-friendly research results. 7. Capitalize on windows of opportunity.

METHODS: A multi-pronged methodology was adopted for this project: a review of social science literature, a questionnaire to academic/researchers, and 21 interviews with policymakers in the United Kingdom, Republic of Ireland, European Union and Northern Ireland in 2002. The majority of the analysis is based on the interview data due to the subjective nature of the topic, the importance of nuance in language and the paucity of literature specific to conflict issues. **CONCLUSION:** The assumption that governments at all levels will improve their ability to handle situations of conflict in step with scholarly advancements may be far from the reality. Yet the onus does not lie entirely on the shoulders of the academic/research community, as no matter how policy-oriented a researcher may be they are still on the outside of the policy labyrinth. It is not only the responsibility of the researcher to insure that their findings appear on the right desk at the right time, but also for policymakers to look for the newest work to inform better decision making.

Excerpt source: Church Cheyanne (executive summary) Focus on conflict resolution.
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance
2) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing Communication / Media Communication and IT 3) Social uses that are made of social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity 4) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 5) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **CIPPEC & ODI (OVERSEAS DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE).** (2007.) *Taller de desarrollo de capacidades para la incidencia política. Informe final*. CIPPEC, Argentina, 12-16 de febrero, Buenos Aires, 27 p.

- **CLAY, E J AND SCHAFFER, B B** (1984*) Room for Manoeuvre: An Exploration of Public Policy in Agricultural and Rural Development*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Clay and Schaffer start from the **assumption that policies can actually make a difference and that there are different policy choices**; i.e. there is room for a manoeuvre. However, this does not mean that policy is a case of linking intentions to implementation. In fact, Clay and Schaffer **point out** that there is **frequently a gap between policy aims and outcomes**, and they claim that this clear divide is upheld because it enables the group on each side (**decision-makers versus implementers**) to **blame the other group for policy failures**. They conclude by e**mphasising the importance of self-awareness in the policy process**, in order to avoid the decision/implementation dichotomy and to encourage responsible action at all stages of the process. They also note the **danger** – especially in rural development – that **policy making may become 'a mystique of elites'**, and therefore it is important to engage with the groups in question. Finally they comment that '**the whole life of policy is a chaos of purposes and accidents'**; however, this is not seen as an excuse for irresponsibility, but rather is used as an argument for increased responsibility.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **CLEGG, S** (1994) 'Constitution of the Resistant Subject' in Jermier, J M, Knights, D and Nord, W R (eds.) *Resistance and Power in Organisations*. London: Routledge.

  The two general ingredients in this chapter are the **relation between the interconnection of power relationships and the constitution of subjectivity**. One way of expressing this is through the construction of a continuum of 'the degree of intensiveness/extensiveness of the power relations constitutive of the subject'. Drawing on the chapters in this volume **it is possible to identify at least three aspects of this dimension of power and subjectivity**. There is, first, the q**uestion of individual organisation**. How coherently organised is the individual, in terms of their subjectivity, as a reflexive agent in power relations? How coherently organised is the individual as one who seeks to enrol, translate, interest or oppose others in their projects? Does the subject have sufficient self-cognisance to be able to exercise this agency? Second, **at the mid-point, there is the question of social organisation**. To what extent is the subject able to draw upon resources of social organisation greater than the self, such as familial networks or an ecology of local community networks? Third, the most extensive point is the question of solidaristic organisation: **to what extent can the subject draw upon consciously organised resources of a social movement or collective organisation in the pursuit of their agency?** Or, to put the question in another, equally appropriate way, **to what extent does power constitute the resources of human agency in terms of self, significant and generalised others**?

  Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  Key theme: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy. 2) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **CNER (COMITÉ NATIONAL D'ÉVALUATION DE LA RECHERCHE).** (2006.) *Pour une meilleure évaluation de la recherche publique en sciences humaines et sociales. Tome 1 et 2, Synthèse et recommandations*. Paris: Documentation française

- **COE, J; LUETCHFORD M. & KINGHAM, T**. (2002.) *ID21: tracking routes towards impact.* 36 p.

  id21's goal is **"to establish means by which the influence of UK development research on policy can be increased in a way that creates significant, lasting and (if possible) measurable impact".** The importance of mobilising research and knowledge for pro-poor development has been outlined before (in DFID's 1997 White Paper for example). But demonstrating the links between research at one end and policy and practice at the other is problematic, the relationships between the two, and those in between, being complex and difficult to track. The literature from which to draw lessons is very limited: **there are no directly relevant examples of any assessment of impact of web-based information programmes and research dissemination mechanisms**. Yet id21 owes it to a range of stakeholders (its users, researchers, policy makers, and funders) to explore these relationships with reference to its own programme in order to ensure that its resources are being used most efficiently and effectively. Overall, this **project sought to gather data and information from a range of sources and stakeholders and to collate this information in ways that**: 1. **allow id21 to explore the ways in which policy makers and decision makers access research**; 2. **test the validity of the dissemination methodologies [formats and channels] that id21 employs**; and 3. **assess actual performance to date in relation to id21's outputs and the outcomes resulting from this** (if possible, also including examples of impact).

  Excerpt source: Coe et al. (abstract)
  Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT 3) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **COHEN, D. K. & GARET, M**. (1975.) "Reforming educational policy with applied social research". *Harvard Educational Review*, 45: 47-43

- **COHRED WORKING GROUP ON RESEARCH TO ACTION AND POLICY.** (2000.) *Lessons in research to action and policy. Case studies from seven countries.* 92 p.

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

Health research can have an impact on many different aspects of health development and at many different levels. It can create better **understanding about the determinants of health, play a crucial role in the development and use of health technologies, and inform decision making of various kinds** which result in actions at an individual level or in health policies and programs at the population level. Researchers often adhere to the idea that the results of relevant and scientifically rigorous research will eventually find their way onto the desks and into the meeting rooms of policymakers and program planners. This is seldom the case and a problem that has itself generated a great deal of research. **How can the link between research and action be strengthened? This question guided the work of the Council on Health Research for Development (COHRED.) A) WORKING GROUP ON RESEARCH TO ACTION AND POLICY. Formed in 1998,** the Working Group strove to better **understand how to improve the linkage between research and action, and in particular, research and policy.** It was **hoped that such an understanding would identify capacity development needs to help countries in their efforts to make research an effective tool for health development.** Case studies were carried out in five countries: **Brazil, Burkina Faso, Indonesia, South Africa, and Uruguay.** A combination of document analysis, interviews with researchers and decision-makers, and, in several cases, the case study authors' personal experience in the research-policy process, were employed to document the use of research around a health problem or development effort. The case studies can be found in this publication. **B) CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR AN HOLISTIC APPROACH TO STRENGTHENING THE RESEARCH-POLICY LINK** : **Previous attempts** at improving the research-to-policy linkage have **focused on the supply side or research generation.** But experience has taught that **efforts must be directed at both the research generation and decision-making processes**. A conceptual framework for an holistic approach to strengthening the linkage between research and policy, **based on interactive learning through equal partnership**, is presented in the publication. Identified, are **five components of the interface between research and policy: 1) the process** (This encompasses the two inter-related processes of research generation and decision-making. It is important to pay attention to the process of how research is planned and executed, and also to the process whereby decisions are made. There are many steps in both processes that need to be linked, not just the initial steps of defining research questions and policy priorities and the later steps of disseminating results and implementing policies and programs.)**, 2) the stakeholders** (Stakeholders include the various groups of people who are concerned or affected by the issues being addressed by the process. Research will have a greater likelihood of being used in decision-making if the intended users are identified and become involved at various stages in the processes of research planning, management, and dissemination.)**, 3) the mediators who help to link the two processes** (mediators are perhaps the most crucial component of the framework. They are individuals or institutions who play an active role in fostering linkages between the research and policy processes, while making sure that all relevant stakeholders are involved. They could be organisations supporting research work. They could be researchers themselves. They could also be academic or civic groups that support evidence-based decision-making)**, 4) the research products** (The products refer to the research studies themselves and how they are linked to the decision-making process. In most cases, researchers are concerned about the quality of research, seeing it as the determining factor in whether or not it is used. The nature of the issues being addressed and the nature of the studies themselves, however, can also play a crucial role.)**, and 5) the larger context within which the decision-making and research processes take place** (context refers to the environment surrounding the research and decision making processes. International organisations and existing funding structures have a significant impact on research linkage to policy, as does the socioeconomic and political situation of the country. The prevailing nature of the decision-making process and the values and perceptions of the research community are important aspects of the environment that should also be taken into account.) **C) LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE COUNTRY CASE STUDIES AND ENTRY POINTS FOR STRENGTHENING THE RESEARCH TO POLICY AND ACTION LINK.** The sociopolitical environment can contribute both positively and negatively to the effective use of research for action. **Overall societal values and practices, for example, must be supportive of transparent, knowledge-based decision-making for research to find use among decision-makers**. In contrast, the political circumstances within a country may not just be at odds with the notion of dialogue between researchers and decision-makers, but may result in the suppression of research and researchers by governmental powers […] **Better linkage of research to action requires commitment and concern of various stakeholders**. It is not the responsibility of researchers alone. Although discrete yet parallel processes, efforts need to be focused on both decision-making and research generation, linking the two at multiple stages. Such efforts need to begin with the initial step of research priority setting and continue through to dissemination of the research results. **There are five critical entry points for strengthening the research to policy and action link. 1) Researchers:** There is a need to foster new skills and ways of thinking among researchers. In order for them to engage fruitfully in both the research and policy processes they must understand how resource allocation decisions are made and how policy is developed, implemented, and monitored. They also need to be good communicators – not only toward the end of the research process when research results have already been obtained. **2) Mediating Mechanism:** Researchers, research

users, and research funders tend to work in isolation from one another and adhere to their own mandates. Within the new framework for strengthening the research to policy link, interaction among all the stakeholders needs to be intensive and to take place at multiple, overlapping stages of the research and decision-making processes. An effective mediator is needed to encourage the various stakeholders to work together. **3) Research managers:** Conventional research managers are entrusted to manage multicentre projects or large studies. Their primary responsibilities are to ensure that projects are completed as proposed, within the allotted timeframe and resources. Research managers who work to ensure better linkages between research and action have different responsibilities. They must make sure that research work has the best chance of being utilised by potential users, by identifying and involving the various stakeholders. **4) Political leaders:** National governments have an important role to play in improving the infrastructure for social communication, both technical and human. Governments set the political climate for listening and responding to the concerns of the people, conducting the affairs of government in an open and transparent fashion, and asking for evidence to support decision-making. Political leaders must also understand that investing in science and technology, for both short- and longer-term purposes, is an investment in enhancing the well-being of the people. **5) International research community:** The international research community includes research funding agencies and international research institutes and individual researchers. Best use of research results starts with ensuring relevance to the potential users. This requires research that fits within national priorities rather than externally imposed agendas. New ideas or issues can be introduced through external research funders, but they need to be carefully discussed at the country level to ensure relevance and sense of ownership from the initial step of research planning. **Conclusion:** Making the best use of available research studies is a priority goal in most countries – developed or developing. **Most efforts have adopted an overly simplistic conceptual framework which focuses on linking the final stage of the research process with the initial stages of the decision making process**. A more **holistic approach is needed**. Improving the research to policy and action link requires not only introducing new tools and techniques, but a paradigm shift among many of the key stakeholders, especially researchers and research funders. This new paradigm calls for a better balance between research supply and demand. It requires new skills and mechanisms to create this balance as well as new partnerships within countries and at the international level.

Excerpt source: Chunharas (introduction and main points)
Key themes: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy 2) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 3) Knowledge Management 4) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 5) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 6) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **COHRED** (2001.) "Bridging the gap between research and policy: learning brief." No. 2001/6. Published by the Council on Health Research for Development (COHRED) as part of the ENHR Handbook.

   This learning brief is based on a paper which reviews the literature assessing how research impacts on policy, and how policy draws on research. The paper seeks to answer two questions: **1) ● How does research impact on policy? 2) ● How does policy draw upon research?** The authors conclude that the relationship is not straightforward - research is not always designed to be relevant to policy, with results packaged appropriately and accessibly for policymakers. Sometimes research is designed to do this, but **fails because of lack of timeliness, bad presentation, or poor communication.** Similarly, **policy making is not always rationally based on relevant research findings**, and policy makers do not always see research as central to their decision making. The paper provides insight into the **various modes of advocacy that researchers can adopt, methods of communication and dissemination they can use**, and a number of new lessons about knowledge utilisation. Research that influences policy: How to become a 'policy entrepreneur': Researchers cannot expect that policy-makers will systematically trawl the research literature for relevant findings and use them rationally and objectively. The real world is more complex. What then, should researchers do? The answers range from 'nothing' to 'better dissemination' to 'active policy entrepreneurship'. There is no shortage of literature on this subject. The key finding is that for researchers interested in policy impact, 'do nothing' is not an option. 'Better dissemination' is better but still only a partial answer. 'Policy entrepreneurship' seems to be the way forward for the researcher. It must be remembered, however, that there are also options for policy makers to become more intelligent customers of research. Targeting research to a particular audience requires different presentation and dissemination strategies. Professional

associations, think tanks and pressure groups for example, use many different mediums to make research policy relevant and publicly accessible. **THE LEGISLATIVE ROUTE:** Parliamentary or Legislative Committees and Inquiries represent institutional targets for researchers both outside and within government. Inquiries often utilise consultative mechanisms which give external researchers the opportunity to influence findings (by, for example, inviting take years to run their course and be significantly altered or abandoned after a change of government. In addition, governments frequently ignore findings and attempt to water-down the recommendations, or try to delay the policy response. **BUREAUCRATIC ACCESS:** Researchers can cultivate relationships with senior bureaucrats either through informal interactions or within policy communities and sometimes will have input into policy agendas. Interaction with 'street level bureaucrats' can build constructive relationships that inform policy implementation and service delivery with research insights. **EDUCATIONAL AVENUES:** The movement of foreign students has consequences for the diffusion of knowledge, policy transmission, and the long-term impact on public policies, though this is not well understood. International student exchange schemes are significant channels for the international movement of ideas, policy and practice. **THE CLIMATE OF OPINION:** A further strategy for influencing policy is to change the general climate of thinking about an issue or policy, and thereby the political contexts in which decisions are made. Appealing to the public or to civil society in order to shape the 'climate of opinion' is a long-term and indirect tactic for affecting policy change. Researchers need to market their research findings and policy ideas so as to reach a public rather than a political or bureaucratic audience. This could include producing 'sound-bytes' for electronic media (and images for television), or crafting 'opinion editorials', eye-catching headlines or short, concise statements for the print media. **COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND LOCAL KNOWLEDGE:** In some instances, the character of a piece of research is shaped by how it is conducted. Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) combines research and practice, thereby addressing implementation and monitoring problems at the same time as testing research and policy ideas. This grass-roots or participatory style of research also helps build relations between researchers and those whom the research is about or for whom it is intended. In developing countries, often traditional (informal and common) communicative structures are more useful than national (top-down) structures or the mass media, which provide information that is too general or prescriptive to assist research users. This literature makes some suggestions for the utilisation of these communicative channels in disseminating research: • Focus on personal interaction through participatory and consultative structures of the provision of technical information and training. • Intermediaries may be of crucial importance in accessing communicative channels. • Community meetings. • Community-based provision of electronic media such as online local databases or village payphones. **NETWORKS:** Policy research networks with decision-makers as active participants have the potential to influence policy in both the local and global domains. Such alliances can connect both researchers and decision-makers with counterparts elsewhere in the world when policy increasingly has transnational causes and consequences. Even without such political involvement, the norms, values and aspirations of leading networks can have significant impact on the climate of elite opinion and culture of public debate. **COMMUNICATION AND DISSEMINATION STRATEGIES**: It is important to ensure that research is linked to appropriate dissemination strategies. A variety of techniques for communication and dissemination are recommended in the literature. In general, these aim at researchers maximising the distribution of their research. Strategies include: • Maximising press and media exposure • Widespread distribution of brochures and pamphlets • Immediate advertising of research results • Increasing the use of the internet and other electronic means of dissemination • Publishing research papers • Engaging with policy makers through policy Debates Holding open seminar presentations or other forum. However, these techniques should not be viewed as a prescriptive list of strategies for a number of reasons: • Dissemination does not occur as a one- way flow from researcher to policy maker - it is an interactive process in which communication includes feedback and an understanding of the research needs of research users. • Lists of techniques to encourage the utilisation of research often ignore the importance of targeting particular researchers groups with different dissemination strategies. • Dissemination does not occur in a social and political vacuum - strategies that work well in one country may fail elsewhere. **CONCLUSIONS:** New thinking and new approaches to 'bridging research and policy' are important. However, it is equally important to understand the various interpretations of how research feeds into policy, the different programmes that attempt to 'bridge research and policy', and the wide range of resources already available to build linkages across these two domains. A critical assessment and evaluative procedures of these endeavours is also needed. **LESSONS LEARNED:** • Convincing arguments and scientific consensus are not sufficient to shift policy. The notion of 'truth speaking to power' is an ideal that does not conform to reality. • 'Incrementalism' is a feature of most political systems - research knowledge may trickle into policy decisions in the long term. • Research groups may need to target public agendas in addition to official decision makers to excite public opinion. Public debate adds to the legitimacy of research. • The 'normal' manner in which research is utilised constitutes a paradigm. Extreme political pressure or crises may cause a paradigm shift opening new ways of thinking. • The issue-attention cycle suggests that old ideas or research either need to be repackaged in new ways, or attached to new problems. • Different models of knowledge utilisation suggest varying strategies for making research matter in policy. • Research is compromised where implementation may distort and undermine research recommendations.

UNESCO

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

Excerpt source: Diane Stone PAIS (text, learning brief)
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy 3) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 4) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **COLEMAN J.S., E.Q. CAMPBELL, C. J. HOBSON, J.MCPARTLAND, A. MOOD, F.D. WINGFIELD Y R.L. YORK**. Coleman Report (1966*.) Equality of Educational Opportunity* (Coleman Report) Washington DC: Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

- **COLEMAN, D. A.** (1991.) "Policy research – who needs It?" *Governance: An International Journal of Policy and Administration,* 4: 420-455

The **relationship between government policymaking** and **policy research changes over time** and **between governments**. It **seldom follows the orderly sequence of logical events** which researchers may like to imagine. In attempting to understand the relationship between the creation of knowledge and its use by policymakers, it is **essential to understand the needs and behaviour of politicians, the pressures upon their time and the wide range of channels of information, informal as well as formal, open to them and to their immediate advisers**. **Social policy research**, partly because of its frequent **ambiguity** and **partiality**, is particularly **likely to be ignored** by its official consumers in government. Some social and economic questions are probably not capable of effective testing by research other than by governments putting policies into effect on a national scale. Evaluation of such experiments is difficult. **More attention needs to be paid to the marketing of ideas by pressure groups and think tanks**. **Governments can shop around** for acceptable advice from **a wide range of sources outside academic life**. Except in highly consensual political cultures, the only **decisions which are made primarily on the basis of research findings are politically unimportant ones**. In considering the role of policy research it is essential to keep the **primacy of politics firmly in mind**.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 3) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 4) Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity

- **COLLIN, A** (2001) 'Learning and Development' in Beardwell, I and Holden, L (eds.) *Human Resource Management: A contemporary approach*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

The article **starts with a series of definitions of learning** which essentially rest on the **view that the acquisition of knowledge facilitates change in perceptions and practice**. These attributes are increasingly **important in the information age** where **people are expected to deal with change and new technology**, and become more skilled in problem solving and creative thinking. One theory of learning (associated with Kolb) sees it as an **integrated cognitive and affective process**, moving in a cyclical manner through concrete experience, to reflective observation, to abstract conceptualisation, to **active experimentation in decision-making** and **problem solving**. However, many people have a preference for a particular phase and do not complete the cycle. **Honey and Mumford,** building on Kolb's phases, **identify four learning styles**: '**Activists'** learn best when they are actively involved in concrete tasks; '**reflectors'** learn best through reviewing and reflecting upon what has happened and what they have done; '**theorists**' learn best when they can relate new information to concepts or theory; and '**pragmatists'** learn best when they see relevance between new information and real-life issues or problems. **Theories of learning are often linked to theories of (life-span) development**. Erikson's model of personal development outlines different stages that each individual passes though. **The critical factor driving change from one stage to the next is the experience and resolution of a 'crisis'**.

Kegan develops a similar model which highlights that **each transformation involves risk, a move away from familiarity towards uncertainty.**

<u>Excerpt source</u>: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
<u>Key themes</u>: 1) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 2) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA.** (2006.) *Research quality framework: assessing the quality and impact of research in Australia*. Issue Paper March 2005, 58 p.
- **CORWIN, R. D**. (1973.) "Use and abuse of social science: behavioral science and national policy making". Book Rev., HOROWITZ, I., *Contemporary Sociology*, 2 (3): 328-30
- **COSMSTOCK, Donald** (1982.) Participatory research as critical theory: The north Bonneville, USA experience. Olympia : Evergreen State College.

- **COSTELLO ANTHONY AND ALIMUDDIN ZUMLA,** (2000.) "Moving to research partnerships in developing countries." *BMJ* 2000;321;827-829

    Much foreign-led research in developing countries remains semi-colonial in nature and may have negative effects on partner countries. "Annexed site" **research led by expatriates should be phased out and replaced by a partnership model in which nationals lead research projects**, with only technical support from outsiders. **Research funded through national academics and institutions improves the chances of findings being translated into national policy and practice**. The principles of an equal research partnership need monitoring by funding agencies.

    <u>Excerpt source</u>: Costello et al (summary points)
    <u>Key themes</u>: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 3) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy

- **COURT, J. & COTTERRELL, L.** (2004.) *What political and institutional context issues matter for bridging research and policy? A literature review and discussion of data collection approaches*. GDN Background Studies, 25 p.
- **COURT, J. & YOUNG, J.** (2003.) "Research impact on policy: what can researchers do?" *Newsletter of the Economic Research Forum, for the Arab Countries, Iran & Turkey*, 10 (4) (Winter 2003).

- **COURT, J. & YOUNG, J.** (2004.) "Bridging research and policy in international development: an analytical and practical framework" In *Global Knowledge Networks and International Development*, D. STONE & S. MAXWELL (eds), Routledge

    Better use of research-based evidence in development policy and practice can help save lives, reduce poverty and improve the quality of life. But for this to happen more effectively **researchers** need to do three things: First, they **need to develop a detailed understanding** of i) the **policymaking process** – what are the **key influencing factors**, and how do they relate to each other? ii) the **nature of the evidence they have, or hope to get – is it credible, practical and operationally useful**? and iii) all the other **stakeholders involved in the policy area** – who else can help to get the message across? Second, they need to **develop an overall strategy for their work** – **identify political supporters** and opponents, keep an eye out for, and be able to **react to policy windows**, ensure the

evidence is credible and practically useful, and **build coalitions with like-minded groups**. Third, they **need to be entrepreneurial** – get to know, and work with the policymakers, build long term programmes of credible research, **communicate effectively, use participatory approaches**, identify key networkers and salesmen and use shadow networks. Based **on over five years of theoretical and case study research**, ODI's Research and Policy in Development programme has developed a **simple analytical framework and practical tools** that can help researchers to do this. **ODI's theoretical, case study and practical work has identified a wide range of inter-related factors, which determine whether research-based and other forms of evidence are likely to be adopted by policymakers and practitioners.** These factors can broadly be divided into **three overlapping areas: 1) the political context; 2) the evidence; and 3) the links between policy and research communities**, within **a fourth set of factors: the external context**. The interplay of these four areas is laid out in the **RAPID Framework**. The framework should be seen as a **generic, perhaps ideal, model**. In some cases there will not be much overlap between the different spheres; in others the overlap may vary considerably […] **When Does Evidence Influence Policy**? Emerging results from this and a synthesis of the other ODI studies seems to indicate that **research-based and other forms of evidence is more likely to contribute to policy if:** 1) • **It fits within the political and institutional limits and pressures of policymakers**, and resonates with their assumptions, or sufficient pressure is exerted to challenge them; 2) • The **evidence is credible and convincing**, provides practical solutions to pressing policy problems, and is packaged to attract policymakers' interest; 3) • **Researchers and policymakers share common networks, trust each other, and communicate effectively**. But these three conditions are **rarely met in practice**. Although researchers and practitioners can control the credibility of their evidence and ensure they interact with and communicate well with policymakers, they often have limited capacity to influence the political context within which they work. Resources are also limited, and researchers and practitioners need to make choices about what they do. By making more informed, strategic choices, researchers can maximise their chances of policy influence.

Excerpt source: Court et al. (abstracts, key points)
Key themes: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy 2) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 3) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 4) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **COURT, J. & YOUNG, J.** (2004.) *Bridging research and policy in international development: context, evidence and links*. London: ODI (Overseas Development Institute) & RAPID (Research and Policy in Development) Briefing Paper 1, 4 p.

- **COURT, J. & YOUNG, J.** (2005.) *From development research to pro-poor policy: evidence and the change process*. London: ODI (Overseas Development Institute), 19 p.

- **COURT, J. & YOUNG, J.** (2006.) "Bridging research and policy in international development: an analytical and practical framework". *Development in Practice*, Number 1, February 2006

- **COURT, J. & YOUNG, J.** (2006.) "From development research to pro-poor policy: Evidence and the change process" In *Science and Technology Policy for Development: Dialogues at the Interface*, L. BOX and R. ENGELHARD (eds). Anthem Press

- **COURT, J.** (2005.) *Bridging research and policy on HIV/AIDS in developing countries*. London: ODI (Overseas Development Institute), 57 p.

- **COURT, J., HOVLAND, I., YOUNG, J. & al.** (eds). (2005.) *Bridging research and policy in development. Evidence and the change process*. Rugby: Intermediate Technology Development Group Publishing

- **COURT, J., MAXWELL, S.** (2005.) "Policy entrepreneurship for poverty reduction: bridging research and policy in international development". *Journal of International Development*, Volume 17, Issue 6 , p. 713-725

- **COURT, J., MAXWELL, S.** (2006.) *Policy entrepreneurship for poverty reduction: bridging research and policy in international development*. Practical Action Publishing

UNESCO

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **COURT, J., MENDIZABAL, E., OSBORNE, D. & YOUNG, J.** 2006. *Policy engagement: how civil society can be more effective*. London: RAPID (Research and Policy in Development), ODI (Overseas Development Institute), June 2006, 50 p.
- **COVELLO, V.** (ed.). (1980.) *Poverty and public policy: an evaluation of social science research*. Boston: G. K. Hall
- **COWEN H et al.** (1998.) "From academe to policy: tensions in conducting policy and community research". *Policy Studies*, 1 (19): 5-16
- **CREWE, E. & YOUNG, J.** (2002.) *Bridging research and policy: context, evidence and links*. London: ODI (Overseas Development Institute) Working Paper 173, June 2002

- **CROSS, M., HENKE, R., OBERKNEZEV, P. & POULIASI, K**. (2000.) *Building bridges. Towards effective means of linking scientific research and public policy: migrants in European cities*. Research Papers/Netherlands School for Social and Economic Policy Research (AWSB), 177 p.

This **study claims** that one of the major reasons for the general feeling that social science analysis of **research-policy linkage has not delivered** much relief is **caused by its fixation** on the **utilisation of knowledge**. Benchmarking the issue of research-policy linkage shows that the discussion on **related issues** (such as **interdisciplinarity**) is primarily in terms of the quality of the relationship between the persons to be linked, and the effects of the relationship (i.e. i.c. non-use or under-use of academic knowledge) are considered in derivative terms. This shift in perspective clearly fits well with the tendencies of particular arrangements to be effective means of linkage, as distilled from our interview material. In terms of new research, arrangements offer good linkage potential if:
1) **Problem definitions** and **project monitoring** are **shared by the research and the policy interests**; 2) And **project teams are open to all disciplines**, necessary for the study of the problem as defined; 3) Within the context of a **long term commitment**; 4) That is flexible enough to allow **mid-term adjustments**. In terms of types or styles of research, **policy-oriented research** is the prime arena for implementing the above described means. The two other relevant styles – **policy relevant research**, and **policy research** – seem best suited for the linkage instruments of state of the art reviews, and staff exchanges, respectively. **Individual qualities** like **overlapping experience**, usually institutionalised in terms of the role of intermediaries, are very important to realise **linkage potential**. However, benchmarking suggests that arrangements for conducting new research would benefit substantially from a wholly new role – that of **facilitator or mediator**. Moreover, implementation of this role opens up the possibility of **using participatory project planning and monitoring techniques**, such as ZOPP, as well. Combining the above insights, **we produced an organisational outline**. Its features are: 1) **Financial and organisational independency**, a limited number of support staff and research (and policy advice) staff on secondment or temporary (part-time) basis ; 2) **Important in-house (support)** skills should cover participatory project planning and monitoring techniques, and other team facilitation management tools; 3) **Documentation and data warehousing facilities**; 4) The **institution should be** at the **heart** of a **network of research** and **policy actors**. It has to offer added value in terms of playing a **coordinating linkage and brokerage role**. This, again, presupposes that the institution **focuses on a certain issue-arena**; 5) The institution can serve as the **secretariat for policy advice councils**; We did not encounter any existing institution possessing all these features. Indeed, all existing linkage institutions lack in-house (support) skills that include participatory project planning and monitoring techniques, and other team facilitation management tools.
The **study also offers a conceptual framework** for **analysing concrete cases** of (the **absence) of linkage between research and policy**. Basically, this framework is a **summary of what 25 years of knowledge utilisation (KU) studies** have taught us, considered from the perspective that emphasises the relationship (instead of utilisation), and elaborated in terms of what has received least attention in KU research and reflection, the context of ideological and institutional influences that go beyond the particular issue arena at hand. The following context factors are described:1) **Differences in the R&D input between countries** 2) **Political Culture** 3) **Academic Culture** 4) **Policy philosophy for the sector concerned** 5) The **place accorded to science as a knowledge producer** by the political and administrative Establishment 6) The **political belief in rational planning** 7) The different **status assigned to different disciplines** 8) The **research system in a particular sector** 9) The **institutional structure of the policy sector** 10) **Mobility of professionals between sectors** and institutional settings 11) **Historical contingencies** besides identifying context factors and outlining effective means of linking research and policy, the **study also explores the information needs of**

researchers and policy makers within the issue arena of "migrants and cities", as well as their attitudes towards international comparison. In terms of content, our interview partners focused on three kinds of analytical perspectives: 1) The predominant concern is not with migration processes per se but rather with their consequences. In this regard, the focus is more on integration. 2) With this in mind, some tend to select "supply-side" questions, such as human capital or resources, while others are concerned with "demand-side" issues such as job supply or adequate housing. 3) In between these two positions are those who worry primarily about the impediments that inhibit the use of resources in fulfilling their available opportunities. We matched these perspectives with the Metropolis list of core themes, "Employment and the labour market", "Urban social and spatial structure", and "Social solidarity and social cohesion", and created a matrix of information needs. The comparison attitudes indicated a need for data harmonisation and for periodic surveys using a common core of measurement instruments.

Excerpt source: Cross et al (executive summary)
Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy. 3) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **CROSSWAITE, C. & CURTICE, L.** (1994.) "Disseminating research results — the challenge of bridging the gap between health research and health action". *Health Promotion International,* 9 (4): 289-296

- **DANISH SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL.** (1974.) *The utilization and development of the social sciences as they affect the public sector.* Danish Social Science Research Council, Copenhagen

- **DAUGHERTY, R**. (2007.) "Mediating academic research: the Assessment Reform Group experience". *Research Papers in Education*, Jun 2007, 22 (2), pp. 139-53

- **DAVIES, H. & al.** (2005.) *Approaches to assessing the non-academic impact of social science research*. Report of the ESRC symposium on assessing the non-academic impact of research 12th/13th May 2005, 35 p.

- **DAVIES, H. & NUTLEY, S.** (2002.) '*Evidence-based policy and practice: moving from rhetoric to reality*'. Discussion Paper 2, Research Unit for Research Utilisation, University of St Andrews, 19 p. http://www.ruru.ac.uk/PDFs/Rhetoric%20to%20reality%20NF.pdf

- **DAVIES, H., NUTLEY, S. & al.** (2005.) *Assessing the impact of social science research: conceptual, methodological and practical issues*. A background discussion paper for ESRC Symposium on Assessing Non-Academic Impact of Research, May 2005, 24 p. http://www.odi.org.uk/rapid/Events/ESRC/docs/background_paper.pdf

- **DAVIES, H., NUTLEY, S. & SMITH, P.** (1999.) "What works? The role of evidence in public sector policy and practice". *Public money & Management,* 20 (4), 3

- **DAVIES, P.** (2004.) "Is Evidence-Based Government Possible?" Jerry Lee Lecture 2004 Presented at the 4th Annual Campbell Collaboration Colloquium Washington D.C. Davies : Government Chief Social Researcher's Office Prime Minister's Strategy Unit, Cabinet office, London.

There are undoubtedly **many competing ideas about evidence-based government** and **evidence-based policy**, and **many models** from which we can learn a great deal. In this lecture I am mainly focussing on evidence-based government and evidence-based policy from a United Kingdom perspective for no other reason than it is the area in which I work and with which I am most familiar […] This lecture addresses **whether evidence-based policy and evidence-based government is possible**, and **whether it is more than a rhetorical device**. It attempts to **define evidence-based policy** and **considers factors other than evidence that influence policy making** and policy implementation. It also considers the **types of evidence used by governments** and the **types of research that can**

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

contribute to that evidence. Some of the **mechanisms that need to be in place for evidence-based government to occur** are also discussed. The lecture concludes that evidence-based government is possible and is well established in the U.K. **It argues that a broader conception of evidence is used by most government than by some academics**, and that a wide range of methods for gathering and appraising evidence for government is required. Some implications for the Campbell Collaboration and the academic community are suggested. Brief **content**: **Evidence-based policy** has been **defined** as an approach that "**helps people make well informed decisions about policies, programmes and projects by putting the best available evidence from research at the heart of policy development and implementation**". This approach stands in **contrast to opinion-based policy**, which **relies heavily on either the selective use of evidence** (e.g. on single studies irrespective of quality) or on the **untested views of individuals or groups**, often in**spired by ideological standpoints, prejudices, or speculative conjecture.** Gray has suggested that there is a new dynamic to decision making in health care and other areas of public policy whereby the speculation of opinion based policy is being replaced by a more rigorous approach that gathers, critically appraises and uses high quality research evidence to inform policy making and professional practice […] **Proponents of evidence-based policy and practice acknowledge that not all research is of a sufficient quality to form the basis of sound policy making**. Many research studies are **flawed by unclear objectives, poor research designs, methodological weaknesses, inadequate statistical reporting and analysis, selective use of data**, and conclusions that are not supported by the data provided.
[…] A further problem for evidence-based policy **is the *uncertainty* of social scientific knowledge,** and the **different status of different fields of knowledge**. Mulgan has suggested that the latter runs on a continuum from fields of knowledge that are well established and almost like a 'normal' science to those where knowledge is inherently novel, such as global governance, regulation of biotech, and *e-*government. **These problems mean that in many areas of policy making there is either little or no valid social scientific evidence**, **the consequence of which is a knowledge vacuum** that other types of evidence can fill until new sound research evidence can be established.

Excerpt source: Davies (foreword and abstract) focus on evidence based policy
Key theme: 1) Evidence-based Policy / New Modes of Governance 2) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance

- **DAVIS, H. R. & SALASIN, S. E.** (1978.) "Strengthening the contribution of social R&D to policy making" In *Knowledge and Policy: The Uncertain Connection*, Washington: National Academy of Sciences pp. 93-125

- **DAVIS ET al.** (2003.) "The Case for Knowledge Translation: Shortening the journey from evidence to effect." *British Medical Journal*, 327: 33-35.

  Knowledge translation is seen as a holistic concept that focuses on health outcomes and changes in behaviour, and interventions are seen to work in function in three ways: 1. **To predispose to change by increasing knowledge or skills**; 2. To **enable the change by promoting conducive conditions in the practice and elsewhere**; 3. To **reinforce the change, once it is made**. They further develop their model of Knowledge Translation (KT) (which by their own admission is still intuitive and untested) and see a continuum from intervention to awareness to agreement to adoption to adherence.

  Excerpt source: Anne-Marie Schryer-Roy
  Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Knowledge Management

- **DAVIS, P. & HOWDEN-CHAPMAN, P. (**1996.) "Translating research findings into health policy". *Social Science & Medicine,* 43 (5): 865-872
- **DE GIER, E., VIJGEN, J. & HENKE, R.. (**2004.) ""Knowledge utilisation" in Dutch social policy: the case of the Disability Insurance Act (WAO)". *International Social Science Journal*, 56 (179): 17-35 (March 2004)
- **DE NEUVILLE, J. I.** (1985.) Knowledge and action: making the link. Institute of Urban & Regional Development, University of California, Berkeley, CA

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **DE VIBE, M. & HOVLAND, I.** (2002.) *Bridging research and policy: an annotated bibliography*. London: ODI (Overseas Development Institute) Working Paper 174, September 2002, 76 p. http://www.odi.org.uk/RAPID/Publications/Documents/wp174.pdf
- **DE VRIES, Jan** (1980.) Science as human behavior: On the epistemology of participatory research approach. Amersfoort : Studiecentrum, 1980.
- **DEEKE, A.** "Applied social research: studies on the exigencies and conditions of production, dissemination and evaluation of knowledge of social sciences", Book Rev., BADURA, B., *Argument*, 21: 599-600 (July 1979)
- **DENIS, J., LEHOUX, P. & al**. (2003.) "Creating a new articulation between research and practice through policy? The views and experiences of researchers and practitioners". *Journal of Health Service Research and Policy,* 8 (Suppl 2 (Oct 2003)): 44-50
- **DEPALMA, J.** (2002.) "Proposing an evidence-based policy process". *Nursing Administration Quarterly,* 26 (4): 55-62 http://www.nursingcenter.com/library/JournalArticle.asp?Article_ID=401787 *(Summary)*
- **DIAMOND, R. & MOEZZI, M.** (2002.) *Becoming allies: combining social science and technological perspectives to improve energy research and policy making*. US Department of Energy, Office of Building Technology, State and Community Programs
- **DIDRIKSSON, AXEL** (2000.) La Universidad de la innovación: una estrategia de transformación para la construcción de universidades de futuro. UNESCO International Institute for Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean (Venezuela) Caracas, UNESCO/IESALC, 172 p.
- **DOCKRELL, W.B.**, (1982.) "The Contribution of National Surveys of Achievement to Policy Formation". En: *Social Science Research and Public Policy Making*. pp. 55-74, D. P. B.
- **DOLOWITZ, D. & MARSH, D.** (1996.) "Who learns what from whom: a review of the policy transfer literature". *Political Studies*, 44 (2): 343-357
- **DONNISON, D.** (1972.) "Research for policy". *Minerva,* 10: 519-536
- **DONNISON, D.** (1978.) "Research for policy" In Social *Policy Research*, M. BULMER (ed.), London: The Macmillan Press
- **DORE CABRAL** (1999.) Carlos et al. Dialogo entre las ciencias sociales y la politica. El caso de la DIAPE. Estudios Sociales. Vol.XXXII, N°117.

About DIAPE: The **DIAPE** (Dirección de Información, Análisis y Programación Estratégica) for the Dominican Republic has participated to various venues with the MOST programme because of its similar action. Its main goal is "to be the principal advisory organ of the Presidency's socio-political strategy ". Its **main values are: 1) Openness, objectivity, rigor, 2) Responsibility 3) Critical sense 4) Efficiency, efficacy, timing**. The work the analyst of DIAPE carries out should be cemented in the capacity "to open up" and apprehend all edges of the political and social environment and not only be thorough and objective*.* Timing is the parameter that distinguishes the DIAPE from a "pure" exercise of social science. Its analysis and recommendations are useful as long as they are elaborated and assumed in time. This might be one of the most difficult lessons learned for civil society and social scientists. **To think as a social scientist with an objective to assist political decision making has implied methodological changes:** 1) Interpretation of reality and its possible effects on the political life of society. 2) Identifying measurable indicators for population perception. 3) Use of qualitative data collection techniques 4) Present results that offer mixed dimensions of applied science.

The **information that the DIAPE offers** has to be oriented as much as possible towards political signification, it **has to be of interest for political action and has to offer possible intervention guidelines**. As politics ask for a limited amount of information, the information researchers provide need to be **synthetic and simple to understand**. DIAPE puts forward the need for sociology to consider the social actor as an actor and not just as an object of observation, **citizens need to participate in the decision making process** for they are the first concerned.

Excerpt source: De Kochko, Unesco internal document.
Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance
2) MOST's Partnerships

- **DOUGLAS, M** (1986) *How Institutions Think*. New York: Syracuse University Press.

  Mary Douglas' seminal book is an **anthropological study of the basis for collective action through institutions.** She **moves away from the rationalist choice model** that **privileges the decision-making of sovereign individuals**, and which would view organisational decisions as the outcome of negotiations between powerful individuals within the organisation. Instead she argues that **organisational decisions** are largely **shaped** by the **institutional 'thought-world'**. All **institutions generate their own world of images, symbols, ideas, and past experiences, and people in the institution to some degree must accept this thought-world in order to function**. Thus individuals' decisions in an institution are largely shaped by the institution as a whole. Moreover, the institutional thought-world orders experience and memory, and **exercises a relatively large degree of control over the way its members perceive and react to new ideas.** In Douglas' term, **institutions exercise 'social control of cognition'.**

  Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  Key theme: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy. 2) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **DOWLING, J. M. & YAP, C.-F.** (2007.) *Modern developments in behavioral economics: social science perspectives on choice and decision making*. Hackensack, NJ: World Scientific

- **DUKESHIRE, S., THURLOW, J.** (2002.) *Understanding the link between research and policy, rural communities impacting policy*, 20 p.

  As briefly outlined in the other two papers in this series entitled, "A Brief Guide to Understanding Policy Development" (Rural Communities Impacting Policy, 2002) and "Challenges and Barriers to Community Participation in Policy Development" (Rural Communities Impacting Policy, 2002), **changing or creating new policy is often a long, complex process, with many factors influencing the policy-making process.** The ability to understand and effectively deal with this process is essential to **impact policy in a manner favorable to the health and sustainability of rural communities.** One way individuals and organizations **can increase their chances of impacting policy in a way that benefits their community is by being as knowledgeable as possible** concerning the key issues associated with the policy they wish to impact. Gaining this knowledge very often **requires research to understand and define the key issues the community is addressing as well as to develop constructive ideas to advance a policy action plan**. The manner in which this knowledge is collected and presented can have a large impact on the success of influencing the policy-making process. This **paper will first outline the importance of research in policy-making and then provide a brief overview of the elements of the research process itself**.

  Excerpt source: Dukeshire et al (introduction)
  Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 3) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **DUNCAN, S.** (2005.) "Towards evidence-inspired policymaking". *Social Sciences*, 61: 10-11
- **DURANT, R. F.** (1999.) "The political economy of results-oriented management in the "neoadministrative state": lessons from the MCDHHS experience". *American Review of Public Administration*, 29 (4): 307-331
- **ECONOMIC RESEARCH FORUM FOR THE ARAB COUNTRIES, IRAN & TURKEY (ERF).** (2003.) "ID21 Study on research-to-policy linkages has applications for

MENA". *Newsletter of the Economic Research Forum for the Arab Countries, Iran & Turkey,* 10 (4), 1 http://www.erf.org.eg/nletter/Newsletter_Winter03/ForumWinter04-P4.pdf

- **EDWARDS, M** (1994) 'NGOs in the Age of Information'. *IDS Bulletin* 25(2): 117–124.

In this article, **Edwards links the rise of NGOs within the development field to the emergence of the information age**, and poses the **question of whether NGOs have a comparative advantage in linking information, knowledge and action in an efficient and relevant way**. He suggests that NGOs have a distinctive competence in this area due to three factors: 1. **NGOs have direct access to fieldwork and local accounts**. 2. **NGOs usually have offices that span the different levels of the global system**, and therefore information can flow easily between the grassroots, NGO local offices, NGO headquarters, and NGO lobbying activity in global centres. 3. **NGOs' value base implies a democratic approach to communication** that emphasises openness, sharing and non-hierarchical communication channels. NGOs rely on their distinctive competence in **handling information for four main purposes**. The **first and second purposes** concern their **own management systems and strategic plans**, and their **processes of institutional learning**. **The third purpose is for advocacy**. NGOs have realised that they have a far greater chance to influence government and donor policy if they are able to **make systematic use of grassroots information** in their advocacy work. The **fourth purpose** is one of **accountability**. NGOs face increasing pressure to evaluate the impact of their work and to stand accountable to various stakeholders, both upwards to donors and downwards to the communities in which they work. The **danger with multiple accountabilities** is that upwards accountability may carry more weight than downwards accountability, which in turn may result in a one-way information flow away from the field rather than in both directions. **Edwards reviews possible barriers to information use in NGOs**: **internal organisational obstacles**; pr**oblems with representativity and the images that are used**; and the **gap between raw information and knowledge**. Possible solutions include organisational decentralisation, viewing information as an integral part of all organisational processes, emphasising the need for information to be relevant, and taking advantage of the opportunities provided by IT.

Excerpt source: ODI :   Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Knowledge Management 3) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing Communication / Media Communication and IT 4) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy.

- **EDWARDS, M AND GAVENTA, J** (2001) *Global Citizen Action*. Boulder, USA: Lynne Rienner.

Edwards introduces this edited volume by pointing out that with the **move away from the 'Washington consensus'** we have **new ideas about what partnership requires**: strong social infrastructure (including social capital); pluralistic governance and decision-making; partnerships between public, private and civic organisations; and public support for international institutions. **As global governance becomes less state-based**, the **role of civil society is certain to grow**. But many **NGOs are criticised for being unaccountable, illegitimate, and dominated by elites**. NGOs with no membership depend on research, experience and good links with partners to justify their growing role as advocates. There is greater consensus on some campaigns (e.g. debt, landmines) than others (trade, environmental, labour rights) due to conflicting interests. **Better links are needed between local and global levels**, but it is also important, he advises, to build coalitions at national levels rather than leapfrogging to officials in Brussels, for example. **Information technology could allow more democratic and horizontal coalitions** and **networks.** On the other hand, since globalisation means that certainty about solutions has become even more elusive, better research and dialogue is needed. The various contributions assess efforts to influence the IMF or World Bank, and run global campaigns to change development or corporate policy, and draw out the lessons learned. In one chapter, **Brown and Fox identify the key components of successful campaigns**: (i) **make the campaign fit the target** (different types of coalition and leadership are needed depending upon whose interests are at stake); (ii) **open up cracks in the system** (e.g. identify sympathisers within the key organisation); (iii) **impact comes in different forms** (so success and failure should be measured by many different indicators); (iv) **create footholds** that give a leg up to those who follow (e.g. it is easier to influence policy than ensure it is implemented but at least a policy standard creates leverage); (v) **leveraging accountability** requires specifying accountability to whom (it is easier to dismiss NGOs that cannot point to genuine and specific grassroots constituencies); (vi) **power and communication gaps in civil society need bridges** ('chains' of relatively short links

UNESCO

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

can work more effectively); (vii) the **Internet is not enough to build trust across cultures** (face-to-face negotiation is required to create trust); (viii) **small links can make strong chains** (a few key individuals can bridge chasms). **Patel, Bolnick and Mitlin write about housing rights to illustrate how a focus on local concerns and processes, with international support, can be a potent recipe for influencing policy at all levels**. Harper asks 'Do the Facts Matter?' and demonstrates why they do. In a bid to raise profile and funds, **NGOs are tempted to exaggerate and simplify conclusions drawn from research and thereby risk their credibility** and undermine the efforts of others engaged in delivering more complex messages. By demanding a total ban on child labour, for example, Christian detracted attention away from organisations, like Save the children Fund, who were recommending more complex strategies. In some instances a ban has led to young girls seeking more abusive forms of work such as street trading and prostitution. **Chapman argues that different structures of collaboration are useful for different purposes**: a 'pyramid' can be dynamic and quick at getting access to the top; a 'wheel' is good for developing specialisation and exchanging information. Gaventa concludes that the **lessons for global citizen action** are that: (i) a diversity of approaches should be embraced, (ii) action is needed at local, national and international levels with links between them, (iii) networks and partnerships should be grounded in local realities, (iv) **learning should include participatory research and sophisticated policy analysis**, (v) internal forms of governance should be participatory, transparent and accountable.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy. 2) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **EDWARDS, M. & al.** (2001.) *Social policy, public policy: from problem to practice*. Allen and Unwin, Sydney

- **EDWARDS, M.** (2004.) *Social science research and public policy: narrowing the divide*. Policy Paper #2. Academy of the Social Sciences in Australia, Canberra, 20 p.

Public policy as a discipline and as an area of practice is heavily contested. Definitions and approaches vary, and for our purposes **we take the position that public policy addresses societal problems and is about 'what governments do, why they do it and what difference it makes'**. To **study public policy is to attempt to formulate answers to these questions**, and that includes attempting to **understand the various processes by which policy is developed**. Definitions of research also vary, depending on the purpose at hand. Of particular relevance here is the definition used by Diane Stone, who considers **research**: .....as a **codified, scholarly and professional mode of knowledge production** that has its prime institutional loci in universities, policy analysis units of government departments or international organisations and private research institutes and produced by academics, think-tank experts and development professionals. **Scholarly research is not the only – or perhaps even the primary – source of evidence available to policy-makers. 'Evidence-based' policy, or even 'evidence-aware' policy, will draw on broader sources than the above definition implies**. In the context of its agenda for modernising government, the UK Cabinet Office has stated: Good quality policy making depends on high quality information, derived from a **variety of sources**: **expert knowledge; existing domestic and international research; existing statistics; stakeholder consultation; evaluation of previous policies; new research, if appropriate; or secondary sources, including the internet.** To be effective as possible, evidence needs to be provided by, and/or be interpreted by, experts in the field working closely with policy makers. Notwithstanding the critical importance of **engaging a wide range of stakeholders and citizens in the policy process**, the main concern here is the **role of scholarly research findings in that process**. Consideration of the literature available concerning the relationship between such research (with a focus on the social sciences) and public policy and its processes, can suggest directions to assist the best use of research in developing public policy. The n**ext section of this paper addresses the dimension of the problem confronting policy makers and researchers as they search for ways to address the shortcomings in the research–policy relationship**. Different **conceptions of the research-policy dynamic are examined**. Next, a **policy 'framework' in practice is considered**, including a **case study** example of how research and researchers have been used to good effect at various stages in the policy process. Finally, **elements of the research-policy nexus are brought together by articulating lessons and more specific suggestions**, drawing on some international experiences.

Excerpt source: Edwards (introduction)

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

Key themes: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy 2) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 3) Evidence-based Policy / New Modes of Governance 4) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **EISENSTADT, N.** (2000.) "Sure start: research into practice; practice into research". *Public Money and Management,* 20 (4): 6-8

- **ELKIN PATARROYO, MANUEL** (1995.) Papel del conocimiento científico en el proceso de integración. La Integración en América Latina: Visión Iberoamericana 2000 ; p. 80-88

- **ELLIOT, H. & POPAY, J.** (2000.) "How are policy makers using evidence? Models of research utilisation and local NHS policy making". *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health,* 54: 461-468

- **ELLIOTT, J.** (2007.) "Assessing the quality of action research". *Research Papers in Education*, Jun 2007, 22 (2), pp. 229-46

- **ELLIOTT, P** (1995) 'Intellectuals, the 'information society' and the disappearance of the public sphere' in Boyd-Barrett, O and Newbold, C (eds.) *Approaches to Media, A Reader*. London: Arnold.

  Elliott argues that the information society is not the democratic force that it is claimed to be. The information society is seen as a process of democratisation by those who emphasise the increased access to information and the expanded possibilities of two-way communication. **Elliott points out that access to information does not just depend on having the physical technology**. **Access is a matter of power relations and the uneven distribution of rights and ability to mobilise one's rights.** The present increase in information availability is linked to an increase in the privatisation of information, meaning that **information is no longer a right but a commodity**. The **information** for which there is highest demand – or **which is demanded by the most powerful consumers** – will be produced, **rather than information which is demanded by marginal groups** or which runs counter to the interests of the powerful actors in the information market. Therefore, Elliott suggests that the information society is not a democratising force, but rather an **erosion of the public sphere**. It represents a shift away from **a society where people were involved as political citizens, to a society where people are involved as consumption units.**

  Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  Key theme: 1) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 2) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **ELLIS, A., TRAPPES-LOMAX, T.** (2003.) "Real-life research: bridging the gap between research and practice". *Journal of Integrated Care*, 11 (4): 17-27 (August 2003)

- **EPSTEIN, W. M.** (1997.) *Welfare in America: how social science fails the poor*. Madison, Wis : University of Wisconsin Press

- **ERIKSSON, J. & SUNDELIUS, B.** (2005.) "Molding minds that form policy: how to make research useful". *International Studies Perspectives*, 6 (1): 51-71 (February 2005).

- **ESRC (DEPARTMENT FOR EMPLOYMENT AND EDUCATION).** (2000.) *Influence or irrelevance: Can social science improve Government?* Secretary of State's ESRC Lecture Speech 2nd February 2000, ESRC/DfEE

- **EUROPEAN CENTRE FOR DEVELOPMENT POLICY MANAGEMENT (ECDPM), DIRECTORATE GENERAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION (DGIS) OF THE NETHERLANDS MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS.** (2003.) *Demanding innovation. Articulating policies for demand-led research capacity building.* An international policy

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

seminar organized by the European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM) and the Directorate General Development Cooperation (DGIS) of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Maastricht, 10–12 October 2001, Summary Report of Proceedings compiled by R. ENGELHARD ECDPM, Maastricht, The Netherlands

- **FALS BORDA O.** (1978.) El problema de cómo investigar la realidad para transformala por la práxis., Ed. Tercer Mundo, Bogotá.
- **FALS BORDA, Orlando** (1978.) El problema de cómo investigar la realidad para transformarla por la praxis. Bogotá : Tercer Mundo, 119p.
- **FAMILY HEALTH INTERNATIONAL.** (2003.) "Research to practice". *Network,* 23 (1)
- **FEIERABEND, ROSALIND** (1978.) The Role of government in violence research; (Le Rôle des gouvernements dans les recherches sur la violence; El Papel de los gobiernos en las investigaciones sobre la violencia) International social science journal L.;XXX, 4; p. 776-800

- **FELDMAN, P. H., NADASH, P. & GURSEN, M.** (2001.) "Improving communication between researchers and policy makers in long-Term care: Or, researchers are from Mars; policy makers are from Venus". *The Gerontologist,* 41: 312-321
- **FESER, E.** (2007.) "Linking research and rural development policy: an introduction to the special issue". Special Issue on Rural Development Policy. *Journal of Regional Analysis & Policy,* 37 (1):1-3
- **FIGUEROA, M. E., KINCAID, D. L., RANI, M. & LEWIS, G.** (2002.) "Communication for social change: an integrated model for measuring the process and its outcomes". *The Communication for Social Change Working Papers Series 1*, New York: Rockefeller Foundation, 50 p.
- **FINCH, J.** (1986.) *Research and policy: the use of qualitative methods in social and educational research*. London, Farmer Press

- **FINE, M, WEIS, L, WESEEN, S AND WONG, L** (2000) 'For Whom? Qualitative Research, Representations, and Social Responsibilities' in Denzin, N and Lincoln, Y (eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

This essay is one of the opening chapters in Denzin and Lincoln's comprehensive 'Handbook of Qualitative Research'. **It engages with questions on how research represents the lives of the poor in a time when the poor are increasingly becoming subjects of scrutiny by dominant institutions** (the state and its liberal policies, as well as the Third World development regime). This presents a **new set of dilemmas for the present generation of researchers,** including questions of **how to influence public consciousness**, how to **link personal stories with social structures**, and **how to reframe both the helpless-victim as well as the degenerate-victim images**. The chapter explicitly states its normative approach, which is centred on **how to use research for the sake of social justice**. They give several suggestions on how this can be done: • The researcher needs to reflect on her or his own standpoint. This has the benefit of **moving away from the myth of the impartial observer**, but at the same time carries the risk of flooding the text with the Self rather than the Other. • Researchers need to be aware that they are usually instinctively drawn towards 'great stories' such as the unusual, the exotic, the bizarre, or the violent. At the same time **researchers tend to look for stories that confirm their own understandings**. This dual bias brings with it the **danger of presenting an end product that over emphasises the extremes of the narratives**. • The research has a greater chance of being representative if it attempts to combine 'big stories' (about the historical, cultural, political, economic circumstance of one group) with individual/ life stories (to show effects at a personal level and to bring out some variation within the big story). • **Research should ideally draw upon a range of methods in order to triangulate the findings**. Different research methods will reveal different versions of the story that the researcher is telling. • The researcher is usually in the privileged position of being mobile and thus having the opportunity to leave a research site, group or topic after a period of time to carry on with

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

something else. This poses **questions of accountability**. Ideally, this requires that the **researcher adequately informs the research group of how the research will be used, invites the research group to critically review the research findings**, strives to stay accountable to them, and furthers their cause through channels that she or he has privileged access to. In practice, however, there are several obstacles to this. • Researchers should consider **to what extent their analyses conform to or challenge the dominant discourse**. In turn, this means considering **how the research might potentially be understood or misunderstood by policy-makers from different political camps**.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: 1) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 2) Knowledge Management 3) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 4) Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity

- **FISCHER, F.** (2003.) "Making social science relevant: policy inquiry in critical perspective". *Reframing Public Policy*, June 2003, pp 1-19 (19)

- **FRANCO, J** (1994) 'Beyond Ethnocentrism: Gender, Power and the Third-World Intelligentsia' in Williams, P and Chrisman, L (eds.) *Colonial Discourse and Post-colonial Theory, A Reader*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

In a brief review of the **development of the Latin American intelligentsia over the past half-century**, Franco notes that they have been **constituted by a metropolitan and masculine discourse** that they have adapted to in order to catch the 'metropolitan attention'. Not only has their intellectual production relied on representations of women as symbolic virgins, mothers or whores, but the entire **process of intellectual production has been characterised by traits typically associated with masculinity**, such as **public space, mobility, activity, and immortality**. Thus research has been occupied with the public and with (modern) production, rather than the private and reproduction, and this has served to subordinate not only women but also the indigenous groups. Moreover, **the act of research and intellectual production becomes characteristic of 'the masculine' through being framed as a quest for immortality and a confrontation between the pursuer and the pursued** (i.e. the writer and the reader). When Latin American intellectual research has been revolutionary in character, this too is viewed as eminently masculine, since the revolutionary is associated with the ideal-type militant who suppresses feelings of weakness, and who is in many ways the diametric opposite of the feminine. The **revolutionary and counter-hegemonic discourses of the intelligentsia are built on conservative and hegemonic gender relations**. In sum, the constitution of the Latin American intelligentsia, in interaction with the metropolitan attention, **has served to embed the production of knowledge in the sphere of domination and masculinity.**

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme:1) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 2) Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity

- **FREEMAN, R.** (1999.) *Policy transfer in the health sector.* Social Learning in the Health Sector working paper, University of Edinburgh
- **FREIRE, Paulo** (1969.) La educación como práctica de la libertad. México : Siglo XXI, 151p.
- **FRENK, F.** (1992.) "Balancing relevance and excellence: organizational responses to link research with decision making". *Social Science and Medicine*, 35: 1397-1404
- **FRIEDMANN, J.** (1987.) *Planning in the public domain: from knowledge to action*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press
- **FRIESE, B. & BOGENSCHNEIDER, K.** (2007.) *The voice of experience: How researchers develop collaborative relationships with policymakers*. *Manuscript submitted for publication*

- **FURTADO, CELSO.** (1993.) Los Vientos del Cambio.

- **GAGNON A.** (1989.)   'Social   Sciences   and   public   policies', pp. 555-567. In International Social Science Journal, November 1989, no. 122. "Knowledge and the state: social scientific discourse, professional knowledge and public policies."

  The article reviews three different theoretical approaches that aim to assess the social and political roles of intellectuals; and **by extension the impact of social science on the formulation of policy**. The three different **theoretical explanatory models** identified are: 1) **The paradigmatic explanation** which seeks to outline the **connections between political power and knowledge** produced by social scientific research. There are **three variants to this model**. The **rationalist model** that sees science as providing solutions to particular problems. The '**enlightenment' model** that sees science as pointing to directions for policy formulation. And a more **relativistic model**, that stresses the role of scientists in directing discourse, interpreting social reality, communicating ideas and participating in institutions of power. 2) **The sociological explanation**, which empirically examines the activities of social scientists in marketing their expertise and establishing their status and promoting their work and careers through connections with other academic, political and economic elites. 3) **The state oriented approach**, which examines the functions and needs of the state over time, relating this to the state's use of social scientific research in the formulation of public policy.

  Excerpt source: Georgios Papanagnou (review)
  Key theme: 1) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 2) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 3) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 4) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **GAGNON, A.** (1990.) "The influence of social scientists on public policy" In *Social Scientists, Policy and the State*, pp. 1-20, S. BROOKS & A. GAGNON (eds), New York: Praeger

- **GANS, H. J.** (1971.) '"Social science for social policy" In *The Use and Abuse of Social Science*, I. HOROWITZ (ed.), Transactions Books

- **GARNER, P., KALE, R., DICKSON, R., DANS, T. & SALINAS, R.** (1998.) "Getting research findings into Practice: implementing research findings in developing countries" *BMJ*, 317: 531-535

- **GARRET, J. L. & ISLAM, Y**. (1998.) *Policy research and the policy process: do the twain ever meet?* Gatekeeper Series no. 74, International Institute for Environment and Development, (IIED).17 p.

  This **paper aims to contribute to the development of methodologies for evaluating the impact of social science on policy choices and outcomes**. Since it is almost impossible to trace a precise pathway from specific research effort to policy decisions, **evaluation of the impact of social science research institutes should**: (i) **evaluate the quality and timeliness of research output**, the **contribution of research to the policy debate**, and the potential (rather than actual) impact of the research on policy; (ii) evaluate contributions of research to 'enlightenment', and not only to policy change; (iii) **take into account the diverse ways in which research findings enter and influence the policy proces**s, (iv) perform evaluations over time to **capture the different ways and different points in time at which research influences policy actors and processes**. **Research does not influence policy in a linear sequence**. Outputs go into a **general pool of information** that influences policy-makers; often they use it to **help them define the scope of problems and possible responses rather than dictate specific solutions**. Information is sometimes better received if produced internally by an internal 'sponsor'. To make an impact researchers have **to understand policy-makers' needs and how they make decisions**; get the **format, style and timing** right for the audience; make sure that the research is useful and rigorous; encourage public debate to build up a consensus of opinion for action.

Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Knowledge Management 3) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 4) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **GARRET, J. L**. (1998.) *Research that matters: the impact of IFPRI's policy research*. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute, 22 p.

With millions of dollars spent each year on policy research in developing countries, **governments and donors want to know that their dollars improve the lives of the poor**. But do they? Or **do research findings and policy recommendations sink silently into vast bureaucracies**? **To better understand how policy research has an impact on policy choices, and to gauge IFPRI's own effectiveness, the Institute commissioned a series of in- depth case studies to look at how research findings are communicated to and used by policymakers.** The case studies show that policy research *can* promote action that improves the lives of the poor. And they demonstrate that research recovers its costs many times over in fiscal savings alone, without even considering more important improvements in poverty, food in security, and mal nutrition. **The case studies show that an organization like IFPRI can have impact in three main ways.** First, **IFPRI works with decision makers in a particular country to respond to their need for answers to a specific policy question**, as in Bangladesh, Pakistan, and Vietnam. Given their interest in the findings, policymakers use the information almost immediately. (**For each and every one of the case studies, the report shows "why research made a difference." A table summary looks respectively at policy questions, IFPRI research, findings or activities, policy decisions and impacts.**) Second, **IFPRI works with researchers and policymakers in individual countries to strengthen analytical and decision making capacity**, as in Malawi. Capacity building is critical for ensuring that policymakers can fully understand and make use of research in formation. Third, **IFPRI pursues research to fill critical gaps in global understanding of agricultural, food, and nutrition issues**. **Broad- based research findings filter into national and international policy debates, changing policymakers' thinking and influencing their actions.** IFPRI's work on food subsidies and its 2020 Vision Initiative on Food, Agriculture, and the Environment are two examples of how IFPRI contributes to cutting-edge food policy research and how it produces knowledge with impacts far beyond a single country's borders [...] A research institute **can also have impact by influencing how the broader development community thinks**. IFPRI's comprehensive program of research on food subsidies illustrates **how communication of results from a series of specific projects can translate into shared knowledge and has a global impact on policies** [...] Developing- country policy makers are not the only ones who have relied on IFPRI's research in these areas. Development practitioners and academic experts, too, have recognized the scope and quality of IFPRI's research on food subsidies. **There is ample evidence that it has reached and influenced the global community of researchers and concerned policy makers.** In a comprehensive review of health and nutrition by Jere Behrman and Anil B. Deolalikar in the 1988 *Hand book of Development Economics*, five of the six studies mentioned on the nutritional impact of subsidies are from IFPRI [...] In sum, academics and policy makers have acknowledged the leading role that IFPRI's work on subsidies has had in **providing guidelines for subsidy policies around the world.** Although the work was undertaken in collaboration with developing- country partners and guided subsidy policy changes in those countries, IFPRI's work on subsidies has also been an essential reference for policy makers and development practitioners outside study countries as they make their own decisions on subsidy policies. **Policy Research Makes a Difference:** Determining how policy research affects policy choices is not easy. **Research is only one source of information reaching policy makers**. Many **groups, including advocacy organizations and the media, bombard the decision maker with different points of view.** In addition, **policy makers invariably take politics, not just data, into account when they make their decisions.** None the less, IFPRI's experience shows that it is possible to discern links between research and policy actions. While IFPRI was not the sole influence on the policy changes described here, research conducted by IFPRI and its developing-country partners was clearly a key element in the decision making process. **The concrete results of policy research can be difficult to see and may take time to emerge. None the less, better information has the great potential to lead to better, more effective action, not only saving money, but also, more importantly, saving and improving lives**.

Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy 3) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 4) Research impact assessment / Policy evaluation

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **GARVIN, T. & GRAVOIS LEE, R**. (2003.) "Reflections on the "policy-relevant turn"". *Research. Social Justice,* San Francisco: 30 (4): 40 (14 p.)

- **GASPER, D AND APTHORPE, R** (1996) 'Introduction: Discourse Analysis and Policy Discourse'. *European Journal of Development Research* 8(1): 1–15.

Gaspr and Apthorpe provide **a comprehensive overview of different approaches to policy as discourse**. Their starting point is to **see policy discourse as 'argumentation'**, **rather than as objective and scientific statements**. In other words, policies are ways of putting forward an argument about what a particular situation (or what the world) is like, and what should be done about it. **Discourse analysis encompasses several strands.** Some of the most important points from these various streams include: • **Policy discourse inevitably frames problems in a certain way**, i.e. includes some aspects rather than others. This approach to discourse analysis might focus on the specific concepts, tropes and frames used in policies. • **Policy discourse determines (and is determined by) a larger set of 'rules' about what is sayable and thinkable**. (For example, it is thinkable that participation is a good thing, but it is less thinkable that participation is a bad thing.) This approach might focus more widely on the stories and narratives that sustain policies, and the explicit or implicit rules of validation. • **Policy discourse is not 'just words' but has material effects**, as a change in discourse will have an effect e.g. on the distribution of resources. The idea of 'emancipatory reading' is introduced. **Discourse analysis which focuses both on the text and the context of policies can serve to draw attention to the argument that the policy is putting forward** (often **under the cloak of neutrality and objectivity)**. This in turn can open up for debate and increase the room for manoeuvre within policy-making.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme:1) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 2) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 3) Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity

- **GIBBONS, M., LIMOGES, C., NOWOTNY, H., SCHWARTZMAN, S., SCOTT, P. & TROW**, M. (1994.) *The new production of knowledge: the dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies*. London, Sage
- **GIBSON, B.** (2003.) *From Transfer to transformation: rethinking the relationship between research and policy*. PhD Thesis 2004, Australian Digital Theses Program, The Australian National University, 401 p.

- **GIDDENS, A** (1990) *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Modernity is inherently globalising. **Giddens examines the globalising process through a sociological lens**, **concentrating on the way social life is ordered across time and space** (time-space distanciation). Globalisation has rapidly increased the level of simultaneous local involvements and the interaction across distance, meaning that **the local is shaped by other local events** and **by the global,** and the global is shaped by multiple locals, at a much more intense rate than ever previously. This **creates a sense of 'one world'**, which has several effects. The **global production process has spread out to include all parts of the world in a global division of labour**. This has enabled the diffusion of production and communication technologies worldwide. It has also brought about shifts **in the global distribution of production and communication** (for example, some of the advanced capitalist market economies of the West are now deindustrialising). The macro shifts brought about by globalisation reach down to the local level through **conditioning our way of perceiving the world and transforming 'knowledge'**; modernity in its present form would not be possible without, for example, the pool of knowledge that we know as 'the news'.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young

Key theme: 1) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 2) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy.

- **GINSBURG, M. B. & GOROSTIAGA, J. M**. (2001.) "Relationships between theorists/researchers and policy makers/practitioners: rethinking the Two-cultures thesis and the possibility of dialogue". *Comparative Education Review,* 45 (2): 173-196

  There is a **long history of concern with the impact of research on policy and practice**, "roughly and conveniently [dating from] the emergence of empirical policy research, including censuses and social surveys, in nineteenth century Europe and North America." In comparative education, as in other fields, concerns have been expressed about the **limited extent and effectiveness of communication between theorists and researchers, on one side, and policy makers and practitioners, on the other**. Many comparative educators, whatever the primary nature of their activity, agree that policy makers and practitioners "**should dramatically increase utilization of research [knowledge] in education.**" Support for greater and more effective one-way communication from theorists / researchers to policy makers / practitioners is based on the belief that **vital decisions within educational systems are taken without sufficient knowledge and information.** At the same time many comparative educators concur that more extensive and effective communication from policy makers / practitioners to theorists/ researchers is also critical if we want to improve the policy-practice relevance of the theory and research in our field. **In discussing communication as transmission and use of knowledge, however, we should follow Carol Weiss's advice to avoid relying on a single, simple model of knowledge utilization**. As Bruce Biddle and Don Anderson observe, disappointment about the level of communication between theorists/ researchers and policy-makers/ practitioners is "based, in part, on misunderstandings about... the ways in which its knowledge can affect institutions such as education. Here **we discuss three general categories of knowledge utilization: instrumental, conceptual and strategic**. [....] Conclusion: We have focused our attention on the limited extent and effectiveness of communication between theorists and researchers, on the one hand, and policy makers and practitioners, on the other. While not wishing to ignore some general cultural differences between these two groups, we **have discounted the two cultures thesis for explaining the communication gap**, arguing that **neither group is culturally homogeneous** and that **there is overlap in the membership of the two groups**. We then **discussed six approaches toward closing the communication gap** (translation/ mediation, education, role expansion, decision-oriented research, collaborative action research, and collective research and praxis), analysing the likelihood that they would promote dialogue (joint reflection and action) between and among theorists / researchers and policy makers/practitioners. While the first two approaches retain a traditional separation of roles, the other four promote varying degrees of movement toward more involvement of policy makers and practitioners in theory/ research activities and, in some cases, more involvement of theory and researchers in policy/practise.

  Excerpt source: Ginsburg et al (partitions; introduction and conclusion)
  Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 3) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 4) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT 5) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy

- **GITU, K. W.** (2001.) *Strengthening the link between policy research and implementation*. KIPPRA Occasional Paper; No.1, Nairobi: Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis, 34 p.

- **GLADWELL, M** (2000) *The Tipping Point: How Little Things Can Make a Big Difference*. London Little, Brown and Company.

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

This journalist's analysis of what makes social epidemics happen draws on history, marketing research and psychological studies. His **main point is that small features can 'tip' a small trend into a huge craze. A few individuals can make a big difference if they have the necessary qualities**. The following characters are usually key: • *connectors* – networkers, they know who to pass information to and are respected so will have influence on key players; • *mavens* – information specialists, they acquire information and then educate others (a personality type that is considered indispensable to marketing); • *salesmen* – powerful, charismatic and, most importantly, persuasive individuals: they are trusted, believed and listened to where others would be ignored. Tiny adjustments to information, whether conveyed in an advertisement or television programme, can make all the difference to what he calls the 'stickiness factor'. He points to psychological research that shows that most people can remember up to *seven*-digit numbers but no more, that **the presenters make a bigger impression if they outline no more than *three* points**, and that organising more than *150* people to work effectively is an uphill struggle. Different presentations stick for different audiences and only piloting it will reveal how they will react; pre-school children loved the mixture of fantasy animals and real people in Sesame Street despite psychologists' predictions that they would find it confusing. Finally, **he describes the 'power of context'**: small environmental 24 changes can have a big impact of people's behaviour, e.g. crime dropped dramatically in New York following a campaign to get rid of graffiti in the subway.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **GLASER, E. M., ABELSON, H. H. & GARISON, K. N.** (1983.) *Putting knowledge to use*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

- **GLOVER, D.** (2002.) *Policy researchers and policy makers: never the twain shall meet? Improving communication and synthesising the needs of researchers and policy makers.* Economy and Environment Program for South East Asia (EEPSEA), Singapore, 18 p.

- **GOERING, P., BUTTERILL, D. & al.** (2003.) "Linkage and exchange at the organizational level: a model of collaboration between research and policy". *Journal of Health Service Research and Policy,* 8 (Suppl 2 (Oct 2003)): S2: 14-19

- **GOFFMAN, E** (1990.) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

  Goffman's focus on micro-sociology has contributed several useful concepts to the study of **why people act the way they do in different situations**. He notes that **people present several 'versions' of themselves in everyday life** depending on the context, as if they were engaged in **different performances for different audiences**. He also notes that some of these performances are directly contradictory, and that in fact people will be at pains to sustain a certain impression in one context only to knowingly counter it when the context changes. **Goffman compares this to play-acting**, where an 'official' version is acted out front-stage, while a wholly different performance plays itself out when the actors come back-stage and step out of their formal roles. **Back-stage is the place where the official audience cannot gain access, and where secrets can be said out loud.** Goffman's ideas have proved durable and have been applied to **several fields where communication is involved**, including the behaviour of communities in PRA exercises.

  Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  Key theme: State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **GOGGIN, M. & LAMIE, J.** (2003.) *Humanities policy: breaking out of the walls of academia*, 22 p.

  The humanities have been severed from the practical or "real" world; the "real" world that we actually live in, where change never stops, problems are always occurring, and solutions constantly sought after. Humanists have been criticized for lacking usefulness in practical situations.

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

This is not entirely unwarranted; in recent decades **humanists have acted exclusively within the walls of academia**. They are expected to learn about an area within their specific discipline, get a Ph.D., teach that area to future academics, and write journals read solely by other academics. Attempts to stray outside this norm are often met with rejection or even contempt. **However, an applied approach to the humanities, we believe, offers hope of making the humanities relevant for policy and for helping policy itself connect better with other areas, such as the sciences**. Applied humanities focus on being relevant to the world outside of academia. Different from traditional humanities, which often seem to aim at perpetuating their own, separate world, **applied humanities strives to develop connections across the disciplines and to take a more pragmatic perspective in public issues.** A humanities policy will be useful, and possibly even essential, to move forward on emerging problems because it will **help us to recognize and to tackle shortcomings within today's policy approaches, for instance with the problems of addressing global climate change**. In this case, policy has postponed action based on uncertainties within the science. However, given that it is unlikely that science will reduce the uncertainty on this issue significantly more than it already has over the past twenty years of research, it seems necessary to move ahead regardless. **Humanists could offer a new perspective on the problem, drawing the debate away from the scientific community and bringing attention into other areas of the issue, such as politics and values**. **In the case of global climate change, it seems that the debate is less about scientific data, and more about political obstacles**. A humanities policy could help us see problems through a broader context, not just within the boundaries of the scientific community. It could allow us to step back and realize that we need to refocus our emphasis on, for example, the political reasons why very little action has been taken to ameliorate the situation. While scientific research has been essential to the global climate change debate, it has not helped to further policy decisions. We seem to have been traveling on the wrong path, or maybe we have just been traveling on this one for too long. Humanities can help us see beyond the road we are on by showing us alternate routes, therefore acting as a kind of map that helps us become aware of where we are and what means, or road, will get us to where we want to go. **Integrating the humanities with policy and science is inhibited by fundamental assumptions we have about the nature of knowledge.** That is, certain distinctions have created barriers preventing the **acceptance of the humanities within the public realm,** such as that between subjective and objective. Modern thinkers, such as Descartes and Bacon, emphasize the advantages of regarding the things we study as objects, separate from ourselves, in an effort to make science more objective. While this has been useful in that, for example, it helped to remove (or more appropriately, account for) biases and dogma, **it also resulted in an unrealistic separation of fact from value.** This **metaphysical dualism, or positivism, supposed a gap between cognition, on the one hand, and ethics and aesthetics on the other.** Therefore, a prominent **assumption developed in the scientific community and within culture at large is that we could not gain accurate knowledge about the world unless we distanced ourselves from it. Positivism has continued to dominate our approaches to acquiring knowledge** to the extent that any discussion of knowledge where values are included alongside "objective" facts is discredited as being subjective and irrational. **Even the terms themselves objective and subjective are constructs, creating an inaccurate representation of the world by sustaining the belief that something can be purely objective or subjective, when in fact these are much closer and intertwined.** When values are categorized as being irrational, we alter the focus of defining and addressing problems to a way that specifically aims to exclude values. We look solely towards science to produce a solution, and do our best to minimize the influence of values on our decisions. **For how can we expect to make decisions if something that is purely subjective, and therefore neither right nor wrong, is in the way?**

Excerpt source: Goggin et al (partition, text)
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 2) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **GOLDEN-BIDDLE, K., REAY, T. & al.** (2003.) "Toward a communicative perspective of collaborating in research: the case of the researcher-decision maker partnership". *Journal of Health Service Research and Policy,* 8 (Suppl 2 (Oct 2003)): S2 20-25
- **GOLLOP, R., KETLEY, D., BUCHANAN, D. & al.** (2006.) "'Research into practice': a model for healthcare management research?" *Evidence & Policy: A Journal of Research, Debate and Practice*, Volume 2, Number 2, May 2006, pp. 257-267 (11)

- **GONSALVES, TAHIRA AND STEPHEN BARANYI,** 2003. "Research for Policy Influence: A history of IDRC intent". For the Evaluation Unit, International Development Research Centre
- **GORDON, L. J.** (1972.) "Use and abuse of social science". Book Rev., HOROWITZ, I., *Social Science*, 47 (1): 61-2
- **GORDON-STRACHAN, G. et al.** (2006.) "Linking researchers and policy-makers: some challenges and approaches". *Cadernos Saúde Pública*, 2006, vol. 22 suppl., p. S69-S76.
- **GRAVERSEN, E.-K., KALPAZIDOU-SCHMIDT, E. & LANGBERG, K**. (2003.) "Innovation and dynamics in public research environments in Denmark: a research-policy perspective". *Science and Public Policy* (Beech Tree Publishing), 30 (2): 107 - 116.

- **GRAY, V. & LOWERY, D.** (2000.) "Where do policy ideas come from? A study of Minnesota legislators and staffers". *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(3), 573-597.

In this article we will **examine the origin of policy ideas in a state legislature**. Using data from a survey of Minnesota legislators and from a survey of staffers, we **compare the sources of information used in each of three stages of the policy process**: **problem identification, policy formulation, and enactment.** We compare the importance of traditional sources to the **influence of think tanks**, **foundations**, and **newspapers editorials**. We find that **legislators rely primarily on their own experiences and those of their constituents**. When they are compared to all other sources, the **new "idea factories" have little influence in the policy process**. There are few differences between policy stages in terms of the information that the legislators and staffers rely upon.

Excerpt source: Gray et al (abstract)
Key themes: 1) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 2) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 3) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance

- **GRAYSON, L. & GOMERSALL, A.** (2003.) *A difficult business: finding the evidence for social science reviews*. ESRC UK Centre for Evidence Based Policy and Practice: Working Paper 19, 21 p. http://www.evidencenetwork.org/Documents/wp19.pdf
- **GRAYSON, L.** (2007.) "Making research count - where it really counts". *Evidence & Policy: A Journal of Research, Debate and Practice*, Volume 3, Number 1, January 2007 , pp. 135-138 (4)
- **GREBMER, K. v**. (2005.) *Converting policy research into policy decisions: the role of communication and the media*. Washington, D.C. : International Food Policy Research Institute
- **GREENWOOD, D. J. & LEVIN, M.** (2007.) *Introduction to action research: social research for social change*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications
- **GREENWOOD, D. J**. (2002.) "Action research: unfulfilled promises and unmet challenges". *Concepts and Transformation*, 7 (2): 117-139 (23) (September 2002)
- **GRINDLE, M. & THOMAS, J. W.** (1990.) "After the decision: implementing policy reforms in developing countries". *World Development*, 18 (8): 1163-1181
- **GRINDLE, M. & THOMAS, J. W.** (1991.) *Public choices and policy change: the political economy of reform in developing countries*. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press

- **GUERON, J. M.** (2007.) "Building evidence: what it takes and what it yields". *Research on Social Work Practice*. Thousand Oaks: Jan 2007, Vol. 17, Issue 1; p. 134

- **GUNDERSON, M.** (2007.) *How academic research shapes labor and social policy*. IAPR Technical Paper Series No. TP-06009 (Forthcoming in the *Journal of Labour Research*, 2007), 32 p. http://www.ucalgary.ca/iaprfiles/technicalpapers/iapr-tp-06009.pdf

How academic research affects labor and social policy is viewed through a program evaluation framework that highlights the **difficulties of determining the causal impact of such research on public policy**. The impact is illustrated through a number of examples. My **conclusion is that academic research can have a modest to substantial impact on policy**. Its impact is enhanced if it has a number of key characteristics: **high-quality; done by reputable researchers; synthesized and translated into a language understood by policy makers, the general public, and the media**; **credible champions who will broker and defend it, in the political process or in the public realm; timely; and, political acceptability**.

Excerpt source: Gunderson (abstract)
Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **HAAGA, J. G. & MARU, R. M.** (1996.) "The effect of operations research on program changes in Bangladesh". *Studies in Family Planning,* 27 (2): 76-87

- **HAAS, E B** (1991) *When Knowledge is Power: Three Models of Change in International Organisations*. US: University of California Press.

Frequently, **informal networks are as important in linking research and policy**, and effecting policy change, as formal structures. **Informal networks may take the form of advocacy coalitions, or friendly relationships between researchers and decision-makers**. Haas adds an important point to this list by **introducing the concept of 'epistemic community'**. An **epistemic community consists of colleagues who share a similar approach, or a similar position on an issue**. They maintain contact with each other across their various locations and fields, thus creating **valuable channels for information flow.** These informal fora can be used to **discuss and pass on alternative perspectives on current issues**, and if the network comprises prominent and respected individuals, pronouncements from these can force policy-makers to engage with an issue. **The conclusion is that such an epistemic community provides a potent means of circumventing tedious public bureaucracies** or the normal chain of command, and it is also a **counter-balance to the conservatism of policy networks**.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key themes: 1) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 2) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy. 3) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT 4) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **HAAS, P. M.** (2004.) "When does power listen to truth? A constructivist approach to the policy process". *Journal of European Public Policy,* 11: 569-592

- **HADDAD, L.** (2001.) "Leveraging Food security with food aid: the role of applied policy research". *African Journal of Food and Nutritional Security,* 1 (1): 26-34

- **HAILEY, J AND SMILLIE, I** (2001) *Managing for Change: Leadership and Strategy in Asian NGOs*. London: Earthscan.

This book is about **how some of the most successful non-governmental development organisations in the world are managed**. It deals with issues of growth, leadership and context, and questions the usefulness of Western management doctrine. The **case studies highlight the important role of learning for the success and growth of NGOs**. But the book questions the myth that NGOs are intrinsically learning organisations. This is no simple process, and neither a formulaic one, readily adaptable from blueprints and manuals. Rather it is seen as **an ongoing informal process of action learning supported by formal training, research and other management systems. Organisational learning is described as a dynamic process that integrates the informal (dialogue, reflection and learning by doing) and the formal (training courses, seminars, commissioned research, evaluations and documentations), with learning as both an incremental and an experiential process**. In terms of the development of strategy, it is pointed out that fundamental strategies frequently take sharp turns in directions as the result of a catharsis within the organisation, or one created by external forces, and also in some cases as the result of opportunistic and entrepreneurial strategies. The emergent and adaptive realities of strategy-making notwithstanding, NGOs everywhere are pressed, especially by donors, for explicit, long-range strategic plans. This is a **throwback to the rationalist school of planning**, and the authors emphasise that formal strategy is not the magic bullet many have made it out to be, largely due to the **volatile environment in which NGOs operate as well as the trade-offs that exist between processes and individuals.**

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key themes: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy. 2) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **HAINES, A. & DONALD, A**. (1998.) "Making better use of research findings". *British Medical Journal,* 317: 72-75

- **HAINES, A., KURUVILLA, S. & al**. (2004.) "Bridging the implementation gap between knowledge and action for health". *Bulleting of the World Health Organization* 82 (10): 724-733

- **HALL, PETER A.** (1990.) "Policy paradigms, social learning and the state: the case of economic policy-making in Britain." Estudio/Working Paper 1990/4

The object of this article is to **examine the process of policy learning more closely with a view to resolving some of these problems.** At the outset, I take up a number of questions about **how the learning process proceeds** with a view to specifying more completely the **overarching role that ideas play in the policy process.** How should we understand the relationship between ideas and policy-making? **How do the ideas that guide an institution like the state change course**? Is the overall learning process relatively continuous over time and incremental, as organization theory might lead us to expect or is it more discontinuous, marked by upheaval and the kind of 'punctuated equilibrium' that some have suggested applies more generally to political change? Then I explore a number of issues associated with the relationship between policy learning and the autonomy of the state. **Are bureaucrats the principal actors in policy learning or do politicians and societal organizations also play a role?** Does a closer examination of the process of policy learning confirm the autonomy of the state, and, if so, in what measure? The **article examines these issues in the context of a specific empirical case, namely that of macroeconomic policy-making in Britain between 1970 and 1989**. A broad concept like that of policy learning deserves to be explored in many contexts; **no single case can fully resolve these issues**. However, the case of macroeconomic policy-making in Britain is an ideal one against which **to test the prevailing conceptions of policy learning** and their implications for state theory. On the one hand, **economic policy-making is a knowledge-intensive process**, long associated with concepts of learning. As Heclo observes, "nowhere is the importance of such learning and alteration of perspective more clearly demonstrated than in the economic doctrines prevalent in any given period." On the other hand, economic policy-making in Britain, in particular, figures heavily in the most prominent attempts by state theorists to apply the concept of learning. This is **also an excellent case against which to test state-centric arguments that the learning process is dominated by officials and highly-placed experts**, since the power of official experts should be at its maximum in a highly technical field like that of macroeconomic policy-making and in a nation like Britain, which has an unusually hierarchical and closed bureaucracy.

- **HAM, C. & HILL, M.** (1993.) *The policy process in the modern capitalist state*. Sussex: Wheatsheaf Books
- **HAMADEH, S., HAIDER, M. & ZURAYK, R.** (2006.) *Research for development in the dry Arab region. The cactus flower*. Southbound/IDRC
- **HAMMERSLEY, M.** (2005.) "Is the evidence-based practice movement doing more good than harm? Reflections on Iain Chalmers' case for research-based policy making and practice". *Evidence & Policy*, vol 1, no 1, pp 85-100

- **HANNEY, S. R, GONZALEZ-BLOCK, M. A, BUXTON, M. J & KOGAN, M..** (2003.) "The utilisation of health research in policy-making: concepts, examples and methods of assessment". *Health Research Policy and Systems,* 2003, 1:2 *A report to the research and co-operation department, World Health Organization, Geneva*. HERG Research Report No 28. Uxbridge, Health Economics Research Group, Brunel University.

  The importance of health research utilisation in policy-making, and of understanding the mechanisms involved, is increasingly recognised. Recent reports calling for more resources to improve health in developing countries, and global pressures for accountability, draw **greater attention to research-informed policy-making.** Key utilisation issues have been described for at least twenty years, but the growing focus on health research systems creates additional dimensions. **The utilisation of health research in policy-making should contribute to policies that may eventually lead to desired outcomes, including health gains**. In **this article**, **exploration of these issues is combined with a review of various forms of policy-making.** When this is linked to analysis of different types of health research, it assists in building a comprehensive account of the **diverse meanings of research utilisation**. Previous **studies report methods and conceptual frameworks** that have been applied, if with varying degrees of success, to record utilisation in policy-making. **These studies reveal various examples of research impact within a general picture of underutilisation**. **Factors potentially enhancing utilisation can be identified by exploration of: priority setting; activities of the health research system at the interface between research and policy-making; and the role of the recipients, or 'receptors', of health research.** The authors use an **'interfaces and receptors' model** to provide a **framework of analysis of research utilization**. Factors that affect the extent to which research reaches the policy level include models of policy-making, categories of health research, and the interfaces between health research system and policy-makers. Models of policy-making include: 1. **Rational model** (ends-means); 2. **Incrementalist** ('muddling through'); 3. **Networks** (role of interests and relationships); 4. **Garbage can model** (idiosyncratic approach). Recommendations about possible methods for assessing health research utilisation follow identification of the purposes of such assessments. The **interfaces and receptor model** integrates various key issues, such as: 1)- A **focus on the need for multi-layered analysis**; 2)- An app**reciation that both researchers and policy-makers have their own values and interests**; 3) - An **emphasis on the role of the receptor**; 4)- An **approach that facilitates analysis of the key paradox highlighted by the systematic review**.

- **HANSOHM, D. & NAIMHWAKA, E.** (2005.) *Policy research networks and policy making in Africa*. NEPRU working paper, no. 100. Ausspannplatz, Windhoek, Namibia: Namibian Economic Policy Research Unit, 11 p. http://www.nepru.org.na/index.php?id=247&no_cache=1&file=883&uid=424
- **HANSOHM, D.** (2003.) *Economic policy research as an input to good governance in Africa*. Windhoek, NEPRU Working Paper 91, December, 15 p.

UNESCO

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **HANSOHM, D.** (2005.) *Research and policy making in Namibia*. NEPRU working paper, no. 99. Windhoek, Namibia: Namibian Economic Policy Research Unit, 15 p.

- **HARGADON, A. B.** (2002.) "Brokering knowledge: linking learning and innovation". *Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 24, pp. 41-85

- **HATTON-YEO, ALAN; OHSAKO, TOSHIO** (2000.) Intergenerational programmes: public policy and research implications; an international perspective. Hamburg, UNESCO, Institute for Education, Beth Johnson Foundation (UK). 55 p.

- **HEAD W., BRIAN** (2008.) "Research and evaluation: Three Lenses of Evidence-Based Policy." University of Queensland. The Australian Journal of Public Administration, vol. 67, no. 1, pp. 1–11.

    This article discusses recent trends to incorporate the results of systematic research (or 'evidence') into policy development, program evaluation and program improvement. This process is consistent with the **New Public Management (NPM) emphasis on efficiency and effectiveness**. Analysis of evidence helps to answer the questions '**what works? and 'what happens if we change these settings?'** Secondly, some of the well known **challenges and limitations for 'evidence-based' policy are outlined.** Policy decisions emerge from politics, judgement and debate, rather than being deduced from empirical analysis. **Policy debate and analysis involves an interplay between facts, norms and desired actions, in which 'evidence' is diverse and contestable.** Thirdly, the **article outlines a distinction between technical and negotiated approaches to problem-solving**. The latter is a prominent feature of policy domains rich in 'network' approaches, partnering and community engagement**. Networks and partnerships bring to the negotiation table a diversity of stakeholder 'evidence', ie, relevant information, interpretations and priorities**. Finally, it is suggested that **three types of evidence/perspective are especially relevant in the modern era – systematic ('scientific') research**, **program management experience ('practice'), and political judgement.** What works for program clients is intrinsically connected to what works for managers and for political leaders. Thus, the practical craft of policy development and adjustment involves 'weaving' strands of information and values as seen through the lens of these three key stakeholder groups. **There is not one evidence-base but several bases**. These **disparate bodies of knowledge become multiple sets of evidence that inform and influence policy rather than determine it.**

    <u>Excerpt source</u>: Head (abstract)
    <u>Key themes</u>: 1) Evidence-based Policy / New Modes of Governance 2) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 3) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy

- **HEALY, A.** (2002.) "Commentary: evidence-based policy-The latest form of inertia and control?". *Planning Theory & Practice*, 3 (1): 97-99.

- **HEIDENHEIMER, ARNOLD J.** (1989.) 'Professional knowledge and state policy in comparative historical perspective: law and medicine in Britain, Germany and the US', pp. 529-555. In International Social Science Journal, November 1989, no. 122. "Knowledge and the state: social scientific discourse, professional knowledge and public policies."

    The article seeks to analyse how, through their interactions with state structures, professions have contributed to shaping differences in national policy profiles. The focus is on a historical comparison of Britain, Germany and the US.

    <u>Excerpt source</u>: Georgios Papanagnou (review)
    <u>Key theme</u>: Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy

- **HENKEL, H AND STIRRAT, R** (2001) 'Participation as Spiritual Duty: Empowerment as Secular Subjection' in Cooke, B and Kothari, U (eds.) *Participation, The New Tyranny?* London: Zed Books.

  Henkel and Stirrat examine **the 'new orthodoxy' within development that has as its mantras 'participation' and 'empowerment'**. This orthodoxy is shared not only amongst NGO practitioners, but also amongst bilateral donor governments and multilaterals. One of the interesting points about this orthodoxy, however, is that there is no systematic ideology sustaining it; i.e. **different groups in the development world are embracing participation and empowerment for different reasons,** and **based on different rationales.** The new orthodoxy of participation and empowerment is characterised by several **cross-cutting trends**: a **preference for bottom-up approaches**; an **assumption that people can escape poverty if they are empowered**; a **focus on the marginal** (women, the poor, ethnic minorities); a **celebration of 'indigenous knowledge'**; a **distrust of the state**; and **trust in NGOs.** The authors trace the long theological and moral history of participation in the West, and suggest that even though participation today appears completely secularised, it nevertheless has many traits and associations that can be likened to religious experiences. As an illustration of this they outline Robert Chambers' beliefs in 'the primacy of the personal' and 'new professionalism'. He**nkel and Stirrat argue that the ways in which participation and empowerment are operationalised within development today, serve to incorporate people into a 'modern' Western mindset** (with overtones of centuries of Western theology and philosophy). Moreover, **participatory and empowering projects often (inadvertently) place people under closer surveillance**, **both as 'participants' in a development project and as 'good citizens' of a state.** In both cases the surveillance is seen as an effort to change not only people's behaviour, but also their hearts and minds. They conclude that although participation and empowerment are marketed as a radical shift away from ethnocentrism and the 'bad sides' of modernity, it is **more useful to see this new orthodoxy as part of the current manifestations of the modernisation process**.

  <u>Excerpt source</u>: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  <u>Key theme</u>: Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age

- **HENRY ODILE.** (1992.) Entre savoir et pouvoir. Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales, Volume 95, Numéro 1p. 37 – 54.

  Le secteur des professionnels de l'expertise et du conseil a connu une très forte expansion. En effet, au cours de la dernière décennie, on observe une **forte croissance du secteur des études et conseils rendus aux entreprises**. L'hétérogénéité de ce groupe professionnel et la **quasi-absence de critères d'évaluation** de ses pratiques rendent cet univers social difficilement objectivable, et par là relativement flou. Bien que les professionnels du conseil s'accordent entre eux pour maintenir un flou qui n'est pas sans fonction dans cet univers social où les stratégies de bluff sont fondamentales, il reste que **l'enquête qui a été menée montre l'existence d'un certain nombre de couples d'opposition autour desquels se structure cet espace** (prestations « techniques » / prestations « générales », logique « intellectuelle » /logique « économique ») et permet de dessiner **deux modèles antagonistes du conseil** qui coexistent actuellement, le modèle français et le modèle américain.

  <u>Excerpt source</u>: Henry (abstract)
  <u>Key theme</u>: 1) Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity 2) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **HERIE, M. & MARTIN, G. W.** (2002.) "Knowledge diffusion in social work: A new approach to bridging the gap". *Social Work,* 47 (1): 85-95

- **HERNANDEZ-BELLO, A. & VEGA-ROMERO, R.** (2006.) "Más allá de la diseminación: lecciones de la interacción entre investigadores y tomadores de decisiones en un proyecto de investigación en Bogotá, Colombia". *Cadernos Saúde Pública*, 2006, vol. 22 suppl, p. S77-S85

- **HERRMANN, P.** (2003.) *Between politics and sociology: mapping applied social studies*. Hauppauge, N.Y.: Nova Science Publishers

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **HIGGINS, P., CHAN, K. & al.** (2006.) "Bridge over a philosophical divide". *Evidence and Policy: A journal of Research, Debate and Practice,* vol 2, no. 2, 2006: 249-255
- **HIRD, J. A.** (2005.) "Policy analysis for what? The effectiveness of nonpartisan policy research organizations". *The Policy Studies Journal*, 33 (1), 83-105
- **HIRD, J. A.** (2005.) *Power, knowledge, and politics: policy analysis in the States*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press

- **HIRSCHMAN, A O** (1970) *Exit, Voice and Loyalty*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

  Hirschman maps out **three possible courses of action for people** (whether in the family, a social circle, a firm, an organisation, or a state): **exit, voice, or loyalty.** Loyalty refers to the choice or pressure to conform to existing structures, policies and practices. Voice is the act of criticising aspects of the status quo in order to try and change it 'from the outside', while still remaining within the larger structures. Exit is the option of leaving in order to move to an alternative organisation or state. **Policies can be shaped and influenced through all three strategies of exit, voice or loyalty.** Certain **policies or policy domains may be more responsive to one of the three rather than the others**. Thus the potential influence of each of the courses of action **depends on the context.** However, **an organisation or policy field needs both voice and exit in order to change and stay healthy**, and Hirschman ends with the suggestion that his book may hopefully encourage the strategies of exit and voice.

  Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  Key theme: 1) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 2) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **HOAGLIN, D. C.** (1982.) *Data for decisions: information strategies for policymakers*. Lanham : University Press of America
- **HOEFER, R.** (ed.). (2006.) *Cutting-edge social policy research*. Haworth Press
- **HOEFKENS-BILON, I.** (2001.) *Evaluation de la performance de la recherche universitaire française en Sciences humaines et sociales*. Thèse de doctorat en sciences économiques, Université de Rennes, 236 p.
- **HOLLAND, J., BLACKBURN, J.** (ed.). (1998.) *Whose voice? Participatory research and policy change.* Intermediate Technology Publications, London

- **HOLLY ANN WILLIAMS,** CAROLINE JONES, MARTIN ALILIO, SUSAN ZIMICKI, INEZ AZEVEDO, ISAAC NYAMONGO, JOHANNES SOMMERFELD, SYLVIA MEEK, SAMBA DIOP, PETER B. BLOLAND, & BRIAN GREENWOOD (2002.) "The contribution of social science research to malaria prevention and control" In Perspectives, Bulletin of the World Health Organization 2002, 80 (3).

  In recent years, malaria has received a dramatic increase in attention worldwide, as witnessed by the growing number of articles in scientific journals, the forging of international partnerships such as the Multilateral Initiative on Malaria and Roll Back Malaria, and a global call to action. These initiatives have recognized the r**ole that human behaviour plays in malaria control** and have **affirmed that social science has an integral role in defining strategies against malaria.** In spite of this, we believe that social science's potential contributions to the field of malaria have not been fully realized. **Numerous factors impede the integration of social science knowledge and practice into malaria research and programmes**: many health personnel overlook the different, complementary disciplines of social science and their prospective interaction with their own fields of activity and they may, in addition, have only a superficial knowledge of the workings of social science research. […] *First of all*, **many malaria control personnel**, physicians and epidemiologists **do not fully appreciate that social science comprises many disciplines** including, but not limited to, anthropology, sociology, economics, political science, demography, and communications. The disciplines share an emphasis on understanding how human behaviour is shaped and modified in the global context by a vast array of influences. **Each**

discipline is, however, guided by its own theoretical orientation, which influences the essential questions it asks and the methodologies it employs to answer them […] *A second factor* contributing to the less than optimal contribution of social science research to malaria control is that, in many cases, those who carry out behavioural research for control programmes may have had some training in rapid assessment techniques, but limited or no training in social science theory and methodology. This situation has led to research insufficiently grounded in social theory, the use of incorrect methodology, and inappropriate analyses resulting in flawed or inaccurate conclusions […] *A final factor* affecting the potential contribution of social science to malaria research and control is the expectation that employing a social scientist for a rapid assessment will be sufficient to ensure greater acceptance of whatever intervention is being provided […] However, simply employing well-trained social scientists may not provide programme planners with the assistance they need: it is essential that effective communication is established between them and the clinical and control programme personnel, using a common language.

<u>Excerpt source</u>: Bulletin of the World Health Organization (key points) focus on public health.
<u>Key themes</u>: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 3) Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity

- **HOROWITZ, I. & KATZ, J. E**. (1975.) *Social science and public policy in the United States*. Praeger, NY.

- **HOROWITZ, I.** (1975.) *The use and abuse of social science: behavioral research and policy making.* New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books

Irving Louis Horowitz has collected and edited a group of essays on social science and public policy. The papers were selected from a 1969 conference in Rutgers University and the result is an excellent overview of problems and prospects for social policy analysis. The essays divide social policy into two broad general categories: the theory and practice. Some contributors make the case that the social policy sciences are related to, but clearly distinct form, academic disciplines. Herbert J Gans argues that traditional academic social science is simply unsuited for policy making. The demands and assumption of academically-oriented study, Gans notes are inappropriate to the needs of the social policy analysts. Academic sociology, for example emphasizes detachment, impersonal universalism, high levels of generality, conceptual abstractness and finally the metaphysics of academic sociology—those broad unspoken assumptions and methodological considerations of sociology that mitigates against successful policy analysis. Policy oriented social science, on the other hand, must be specific as well as general, concrete instead of abstract, account for socio-political processes be concerned with values, and in Gans' view, one of those prime values must be a commitment to democracy. Social scientist may be involved in social policy by defaut, and Kenneth E Boulding demonstrates how economists perhaps unwittingly are committed to remarkably stable patterns of research activity. By analysing the distribution of articles in the Index of Economic journals, 1881-1965 into substantive categories […] Boulding finds that there is little relationship between what politicians and citizens think is important at the moment and what economists are studying. It is interesting research, especially so since it relies on unobstrusive measures and is adaptable for research in other academic fields as well […] The relationship between long term policy and short term expedience, the problem of rationality and irrationality in public policy is also discussed by Benjamin Chinitz. He shows how the limits of rationality in public policy making operate at the federal government and congressional level. He argues that the very structure of research grant funding procedures by the federal government mitigates against intelligent policy analysis. He shows in a variety of ways how funding and control patterns, evaluation needs, and administrative complications weaken the government's authority to intelligently analyse it own policies. […]Several other articles should be mentioned. Alvin L Schorr examines the problem of developing rational public policy when social science like other science is moved by greed, self-interest and the tendencies and momentum of the larger society. Irving Louis Horowitz and Ruth Leonora Horowitz explore the interrelationship between social science, corporations, the Federal Government and foundations. In the Horowitzes' view, the foundations are lodged between corporate demands, government scrutiny, ant the resentment of "both right wing crusaders and left wing critics." At

the moment the foundations have been able to play off these forces but a major increase in the strength of any one of them "would precipitate a crisis [for foundations] in self –definitions." For the moment, **foundations can be expected to continue sponsoring the cautious middle-of-the-road type research activity** they have sponsored in the past. Kurt Lang in his discussion of commissioned Policy Research is another who explores and laments the **limits of rational public policy making in the context of political consideration.** Jerome H Skolinick's discussion of the National Violence Commission established after the assassination of Robert Kennedy and the internal politics of that commission's activity serves to reinforce the problems identified by Lang. Taken together, **the Lang and Skolnick pieces raise difficult, perhaps overpowering, questions about how social science findings impact on government policy**. To be sure, both articles should be read by social science students as they study the reports of either the Report of The National Advisory Commission on Civil disorders or the Violence Commission on Civil Disorders of the Violence Commission Report, both of which have become best sellers on the campus.[…] In sum, the book draws together some **outstanding scholars and social policy practitioners who have commented on the theory and practice of social policy.**

Excerpt source: Corwin RD (review)
Key themes: 1) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 2) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy 3) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 4) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **HOVLAND, I. & START, D.** (2004.) *Tools for policy impact: a handbook for researchers*. London: RAPID (Research and Policy in Development), ODI (Overseas Development Institute), 72 p.

   Civil society organisations are increasingly recognising the need to influence policy and decision making processes more effectively, whether that be to represent the needs of their interest groups, or to ensure that new policies are based on sound research and evidence. This is not least true for think tank bodies. The number of think tanks worldwide has expanded rapidly over the last two decades as government becomes more receptive to evidence-based policy solutions and seeks new solutions in rapidly changing political environments. **Think tank-like organisations continue to spring up all across the world, as off-shoots of university departments, programme evaluation and policy divisions of NGOs, or independent consultancies**. What they all have in common is a wis**h to capture the political imagination;** they aim to **use their *insight* to have political *impact***. This **handbook** addresses various factors that need to be considered in this process, and provides a **comprehensive selection of tools that can be used when attempting to turn research into policy influence**. This work will be developed further within the RAPID programme at ODI. **Why is this handbook important? The role of CSOs in policy processes: enlarging the democratic space.** The changing nature of the international development context has led to an increasing emphasis on the crucial – and as **yet not fully utilised – role of civil society organisations (CSOs) in poverty reduction policy**. Experience has shown that when CSOs are able to assemble and communicate information effectively, there is a significant and pro-poor impact on policy. The role of civil society is at the moment especially relevant to the large-scale development efforts around democratisation, where strong CSOs are among the 'drivers' for democratic change, and PRSPs, where **CSOs can potentially play a vital part in the planning process – and in the immediate response phase**. **The role of CSOs in the South:** Although there is widespread agreement that the **policy role of CSOs is a key issue within development today**, one of the emerging problems is the question of **how to enable CSOs to play this role;** it will not happen automatically. ODI's research and experience so far suggests that CSOs in the South will be **more able to engage with the policy processes of their government and of international institutions if they have a good understanding of how policy processes work**; they have the capacity to generate high-quality relevant research or have access to such research e.g. through research/practitioner networks; they are able to access and participate in Southern and Northern policy networks; and **they are able to communicate their concerns in an effective and credible manner**. This list, with its focus on Southern CSOs, reflects the changing role of Northern development and research institutions in the current context. **Development institutions today need to focus not just on service provision and technical skills, but also on the way knowledge is distributed and used – especially in capacity building efforts.** Northern CSOs and institutions have a new role to play in supporting and strengthening the capacity of Southern CSOs to engage with national and global decision-making. As DFID's Research Policy Paper points out: '**The evidence suggests that the capacity of developing countries to generate, acquire, assimilate and utilise knowledge will form a crucial part of their strategies to reduce poverty'** (Surr et al, 2002). The ability to manage knowledge about

development effectively is not only relevant to CSOs in the South. Northern development NGOs are increasingly called on to do analytical work based on evidence from the South, and to add value to policy debates both nationally and internationally. Yet experience indicates that NGO programme managers and policy officers are under perennial time and funds pressure to move quickly from concept to implementation, with less space than they would wish for undertaking comprehensive research to strengthen their evidence or undertaking analysis on how to influence policy effectively.

Excerpt source: Hovland et al (handbook background information)
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy 3) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 4) Evidence-based Policy / New Modes of Governance

- **HOVLAND, I.** (2003.) *Communication of research for poverty reduction: a literature review*. London: ODI (Overseas Development Institute) Working Paper 227

- **HOWE, D**. (1997.) "Relating theory to practice" In *The Blackwell Companion to Social Work*, M. DAVIS (ed.), Oxford: Blackwell

- **HUBERMAN, M. & M. BEN-PERETZ.** (1994.) "Dissemination and using research knowledge". *Knowledge and Policy: The International Journal of Knowledge Transfer and Utilization*, 7 (4): 3-13

As a field of study, "**research utilization" (RU) has addressed the gap between research and practice for some 80 years**, providing conceptual scaffoldings, empirical findings, and periodic syntheses. The **core problem**, however, is that many **social and educational dilemmas are there** in the first place **not because of absence of knowledge, but because of conflicting interests**. As a result, the "soft technology" developed by RU specialists has had an uneven impact. At the same time, the **paradigms of the RU field itself are undergoing change**, with a greater appreciation of practitioner-generated research, the ascent of postmodernism and the tenets of critical theory. The articles in this special issue cover this territory, with **concerns ranging from the epistemological level to new arrangements for exchanging research findings** between social scientists and professionals.

Excerpt source: Huberman et al (abstract)
Key theme: Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance

- **HUBERMAN, M. & THURLER, G.** (1991.) *De la recherche à la pratique. Éléments de base.* Bern, Peter Lang SA, Éditions scientifiques européennes
- **HUBERMAN, M.** (1990.) "Linkage between researchers and practitioners: a qualitative study". *American Educational Research Journal,* 27: 363-391
- **HUBERMAN, M.** (1995.) "Research utilization: the state of the art". *Knowledge and Policy,* 7 (4): 13-33

- **HUDSON, A** (2000) 'Making the Connection: Legitimacy Claims, and Northern NGOs International Advocacy' in Lewis, D and Wallace, T (eds.) *New Roles and Relevance. Development NGOs and the Challenge of Change*. Hartford, US: Kumarian Press.

The article broadly deals with the **shift of NGOs from a 'development as delivery' to a 'development as leverage' approach.** Although **advocacy takes a variety of forms** – from **careful research and policy advice**, to **parliamentary lobbying, to public campaigning and development education** – the **overall goal** is described as the attempt to **alter the ways in which power, resources, and ideas are created, consumed and distributed at a global level**, so that people and organisations in the South have a more realistic chance of controlling their own development. As UK **NGOs increasingly move into advocacy and policy work,** they have to respond to a variety of **challenges concerning issues of legitimacy and related issues of accountability, governance, and effectiveness.** Legitimacy questions concern, first, the right of the NGO to speak to its target audience, perhaps on behalf of other groups or interests; and second, the wisdom of NGOs moving closer towards an advocacy focus. The author argues that in order to substantiate their claims to legitimacy, NGOs need to map out their legitimacy chains. **When legitimacy is claimed on the basis of representation**, systems of accountability need to be in place. **When legitimacy is claimed on the basis of expertise and**

experience, the relevance of southern operational experience to northern advocacy needs to be demonstrated. In relation to this they have encountered challenges and criticisms. These **challenges question the effectiveness of their advocacy work**, their **legitimacy as advocates for development**, their accountability to those they are perceived as representing, and the suitability of their governance structures for a development-as-leverage approach. Some of the **criticisms claim that they are not representative organisations in any obvious sense and poorly accountable**. Legitimacy is pointed to as important as it increases the persuasiveness of advocacy, which increases its effectiveness. The author also suggests that southern partners and supposed beneficiaries are increasingly **questioning the legitimacy of northern NGOs advocating**, **supposedly on their behalf.** At the same time many NGOs defend their right to take positions on issues of international development as long as they were developed though 'real dialogue' with southern partners. **NGOs claimed legitimacy for their advocacy work on a variety of bases: history; organisational structures; principles, rights and values; and southern roots**, and many NGOs carefully avoided claiming to speak for the South or represent the South. The strength of their legitimacy claims is seen to depend on the ability of the NGO to demonstrate the links, or legitimacy chains, between their operational work and experience in the south and their advocacy work. **Many NGOs are currently thinking about how to develop more synergistic relationships between their operational work and their advocacy.** The author points out, however, that in general **NGOs have been slow to restructure their organisations** in order to ensure appropriate downward accountability for advocacy and influencing.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key themes: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy. 2) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 3) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **HULME, D AND EDWARDS, M** (1997) 'NGOs, States and Donors: An Overview' in Hulme, D and Edwards, M (eds.) *NGOs, States and Donors: Too Close for Comfort?* London: Macmillan, in association with Save the Children.

  In the opening chapter of their collection of essays on NGOs, states and donors, Hulme and Edwards chart the rise of NGOs. **Their opening question is whether the popularity of NGOs reflects genuine recognition of their alternative approaches and special relationship with the grassroots**, or, conversely, **whether the popularity is rather a sign that NGOs have now become fully institutionalised into the mainstream 'development industry'**. They link the NGO revolution to the wider 'associational revolution' of the past couple of decades. They also **place the rise of NGOs in the context of the 'New Policy Agenda'** (**comprising neo-liberal economics and liberal democracy**) adopted by Northern development agencies and donors in the 1990s, following the World Bank's lead. Under the New Policy Agenda, NGOs have several comparative advantages as efficient service deliverers, credible vehicles for democratisation, and components of civil society. **The close link between the New Policy Agenda and NGOs illustrates the close relationship between (Northern) donors and NGOs.** Hulme and Edwards point out that there is a **continuous danger of cooption** involved when one party funds the other, and that even though many NGOs pride themselves on behaving independently of their donors, on balance it is clear that donors have far greater influence over NGOs than vice versa.

  Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  Key theme: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy. 2) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **HUMPHREYS, P** (1998) 'Discourses Underpinning Decision Support' in Berkeley, B, Widmeyer, G, Brezillon, P and Rajkovic, V (eds.) *Context-Sensitive Decision Support*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

  The **fundamental task facing the decision maker is how to decide to go about developing a prescription for action and get it implemented.** The desire to take some action is generated from a feeling that there is a lack (or gap) between the actual state of affairs (as perceived by the decision maker) and some imaginable preferred state. The **article presents a brief outline of the kind of discourse which informs and constrains the operations at each of the five levels of the decision making process along a continuum feeling – thinking/discussing – commitment to action**.

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

• **Level 5**: (top level): Exploring what needs to be talked about within a 'small world' defined by the decision makers 'unconscious thinking' about the decision problem. • **Level 4**: Use of problem expressing discourse. • **Level 3**: Developing the structure of the problem within a frame. • **Level 2**: Exploring what-if questions • **Level 1**: Making best assessments. **The article attempts to challenge the way in which textbook accounts of decision-making** normally concentrate on modelling the decision problem while **viewing participants in the decision-making as mere accessories**. Humphreys goes through various early decision-making theories, tracing this view of participants as accessories: The legacy of '**scientific management**' is described as the perpetuation of the idea in management thinking that the organisation is something that can be acted upon or transformed by management, also promoting management-centrism and **the juridico-discursive model of power**. The **'Human Relations School'** tempered the above approach, with a theory about the need to release the autonomous subjectivity of the worker in such as way that it aligned with the aspirations of the enterprise. This instigated a change of understanding of the **operation and power in organisations to something approaching a Foucauldian perspective, where power is understood as continuous, disciplinary and anonymous**. In both these approaches, the structure is assumed to be pre-defined, and the history of how these structures came about is generally ignored. Humphreys argues **that it is necessary to recognise that these structures are negotiated by the participants in the decision making process**, and to beware of the cases where the history of the constitution of these discourses is naturalised.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: 1) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 2) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

• **HUNT J.D, B.J .GREGOR, T.J. WEIDNER, J.E. ABRAHAM** (2005.) "Enhancing policy decisions using integrated models." IAPR Technical Paper series. No TP-05016. Institute for Advanced Policy Research. University of Calgary, Alberta, Canada.

Policymakers are increasingly asking questions about the wider **impacts of transport policy**, expanding consideration beyond the transport system to include land use and the larger economic system. **Integrated transport land use economic models** support this trend, recasting travel and transport as by-products of economic activities and representing the **connections between transport policy and economic impacts in a spatial context**. As such, they help in addressing complex policy questions that models with a more limited transportation-only scope of representation – from the oldest traditional 4-step models to the latest tour-based microsimulations – cannot address, at least not well. **This paper highlights some of the support provided by integrated models**, based on applications of the Oregon TRANUS and Sacramento MEPLAN and PECAS integrated models. It **outlines how these integrated models have been found to add value**, helping land use forecasting, cumulative and indirect impact analyses, evaluation of economic impacts and communications across disciplines.

Excerpt source: Hunt et al (abstract) focus on urban planning.
Key themes: Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance

• **HUTCHINSON, J.R.** (1995.) "A multimethod analysis of knowledge use in social policy". *Science Communication*, 17 (1): 90-106
• **HUTCHISON, B.** (2006.) "Researchers' role in policy decision making: Purveyors of evidence, purveyors of ideas?" *Healthcare Policy,* 1 (2) : 1-3
• **HUTJES, J.** (1991.) "Policy research between the accumulation and implementation of knowledge". *Knowledge and Policy: The International Journal of Knowledge Transfer and Utilization*, 4 (3): 10-26
• **INTERNATIONAL FOOD POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE (IFPRI).** (2002.) *Impact evaluation. Assessing the impact of policy-oriented social science research,* 4 p.

- **INCLEN LAMP** Modules Working Group, 2002. "Unit 2: Knowledge Translation: Using knowledge for policy, practice and action". Training modules - Health research for policy, action and practice. http://www.inclentrust.org/Modules/Module_Two_KnowledgeManagement/Unit2.pdf http://www.inclentrust.org/modules.htm

- **IOM (International Organization for Migration).** (2004.) *Enhancing the contribution of migration research to policy making. Consultative meeting for governments. Geneva, 5-6 February 2004*

- **IREDALE, R., TURPIN, T., HAWKSLEY, C., GO, S., KANCHAI, S. & KUANG, Y. M**. (2001.) *Migration research and policy landscape. Case studies of Australia, the Philippines and Thailand*. APMRN Working Paper no. 9. Paris: APMRN/UNESCO

- **JACKSON, M. C., KEYS, P. & CROPPER, S. A.** (1989.) *Operational research and the Social sciences*. New York: Plenum Press

- **JACKSON-ELMOORE, C.** (2005.) "Informing state policymakers: Opportunities for social workers". *Social Work*, 50 (3), 251-261

- **JACOBS, K.** (2002.) *Connecting science, policy, and decision-making: a handbook for researchers and science agencies*. Silver Spring, Md.: NOAA Office of Global Programs

- **JACOBSON, N., BUTTERILL D., AND GOERING**, P. "Development of a framework for knowledge translation: understanding user context." *Journal of Health Services Research and Policy*, 8(2): 94-99.

   The **authors developed a generic framework to be used in various contexts by researchers and other disseminators involved in Knowledge translation** (KT), the intention being to increase their familiarity with the intended user group(s). The framework consists of **five domains**: 1. **The user group** – context within which the group operates (includes formal and informal structures), morphology, decision-making practices, access to and use of information (purposes, incentives, etc.), experience with KT; 2. **The issue –** its characteristics have an impact on the user group and on the KT process; 3. **The research** – look at what is available, what the user's preferences are, and how relevant and congruent the research will be to them; 4. **The researcher-user relationship** – early engagement is key to facilitating KT; 5. **The dissemination strategies** – awareness, communication and interaction. Researchers need to consider what strategies will be most effective in light of the other four domains.

   Excerpt source: Anne-Marie Schryer-Roy (review)
   Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance
   2) Knowledge Management 3) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **JAEGER, J.** (1998.) "Current thinking on using scientific findings in environmental policy making". *Environmental Modelling and Assessment,* 3 (3): 143-153

- **JAIN B. RANDHIR**, (1990.) 'The role of bureaucracy in policy development and implementation in India', pp. 31-49. In International Social Science Journal: "Policy actors: Bureaucrats, politicians and intellectuals." February 1990, no. 123.

   The article proposes an analysis of the role of bureaucracy in India in the processes of policy formulation, development and implementation. The author concludes by arguing that in India the two major areas that appear to call for attention in the field of public policy-making are: 1. **improvement in the acquisition and integration of knowledge and information**; 2. **development of personnel involved in policy making**.

   Excerpt source: Georgios Papanagnou (review)

<u>Key themes</u>: 1) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 2) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **JAMES, O. & LODGE, M.** (2003.) "The limitations of 'policy transfer' and 'lesson drawing' for public policy research". *Political Studies Review*, 1 (2): 179-193, (April 2003)

- **JANSEN J., GEVERS W., MATI X.** (eds.) (2006.) "Evidence-based Practise: Double Symposium proceedings on problems, possibilities and politics. Symposium 1: "Is evidence overated ?- An international symposium on the nature, purposes, ethics and politics of evidence in a democracy." Symposium 2: "Evidence based advice: How can governments and the nation at large best draw on the knowledge and skills of the science community?" Published by the Academy of Science of South Africa.

The **symposium deals with evidence-based practice**. The evidence-based movement had its roots in France in the 19th century. The evidence-based movement has resurfaced quite forcibly in recent years as the result of many factors, including the shift towards a knowledge economy, as well as changes in the balance of power between the creators of policies and services and those that receive them. The central argument of evidence-based practice is hard to refute. In essence, it says that policy-makers and practitioners take it upon themselves to intervene in the lives of others, intending to do good, but sometimes they do more harm than good. To minimise the risk of harm, it **is argued that interventions should be informed by reliable research evidence, and that evidence-based or evidence-informed decision-making should always be undertaken whenever possible**. Not to do so would be to act irresponsibly. However, **not everyone is persuaded by this argument**. Questions have been raised about **factors such as the privileging of some forms of evidence**, the **accessibility of evidence that may be context sensitive**, and there have **also been arguments for a greater role for judgement in decision-making a**nd concerns about the **roles played by values and cultural insights into the use of evidence**.
Challenges for researchers: The challenge for researchers in fields such as health, education and social policy is to: 1) **Anticipate policy-makers' questions**. 2) **Define alternative policies or interventions**. 3) **Identify outcomes in terms of potential benefits and harms**. 4) **Decide on interventions** based on best available evidence from a systematic review, **taking into account the community view** of how the benefits and harms weigh up. If uncertainty remains, it becomes necessary to conduct a study, which would be a randomised trial if the question is about the effects of an intervention: Is it ethically justifiable not to conduct randomised controlled trials?
Jonathan Jansen: Some reflections and criticisms of, some of the powerful positions in the 'evidence' debate.
THE QUESTION OF POLITICAL CONTEXT: There is a difference between '**hard' and 'soft' advocates of evidence**, not simply with respect to style and approach, but also in their approaches to truth, culture, and the nature of knowledge. **The soft advocacy of evidence** can demonstrate sensitivity to, and accommodation of, matters of ethics, autonomy, complexity, judgment, and transparency in randomized controlled trials in the search to establish 'the best evidence' for a particular medical intervention, for example, as well as humility and concern for social justice not always apparent among the hard advocates of evidence. But it can, nevertheless, **underestimate the political context of evidence and evidence-based pursuits**. **Evidence is never neutral**; it **operates within a political context especially when it advises people in power**. The **very questions posed**, and the designs followed, **predispose research towards particular kinds of evidence**. On the local scene, nothing demonstrates more powerfully the politics of evidence than the response of authorities to research questions and results, on topics such as the following: 1) how many teachers are HIV positive in South Africa? 2) how much mathematics do South African teachers actually know? 3) how does South Africa rank in primary school science compared to other African countries? 4) how many new teachers does South Africa really need? Of course, it needn't be an education question that draws political fire. Try this one on the powerful: 5) does South Africa have more or less crime today than in 1994? **Few would deny that the results of commissioned research, whether from within or outside government, are always subject to political intervention**. This might not mean direct censorship or incarceration, for new democracies (such as South Africa) have a subtler response to disconcerting information. It takes the form of **delay, editing, claims of uncertainty, the questioning of methodology (if not the methodologist), and the citation of rival studies**. One of the commonest words in the post-1994 South African lexicon is "moratorium". That a modern, science committed state like South Africa could even question, from within

the corridors of power, causal agency in the HIV-to-AIDS debate, continues to puzzle the science community and the lay public alike. **The claim, therefore, that 'the evidence speaks for itself'** is **without foundation**. The issue, rather, is: **Who speaks for the evidence?**

THE QUESTION OF DISCIPLINARY CONTEXT: How is the subject of evidence treated in different fields – such as law, education, and anthropology? **Lawyers think about evidence very differently from researchers in the health sciences in general and in the evidence-based movement in particular**. The **standards of evidence are different,** for legal minds argue by precedent and 'on the balance of the evidence'. In courtrooms, evidence presented and decided on is deliberately selective. Judgment draws on, but is not confined to, expert opinion. And, crucially, evidence is led in an adversarial context in which 'the legal hired hand' is a much greater factor than objective rules of balanced reporting. **The legal use of 'evidence' leaves one with the intriguing notion of** *eminence-based* **decision-making in the field of law**. In the field of education, policymakers remain wary of research, partly because of frequent lack of rigour in social sciences fields. But the problem also lies much deeper in **the antagonism between scientific and practitioner modes of inquiry**. **Educational inquiry is charged with holding poorly codified practices, compared to the natural sciences**, which therefore **offer little potential for generalizing from the results of a single study.** Yet there appears to be growing consensus about the importance of evidence (as well as its limits) in professional activities such as evaluation. An anthropological perspective uncovers powerful, and often unspoken, connections between evidence, rationality, and the world of research through riveting questions such as: **Who makes the claim to have 'the evidence'**? **Whose evidence counts?** Our lenses can be criticized for focusing on the seen, material world, and for **failing to value evidence in relation to the people that the evidence claims to serve** – and also for **overvaluing institutions from which evidence comes**. What kinds of institution are valued, and deemed fit to pronounce

on evidence? By whom are they given such status? **In this context, the question of evidence is inescapably a question of power**. Such a variety of perspectives mean that **disciplinary contexts matter a great deal in speaking about evidence.** A common example of how complicated it can get is the body of classic studies on the **relationship between class size and student achievement**. Probably no subject has received so much attention in the field of education through the application of meta-analytic methods. Yet, **depending on which body of research you study, the results are mixed. Why? What are the problems?** One – **the complexity problem. The sheer number and complexity of variables** (teacher experience, national culture, subject matter, teacher qualifications, pedagogical strategy, and many more) involved in seeking to establish the relationship between the number of students in a class and the level of academic achievement attainable, **are formidable**. Two – **the compositional problem**. It **depends on who's in the class in the first place. Is it middle-class children with high levels of cultural capital, or poor children with illiterate parents**? Random assignment of groups doesn't begin to deal with this challenge, especially when the study is conducted in developing contexts whereas the standard research claims are being made elsewhere. Three **– the curriculum problem.** By considering nothing but class size in the research design, and 'holding constant' what's being taught, there is more than methodological finesse at play. Students could be achieving well on an outdated or offensive curriculum, for instance, yet the significant variable of curriculum content is thereby neatly set aside in the pursuit of simple causality. Four – **the ethical problem.** The research findings come in, then what? What do they mean for poor schools, operating in contexts where the results are simply irrelevant because class size is overwhelmingly determined by the national education budget rather than by definitive research results. Five – **the political problem. To whom does class size matter**? Sure, the test scores might determine that class size within broad limits (say, no more than 50 students per class) does not matter. But I've yet to meet a teacher experiencing the daily toil of classroom life who would find any meaning in such a result. This kind of systematic review of class size effectively has to sacrifice the power of experience and the emotions of teaching for a sanitized account of what, or rather who, counts. I raise the example of class size and student achievement to suggest that **where human actors are involved in an endeavour as exhausting as teaching, such a research context is infinitely more complex than that of a simple inquiry to establish if drug X is better than drug Y in dealing with tuberculosis.**

MORE QUESTIONS THAN ANSWERS, and that's a good thing*:* The health sciences give such a powerful context for the evidence debate because the consequences of intervention (or non-intervention) are immediate: the subjects could, quite literally, die. The '**harm' versus 'good' question in evidence debates** therefore turns the heat onto those who dare question the activity of 'getting to the truth.' In such pursuits, however, it's possible to **overlook two significant questions about knowledge**, **knowing, and power that lie at the heart of the dispute.** First, is rigour possible only within systematic review? To answer 'yes' constitutes striking arrogance. It means ignoring the methods of inquiry and perspectives on knowledge that have greatly enlightened scholarship across the disciplines in the past 60 years. It accepts **the tyranny of positivism to the exclusion of other ways of knowing and of knowing in different contexts**. It refutes the **notion that evidence, like the truth, has many faces.** Second, what social questions are ignored by the way in which evidence focused inquiry is

pursued? What is 'held constant' in class size research can often be much more important than the variables we choose to play with.

AND SO, ON TO THE FUTURE*:* I propose, as have others, the n**eed for humility in both advocates and critics of evidence**. Clearly we need evidence; and there is no question that in certain fields, like education and the social sciences more broadly, the degree of rigour and credibility in research remains a major problem. **But we should also recognize that what counts as 'best evidence' is itself a matter adjudicated by human subjects**, **within the privileged status of particular kinds of institution that we deem fit to make such pronouncements**. In this context **objectivity needs (again) to be rescued from its laboratory pretence of being universal and timeless**, and **redefined simply as 'intersubjective agreement'**. One thing that the evidence evangelists cannot refute is this: the **truth, historically, is unstable**, and what counts as fervent knowledge claims in one generation of medical practice is typically scorned among the next generation of physicians. Yet, frozen in time, each generation would proclaim its truth with a frightening certitude. We are in danger of taking the social, natural, and medical sciences back into the epistemological dark ages if zealotry rather than humility defines the terms of the evidence debates.

INTERROGATING "EVIDENCE": Here are some **serious questions that arise about the relationship between research and policy, and about the theoretical, methodological, and political problems of evidence**. 1) Is **'scientific evidence'** (such as that derived from careful methods such as meta-analysis) not simply **one of many sources of authority** in making social or medical decisions? 2) **What is the role of judgment in decision-making**? 3) **What should be the status of traditional beliefs**, values, and understandings **when faced by scientific claims** and conventions? 4) **Does evidence-based policy not in fact privilege causal modelling** and the material or physical world? 5) **Given the instability of evidence as new knowledge replaces old, how should strident claims about evidence be evaluated**? 6) **How 'culture-dependent' is evidence**? How well do claims about evidence travel across contexts and cultures? 7) How **does evidence-driven policy or practice deal with uncertainty**? As claims as to 'the best evidence' vary across disciplines – for example, in law compared to medicine – what are the implications for universal or science-based claims about evidence? 8) **How valid are non-scientific (non-rational?) sources of evidence**? **How neutral is evidence-based policy and practice**? And **how far do power, politics, and political interests** (funding agencies, pharmaceutical companies, Western governments, and others) **in fact determine the choice of questions**, the design, and even the **outcomes of scientific inquiry**? What **ethical and moral problems arise with evidence-based scientific methodologies** (such as randomization) when they're applied to humans?

Excerpt source: Volmink symposium introduction and Jansen's "Is evidence overrated?"
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Evidence-based Policy / New Modes of Governance 3) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 4) Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity

- **JAPAN BANK FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION INSTITUTE.** (2006.) *How to influence policy in the African energy sector. A guide for researchers*. JBICI Discussion Paper no. 13, 67 p. http://www.jbic.go.jp/english/research/report/discussion/pdf/dp13_e.pdf
- **JEANNIN P.** (2004.) "Penser l'évaluation de la recherche. Le cas des sciences humaines et sociales en France". *Sciences de la Société*, no. 61, p. 177-192
- **JEANNIN, P.** (2005.) "Politique de la recherche. Le cas des sciences humaines et sociales". *Cahiers du GRES* 2005-20, Septembre 2005, 13 p.
- **JEFFERYS, M., TROY, K., SLAWIK, N. & LIGHTFOOT, E.** (2007.) *Issues in bridging the divide between policymakers and researchers*. University of Minnesota. 24 p.
- **JOHNSON, I. M., WILLIAMS, D. A., WAVELL, C. & BAXTER, G.** (2004.) "Impact evaluation, professional practice, and policy making". *New Library World*, London, 105 (1/2): 33
- **JONES FINER, C. & LEWANDO HUNDT, G.** (2001.) *The business of research: issues of policy and practice*. Malden, Mass. : Blackwell Publishers
- **JONES, A. & SEELIG, T.** (2004.) *Understanding and enhancing research-policy linkages in Australian housing: a discussion paper*. Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute Queensland Research Centre, June 2004, no. 075

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **JOSHI-KOOP SIMA**. (2007.) "Science, Analysis or Rhetoric? Teaching Public Policy in the Post-Positivist Era." Ph.D. Candidate Political Science Simon Fraser University. May 2007 Paper delivered at the 2007 Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.

Scholars committed to the project of teaching public policy are faced with a significant challenge: what do they teach and how do they teach it? **Since public problems rarely fit neatly into the self-contained spheres of academic disciplines, the study of public policy cannot be confined to any disciplinary boundary.** But can a scholar switch hats from political scientist to biologist to economist without causing confusion about the area of study and without damaging the credibility of their imparted knowledge? As several authors contend, indeed one can, and one must, in order for the field of public policy to be of any use to both practitioners and academics alike (Brunner 1997, Lasswell 1971; deLeon 1986; Mead 1985). **Proficiency in *politics* (the domain of political scientists and *policy* (the field of scholars in economics, management, and public administration) are essential to a society-relevant, theoretically-sound, government practical public policy scholarship**. While efforts have been made over the past forty years to develop the **multidisciplinary, normative, problem-oriented policy sciences** desired by its founder, **Harold Lasswell** (1971), they have largely failed due to **resistances from within the academic disciplines** (Brunner 1992; Tribe 1972; Garson 1986; Dunn and Kelly 1992). However, if the policy sciences are to develop, the present climate is a promising one. **Over the last two decades, scholars have taken interest in reconciling individual behaviouralism with more contextual, post-positivist theories of public policy** (Dryzek 1992, Hall and Taylor 1996; Danziger 1995; Howlet 1998). Kelly (1992) emphasizes that a movement is taking place away from the **technocratic "handmaiden" approach to policy analysis** that dominated the 1970s-80s in government. There is greater recognition of the existence of a "multiplicity of perceived realities" rather than a single empirical one (Dunn and Kelly 1992: 13). **The increasing complexity of the governance environment – policymaking through networks – further demands a shift in policy skills and in approaches to public policy that suit decentralized decision-making and are informed by interpretivist frameworks** (Lindquist 1992; Hajer and Wagenaar 2003). Despite societal hospitality for a post-positivist public policy however, evidence of such an academic shift has been found wanting. **In neither journal articles nor methods texts has there been an indication that post-positivism is becoming incorporated into the institutional architecture of policy-related academic programs and professional schools** (Schwartz-Shea and Yanow 2002; Palumbo 1992). The **endurance of the positivist myth in the social sciences** ("institutional inertia") partially accounts for this non-development (Durning 1999) alongside the **historical bifurcation of policy-related study into separate schools of politics (political science) and policy (public management, public policy, public administration)** (Mead 2005). Taken together, political scientists have sought to understand the policy process without improving it, while policy experts have sought to improve policy content without understanding the political process. The unfortunate consequence for governance has been marked: a lacuna of policy studies linking government to the 'good life' has persisted. No one develops public policy alternatives with the dual concern for the good societal effects that work for government whilst also improving democracy (Mead 1985; 2005). Since recent societal developments necessitate a policy analysis practice more consistent with post-positivism (Hajer and Wagenaar 2003), **it is worth revisiting previous works and prognoses to consider the extent to which post-positivism is being incorporated into universities *through other avenues* than just published research – within post-secondary *teaching* as an example**. If indeed institutional inertia explains the lack of post-positivist 'up take' in universities, a study of policy course content – a site where institutionally embedded practices collide with young scholars potentially exposed to new pedagogies – will give scholars an idea of the myths that future methods texts and future journal articles will contain if policy-oriented programs continue to endorse current pedagogy 'business-as-usual', whatever that might be. Thus, the **conclusions of Palumbo (1992), Mead (1985), and Schwartz-Shea and Yanow (2002) will be revisited here with a view to understanding the role of teaching in both perpetuating *and* permeating positivist myths in the policy-oriented disciplines**. This **paper will discuss the emergence of post-positivist thought in the social sciences, explore its influence on the policy disciplines, and assess the extent to which positivist myths continue to influence public policy through pedagogy in related post-secondary departments and schools across British Columbia**. **This initial investigation suggests that coursework on the policy process continues to dominate political science pedagogy to the neglect of policy performance**, a finding that is consistent with Palumbo's work which attributes political scientists' neglect of policy content to its positivist upbringing. **That is, political scientists avoid the study of policy content because of the value considerations that such an activity would demand, the result of which has been a political science that is less relevant to the intellectual needs of policy makers**. While this paper takes the position alongside Mead (2005) that policy entrepreneurs (those who link politics with policy) may therefore be a luxury in Canada, it also contends that this may be changing given the emphasis on politics in course curriculum

within professional schools of policy and administration in British Columbia. While policy scientists' knack for i) policy content and ii) skill in political analysis were long ago siphoned into separate schools of public policy and political science respectively, the shape of public policy pedagogy in Canada can play – and may be playing – a vital role in changing this. **If indeed policy-oriented scholars would like to see a convergence between politics and policy, attention to the field of study as it is taught is just as important – if not more so – than developments within its academic theory and professional practice.**

Excerpt source: Joshi-Koop Sima (introduction)
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 2) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **JUMA, C. & CLARK, N.** (1995.) *Policy research in Sub-Saharan Africa: an exploration*. African Centre for Technology Studies, 16 p.
- **KABEER, N. & COMMONWEALTH SECRETARIAT/IDRC/CIDA.** (2003.) *Gender mainstreaming in poverty eradication and the Millennium Development Goals. A handbook for policy-makers and other stakeholders*
- **KALLEN, D. B. P**. (1982.) *Social science research and public policy-making: a reappraisal.* Windsor, Berks. NFER-Nelson; Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Distributed in the USA by Humanities Press, 375 p.
- **KAREKEZI, S., KIMANI, J. & WAMBILLE, A.** (2005.) *Understanding the policy-making processes in Eastern Africa and identifying intervention opportunities for energy research*. Study Report prepared for the UNDP/GNESD "Capacity Building Initiative for the Development of Policy Dialogue in the Energy Sector in East Africa". AFREPREN/FWD, Nairobi.
- **KASPRZYK, LESZEK** (1989.) Science and technology policy and global change (La Politique scientifique et technique et les changements de l'environnement planétaire); (Política científica y tecnológica y cambios en el medio ambiente planetario); International social science journal XLI, N°3;1989; p. 433-439
- **KAZANCIGIL, ALI** (2003.) Strengthening the role of the social sciences in society : the World Social Science Initiative, in: International social science journal, September 2003, 177 (Vol. N°). p. 377-380

- **KECK, M AND SIKKINK, K** (1998) *Activists beyond borders: advocacy networks in international politics*. New York: Cornell University Press.

In their book on the **emergence of networks as mode of operation for advocacy groups** in international politics Keck and Sikkink deal with central issues of the **network structure**. They assess the **importance of the construction of 'cognitive frames'**, and of alignment of frames and **the fitting of issues appropriately depending on the context**. They see the **networks** as **both structured and structuring**, with focus on what they call the **Boomerang pattern**. The boomerang pattern consists of the following idea that **Transnational Advocacy Networks are most likely to emerge around issues** where; (i) the **channels between domestic groups and their governments are blocked**, hampered or inefficient; and where (ii) **activists or 'political entrepreneurs' believe that networking will further their missions** and campaigns, and actively promote networks; with the third element of (iii) conferences and other forms of **international contact that create arenas for forming and strengthening networks.** The authors also assess the number of complications and tensions that might be related to the operation of these networks. Furthermore they also **look at the different kinds of methods used by the networks**, grouping them in four: (i) **information politics** (ii) **symbolic politics** (iii) **leverage politics** (iv) **accountability politics**.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy. 2) Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity 3) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **KEELEY, J AND SCOONES, I** (1999) 'Understanding Environmental Policy Processes: A Review' *IDS Working Paper* 89, Institute of Development Studies (IDS), Sussex.(http://server.ntd.co.uk/ids/bookshop/details.asp?id=494)

  Policy is an inherently political process, **rather than an instrumental execution of rational decisions, where planning and implementation overlap**. Different models are useful for analysing different contexts: e.g. the **linear model** is useful for understanding environmental policies whereas an emphasis on **negotiation and incrementalism** is more appropriate when looking at rural resource management. They point to **Foucault-inspired idea that policy is discourse**, only understood if you look at the **relationship between knowledge and power**, whereby a **political problem is recast in the neutral language of science**. Their **critique of technocracy**, with its scientifically-driven policy making, is that it glosses over the **difficulties of choosing experts** and works against democracy. **Science is value-laden socially-constructed knowledge and the result of competition between interest groups**. The **scientific enterprise** involves **universalising, removing uncertainties, and hiding assumptions**. Given the growing public distrust of institutionalised science, greater reflexivity in the interactions between scientific institutions and the public makes sense. They **review different ways of looking at policy change:** (i) as **interactions between different groups** with differing political interests – whether it is between competing groups, classes, or within the state (or bureaucracies more generally). A **case study of bureaucratic politics** within the World Bank **illustrates how effective policy making is constrained** (page 17); (ii) **actor-oriented approaches: policy communities and networks, interfaces, actor-network, epistemic communities, entrepreneurs/saboteurs**; (iii) as discourse, which is an ensemble of **ideas communicated through practices via coalitions, narratives, tropes, rhetoric** etc. The differences between these approaches are elegantly summarised (page 27–9). They try to **fuse the best of all three**: '**structure and agency continuous and recursively interact'**. As to the future, building on the explosion of participatory methods, they argue for **new forms of participatory democracy** with more inclusionary and reflexive policy making.

  <u>Excerpt source</u>: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  <u>Key themes</u>: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 3) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 4) Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity

- **KEELEY, J AND SCOONES, I** (2000) 'Knowledge, power and politics: the environmental policy-making process in Ethiopia' *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 38(1): 89–120.

  This **article casts light on how policy decisions are made in Ethiopia**. It reveals a complex environment in which **policy debates are not resolved as a result of rational choices but are often fudged as conflicts rage among ever-shifting networks of scientists**, **donors, ideologues and bureaucrats.** The study traces controversies characterising the evolution of rural development policies. Those clinging to the original Maoist inspiration of the ruling party argue that mass mobilisation schemes can combat the long-term challenge of soil erosion. Others promote policies to increase incentives for farmers to invest in their own land. Some look to off-the-shelf modern Green Revolution technologies to avert the recurrent food crises, while others argue for low external input solutions based on the principles of conservation agriculture. The **study looks at the types of knowledge about natural resources from which policy conflicts emerge and how positions get established, challenged and excluded**. Seemingly regardless of the regime in power, agricultural extension policies in Ethiopia have offered more of the same: external inputs (seeds and fertiliser) linked to credit programmes and mass mobilisation to check erosion. The SG-2000 programme, launched in 1995 with support from the World Bank and international scientists, chimed with a huge, ultimately unsuccessful, World Food Programme food-for work scheme to build bunds and plant seedlings. **In a political climate dominated by a government staking its credibility on achieving food security, little space remained available for different views on agricultural extension**. Ethiopia today, like past regimes, tends to authoritarianism, hierarchy, centralised rule and lack of transparency. **However, despite a political culture inheriting a bureaucratic mind-set antithetical to bottom-up policies, debate goes on**. More recently **alternative types of policy process** – **participatory and inclusive** – have **begun to emerge**. The paper concludes by suggesting why these are happening in some parts of Ethiopia but not others. Other key features highlighted are: • The surprising commonality between policies of Green Revolution and environmental rehabilitation enthusiasts, united by a misplaced belief in over-population and impending

chaos. • Ideas of environmental degradation, which are central to policy narratives in Ethiopia, need to be examined much more critically than is often the case. • Significant differences, as regionalisation policies come on stream, between Tigray (where participatory approaches belatedly find an audience) and elsewhere where (much resented) topdown orthodoxy prevails. • **When actor networks are tightly formed and impenetrable, no amount of rational argument will budge a policy from its pedestal**. The findings suggest that **external actors and policy makers should**: • **recognise that funding of successful NGO participatory projects, together with the imaginative creation of networks around these activities can create new policy spaces**, and help reshape official thinking • seize opportunities presented by decentralisation to promote effective and appropriate local interventions.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: 1) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 2) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **KELLY, L.** (2002.) *Research and advocacy for policy change: measuring progress.* The Foundation for Development Cooperation

- **KENNIS, S AND MCTAGGART, R** (2000) 'Participatory Action Research' in Denzin, N and Lincoln, Y (eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks, US: Sage Publications.

  Participatory action research was originally an **alternative 'philosophy' of social research** that **emerged out of movements for community empowerment** and **development as social transformation** (cf. Freire and Latin American liberation theology). The approach was a reaction to conventional social research, which was seen to sustain rather than challenge the status quo, and which served the interests of the wealthy and powerful rather than 'ordinary people'. **Some key features of participatory action research are**: • There is a **continuous dynamic between action and reflection**. • The **link** is made between the **individual participant and larger social processes**. • The **research process is 'owned' by the whole group**, and it is assumed that social problems are best analysed and dealt with by the community rather than individual researchers. • **The research examines social practices, and is geared towards the practical aspects of putting knowledge into use**. Reality is investigated in order to change it. • **The research process is seen as emancipatory in that it enables people to gain more control over their own lives**, rather than being subordinate to limiting social structures. **Participatory action research has branched out into several streams** (action research, action learning, participatory research, PRA, etc), many of which see it more as a **methodological tool rather than a philosophy of social transformation**. Thus the **label 'participatory/action research' does not necessarily imply that the research has been carried out with the normative aim of social justice**; it could equally well imply that the researcher needed an efficient method of gathering data and/or the conferred legitimacy that such a label brings. Kennis and McTaggart conclude that what makes participatory action research 'valuable research' is not the particular technical methods used, but a demonstrated concern with the **relationship between theory and practice**.

  Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  Key theme: 1) Knowledge Management 2) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **KEREN MICHAEL** (1990.) 'The pen, the sword and the nation-state', pp. 59-69. In International Social Science Journal : "Policy actors: Bureaucrats, politicians and intellectuals." February 1990, no. 123.

  The paper deals with the gradual disenchantment of intellectuals in new states. The **case study** used is that of **Israel**, where during its 'formative' years **intellectuals (scientists as well as literary authors) played a crucial role** (with the blessings of the political leadership) in **supporting the process of state building.** The author finds the following pattern, common to all new states, also at play in Israel. *Such restlessness does not appear overnight; it evolves over time and is strongly connected with relationships to the political authorities…. First there is a proclamation by political leaders that the national struggle is not yet over (the romantic era). **Then comes the realization by intellectuals that reality***

*no longer matches the nationalist rhetoric (the realistic era). And finally, many **intellectuals abandon nationalistic criteria altogether for cosmopolitan standards** of **performance** amidst strong criticism by those who continue to cling to parochialisms (the modernist era).* (p. 59).

Excerpt source: Georgios Papanagnou (review)
Key themes: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy 2) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **KERR, D. H.** (1981.) "Knowledge utilization: epistemological and political assumptions". *Knowledge; Creation, Diffusion, Utilization*, 2(4): 483-581

- **KETEFIAN, S.** (2001.) "Issues in the application of research to practice". *Revista Latino-americana Enfermagem,* 9 (5): 7-12

- **KICKERT ET AL.** (1997) 'A Management Perspective on Policy Network' in Kickert, W, Klijn, E H and Koppenjan, J F M (eds.) *Managing complex networks*. London: Sage.

  The **article deals broadly with the idea of policy networks as an opportunity for public policy making**. It starts by explaining the **move away from an anti-statist approach to an increasing recognition of the need for government involvement**. It is, however, also clear that government cannot reclaim its post-war welfare state position as the central governing authority in society. These observations necessitate reflection upon the **relation between government and society**. In social science this reflection has contributed to the rise of a new idea which is becoming increasingly popular: the **concept of policy networks**. The concept '**policy network' connects public policies with their strategic and institutionalised context**: the **network of public, semi-public, and private actors participating in certain policy fields**. The **main argument** of the book is that p**ublic policy is made and implemented** in **networks of interdependent actors**. Public management should therefore be seen as network management, and interdependency is the key word in the network approach. Interdependency is based on the distribution of resources between various actors, the goals they pursue and their perceptions of their resource dependencies. Information**, goals and resources are exchanged in interactions**, these are frequent and some formalisation and institutionalisation occurs. **The policy networks take shape around policy problems and/or policy programmes**. The authors seek to move away from the network analyses that focus on the failure and incompetence of governments. They rather focus on the **potentials of policy networks for problem resolution and governmental steering**. **Network management is described as an example of governance and public management in situations of interdependencies.** It is aimed as coordinating strategies of actors with different goals and preferences with regard to a certain problem or policy measure, within an existing network of inter-organisational relations. **Network management aims at initiating and facilitating interaction processes between actors, creating and changing network arrangements** for better coordination.

  Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  Key theme: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy. 2) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 3)

- **KILPATRICK, H.** (1998.) *Some useful methods for measuring the benefits of social science research*. Impact Assessment Discussion Paper No 4, International Food Policy Research Institute, 18 p.

  What are the "returns" to policy-oriented research in the social sciences? One presumes that the positive net benefits to society, or at least a certain segment of society, would be treated as returns, but **how does one determine what these benefits are?** Clearly benefits to some social science research are available because society continued to fund it, albeit at different levels in different locations and times. This paper cannot fully answer the questions of what it is we seek to measure in any empirical sense, although it will discuss this issue**. The returns in the marketplace for social science research are those that exist in the eye of the customer who bears the cost of the research**. This paper's primary goal is to offer the client some ways of measuring these returns. It does this with particular emphasis on methods that are often overlooked, even though some of them have been available to the

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

analyst for decades. It **also explains some of the costs and benefits of each method and explains how some of them may be used together in order to achieve a higher level of efficacy in measurement**. **How do we determine the returns to policy-oriented research in the social sciences**? First, **research should be evaluated both ex ante and ex post**. **An ex ante evaluation** of potential benefits is needed to determine whether research should be funded to begin with. **Ex post evaluations** are needed to determine whether additional research should be funded (one might also call these ex ante evaluations occurring before the next round of funding). **Ex post evaluations** can also determine whether the research has paid off and whether it should be given additional funds. These additional ex post evaluations may be based upon evaluating programs that are put into effect as a result of the research. **Since the benefits of social science research may accrue slowly, the methods used to determine whether to conduct additional research at an early stage** (that is, to make a first assessment of benefits from completed research) **may be different from the methods used when the results can be evaluated more fully**. However, if one waits until all costs and benefits are fully measured before providing additional funding for promising research, start-up costs must again be incurred and institutional knowledge may be lost. This **paper will offer an overview of methodologies that can be used for ex post and ex ante evaluations** of the **benefits of social science research**. Its **primary focus will be on research that supports policy**, but it should be noted that research must be evaluated continuously. The evaluation should begin before the actual research is undertaken and only end after a program to disseminate the benefits from research is put into place or even later.

Excerpt source: Kilpatrick (introduction)
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 2) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 3) Research impact assessment

- **KINDER, T.** (2002.) "Good practice in best Practices: the use of best practice case studies in service innovation by local public administrations". *Science and Public Policy,* 29, 3, 221-233

- **KING, K., PALMER, R. & HAYMAN, R**. (2005.) "Bridging research and policy on education, training and their enabling environments". *Journal of International Development*, Chichester: Aug 2005, Vol. 17, Iss. 6; p. 803 (15 p.)

- **KINGDON, J W** (1984) *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. New York: Harpers Collins.

Kingdon **argues that it is necessary to take into account the agenda-setting process that surrounds and determines the policy-making process itself**. Kingdon builds his framework around the **'garbage can' model of decision-making** (developed by Cohen, March and Olsen in the early 1970s), which **views organisations as choices looking for problems, and solutions looking for issues, rather than vice versa.** Kingdon identifies **four factors that influence the movement of choices and solutions within the agenda-setting process**: 1. **The problem stream** denotes which issues are recognised as significant social problems. Citizens, groups and journalists work actively within this stream to trigger interest in problems. 2. **The policy stream** refers to which advice is regarded as 'good advice'. This changes in tandem with the problem stream and with external events. 3. T**he political stream**: both the problem stream and the policy stream operate within a political environment characterised by elections, changes in government, changes in political champion causes, and changes in public opinion. 4. **Policy windows** occur when there is an opening for new views. This is usually triggered by a major event such as a crisis, a new international agreement, budget negotiations, or a priority setting exercise. Policy windows provide the opportunity to have alternative issues and solutions considered seriously. In short, **critical factors in this model of agenda-setting** are **timing, chance and external influence**. Problems and solutions may disappear or float to the top of the streams in a somewhat random manner, which means that **important decisions can be taken in various places and with varying interest in relevant research.** However, the role of external influences also indicates that **research that is circulated within policy networks may have a significant impact when it chances to address an emerging issue at the right time and place**.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: 1) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **KITSON, A.** (1999.) "Research utilization: current issues, questions, and debates". *Canadian Journal of Nursing Research,* Vol 31, no. 1, 13-22

- **KLEMPERER, A., THEISENS, H. et al.** (2001.) "Dancing in the dark: the relationship between policy research and policy making in Dutch higher education". *Comparative Education Review,* 45 (2): 197-302.

The idea that research is directly useful in the policy process has been widely disputed. Much has been written about the differences between the contexts or "cultures" in which research is produced and in which policy is made. A number of authors, however, have pointed out **indirect ways in which policy makers may make use of research findings** or have tried to find more complex ways of understanding and describing the relationships between researchers and policy makers. It has been proposed, for example, that the categories of researcher and policy maker are not always mutually exclusive and that *interactions between all actors involved in this process could be described as two-way interactions*. In our experience, the **relationship between policy making and policy research resembles "dancing in the dark," where the dancers do not completely see each other**, the movements are complex, and the environment influences the flow of the dance. In this article **we want to reflect on the complexities involved in this dance**. We will address different approaches to understanding the relationship between policy and research. While keeping in mind previous discussions of the complex relationship between research and policy, we want to see if we can **identify and classify the uses made of a few particular cases of comparative research**. By examining a few specific cases of research commissioned for the Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS), we hope to **explore in more detail the direct and indirect ways in which this research had an influence on the policy process**. In doing so, we have assumed a static, rational perspective, and we limit our discussion to an **examination of only one direction of influence**-the influence of research on the policy process. We do not think that this is the only or best way to understand the relationship, but we hope that this will serve as a starting point for a discussion about the usefulness and limitations of such frameworks. We use our framework as a heuristic device that helps us to make sense of the intricate relationship between policy and policy research. **The framework is not a full explanatory model.** In our conclusion, we will return to the ideas about the more complex nature of the relationship between policy and policy research. **The main questions that will be addressed in this study are as follows:** (a) Is it possible to classify how and at what stages in the policy process re-search results are used? (b) Can an examination of the strengths and weak-nesses of such a classification contribute to the ongoing discussions of the complex relationship between research and policy?

Excerpt source: Klemperer et al. (Introduction) focus on education.
Key theme: Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance

- **KNORR, K. D**. (1976.) "Policy-makers' use of social science knowledge: symbolic or instrumental?" In Proceedings of the First International Conference, Society for Social Studies of Science. Ithaca. New York: Cornell University
- **KNORR, K. D.** (1977.) "Policymakers' use of social science knowledge: symbolic or instrumental?" In *Using Social Research in Public Policy Making*, C. H. WEISS (ed.) Massachusetts: Lexington Books

- **KNOTT, J., AND A. WILDAVSKY**. (1980.) If dissemination is the solution, what is the problem? *Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization* 1:537-78.

The Knott and Wildavsky stages of knowledge utilization are still being used to explain how research evidence reaches the policy level, where utilization is seen as process rather than a one-time transfer. Accordingly, these stages are: 1. **Transmission** – results were transmitted to practitioners and professionals; 2. **Cognition** – findings were read and understood; 3. **Reference** – findings cited as a

reference by stakeholders; 4. **Effort** – efforts made to adopt results; 5. **Influence** – results influences choices and decisions; 6. **Application** – search led to applications by stakeholders.

Excerpt source: Anne-Marie Schryer-Roy (review)
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance

- **KOENIG, M. & De GUCHTENEIRE, P**. (2005.) "The links between academic research and public policies in the field of migration and ethnic relations: selected national case-studies". *International Journal on Multicultural Societies* (IJMS), Vol. 7, No. 1 http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001406/140653M.pdf

- **KOGAN, M., HENKEL, M. & HANNEY, S.** (2006.) *Government and research: 30 years of evolution*. 2nd ed., Dordrecht: Springer.

- **KOSTOFF, R. N**. (1995.) "Research requirements for research impact assessment". *Research Policy,* 24 (1995): 869-882

This paper describes research required to advance the state of research impact assessment. **Generic research requirements**, such as **certification, quality, motivation, and review frequency** are discussed initially. Then, research requirements for **retrospective methods** (such as projects Hindsight and TRACES), **qualitative methods** (such as **peer review**), and **quantitative methods** (such as **cost-benefit analysis and bibliometrics**) are **described**.

Excerpt source: Kostoff (abstract)
Key theme: 1) Research impact assessment

- **KOTHARI, A., BIRCH, S, CHARLES, C.** (2005.) "Interaction and research utilization in health policies and programs: does it work?" *Health Policy,* 2005, 71: 117-25

- **KOTHARI, A., EDWARDS, N., BRAJTMAN, S. & al.** (2005.) "Fostering interactions: the networking needs of community health nursing researchers and decision makers". *Evidence & Policy: A Journal of Research, Debate and Practice*, Volume 1, Number 3, September 2005 , pp. 291-304 (14)

- **KOTLER, P, ARMSTRONG, G, SAUNDERS, J AND WONG, V** (1999) *Principles of Marketing*, 2nd Edition. Prentice Hall Europe.

The book provides a **comprehensive introduction to marketing**, using a **practical and managerial approach**. Marketing is described as a process containing much more than selling or advertising, with new challenges emerging constantly. Five **main philosophies that guide marketing management are outlined**. These are: **Production concept** (goal to bring down prices, making products more affordable); **Product concept** (higher quality products); **Selling concept** (promotion matters); **Marketing concept** (determining needs and wants of target markets, comparative advantage); **Societal marketing** (determine needs and wants, and customer satisfaction). On societal marketing: **Determine the needs and wants of the target market**, and then deliver satisfaction in a competitive way, improving the consumer and the society's well being. This is a new market philosophy, and questions the standard marketing approach in the face of environmental, inequity and poverty problems. It tries to look at both consumer wants and long-run welfare. This approach calls on firms to balance consumer wants, firm profits, and society welfare. Firms should have ethical and environmental policies, and back these up with action, and sometimes there is a call for ethical auditing exercises. **There is furthermore a call for the need for debate and counter arguments in the media, as well as a need for regulation**. Societal marketing is also described as one of five principles of **enlightened marketing**, together with: C**onsumer-oriented marketing** (the whole operation from the customer's point of view); **Innovative marketing** (real and innovative improvement to product and marketing); **Value marketing** (improving long term value of products, rather than short term sale focus); **Sense-of-mission marketing** (the company should define its mission in broad social terms). **Steps in developing effective communication**: **Identify the target audience** (this determines the next choices of strategy). **Determine the communication objectives** (be aware of the different stages the buyer passes through awareness, knowledge, liking, preference, conviction and then purchase). **Design the message**. Generally **three types of appeals are used**: **rational** (showing that the product will fulfil the buyer's self-interest and give expected benefit), **emotional** (stirring up negative or positive emotions), or **moral**

(appealing to the buyer's sense of right and wrong). **Select the message format and the message source**. Use eye-catching and novel images and tools, and bear in mind that who promotes the message can have a significant impact. The main idea is to get people to respond, and they will do so if they are motivated and if they see a benefit. Therefore it is **important to identify the benefits that you see the consumer having from the product**. It is important to put this message across in a memorable way, tapping on the motivations that drive human consumption: **functional, pleasure, self-identity, image, admiration, and altruism.** Also the message can build on an in-depth knowledge of the consumer's own experience with the product.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **KUPI. Knowledge Utilization and Policy Implementation (KUPI) research program** (2004.) *Knowledge utilization resource guide*, September 2004, 27 p.

  This resource guide was developed in response to the increased interest in, and challenges of, linking research about KU with other disciplines. This guide aims to highlight resources that can help answer some common questions, such as: Wh**at is knowledge utilization? How is knowledge utilization accomplished in organization? How does knowledge utilization shape policy implementation? How do the determinants of knowledge utilization vary across levels of decision-making?** This guide was **developed by an interdisciplinary team of knowledge and information specialists**, together with the investigators of the Knowledge Utilization and Policy Implementation (KUPI) research program. KUPI is a multi-year (2002-2007), collaboration funded by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR). Principal investigator, Dr. Carole Estabrooks, along with the rest of the KUPI team, are **investigating the determinants and processes of using research knowledge in implementing policy to improve patient and system outcomes**. KUPI consists of a **unique team of researchers from across Canada that brings together the disciplines of nursing, organization studies, political sciences and sociology**. Among our various titles and subjects areas, you will find a variety of introductory to advanced-level resources to help you better understand the different ways knowledge can be used, created, measured, transferred and translated in practice.

  Excerpt source: Kupi (about the guide)
  Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **LACZKO, F. & WIJKSTRÖM, B.** (2004.) "Enhancing the contribution of migration research to policy making: intergovernmental workshop". *International Migration*, 42 (2): 175-183 (June 2004).

- **LAGERSPETZ, M.** (2003.) *Theory is power? Reflections on the relationship between politics and social research in Estonia*. Paper presented at the 2nd Baltic Reading in Riga, Latvia, 18 October 2003. Estonian Institute of Humanities

- **LAIDI, B. ZAKI**.(1998.) Malaise dans la mondialisation. Textuel, Paris.

- **LAMBIN, J** (1996) *Strategic Marketing Management*. UK: McGraw-Hill.

  The book starts from the assumption that **marketing is both a business philosophy and an action oriented process**. Marketing is explained as **rooted in the market economy** and functioning of the firm (improve market opportunities, achieve target market share), with the main role seen to be the organisation of exchange and communication (supply/demand). Furthermore the book emphasises the need to **shift focus from marketing to market-driven management**, in a context of increased competition. With the process of globalisation, more competition, and better educated consumers, mass-**marketing techniques are coming of age**, and customised marketing is seen as necessary. This includes sensitivity to environmental and ethical demands and socio-cultural specificities. Marketing should, importantly, be viewed as a process integrating different functions and not a separate entity within the organisation. **Purchasing behaviour is seen as rational within the principle of limited rationality**, i.e. within the bounds of individual's cognitive and learning capacities. For the buyer the product is seen as the solution to a problem (process of problem solving). **Products are seen to have a**

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

core functional value, and a set of secondary values or utilities. The advertising information is important in clarifying risk/value as relative to other products. There are **various forms of buyer response** to marketing: **cognitive** (retained information and knowledge), **affective** (attitude and evaluation), and behavioural (action). The **four main communication tools** are: personal selling, advertising, sales promotion and public relations.

Excerpt source: ODI :   Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **LAMPINEN, O.** (1992.) *The utilization of social science Research in public policy*. Suomen Akatemian Julkaisuja 4/92, Publications of the Academy of Finland, Helsinki: Vapk-Kustannus

- **LANDRY, R., AMARA, N. & LAMARI, M.** (2001.) "Climbing the ladder of research utilization". *Science Communication*, 22: 396-422.

Knowledge utilization is a **field of research** concerned with **factors explaining the utilization of scientific and technical knowledge by decision-makers** and those in **professional practices**. This research field is expanding rapidly as universities and researchers are under pressure to increase the utilization of research results by decision-makers and society at large. The perception that taxpayers are not getting an adequate return from their investments in university research is accompanied by a growing **demand for more measurable results regarding the utilization of university research**. Although there is an enormous reservoir of research results, the study of knowledge utilization is still in its infancy, with a **large pool of normative studies and case studies cohabiting with a rather small pool of quantitative studies**. Furthermore, the field of **knowledge utilization** is still in its **infancy regarding** the **development** of a **general theoretical framework** that **explains the conditions under which research is utilized**. This article tackles these issues in adopting the view that the utilization of research is more adequately **described as a process comprising many stages** rather than as a product arriving at the final stage of decision making. More specifically, the **objectives of this article** are (1) to find factors explaining why social science scholars succeed in climbing up the lowest echelon of transmission to that of cognition, reference, effort, and influence up to the highest echelon of application of their research results in the **ladder (or process) of knowledge utilization** and (2) to **derive implications for future research and future public policy** from the factors explaining success in climbing the echelon of the ladder of knowledge utilization. To our knowledge, there are as yet no studies that have explored the actors explaining why researchers succeed in climbing up though the various stages of knowledge utilization. The **article is organized as follows**. First, it deals with the **main approaches to the measurement of the utilization of knowledge**. Second, it briefly **reviews the major explanatory models of knowledge utilization** to apply these explanations to data about 1,129 Canadian scholars in six social science disciplines (anthropology, economics, political science, social work, sociology and industry relations.) The last part of the article discusses the **implications of the findings** for future research and policies.

Excerpt source: Landry et al (introduction)
Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **LANDRY, R., AMARA, N. & LAMARI, M.** (2001.) "Utilization of social science research knowledge in Canada". *Research Policy*, 30: 333-349

This paper addresses three questions: What is the **extent of use of social science research in Canada**? Are there **differences between the social sciences disciplines in regard of extent of use**? What are the **determinants of utilization of social science research knowledge in Canada**? The paper develops and **test an empirical model** which derives its **dependent and independent variables from prior studies in knowledge utilization**. Instead of limiting utilization to instrumental use, the paper **defines utilization as a six stages cumulative process**. Based on a survey of 1229 Canadian

social science scholars, the findings of this study show that **nearly half of the research results lend to some use by practitioners, professionals and decision-makers.** Furthermore, comparisons of means of utilization show that the **professional social sciences** (social work and industrial relations) **lend to higher levels of utilization than the disciplinary social sciences** (economics, political science, sociology and anthropology). Multivariate regression analyses show that the **most important determinants of utilization are the mechanisms linking the researchers to the users**, the **dissemination efforts, adaptation of research outputs undertaken by the researchers, the users' context and the publication assets of the researchers.** The other explanatory factors exert a more mitigated influence on knowledge utilization. The **last part of the paper derives policy implications from the regression results**. Overall, the **most important finding of this paper** is that **knowledge utilization depends** much more heavily on **factors regarding the behaviour of the researchers' and users'** context **than on the attributes of the research products.**

Excerpt source: Landry et al (abstract)
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance

- **LANDRY, R., LAMARI, M., & AMARA, N.** (2003.) "The extent and determinants of utilization of university research in government agencies". *Public Administration Review*, 63 (2): 191-204

    The authors use the Knot and Wildavsky framework to explain **what factors allow certain researchers to 'climb up the ladder of research utilization'.** They also offer **four models of research utilization**: 1. **Technological** – push model where supply is the major determinant of uptake; 2. **Economic** – pull model, where the needs and context of users is the major determinant; 3. **Institutional dissemination** – Two main determinants: adaptation of research products to meet the needs of stakeholders and the dissemination efforts; 4. **Social interaction** – favours sustained interactions between researchers and research-users, at all stages of knowledge production, dissemination, and utilization.

    Excerpt source: Anne-Marie Schryer-Roy
    Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance

- **LANGER, A., BRONFMAN, M. & TROSTLE, J..** (1996.) *Linking research to decision making: case studies of family planning, AIDS, immunization, and cholera policies in Mexico (Summary findings and recommendations).* Presented at the International Workshop on Linking Applied Research with Health Policy, Cuernavaca, Mexico, February 25–28, 1996

- **LANIEL, D**. (1999.) *The relationship between research and drug policy in the United States*. UNESCO MOST, MOST discussion paper series 44, SHS.2000/WS/1, 65 p.

- **LANUEZ, D AND JERMIER, J M** (1994) 'Sabotage by Managers and Technocrats – Neglected patterns of resistance at work' in Jermier, J M, Knights, D and Nord, W R (eds.) *Resistance and Power in Organisations*. London: Routledge.

    The central thesis of this chapter is that **some managers and technocrats have sufficient motive to sabotage the production of goods and services**. We begin by citing illustrative examples of episodes of managerial and technocratic sabotage. In reviewing the existing literature we find that **low or reduced personal control and the experience of negative affect at the workplace underlie many acts of sabotage.** We examine major societal and organisational forces that have eroded and redefined the power and privileges of managerial and technocratic positions and find that managers and technocrats have experienced increasing powerlessness and insecurity. We draw on neoclassical economics, managerialist literature and modern social-class analyses to establish the plausibility of the central thesis. **As the interests, values and motives of managers and technocrats drift further from alignment with those of capital elites who desire to maximise profit, a willingness to engage in forms of deep opposition is more probable**. Although it may seem counter-intuitive, we argue that for reasons similar to those of workers, some managers and technocrats resist capitalist domination by selecting sabotage responses. In closing sections, a typology of managerial/technocratic sabotage is presented.

- **LARSEN, J. K.** (1980.) "Knowledge utilization – what is it?" *Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization*, 1 (3): 421-442
- **LARSSON, N. O.** (2001.) "A design view on research in social sciences". *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, 14 (4): 383-405 (23) (August 2001)
- **LAVIS, J. N., LOMAS, J. HAMID, M. & SEWANKAMBO, N. K.** (2006.) "Assessing country-level efforts to link research to action". *Bulletin of the World Health Organization,* Volume 84, Number 8, August 2006, 589-684

- **LAVIS, J. N., ROBERTSON, D., WOODSIDE, J. M., MCLEOD, C. B., ABELSON, J. & THE KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER STUDY GROUP.** (2003.) "How can research organizations more effectively transfer research knowledge to decision makers?" *The Milbank Quarterly*, 81 (2), 221-248

Five questions-**What should be transferred to decision makers? To whom should it be transferred? By whom? How? With what effect?-provide an organizing framework for a knowledge transfer strategy.** The authors propose a classification of the different ways in which research is or can be used: 1. **Instrumental:** when research is acted upon in specific and direct ways, i.e. to solve the problem at hand; 2. **Conceptual:** more general and indirect form of enlightenment; 3. **Symbolic**: to justify a position or course of action taken for reasons that have nothing to do with the research findings ('political use'), or use the fact that research is being done to justify inaction on other fronts ('tactical use'). For Lavis et al., **effectiveness is judged in terms of the impact that research findings are having on decision-making processes**, and **not on the impact in terms of health, economic and social outcomes**. The authors **highlight the determinants that should guide knowledge translation** efforts: 1. **Message** (WHAT?) – actionable messages are preferable to single research reports or the results of single studies. "Research on managerial and policy decision making has taught us that research in the form of 'ideas', not 'data', most influences decision-making". 2. **Target Audience** (WHO?) – The types of decisions being made and the types of decision-making environment at hand need to be considered (organisational and political factors cannot be neglected) . • When selecting a target audience, one should consider who will be able to act on the basis of the research, who can influence those who act, and with which audience can the most success be expected. 3. **Messenger** (BY WHOM?) – the key here is credibility. 4. **Knowledge transfer process and support system** (HOW?) – passive processes are widely recognised as ineffective, and interactive engagement is preferred. Two-way exchanges can, in the long term, produce beneficial cultural shifts. 5. **Evaluation** (with what EFFECT should it be transferred?) – judgements about the success of an initiative depend on the objective: are we looking for a change in behaviour? An increase in awareness? Introduction of the issue into a debate? Measures can capture: 1) **A process** (e.g. a presentation.) 2) **An Intermediate outcome** (e.g. a change in awareness, knowledge, attitude.) 3) **An actual outcome** (e.g. a decision to select the suggested course of action.) The authors also highlight opportunities for improving how research organizations transfer research knowledge can be found in the differences between the answers suggested by our understanding of the research literature and those provided by research-organization directors asked to describe what they do. In Canada, these opportunities include: • **Developing more and better targeted actionable messages for decision-makers** (only 30 percent of research organizations frequently or always do this); • **Developing knowledge uptake skills** among target audiences and **developing knowledge transfer skills** (within organisations only 20 to 22 percent frequently or always do this); • **Evaluating the impact of activities** (this area is seem as particularly under-explored; only 8 to 12 percent frequently or always conduct an evaluation. Lavis et al. suggest that **research funders "could structure the knowledge transfer requirements for the research organizations they fund** in ways conducive to these opportunities. For example, a funder could require research organisations to move beyond transferring reports on research projects to transferring **actionable messages** based on whole bodies of research knowledge. Such a move could **help counter the academic incentives *for* focusing on peer-reviewed publications** and **against transferring research knowledge to decision makers**".

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

<u>Key theme</u>: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Research impact assessment / Policy evaluation 3) Knowledge Management 4) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy

- **LAVIS, J., ROSS, S. & al.** (2002.) "Examining the role of health services research in Public policymaking". *The Milbank Quarterly*, Volume 80, Number 1, March 2002, pp. 125-154 (30)
- **LAWRENCE, R.** (2006.) "Research dissemination: actively bringing the research and policy worlds together". *Evidence & Policy: A Journal of Research, Debate and Practice*, Volume 2, Number 3, August 2006, pp. 373-384 (12)
- **LAWS, S., HARPER, C. & MARCUS, R.** (2003.) *Research for development: a practical guide*. London: Sage
- **LE PLAY, F**., (1855) Les ouvriers européens. París: PUF.
- **LEFEBVRE, R C** (2001) 'Theories and Models in Social Marketing' in Bloom, P N and Gundlach, G T (eds.) *Handbook of Marketing and Society*. London and New Delhi: Sage Publications.

The **article outlines the origins of the theory of social marketing,** and describes more in detail the **current key theoretical approaches** used in the field of social marketing. The theories presented in the article are only some of the ones in use, and **have a health bias, due to this being the area where social marketing has been taken the furthest.** Behavioural change is a complex process, with dozens of theories, and often too focused on individual processes. **Social marketing is not an alternative to individual behaviour change strategies**; rather it is a **process to increase the prevalence of specific behaviour among target audiences.** Other theories that also need to be looked at by social marketers include: **motivational theories to inform message development**, **social network theories to inform message dissemination**, **organisational development to inform coalition and partnership development and management**, **political theories to inform policy alternatives**. The **Health Belief Model**: This model was originally designed to better understand why people did not participate in health projects, and its tenets have found their way into social marketing projects. As social marketers make choices about the theoretical models they use in their programs, this model of understanding different predictors of various types of behaviours is useful. This has particularly been the case in relation to addressing issues for at-risk populations who might not perceive themselves as such, through the use of fear- or anxiety-arousing messages. **Theory of Reasoned Action**: This theory is organised around the construct of behavioural and normative beliefs, attitudes, intentions and behaviour. **The most important predictor of subsequent behaviour is one's intention to act, influenced by one's attitude towards engaging in that behaviour**. In social marketing this theory is applied, but often implicit and incomplete. **Subjective norms and referent, for example, are often important to social marketing programs**, even though the theoretical model might not be specifically used, and there is often little focus on how to change the attitudes towards the behaviour. **Social cognitive theory**: This theory explains behaviour in terms of triadic reciprocality in which behaviour, cognitive and other interpersonal factors, and environmental events all operates interacting determinants of each other. Changes in any of these three factors are hypothesised to render change in the others. A key concept in this theory is **observational learning**. In contrast to earlier theories this one views the **environment as reinforcing and punishing behaviour**, but also as a milieu where one can watch actions of others and learn about the consequences of their behaviour. The theory is seen as one of the most comprehensive attempts to explain human behaviour, and points to the **need to focus on attention, retention, production and motivational processes for effective learning and performing of new behaviours**. The Transtheoretical Model of Health Behaviour Change: This is more popularly known as the '**stages of change' model**, and has become one of the more frequently used models in social marketing, applied by some as the theoretical model for marketing social change. **The model emerged from an analysis of leading theories of psychotherapy and behaviour change** in which **ten distinct processes of change were identified.** These suggest certain interventions that will be most appropriate for **moving people through stages of change**. Some of these **include consciousness raising, self-re-evaluation, social liberation, and helping relationships.** The most popular tools from this model however are the stages themselves: precontemplation, contemplation, preparation, action, maintenance, termination. What the model attempts to drive home to social marketers is that few **people are ready for action-oriented programs**, and time must be invested to allow for people to move through the earlier stages. **Diffusion of Innovations Theory**: One of the points coming out from this theory is the fact that there are different types of adopters of innovations in every target audience that are represented in certain proportions and have unique motivations for adopting new behaviour. This

is complemented further by the focus on determinants of speed and extent of diffusion of innovations, and on the **relative effectiveness of different methods of dissemination of innovation**. So far these ideas have not been used to a large extent in social marketing, however, it has a value given that it is one of few population-focused models available to social marketers. This in**volves a view of behavioural change not just taking place at an individual level,** but that there **are indeed processes available to manage widespread behaviour change**.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: 1) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 2) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **LEFF, N. H.** (1985.) "The use of policy-science tools in public sector decision-making: social benefit cost analysis in the World Bank". *Kyklos*, 37: 60-76
- **LEFTWICH, A** (1994) 'Governance, the State and the Politics of Development' *Development and Change* 25(2): 363–386.

In this article, Leftwich outlines the **current 'good governance' agenda** as advocated by the World Bank. He starts off by tracing the events that led to an interest in good governance: the experience of **structural adjustment programmes (SAPs)** in the 1980s and the questions of why they did not achieve everything that they set out to do; the **expansion of the neo-liberal approach to include not only economic issues but also specifically political ones**; the collapse of communism and the subsequent 'monopoly' enjoyed by Western liberal democracy; and finally, the impact of prodemocracy movements. **Leftwich divides the good governance agenda into three aspects**. The **'systemic' aspect** of good governance **deals with the rules governing the distribution of power**, and advocates a political system with a minimal state that provides the enabling environment for an open market and democracy. The **'political' aspect specifies more closely what this means**: free and regular elections, checks and balances on power, structures of accountability, and pluralism. The '**administrative' aspect outlines the need for reliable and accessible information**, efficient and accountable public services, and a transparent public administration. Leftwich concludes that everybody can agree that the good governance agenda comprises many 'good things', but he **argues that the project as a whole is nevertheless rather naïve because it fails to recognise that good governance is a function of state capacity.** He criticises the current version of good governance for relegating the state to a peripheral role of creating an 'enabling environment', and suggests that this turns the good governance agenda into a universal, managerial, and illusory 'fix-it'.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: 1) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 2) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **LENGYEL, PETER** (1989.) 'Elements of creative social science: Part I – Towards greater authority for the knowledge base', pp. 567-585. In International Social Science Journal, November 1989, no. 122. "Knowledge and the state: social scientific discourse, professional knowledge and public policies."

The question the author wishes to answer is 'why social scientific knowledge has less respect than other knowledge bases (e.g. medicine or engineering)'? He finds that **the limits to social scientific credibility** have to do primarily with: the **resistance of archaic modes of belief and knowledge**, the **competition of other more persuasive knowledge bases** (grounded on technologies), and an anti-rationalist mood – since **what is known does not necessarily govern what is done.** Furthermore, according to him, social sciences had greater impact in support of three ideologies: Soviet style communism, mature industrial democracy coupled with welfarism and developmentalism for the Third World. The author believes however that the breakdown of these creates a void that paradoxically opens new opportunities for the social sciences. The answer to this void, he thinks, is to be found in the **establishment of a social scientific equivalent of Research and Development.**

Excerpt source: Georgios Papanagnou (review)

Key theme: Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **LENGYEL, PETER** (1994.) The first intergovernmental programme in the social sciences, (le premier programme intergouvernemental de sciences sociales; El MOST, primer programa intergubernamental de ciencias sociales) in : International social science journal, Vol. XLVI, N°4;1994 p. 597-603

- **LEVIN, B.** (2003.) *Connecting research to policy and practice*. Paper presented to the Canadian Society for the Study of Education, Halifax

- **LEVIN, B.** (2003.) *Improving research-policy relationships: lessons from the case of literacy*. Paper prepared for the OISE/UT International Literacy Conference: Literacy Policies for the Schools We Need, Toronto, November 2003, 29 p.

  The relationship between research and policy, a long-standing concern in education, has taken on even greater salience in recent years. Researchers feel that their knowledge is not given sufficient weight in policy or practice while policy-makers feel that they cannot get timely assistance with the questions of importance to them. The picture is not as bad as often claimed; in fact, **research has had strong impacts on policy in education over time**. A **main barrier to greater impact** is the reality that **research and policy are different contexts for knowledge production and use**, each **producing its own incentives, constraints and pressures**. Stronger links between research and policy are possible if there is greater **understanding of the realities of each context** and the links that can exist between them. Politics and policy-making are not well understood by those who are not directly involved, so this **paper focuses largely on the nature of government and policy-making, and how research might influence that process** more effectively with specific reference to issues of early literacy.

  Excerpt source: Levin Benjamin (abstract) focus on education.
  Key themes: 1) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 2) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy. 3) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 4) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance

- **LEVITT, B AND MARCH, M G** (1988) 'Organisational Learning' *Annual Review of Sociology* 14: 319–340.

  This paper **reviews the literature on organisational learning**. Organisational learning is viewed as routine-based, history-dependent, and target-oriented. **Organisations are seen as learning by encoding inferences from history into routines that guide behaviour**. Within this perspective on organisational learning, topics covered include how organisations learn from direct experience, how organisations learn from the experience of others, and **how organisations develop conceptual frameworks or paradigms for interpreting that experience**. The section on organisational memory discusses **how organisations encode, store, and retrieve the lessons of history despite the turnover of personnel and the passage of time**. Organisational learning is further complicated by the ecological structure of the simultaneously adapting behaviour of other organisations, and by an **endogenously changing environmen**t. The final section discusses the limitations as well as the possibilities of organisational learning as a form of intelligence.

  Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  Key themes: 1) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 2) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access point

- **LEVY ZLOTNIK, J. & SOLT, B. E.** (2006.) "The Institute for the Advancement of Social Work Research: working to increase our practice and policy evidence base". *Research on Social Work Practice,* 2006 16: 534-539.

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **LEWIG, K., ARNEY, F. & al.** (2006.) "Closing the research-policy and research-practice gaps: Ideas for child and family service". *Family Matters,* (74): 12-19
- **LIEBERWITZ, R. L.** (2005.) "Confronting the privatization and commercialization of academic research: an analysis of social implications at the local, national, and global levels". *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies,* Bloomington: Winter 2005. Vol. 12, Iss. 1, p. 109 (44 p.)
- **LILFORD, R. J., PAUKER, S. G. BRAUNHOLTZ, D. A. & CHARD, J.** (1998.) "Decision analysis and the implementation of research findings". *British Medical Journal,* 317: 405-409
- **LIN, V. & GIBSON, B**. (2003.) *Evidence-based health policy: problems & possibilities*. New York: Oxford University Press
- **LINDBLOM, C. & COHEN, D.** (1979.) *Useable knowledge: social science and social problem solving.* New Haven, CT, Yale University Press
- **LINDBLOM, C. E.** (1980.) *The policy-making process (Second edition)*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- **LINDBLOM, C. E., HALL, R. H. & WINDHAM, D. M.** (1984.) *Who needs what social research for policy making?: proceedings of the New York Education Policy Seminar*. Albany, N.Y.: Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government, State University of New York, 55 p.

- **LINDQUIST, E. A.** (2001.) *Discerning policy influence: framework for a strategic evaluation of IDRC-supported research*. School of Public Administration, University of Victoria, September 2001, 28 p.

  Understanding causal influence is difficult in the best of circumstances for any activity: it is an especially **complex task to assess the impact and role of research on public policymaking**. Such assessments are difficult, first, because of the intrinsic nature of research and related activities, and, second, because the **goal is to achieve influence in dynamic processes with a multiplicity of actors**. The challenge is even greater when one asks such questions about the impact of research in Southern contexts, since most of **the precepts developed for analyzing research utilization and policy-making processes more generally have come from Northern scholars** addressing issues in their home jurisdictions. The purpose of this paper is to **survey the academic literature** pertinent to these questions and to **develop a conceptual framework that will guide a strategic evaluation of the policy influence of IDRC-sponsored projects**. Informing such a framework requires a wide ranging review of several analytic approaches which **includes writing on knowledge utilization, policy communities and networks, policy-oriented learning and conflict, and agenda-setting**. This work, no matter how diverse and perhaps bewildering, nevertheless provides useful guidance, and need not lead to developing an overly complicated framework to guide the strategic evaluation. **It is critical that readers and evaluators alike have a sufficiently nuanced understanding of how research and other activities might achieve policy influence** in order **to ask the right evaluative questions** and to select pertinent case studies. In short, the IDRC strategic evaluation must be guided by a robust yet sufficiently refined framework that generates reasonable expectations about research and policy influence, develops an appropriate research design, and produces useful findings that can guide or illuminate future IDRC projects. This **paper is divided into seven parts**. The first provides some **general perspectives on themes that emerged in the knowledge utilization literature,** which examined the relationship between research and public policy, and suggests that there be a broader focus on a range of activities embraced by the notion of "policy inquiry" and not simply research. The second and third parts **introduce frameworks for mapping the multiplicity of actors that are involved in public policy**, and accounting for **differences in how those communities and networks are structured in different jurisdictions and sectors**. The fourth part encourages observers to **move beyond the formal titles of organizations and those that lead them**, and to identify the **actual capacities and informal relationships at play on specific issues.** The fifth section is the longest, and **explores the dynamics of policy communities and networks** by introducing frameworks that account for external influences, political and **value-based competition among actors, the random nature of policy-making, and different modes of decision-making** and their implied receptivity to different forms of policy inquiry. The sixth section **reviews how policy networks can be reshaped by key actors inside and outside**

UNESCO

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

the jurisdiction in question. The final section distils these perspectives, **identifies three clusters of questions to pose to project managers and other respondents, and offers recommendations** to guide the methodology for the strategic evaluation.

Excerpt source: Lindquist (introduction)
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance
2) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy
3) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 4) Research impact assessment / Policy evaluation

- **LNDQUIST, E A** (1988.) What Do Decision-Models Tell Us About Information Use? *Knowledge in Society* 1(2): 86–111.

  Lindquist has argued that **organisations or networks**, for that matter, a**re often in different decision modes – routine, incremental, or fundamental**. Each involves a different level of scrutiny and debate over the integrity of its policy underpinnings: (i) **routine decision regimes focus on matching and adapting existing programs and repertoires to emerging conditions**, but involves little debate on its logic and design, which is built into the programs and repertoires; (ii) **incremental decision-making deals with selective issues as they emerge**, but does not deal comprehensively with all constituent issues associated with the policy domain; and (iii) **fundamental decisions are relatively infrequent opportunities to re-think approaches to policy domains**, whether as result of crisis, new governments, or policy-spillovers. Where fundamental decisions are concerned, it is important to note that that they are anticipated and followed by incremental or routine regimes. There is a **connection to this line of thinking with the agenda-setting model described just above**. Decisions emanating from the 'choice opportunities' that arise **as policy windows open**, however briefly, may involve either limited or significant change, or perhaps none at all. If one **believes that the vast majority of decision-making in a policy area over time is routine or incremental, then there is a built-in bias against the use of research by policy-makers**. There will be greater interest in useful data and analysis that deals with incremental issues as they arise, and **the findings from ongoing research must achieve influence through enlightenment and percolation**. Conversely, the **greatest demand for, and receptivity to, research comes in anticipation of fundamental policy decisions**, or following sharp regime shifts.

  Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 3) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **LINNEROOTH, J** (1987) 'Negotiating Environmental Issues: A role for the analyst?' in Hawgood, J and Humphreys, P C (eds.) *Effective decision support systems*. Gower, Aldershot: Avebury.

  A **fundamental element of environmental policy making is negotiation**. Even in the adversarial environment of the United States, regulatory agencies and other governmental decision makers implicitly **negotiate problem definitions and solutions with public stakeholders to avoid costly court battles**. These interactions are developing into more explicit negotiation forums with the growing awareness that all participants can reduce procedural costs through direct cooperation rather than confrontation. **In the US, new institutions to accommodate negotiated policy making are therefore evolving**; these institutions **are kin to the pluralistic committee structures found in much of Europe**. More cooperative forms of environmental policy making presents a challenge and an opportunity to analysts. How can traditional forms of expertise, including the fact-finding and strategic decision aids, be adapted to support the participants of a negotiation or even to improve the outcome of a negotiated settlement? A **challenge for designers of systems of 'decision support' is to find the relevant links for adapting these systems to provide 'negotiation support'**. In linking these concepts, it is important to understand the **interrelationship between decision making and negotiation**, and particularly **the institutional contexts** in which they occur. This paper will examine three separate contexts selected to illustrate the diversity of both concepts and ultimately the diversity of tools that can potentially provide support. The **first context is a multi-party, adversarial process where the stakeholders interact only through indirect negotiation and where decisions are taken in more formal court proceedings**; the **second context is an organisational decision**

setting where positions are again implicitly negotiated, but internal to the organisation; **the third context is an explicit, around-the-table negotiation where the parties have a shared interest in reaching an agreement.** This latter context shows the successful use of a **computer model in providing support for a negotiation**. This success, however, is tempered by the rather novel conditions surrounding the case, and cannot be easily transferred to other negotiation contexts. **It is shown that political tradition and institutions can severely constrain, as well as present opportunities, to the use of many types of decision and negotiation aids**.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **LIPSKY, M** (1980) *Street-level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

  Lipsky examines **what happens at the point where policy is translated into practice**, in various human service bureaucracies such as schools, courts and welfare agencies. He **argues that policy implementation in the end comes down to the people who actually implement it** (teachers, lawyers, social workers). They **are the 'street-level bureaucrats'**, and they exercise a large **amount of influence over how public policy is actually carried out**. Lipsky suggests that they too **should be seen as part of the policy-making community**. He discusses several pressures that determine the way in which street-level bureaucrats implement policies. These include the **problem of limited resources**, the **continuous negotiation** that is necessary in order to make it seem like one is meeting targets, and the relations with (nonvoluntary) clients. Some of the patterns of practice that street-level bureaucrats adopt in order to cope with these pressures, are different ways of rationing the services, and ways of 'processing' clients in a manageable manner. **Lipsky concludes that there are potentially means of changing street-level bureaucracies to become more accountable to 'clients' and less stressful for the 'bureaucrats'.** One of the ways of doing this, he suggests, is to **move research from the ivory tower and onto the street**, for example through conducting research while running a social work centre at the same time.

  Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  Key themes: 1) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 2) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy.

- **LIVNY, E., MEHENDALE, A. & VANAGS, A.** (2006.) *Bridging the research policy gaps in developing and transition countries: analytical lessons and Proposals for action*. A synthesis of findings from the Global Development Network's Bridging Research and Policy Project, 59 p.

- **LOCOCK, L., BOAZ, A.** (2004.) "Research, policy and practice: worlds apart?" *Social Policy and Society*, Oct 2004 3(4) pp 375-84

- **LOMAS, J.** (2000.) "La diffusion et l'utilisation de la recherche/Connecting research and policy". *ISUMA*, 1 (1), printemps 2000

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **LOMAS, J.** (2000.) "Using 'linkage and exchange' to move Research into policy at a Canadian foundation". *Health Affairs*, no. 3, 19: 236-240

  Evidence-based decision making became a touchstone of health care in the 1990s. The idea of better informing practice with research findings has spread from medicine to management and policy decisions. **The expectation is that those allocating funding and those designing and running health services, as well as those delivering care to patients, use the most up-to-date findings from health services and medical research to inform their decisions**. Unfortunately, the rhetoric has so far largely exceeded the reality. Saul Feldman recently compared researchers and practitioners to "strangers in the night, dimly aware of each other's presence…Research findings have had only a negligible effect on managed mental health care." **Feldman calls for a new "iron triangle,"** linking researchers, managed mental health organizations, and research funders. **Part of the problem lies in the different cultures surrounding those doing research and those who might be able to use it**. Discussions on the use of research in decision making quickly descend into finger-pointing. **Decision-makers accuse researchers of irrelevant, poorly communicated "products"; researchers accuse decision-makers of political expediency that results in irrational outcomes.** In one of the few recent empirical studies of the use of health services research in policy making, Andrew Coburn highlighted the important role in state health policy development of "'**policy entrepreneurs** '—persons who **have sufficient research backgrounds** and credentials to understand the culture and methods of university research organizations but **who also understand the policy process** and can communicate effectively with state policymakers." **Coburn likewise sees an important role for research funders, particularly foundations**, in bringing about a mutual exchange. **This essay describes the efforts of one foundation to link the processes of health services research and decision making** through all aspects of its research funding. This **philosophy of "linkage and exchange" is a promising way to increase the relevance and use of health services research.**

  Excerpt source: Lomas (introduction)
  Key themes: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy 2) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance

- **LONG, N AND LONG, A** (eds.) (1992) *Battlefields of Knowledge*. London: Routledge.

  This **collection of essays explores 'knowledge encounters' in everyday life** through an actor-oriented analysis, i.e. an analysis that **privileges actors' agency** and also their different understandings of the world. By extension, this means that any intervention in everyday life – such as **policy implementation – will be continuously negotiated and re-constructed by the various actors i**nvolved. 'Battlefields of Knowledge' provides an important contribution to the way knowledge is viewed. **Usually, knowledge is seen as a fixed entity** (a list of facts, a set of recommendations), and **there is a clear divide between knowledge and action**. The chapters in **'Battlefields of Knowledge', however, view knowledge as a site of contestation and struggles over meaning**. Any research ('knowledge for understanding') or practical intervention ('knowledge for action') becomes imbued with various different associations by the actors. The **research/policy process is therefore not a case of meaning transfer** (as if knowledge were passed unscathed from one stage to the next), but **rather a case of meaning transformation** (as the knowledge interacts with different actors and acquires new meanings).

  Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  Key themes: 1) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 2) Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity 3) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 4) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy.

- **LOUE, S.** (2004.) "Forging alliances to bridge the research policy gap". *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, Ottawa: 95 (3): I35 (3 p.) (May/Jun 2004)

  It is critical that research findings be translated into policy if the research is to be beneficial. **Researchers can play a role** in bridging the research-policy gap by **participating in the drafting of legislation and regulations**, by **testifying before lawmakers**, and by **building collaborations with key entities**, including **non-profit and governmental bodies** outside of the health arena. **Advocacy** is inherent in the **responsibilities of a researcher**. A **distinction** must be made between **researchers who serve as**

educators and advocates of change based on our current state of knowledge, and **"scientific advocates"** who **rely on science only when it supports their political position**. It is critical that researchers **identify appropriate collaborators** to bridge the research-policy gap and that the communities be involved in this process.

Excerpt source: Loue (abstract) focus on Public Health
Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity 3) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy.

- **LOUGHBOROUGH UNIVERSITY, CENTRE FOR RESEARCH IN SOCIAL POLICY**. (2004.) *Using social research to shape policy.* Presentation to Centre For Research in Social Policy, Loughborough University. September 2004, 11 p.

- **LUKES, S** (1974) *Power: A Radical View*. London: Macmillan.

In his seminal book, **Lukes outlines three dimensions of power**. The first dimension is the **power of A to influence the behaviour of B**. This exercise of power is observable and is tied to **public conflicts over interests**. It is **played out in public decision-making processes**. Dahl's classical study, 'Who Governs?', defines power in this way. The second dimension is the **power of A to define the agenda, and thus to prevent B from voicing her/his interests in the public negotiation and decision-making process**. Potential issues and conflicts are not brought into the open, to the benefit of A and to the detriment of B. This exercise of power can be both overt and covert. The third dimension is the **power of A to define what counts as a grievance, and to mould B's perceptions and preferences in such a way that B accepts that she/he does not have any significant grievances**. The power **to shape people's thoughts and desires is the most effective kind of power**, since it pre-empts conflict and even pre-empts an awareness of possible conflicts. This dimension of power can be played out for example in **processes of socialisation, the control of information, and the control of the mass media**.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key themes: 1) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 2) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 3) Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity

- **LUNGO, MARIO** (1996.) The Challenges of urban research: a Latin American perspective (Les Défis de la recherche urbaine: le cas de l'Amérique latine) in : Revue internationale des sciences sociales, mars 1996, 147 (Vol. XLVIII, N°1) p. 135-141.

- **LUNT, N. & DAVIDSON, C.** (2002.) "Increasing social science research capacity: some supply-side considerations". *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand,* Issue 18, June 2002

- **LYNCH, L.** (2005.) *Job Loss: Bridging the Research and Policy Discussion*. Bonn, Germany: IZA Discussion Paper 1518. (March 2005): 1-18

- **LYND, R.A.** (1939.) *Knowledge for What? The Place of Social Science in American Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- **LYND, ROBERT** (1939.) Knowledge for what? The place of social science in american culture. Princeton University Press.

- **LYNN, L.** (ed.). (1978.) *Knowledge and policy: the uncertain connection*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences

This is a volume consisting of **six commissioned papers plus an introduction by the editor**, who is professor of public policy at Harvard university's John F Kennedy School of Government. **Each paper is**

addressed to an aspect of the problem of relating social science knowledge to public policy decisions. While the **focus is on the usefulness of funds spent for federal social research and development** (some 1.8$ biliion in 1976) **many of the instances cited and the arguments set forth apply as well to non-federally-supported research**. The **first five papers are analyses of the research into-policy process**; the overall conclusion is that **social science research is insufficiently used by policy-makers for a wide range of reasons described by the authors**. The **sixth paper, "** the Use of Social Research in the Courts" by Sharon M. Collins of Cornell University Law School, is a **very competent review of many instances of effective use of research in the legal system**. The contrast between the first five and the sixth paper should not be more striking. James Q. Wilson, professor of government at Harvard University, on the basis of his experience and observation of governmental policy making on such issues and problems as crime, drug abuse, urban and campus riots, pornography, family structure, and economic regulation observes that " ...**only rarely have I witnessed serious government attention being given to serious social science research...**" I have only rarely observed serious social science being presented to government agencies. "Collins, while attempting no such sweeping conclusions, while admitting that there are many barriers to the **greater utilization of social science research and development most commonly incorporated into legal cases...: 1) expert testimony 2) result of existing studies, 3) public opinion polls 4) results of studies conducted specifically for the case in hand."** Although the structure of the book does not permit an examination of the contrast between use of social science research by policy makers and by the courts, it is clear from the examples given by the Collins that it is the specificity of the needs of the needs of the court system that explains much of the difference. The courts need evidence, and once a type of data is taken as admissible evidence (eg., public opinion polls), it is readily used. It is precisely this absence of a structure that marks this otherwise excellent book. As is often the case in collection of commissioned papers, the individual papers are better than the volume as a whole. Although the contributors are all qualified people (in addition to those mentioned, the contributors are the editor, Laurence Lynn, Carol H. Weiss, Howard R Davis, Susan E. Salasin, James L Sundquist) they seem not to have collaborated and, and the papers are generally (with the exceptions of Weiss' paper) overflowing with illustrations but lacking in analysis.

Excerpt source: David L. Sills (review)
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 3) Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity

- **LYNN, L. E., Jr.** (1998.) *Policy making through the lenses of social science*. Prepared for presentation at the fiftieth anniversary celebration of the Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan

- **LYONS, R. F.** (1999.) *Building social capital for health: the new 'research to action' paradigm*. Unpublished manuscript: Atlantic Health Promotion Research Centre

- **MAAREK, P J** (1995) *Political Marketing and Communication*. London-Paris-Rome: John Libbey.

The book provides a **thorough introduction to political marketing**, **its history, foundation, stages, tools and their application as shown in politicians' public relations efforts** and **electoral processes**. Furthermore the book covers campaign **organisation, strategies and tactics**, as well as media relations in general on a local as well as a global level. The author also discusses t**he effects of political marketing on political discourse**, public opinion and voter participation.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key themes: 1) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT 2) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **MABLY, P.** (2006.) *Evidence based advocacy: NGO research capacities and policy influence in the field of international trade*. IDRC Working Papers on Globalization, Growth and Poverty, no. 4, November 2006, 41 p.
- **MACGREGOR, S. (ed.).** (2004.) *The Impact of social science research on social policy government and management*. Cross-National Research Papers 7 (5). European Cross-National research and Policy, 61 p.
- **MACKINNON, J. & REINIKKA, R.** (2002.) "How research can assist policy: the case of economic reforms in Uganda". *The World Bank Research Observer*, Cary: 17 (2): 267 (26 p.) (Fall 2002)
- **MACLEOD, M.** (2006.) "Building bridges with decision makers: rules for rural and remote health researchers". *The International Electronic Journal of Rural and Remote Health Research, Education, Practice and Policy,* 6: 567
- **MACRAE, D.** (2005.) *An academic odyssey: natural science to social science & policy analysis*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Xlibris
- **MACRAE, D. Jr.** (1990.) "Book reviews: effective social science / the limits of social policy". *Social Forces,* Chapel Hill: 68 (3): 933 (3 p.) (March 1990)
- **MARDONES FUENTES, C. A.** (2005.) *Factores claves en la relación investigación y políticas públicas en Chile*. Estudio de caso no. 88, 66 p. http://www.dii.uchile.cl/~webmgpp/estudiosCaso/CASO88.pdf
- **MARTIN, M. & NGOLA, G.** (1995.) *Forging links: economic research and policy making in sub-Saharan Africa: report of the 1995 senior policy seminar*. Seminar report / African Economic Research Consortium. Nairobi: African Economic Research Consortium, 72 p.

- **MATTELART, A AND MATTELART, M** (1998) *Theories of Communication, A Short Introduction*. London: Sage Publications.

The first formal model within **information theory** was **Claude Shannon's mathematical model** of communication, developed in the 1940s, which laid out a **linear schema of production, transmission, channel, receiver, and destination**. This model **views technology as an instrument that is merely inserted into (human) calculations, plans and predictions.** The reaction to the mathematical model came when social science researchers started emphasising the **circular nature of communication**. Even the smallest situation of interaction is determined by so many variables that a **linear schema can only obscure more than it clarifies**, and instead they suggest analysing interaction through looking at different levels (such as the communication between the actual elements of the message, the communication embodied in the human/social relations involved, the communication implied by previous messages, the communication of the message in relation to wider society). **This approach argues that it is also necessary to take into account the large amount of 'silent' messages that surround every pronounced message**, such as the implicit understandings of gestures, space, linguistic codes, time, ways of relating, and ways of disagreeing or reaching agreements. From this perspective, both the 'sender' and the 'receiver' are equally important actors.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key themes:1) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **MAXWELL, D.** (1998.) "Linking policy research to policy reform: two examples in urban food security"*. Food Policy*, 23 (2): 123-130 (April 1998)

- **MAXWELL, S** (2000) 'Is Anyone Listening?' Paper prepared for GDN annual meeting in Tokoyo, December 2000. GDNet. (http://nt1.ids.ac.uk/gdn/tools/respol.htm)

This paper starts from the observation that there is a **lot of research activity, with an uncertain impact on policy.** It briefly reviews various **inputs into the debate on research/policy linkages**, and highlights the **need to understand the policy process** and to attempt to **see issues from the policy-makers' perspective**. This includes the need to develop a more thorough understanding of policy that includes policy implementation; **'policy is what policy does'**. It also **touches on ways of making use of 'policy narratives' and 'epistemic communities'**, as well as **entrance points into the literature on campaigning**. The paper concludes that if researchers are to have an impact on policy, they need to build up an understanding of how policy is made and how it is implemented.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance

- **MAYNTZ, R. & SCHIMANK, U.** (1998.) "Linking theory and practice: introduction to a special issue on intermediation between science and society and its effects on the development of scientific knowledge". *Research Policy,* 27: 747-755

  The articles assembled in this special issue of 'Research policy' are based on a set of papers originally commissioned for a conference held in November 1997 at the Max Planck Institute for the Study of Societies in Cologne. This conference, organized by the editors of this special issue, dealt with the **mechanisms that link scientific research and the users of its products, with special emphasis on the consequences this has for the cognitive development of science.** This is not a new topic. Since their beginning, science studies have probed into the linking of theory and practice in modern science. Different perspectives in the philosophy, history, and sociology of science as well as in economic theories of innovation have highlighted manifold facets of their relationship. In the first part of this introduction, we **will review some especially influential approaches in science studies to the issue of linking theory and practice**—the **Mertonian / Popperian alliance of the fifties and sixties**, the **finalization theory of the seventies**, and **social constructivism** which dominated the eigthies, and is still with us today. We **will show that each of these approaches has different but equally serious weaknesses** which do not allow them to deal adequately with our topic. In the second part of the introduction, we will turn to the contributions in this special issue and **argue for a new approach to the old question of how demands of practice influence scientific development.**

  Excerpt source: Mayntz et al (introduction)
  Key themes: 1) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 2) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance

- **MBOCK, C. G., NGO-MPECK, M.-L., KOM, D. & ZAMBO BELINGA, J.-M**. (2004.) "Policy utilisation of research results in Cameroon". *International Social Science Journal*, Paris: Mar 2004. Vol. 56, Iss. 1; p. 37, 9 p.
- **MCCALL, G. J.** (1984.) "Social science and social problem solving: an analytic introduction" In *Social Science and Public Policy: The Roles of Academic Disciplines in Policy Analysis*, G. J. MCCALL & G. H. WEBER (eds), Port Washington, NY: Associated Faculty Press
- **MCDONALD, M. SPRENGER, E. & DUBEL, I**. (2002.) *Gender and Organizational Change: Bridging the Gap between Policy and Practice*. Royal Tropical Institute-The Netherlands
- **MCGANN, J. G.** (2007.) *Think tanks and policy-making in the US: academics, advisors and advocates*. Routledge research in American politics. London: Routledge

- **MCMASTER, T, VIDGEN, R T AND WASTELL, D G** (1997) 'Technology Transfer: Diffusion or Translation?' in McMaster, T, Mumford, E, Swanson, E B, Warboys, B and Wastell, D, (eds.) *Facilitating Technology Transfer through Partnership*. London: Chapman and Hall, on behalf of IFIP.

  Diffusion theory developed in the 1960s and has had considerable influence on the way both marketing and technology transfer have been analysed. Diffusion theory **assumes that an**

innovation (idea, practice, object, or technology) is communicated outwards through social systems, and that it is a matter of time before the innovation becomes widely accessible. The speed at which the innovation is diffused depends on its perceived advantages, its compatibility, its comprehensibility, and also on the **efficiency of the communication channels**. The **mass media provides a manifold intensification of this process**. Diffusion theory has been **challenged** by more recent theories, such **as actor-network theory** (often associated with **Bruno Latour**), which stress **the concept of translation rather than diffusion**. Actor-network theory distances **itself from the view that innovation and technologies are stable entities that are passed from person to person and then put into use**. This view predicates a **separation between 'society' and 'technology'**, where technologies are seen as independent of the different people they are transferred between. Instead, **actor-network theory sees technologies as parts of networks between actors.** The technologies only 'make sense' when used by an actor and this **actor will always have certain interests and roles**. When technologies are transferred within and between actor-networks, they make sense in different ways depending on **the way they are translated by the actors**, and the way they used to sustain or challenge the network.

<u>Excerpt source</u>: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
<u>Key theme</u>: 1) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT 2) Knowledge Management

- **MCNIFF, J.** (2002.) *Action research principles and practice*. New York: Routledge

- **MCPHERSON, P K** (1994) 'Accounting for the Value of Information'. *Aslib Proceedings* 46(9): 203–215.

  Traditionally, value has been accorded to whatever could be measured in monetary terms. Therefore it is **difficult to incorporate the value of information into traditional accounting and institutional practices**, given that **information is an intangible asset** and non-quantifiable in conventional economic terms. This tension is becoming all the more apparent as information, intelligence and knowledge are rapidly gaining importance relative to fixed assets. **The value of information lies, for example, in reducing uncertainty and risk, and in improving coordination and efficiency**. McPherson argues that it is **necessary to develop methodology for assessing the value of information within a system**, as a rigorous method of accounting for information value will help convince those who still adhere to the traditional view of value in monetary terms. **He draws up a model for assessing information value, which emphasises integrated value and multi-dimensional spatial thinking**. His article shows the importance of handling information as a valued asset both in its own right, and as an integrated aspect of all other assets/technologies.

  <u>Excerpt source</u>: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  <u>Key theme</u>: 1) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 2) Knowledge Management

- **MEAD, L. M.** (2005.) "Policy research: the field dimension". *The Policy Studies Journal,* 33 (4): 535-557

- **MEENAGHAN, T. M., KILTY, K. M. & Mcnutt, J. G.** (2004.) *Social policy analysis and practice*. Chicago: Lyceum Books

- **MENDIZABAL, E.** (2006.) *Building effective research policy Networks: linking function and form*. London: ODI (Overseas Development Institute) Working Paper

- **MENDIZABAL, E.** (2006.) *Understanding networks: the functions of research policy networks*. London: ODI (Overseas Development Institute) Working Paper

- **MEYER, C** (1997) 'The political economy of NGOs and information sharing' *World Development* 25(7): 1127–1140.

  To a large extent, **information sharing is what nongovernmental organisations (NGOs) do**, and the **costs of sharing information are falling dramatically**. Joining politics and economics, this paper

builds an **analytical framework to illuminate how these falling costs are affecting information-intensive NGOs in Latin America.** Case studies describe the various information-sharing outputs and inputs of non profit, NGO production. I argue that the participatory activity of NGOs affects both political and economic realms, and that as the costs of sharing information fall**, NGOs will be a more powerful link in the changing balance between states, markets, and civil society.**

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key themes: Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT 2) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 3) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy.4) Knowledge Management

- **MILES, M. B., & HUBERMAN, M. A**. (1994.) *Qualitative data analysis*. SAGE Publications (2nd ed.)

- **MIMOUNA, ABDERRAHMANE,** *Research-Policy Link(age)s.* Paris, UNESCO, 2007. 44 p. (Electronic version only) SHS-07/CONF.205/7; SHS.05/CONF.205/7 REV.

- **MINISTERE DE LA SANTE ET DES SOINS DE LONGUES DUREE. ONTARIO.** (2001.) *Pertinence de la recherche. Rapport annuel sur la recherche en santé 2000-2001.* 42 p. http://www.health.gov.on.ca/french/publicf/pubf/ministry_reportsf/research_apf/research_report_f.pdf

- **MOHANTY, C T** (1988) 'Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses' *Feminist Review* 30: 65–88.

Mohanty examines **how research on women in the Third World has been shaped by the interests and standpoint of Western feminists who have taken the West as the primary referent**. The research on Third World women has frequently been characterised by representations of 'the Third World Woman', **a monolithic and passive subject who is variously presented as the victim of male violence**, the universal dependant, trapped in the patriarchal family, or subordinated by religious doctrines. The Third World Woman serves as Other not only to men, but also as Other to the implicit self representations of Western women. **While the Third World Woman is ignorant, poor, tradition bound, sexually constrained, and generally lacks agency, the Western woman is educated, modern, has control over her body, and the freedom to make her own decisions**. Mohanty seeks to show that while Western feminist researchers may draw legitimacy from being members in a 'global sisterhood', thus implying that they are well suited to represent Third World women and have the same interests as them, this covers over the **vast differences between different groups of women and the power relations between these groups**. She concludes that (**feminist) scholarship is inherently political**, and that it is necessary to challenge the ideology that portrays research as a 'disinterested' inquiry.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: 1) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 2) Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity

- **MORGEN, S.** (2002.) "The politics of welfare and of poverty research". *Anthropological Quarterly*, Volume 75, Number 4, Fall 2002, pp. 745-757

- **MORRISON, A. & STAMBAUGH, R**. (1975.) *The use of social science knowledge in policy decisions at the national level*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Institute for Social Research

- **MORTIMORE, M. & TIFFEN, M.** (2003.) *Promoting research-policy dialogues: lessons from four studies of dryland development in sub-Saharan Africa.* Drylands Research Working Paper no. 41, 31 p., March 2003

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **MORTIMORE, M. & TIFFEN, M.** (2004.) "Introducing research into policy: lessons from district studies of dryland development in Sub-Saharan Africa". *Development Policy Review*, 22 (3): 259-285 (May 2004)

- **MORTON-COOPER, A**. (2000.) *Action research in health care*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Science

- **MORTON S. , NUTLEY S. , JUNG T.**, (2008.) NORFACE seminar series on Evidence and Policy (2007 to 2009) : The impact of the social sciences on public policy and the impact of evidence-based policy on the social sciences. Report Seminar 2 Rotterdam, March 10, 2008.

The seminar series as a whole **aims to advance international and comparative understanding of the use of different forms of knowledge and evidence in the policy process through a process of sharing of ideas and discussion across these jurisdictions**. The topic for the second seminar was the *The impact of evidence-based policy on the social sciences and vice-versa*. The **objectives** were to explore: • **What we know about the impact of the social sciences on policy**; • **How research impact is conceptualised and assessed**; • The i**mpact of the evidence-based policy agenda on the social sciences.** In relation to all of these objectives, the aim was to consider both general issues and specific experiences in our partner countries. (Iceland, Ireland, the UK, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden.)
WHAT HAS BEEN THE IMPACT OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES ON POLICY? The past decade has seen growing interest in trying to **understand the spread, use and influence of research in non-academic settings.** This includes cross national interest in the **potential for research to improve policy making and contribute towards better social outcomes**. There have been many initiatives aimed at improving both the supply of research and its use in policy and practice settings, and Seminar 3 will explore these initiatives in more detail. However, as discussed in Sandra Nutley's presentation, there **has been only limited evaluation to date of the actual impact of research on policy, service delivery or social outcomes**. There are examples of research that appears to have had a demonstrable impact on policy and practice, such as the impact of "synthetic phonics" research on approaches to teaching children to read and write. Many countries have also developed early intervention policies and programmes for young children, such as Sure Start in the UK, on the back of research that demonstrates that people's life chances are heavily influenced by their experiences early in life. However, **many of the examples identified rely more on anecdotal evidence than on rigorous assessment of research impact**. In short, the answer to the question about the impact of the social sciences on policy is that we **don't really have much evidence about this**. There is a **lot of literature on potential impact and models of the research impact process but only limited empirical data** on actual impact. This signals a need for more research impact assessment but before discussing this, we need to be clear about what we mean by research use and impact.
***WHAT IS RESEARCH USE AND IMPACT?* Research use and impact is concerned with how and where research-based knowledge gets used and the consequences of this use**. Given the aim of developing more evidence-informed policy and practice, the assessment of research use and impact is primarily concerned with the use of research outside of academic settings. Researchers and others are perhaps more used to thinking about notions of 'impact' in terms of the desirable outcomes for specified client groups delivered by policy or practice interventions, programmes or services – with these impacts being assessed through careful research study of the outcomes for specific target groups. **If the interventions or programmes are themselves based on research findings, intervention effectiveness studies do begin to explore research impact**. However, **widespread impact only occurs if these research-based interventions or programmes move beyond the context of experimental research and pilot studies, through being adopted and implemented in a range of practice settings** (as has been the case with a number of programmes, such as use of Peer Assisted Learning programmes – PALS – in schools in the US). It was clear from the seminar discussion that for several partner countries, **interest in research impact assessment has been focused on studying the effectiveness of research-based social programmes**. However, it is important to recognise that studying the effectiveness of research-based programmes only addresses the impact of 'what works' research knowledge. As was discussed in Seminar 1, **research knowledge about the nature of social problems and why they occur is as important as knowledge about what works in addressing these problems** (and indeed the latter often depends on the former). So beyond assessing the impact of research-based intervention programmes, we also need to think more broadly about the impact of a wider range of research. In doing so, we need to recognise that **research is not only used instrumentally to change practices on the ground; it is also has a more conceptual impact through reshaping the way people think about policy problems** (e.g. a shift in thinking from mental ill-health to mental

wellbeing). Several speakers at the seminar emphasised the **importance of taking a broad view of research impact.** A wide range of research may influence or even shape service delivery and so impact on the lives of service users and citizens. Of course, the i**mpacts here are likely to be much less direct, longer term, and harder to track than when assessing the short- or medium-term impact of a particular research-based intervention** on a specific target group. So how do we go about this broader task?

ASSESSING RESEARCH IMPACT. Both Sandra Nutley's and Annette Boaz's presentations considered the **main methodological approaches and choices in research impact assessment**. Annette Boaz presented the main findings from her review of the literature on assessing the impact of research on policy. This review found that a **wide range of methods and approaches have been used**:
• **Qualitative methods** – semi-structured interviews, documentary analysis, field visits and observations;
• **Quantitative methods** -- surveys, bibliometric and patent/new technology tracking; • **Panels and peer review**; • **Workshops and focus groups**; • **Process tracking**. The **two key approaches to research impact assessment** are forward tracking studies and backward tracking studies. **1) Forward tracking starts with a research project**, programme or centre and seeks to **trace whether its research outputs have been used by people and organisations outside of academia** and, if so, what impact they have had on policy and practice. **2) Backward tracking starts with a policy statement** or position and seeks to **trace back to uncover whether and in what ways research impacted on this policy.** Forward tracking approaches often appear to produce more positive results about the impact of research than backward tracking approaches. A question was raised at the seminar about whether this might reflect greater optimism amongst researchers about the usefulness and use of their research, compared with the more pessimistic view of policy makers. Unsurprisingly, **the various approaches to impact assessment have different advantages and disadvantages, depending on the context and purpose of the assessment.** For example, a research impact assessment aimed at judging the extent of impact requires a different approach to one concerned more with learning about the process by which research impacts policy and practice. **Annette Boaz identified eight key questions that need to be addressed when designing a research impact evaluation: 1. What is your conceptual framework? 2. What are the outcomes of interest? 3. What methods will best explore the outcomes of interest? 4. How do you address attribution? 5. What is the direction of travel for the evaluation (forward from research or backward from policy)? 6. Is this a mixed-method approach, providing scope for triangulation? 7. Will the methods selected capture context and the complexity of the research use process? 8. When might be the best time to conduct the evaluation?** She highlighted that these questions need to be considered in the light of the time, skills and resources available for an evaluation. There are concerns about the narrowness of many existing assessments of the influence of social research, such as bibliometrics and citation counts, one-off case studies and simple surveys of potential research users. This gives rise to a need for more sophisticated studies of research use and impact, studies that **take into account how research-based knowledge flows and interacts in complex social systems.** This means that **research impact assessment needs to be shaped by a conceptual framework that captures the complexity of the research use process** (see Roland Bal's presentation). Tracing direct research impacts on important end outcomes (for service users and citizens) will often be too ambitious to contemplate. Instead, studies of how research is used generally focus on assessing the impacts of research on a range of intermediate or proxy variables that link through logic models to those important end outcomes. For example, **assessments may focus on the influence of research on patterns of service delivery, without necessarily examining the full impacts of these service patterns on service outcomes. Unpacking the inter-linkages of these complex processes, influences and impacts – through time and through intermediary variables – is a major task for theory and methodological development.** Roland Bal reminded seminar participants of **how inadequate proxies of impact can lead to ritual behaviour and compliance - seeking to score well in terms of indicators of impact without necessarily seeking to actually improve impact.** Anne McFarlane's presentation used the example of migrant health research and policy development in Ireland to illustrate the challenges of conceptualising and assessing research impact. She emphasised the importance of viewing research use as a process rather than as an event. It is a process involving interaction and dialogue, and informal as well as formal communication. In the case of the migrant health research project, the message of the research was heard at policy level and it was used in the development of the national intercultural health strategy. However, there is a big question about whether it has led to any visible change on the ground.

THE IMPACT OF THE EVIDENCE-BASED POLICY AGENDA ON SOCIAL SCIENCE. Just as judgements about the impact of social science on policy relies largely on anecdotal evidence, so do judgements about the impact of growing interest in evidence-based policy on the social sciences. William Solesbury and Vivian Tseng reflected on their experiences and observations in the UK and US respectively. William Solesbury observed that **in the UK the growing interest in evidence based policy had been associated with a shift in research resources: changes in funding sources; a shift in the balance between basic, strategic and applied research; and changes to supply patterns. Government and other central bodies are now influencing research priorities to a greater extent than had**

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

previously been the case. The evidence-based policy agenda also appears to **have prompted methodological development**, particularly in relation to evaluation methods, social experiments and systematic review techniques. It has also **prompted changes in the relationship between research and policy, with a move to more collaborative working**. There are **concerns** about whether, as a result, **research has become "politicised".** This entails asking questions about whether politics is now shaping research priorities, research methods or research findings. There are **no clear answers to these questions** but some angst amongst researchers that the answer to each of these questions maybe yes. The lessons for social scientists include the **need to defend diverse funding sources** and to beat the drum for basic research. Vivian Tseng's presentation emphasised **how the evidence-based policy agenda in the US has focused mainly on "what works" questions and has been particularly concerned with the identification of effective intervention programmes.** The impact of this on social science has been a **drive to strengthen research through defining standards of evidence and ensuring strong research design**, **analyses and reporting of findings**. **Researchers are heavily involved in the identification, dissemination and implementation of evidence-based programmes and practices**. Several new organisations, involving researchers, have been established to take forward this agenda, such as the What Works Clearinghouse for education programmes and practices. Maybe because of this strong focus on what works, there appears to have been little attention paid to how research is used more generally.

Excerpt source: Norface seminar
Key themes : 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy 3) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 4) Evidence-based Policy / New Modes of Governance

- **MOSLEY, P, HARRIGAN, J AND TOE, J** (1995) *Aid and Power – Second Edition The World Bank and Policy-based Lending*. London: Routledge.

In the introduction to the second edition the authors point out some of the **recent changes of importance in terms of the operation of the World Bank and its role in shaping the development arena and discourse.** They point to the fact that the World Bank can be diagnosed as an institution which **suffers from a chronic ambiguity** of, and **conflict between, objectives**. Over time it moves uneasily between **four major roles.** These, the authors argue, are (i) a **financial intermediary** between world capital markets and its own borrowers – 'the bank as a bank'; (ii) **an instrument for the advancement of the interests of the rich countries** who are its majority shareholders; (iii) **an evangelist seeking changes** in the beliefs and behaviour of developing countries' governments; and (iv) **an agent for the net transfer of resources** from rich to poor countries. The authors argue that in the last 15 years the Bank has placed **increasing focus on the role as evangelist, with the introduction of policy-based lending** with the aim to influence policy more effectively. In a nutshell the story presented in the book, argues the authors, is about the **conflict between objectives (iii) and (iv) in the context of adjustment lending.**

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key themes: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy. Evidence-based Policy / New Modes of Governance

- **MOSSE, D** (forthcoming) 'The Making and Marketing of Participatory Development' in Quarles van Ufford, P and Giri, A K (eds.) *A Moral Critique of Development: In Search of Global Responsibilities*. London and New York: Routledge.

Mosse briefly outlines **two traditional views of development policies**: the **instrumental view of policy as problem solving**, and the **critical view that perceives policy to be a cover for state or institutional power**. **These views** both **ask how policy influences and shapes practice**. Mosse argues that it is more useful to ask the **reverse,** i.e. **how practice sustains and protects policies**. Through analysing the making of a participatory rural **development project in India**, he shows that the **policies did not primarily serve the function of guiding action**. Rather, they served the vital function of **interpreting and legitimising the action that was taken**. In other words, the policies were not turned 'downwards' to implementation and field activity, as commonly assumed, but instead were turned 'upwards' as **validating codes in relation to higher policy authorities**. The representations used in policy (in this case the system of representations surrounding 'participatory development') may even be

seen as commodities that are marketed upwards and outwards because this is the **recognised currency to be used in exchanges with donors.** In this way **policies can be used to secure funds and to garner higher political support**. Policies as systems of representations are also able to present one coherent version of reality. Although several divergent voices and versions exist on the ground, **policy as a system of representations is able to cover over these differences and can thus define the project as a 'success' – a necessary criteria for the project to be able to carry on**. In sum, Mosse suggests that the **policy process is not a process where policy is followed by practice**. Rather, **the policy process is a matter of practice needing to be followed up by policies**, both in order to interpret as well **as justify the practice**. Policies should be understood as **interpretive frameworks rather than as guides to action**. Mosse concludes that 'For policy to succeed it is necessary it seems that it is *not* implemented, but that enough people firmly believe that it is.'

Excerpt source: ODI :   Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key themes:1) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 2) Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity

- **MOYNIHAN, R.** (2004.) *Using health research in policy and practice: case studies from nine countries*. Washington, DC: Academy Health

- **MULLIN, JAMES** (2001.) Évolution des modes de financement de la recherche, 1960-2000 in : Revue internationale des sciences sociales, juin 2001, 168 (Vol. 53, N°2) p. 269-298. Changing patterns of research funding, 1960-2000 in: International social science journal; June 2001; p. 247-270

- **MUNDEL, D. S**. "The use of information in the policy process: are social policy Experiments worthwhile?" In *Social Experimentation,* J. A. HAUSMAN and D. A. WISE (eds), Chicago: University of Chicago Press

- **NASON, E., KLAUTZER, L., RUBIN, J., HANNEY, S., WOODING, S. & GRANT, J.** (2007.) *Policy and practice impacts of research funded by the Economic and Social Research Council. A case study of the Future of Work programme, approach and analysis*. Prepared for the Economic and Social Research Council, 139 p.

- **NATH SHAMPA** (2007.) "Final Report: Getting Research into Policy and Practice (GRIPP)"JSI Europe July 2007. Support from USAID and Population Council Frontiers.

Documentation Process: Lessons Learned : 1. Progress in the initial stages of the documentation process can be slow, though it gathers momentum over time. **Successful communication channels** such as email are important for maintaining the momentum. 2. **Familiarity with applying the GRIPP framework** and process and having existing networks in the field **adds value to the product**. 3. An initial **lack of knowledge about stakeholders can slow down the documentation process**. However, the documentation process can help discover who these stakeholders are and the usefulness of the study to them. 4. **Case study information is much easier to recall** and richer **when the research is still current** or only recently concluded. 5. A **snowballing effect**, which results in **getting more stakeholder perspectives** than originally thought, can occur during the process. 6. A study may have clinical and social and other dimensions, which have very different processes and outcomes with relation to a given research study. Each needs to be followed up in order to fully understand the utilisation and effectiveness of the research. 7. A **well-positioned facilitator** may be the best placed to assume a neutral position and document the research process. 8. Many of the obstacles in relation to the documentation process that were encountered could be overcome if researchers **built the documentation process into their research schedule**.
Scale Up and Utilisation: Lessons Learned 1. **Involvement of stakeholders in the study** and good **inter-personal relationships** with them is important for enabling the scale up and utilisation of research results. 2. **Timing of the research** and its associated activities is an important factor that may affect scale up and utilisation of research results in a given country context. 3. **Communication activities are important for ensuring the right messages about the research get to the right persons** at the right time. 4. The way in which research on sensitive issues, particularly those of a social, religious or cultural nature are handled could determine the extent to which the research results are accepted and used on a wider scale. 5. The **nature and extent of donor involvement** significantly influences the course of the research process and its scale up. 6. Even if the right policies are in place, practices may not

follow because of **lack of sufficient resources or commitment** from those who have the authority to make the changes happen.

<u>Excerpt source</u>: Nath (Summary of lesson learned) focus mainly on public health. See GRIPP (section relevant links and programmes)
<u>Key themes</u>: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy. 2) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 3) Knowledge Management 4) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **NATHAN, R. P.** (2000.) *Social science in government: the role of policy researchers*. New York: Rockefeller Institute Press
- **NATHAN, R. P**. *Social science in government: use and misuses*. New York: Basic Books
- **NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES.** (2003.) *The impact of academic research on industrial performance*. National Academy of Sciences: United States
- **NATIONAL AUDIT OFFICE PRESS NOTICE.** (2003.) *Getting the evidence: using research in policy making*. Report by the Comptroller and Auditor General HC 586-I and HC 586-II 2002-2003, 16 April 2003, vol. I: 48 p.; vol. II: 45 p.

- **NATIONAL CENTER FOR THE DISSEMINATION OF DISABILITY RESEARCH (NCDDR).** (1996.) *A review of the literature on dissemination and knowledge utilization: purpose and overview*. July 1996, 37 p.

  They offer some **useful frameworks about the use of knowledge**: (i) **conceptual** (which changes attitudes), **instrumental** (changes practices), **strategic** (achieves goals, such as increase in power); (ii) **spread** (one-way diffusion of information), **choice** (process of expanding access to sources), **exchange** (interactions), **implementation** (increasing use of knowledge or changing attitudes and practice). Ideas about how knowledge diffuses have not greatly changed over the years, for example, that there is a **cultural and needs gap between researchers and users,** but **information technologies have transformed practice**. The notion of learning taking place on a blank slate still prevails in many schools, whereas **constructivist theories point out the obvious fact that learners filter knowledge through pre-conceived ideas and people** make sense of ideas based on their prior experience. **People change their beliefs only when serious discrepancies emerge in their thinking and practice**. The **source of information is more important than the content**, for example people accept information more readily from those they trust, e.g. dairy farmers trust each other more than experts. **Comprehensibility has more impact than quality.** They also **summarise key ideas from social marketing**, e.g. audience segmentation (dividing your audience into different groups and designing different information, training, rewards etc.). **Identity and cultural differences will also play their part in deciding how information will be received.**

  <u>Excerpt source</u>: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  <u>Key themes</u>: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Knowledge Management 3) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **NEDLEY, A.** (2000.) *Policy transfer and the developing-country experience gap: taking a southern perspective*. Paper presented at the ESRC Research Seminar, February 18, 2000

UNESCO

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **NEILSON, S**. (2001.) *IDRC-supported research and its influence on public policy: knowledge utilization and public policy processes: a literature review*. IDRC Evaluation Unit, Ottawa, December 2001.

For many social science researchers, influencing policy makers and/or decision makers is an intended result or expectation of their research. Development researchers are no exception, least of all because they want to know if their research has had an impact on people's everyday lives in terms of poverty, food insecurity, malnutrition or environmental sustainability. As a result, **IDRC's Evaluation Unit** is undertaking a study that will **examine these main questions**: (i) **what constitutes policy influence in IDRC's experience**; (ii) **to what degree and in what way has IDRC-supported research influenced public policy**; and (iii) **what factors and conditions have facilitated or inhibited the public policy influence potential of IDRC-supported research projects**. This study will serve **two main purposes**: (i) to **provide learning** at the program level which can enhance the design of projects and programs to **increase policy influence where that is a key objective**; and (ii) to create an opportunity for **corporate level learning** which will provide **input into strategic planning** processes as well as feedback on performance. As part of the study, **this paper presents the main bodies of work that address the issue of research influence on policy**. A considerable literature exists detailing the **nature of policy processes**, and on **whether and how research does or does not inform public policy**. There are **numerous frameworks and/or models** found within the literature to help explain or represent knowledge utilisation in decision-making, as well as frameworks explaining how policy change occurs. The first section of the literature review presents an **overview of the knowledge utilisation literature** including its views on the use of knowledge and research in decision-making. The two most enduring findings from this literature are discussed: (i) **Caplan's theory** regarding the behavioural differences or '**cultural gap**' between researchers and policy makers; and (ii) **Weiss' 'enlightenment function' of research**. As well, **various ideas and meanings of 'research' and 'use'** are also considered. The **second section** provides a **synopsis of the various policy process frameworks**. These include: (i) **linear**; (ii) **incrementalism**; (iii) **interactive**; (iv) **policy networks**; (v) **agenda-setting**; (vi) **policy narratives**; and (vii) **policy transfer**. Each of **these conceptualisations has different implications** for the extent to which research is able to influence policy, and for **how research could be designed to influence policy**. Moreover, **each has different implications for who are considered to be the main decisions makers in society**, and/or to whom the research should be addressed. Further, while much of this literature reflects Northern or developed country settings, some acknowledges the diversity of policy contexts throughout the world. The final **section of this paper will address a number of issues**. Few studies examine issues related to **research quality and/or completeness** in terms of considering the analysis in relation to policy development. Additionally, the **notion of perceived influence brought forth by Diane Stone** looks at the **use of inappropriate evaluation indicators**, political patronage and the **selective use of research for legitimisation rather than policy development** (Stone, personal communication, 2001). Krastev's concept 'faking influence' also recently emerged which addresses issues related to the idea that perhaps it is not the strength of the research institution of or the research itself, but the weakness of the other players that allows for 'policy influence'. This posits the question, **has this research, or research institution, truly influenced policy, or is the research being utilised merely because policy makers need solutions and these are the only available solutions?** The issue of quality, along with the issues of perceived influence and **faking influence**, lead us to question **whether policy influence should always be construed as a positive development outcome**? Finally, this paper explores issues associated with two new areas, which for the purpose of this paper will be called generally as 'new policy fields' and 'new policy environments'. **New policy fields covers those fields related to such things as information and communication technologies** (ICTs), **genetics and tobacco control**. New policy environments that encompass policy fields which may not be considered as new (i.e., economics, environment, health and education), but are being developed in newly independent states (e.g., Ukraine, countries in Central Asia). The question here is ho**w the policy processes in these areas work to either facilitate or inhibit the use of research in new policy fields or new policy environments**.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity 3) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 4) Knowledge Management

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **NEILSON, S.** (2003.) *Using their own evidence: building policy capacities in the South*. IDRC Evaluation Unit, prepared for the UKES Conference, Ottawa, 3 December 2003

- **NELSON, C. E.** (1987.) *Utilization of social science information by policymakers*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage

- **NEWBOLD, C** (1995) 'Approaches to Cultural Hegemony within Cultural Studies' in Boyd-Barrett, O and Newbold, C (eds.) *Approaches to Media, A Reader*. London: Arnold.

  Newbold briefly charts the **rise and decline of the hegemony approach within media studies/cultural studies.** Media studies focused primarily on **psychological and sociological frames** in the 1960s and 70s, studying the **effects of media on audience attitudes and behaviour**. Since then it has expanded its scope, in **interaction with cultural studies**, to also **include analyses of the wider cultural environment within which media operates.** The cultural effects theory suggests that the media is embedded in the relations that constitute a particular society, **working both to produce and reflect powerful interests and social structures.** One of the big debates within this field has been concerned with the **extent to which the media is an ideological instrument that serves the interests of the elites, or whether it provides strategic spaces for resistance and change of social systems**. One approach to this question uses **Gramsci's concept of hegemony**, and views the **media as communicating a dominant version of culture** as if no other version existed, i.e. portraying a certain vision of society as though it were **simply 'natural' and not a product of historical and political processes**. This applies both to the symbolic codes used in media communication, as well as to the way in which media communication is generated. **The 'naturalisation' of the codes and the production process pre-empts further questioning**. However, media studies/cultural studies has brought this debate further by including a human experience approach, which recognises the struggle over meaning involved, and the **polysemic nature of the message**. The media may communicate culture, but this is not simply a process of pushing out the dominant culture. Rather, the communication of culture is a process whereby culture is experienced and lived out by the audience; **culture**, according to Raymond Williams, constitutes '**structures of feeling'**.

  Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  Key themes: Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **NICHOLSON, L. J.** (1979.) "Policy Science - successful application of social science to public policy". *Journal of Thought*, 14 (2): 137-46

- **NORRIS, P** (2001) *Digital divide? Civic engagement, information poverty and the internet in democratic societies; Can the Internet change the national distribution of power and income?* Cambs, MA: John F. Kennedy School of Government (KSG), Harvard University.

  Will the Internet transform conventional forms of democratic activism, or only **serve to reinforce the existing gap between the technologically rich and poor**? Will it level the playing field for developing societies, or instead strengthen the advantages of post-industrial economies? Will parties, interest groups, and governments use the Net to encourage interactive participation, or will the technology be used as **another form of 'top-down' communications**? This **book argues that the political role of the Internet reflects and thereby reinforces, rather than transforms, the structural features of each country's political system**. In some, voluntary organisations and community groups mobilise people into politics. In others, citizens often become active via strong mass-branch party organisations. In yet others, grassroots social movements involve people in protest politics, such as direct action to protect the environment. Th**e Net becomes a common resource which different agencies can use in the attempt to generate public support and to influence the policy process**. The Internet thereby **alters the mobilising structure**, providing **new points of access into the political system**, creating new possibilities for collective action, organisational linkage across distances, and informal networks. **Part I** of the book sets out the **theoretical framework in the Internet Engagement Model** which suggests that **use of the new technology can be understood as**

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

the product of resources (like time and money), motivation (like interest and confidence) and the structure of opportunities (such as how social networks and political actors use the Internet). It locates the discussion within broader theories of social communications and civic engagement. It distinguishes the global divide meaning inequalities of Internet access between countries, the social divide between groups within societies, and the democratic divide between those online who do, and do not, use political resources on the Internet. Chapters 2 and 3 then discuss the trends in global access to the internet and the social divisions in the online community, including gaps of gender, class and generation. Part II compares the structure of opportunities for political use of the Internet, in terms of the news environment, political parties and campaigns, civic society and the government. Part III then examines the impact of attention to the Internet for news and political engagement, considers the major explanations of net civic engagement, and evaluates the main policy options for reducing the digital divide. Much of the focus is on OECD countries, especially the United States and the 15 member states of the European Union.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **NORTON, G. W. & ALWANG, J.** (1998.) *Policy for plenty: measuring the benefits of policy-oriented social science research*. International Food Policy Research Institute. Impact assessment discussion paper No. 6, 32 p.

  This paper suggests practical methods for assessing policy research programs, both ex post and ex ante. Measuring the benefits of policy research is difficult: the path **of causation between research and policy change is nearly always uncertain**; **multiple factors influence any particular policy change**; policies are diverse in nature as are their intended and actual effects; and some effects of policy research are not priced in the market. Many of **the benefits of changes in policy stem from the reduced cost of welfare improving institutional change**. Economic surplus analysis can be used to assess such changes. In some cases, **Bayesian decision theory may be helpful in evaluating policy research**, although it is usually **difficult to obtain estimates of the probability distributions a decision-maker has before the research becomes available.** Subjective estimates of parameters and some measure of their degree of uncertainty are likely to be needed for an economic surplus model. The **paper suggests a set of steps for policy research evaluation**. It is applied to two cases: an **evaluation of pesticide policy research in Brazil, and an evaluation of policies affecting deforestation in Indonesia.**

  Excerpt source: Norton et al (abstract)
  Key theme: Research impact assessment / Policy evaluation

- **NOWOTNY, H**., (1987.) "A New Branch of Science", En Brooks, H. y C. Cooper (Comps.): Science for Public Policy. 0xford: Reidel.

- **NUTLEY, S, WALTER, I & DAVIES, H.** (2002.) *From knowing to doing: a framework for understanding the evidence-into-practice agenda*. Discussion Paper 1, Research Unit for Research Utilisation (RURU), University of St Andrews. Linked to the ESRC Network for Evidence-based Policy and Practice, 7 p.

  This paper was **prepared with the intention of identifying existing literature on research utilisation (RU) and evidence based practice (EBP)** from a **number of public sector sources** to inform thinking about **improving the use of this knowledge** by **policy makers, leaders and practitioners**. The authors This map organises the literature into **six inter-related concerns**:
  1) TYPES OF KNOWLEDGE (RU/EBP does not just require know-how, but also know-who and know-why. This type of knowledge is often based on more **tacit understanding – such as 'craft expertise'** – rather than explicitly systematic investigation. The **implementation of evidence-based practice requires a broad knowledge base** covering problems, solutions, implementation, processes and management of people. 2) TYPES OF RESEARCH UTILISATION (It is emphasised that research may be used in different ways, ranging from **instrumental use** that results in practical/behavioural change, to **conceptual use** that results in changes in understanding and attitude. **Conceptual change is perhaps the most**

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

important impact that research can have long-term. Research can be used to inform practice in different ways for instance directly **informing practice informing thinking about problems**, **helping to mobilise support for action** and influencing beyond the events studied. It can also be used inappropriately. 3) MODELS OF PROCESSES (The shift from a **linear model of research/policy linkages** ('research into practice' ie. where research evidence is created, disseminated and utilised) to a **multi-dimensional model** ('research in practice', or complex model of research in practice, based on the premise that **theory cannot stand outside practice**) is echoed in the **shift from researcher-as-disseminator to practitioner-as-learner**. 4) CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS (Different conceptual frameworks are often used implicitly to **frame the RU/EBP problem in a specific way**. The paper briefly **outlines six possible conceptual frameworks** that can inform evidence-based practice: diffusion of innovations, institutional theory, managing change in organisations, knowledge management, individual learning, and organisational learning.) 5) IMPLEMENTATION INNOVATIONS (main **ways of intervening to increase evidence uptake**. Broad-based approaches to securing long term change face **three key challenges**: **cultural challenges** when dealing with multiple cultures; **logistical challenges** arising from difficulties with information systems and access to resources; and **contextual challenges** linked to differences in learning among different groups. Innovative ways of intervening to implement changes include professional, financial, organisational, patient/client-oriented, structural and regulatory interventions. 6) EVIDENCE BASED PRACTICE (Evidence based practice was conceptualised in the literature in two ways: the **research implementation model** and the **outcomes feedback model**. Different ways of conceptualising what RU/EBP means in practice. **Four different 'types' or dimensions are suggested**: i) the **evidence-based problem solver**, who has an individual and dayby- day, case-by-case focus; ii) the **reflective practitioner**, who uses observational data to learn from the past and adjust for the future; iii) **system redesign**, which emphasises the importance of reshaping total systems, often in a centrally driven way; iv) **system adjustment**, which refers to system level 'single-loop' learning.)

Excerpt source: Nutley et al (abstract and key findings) focus on evidence-based practises.
Key themes: 1) Evidence-based Policy / New Modes of Governance 2) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 3) Knowledge Management

- **NUTLEY, S, WALTER, I & DAVIES, H.** (2007.) *Using evidence: how research can inform public services*. Bristol: Policy Press

- **NUTLEY, S. & WEBB, J**. (2000.) "Evidence and the policy process" In *What Works? Evidence-Based Policy & Practice in Public Services*, H. T. O. DAVIES, S. M. NUTLEY & P. SMITH, Bristol: Policy Press, 13-41

- **NUTLEY, S.** (2003.) "Evidence and organisational learning for public management and governance" In T. BOVAIRD & E. LOFFLER (eds) *Public Management and Governance*, Roudledge

- **NUTLEY, S.** (2003.) *Bridging the policy/research divide: reflections and lessons from the UK*. Keynote paper presented at "Facing the Future: Engaging stakeholders and citizens in developing public policy". National Institute of Governance Conference, Canberra, Australia 23/24 April 2003, 20 p.

This paper draws upon data from the UK to argue that there is the potential for policy decisions to be better informed by research evidence than has hitherto been the case. This requires an investment in research, some rethinking of policy processes, and the development of mechanisms for bringing research and policy closer to one another. There has been a significant increase in social research funding in the UK. This has been accompanied by exercises to: **identify and plug key gaps in research knowledge; agree and develop appropriate research and evaluation methods; increase the use of systematic review methods to assist the process of knowledge synthesis and accumulation**. All of these **initiatives are aimed at improving the evidence base for policy and practice decisions**. The modernising government agenda in the UK argues that policy making should be based on the best available evidence and should include rational analysis of the evidence about what works. While this is a laudable aim, research evidence does not always, or even often, enter the policy process as part of a rational consideration of policy options. **Instead research tends to become known and discussed within policy networks through a process of advocacy**. This suggests that other aspects of the modernising government agenda which seek to open up policy processes, to make them **more consultative and inclusive of stakeholder interests, are likely to be a more powerful vehicle for increasing research impact.** The implications for mechanisms to bridge the policy/ research divide are

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

that many bridges are needed to link researchers with relevant policy and practice networks; **government ministers and officials are not the only policy audience. Intermediary bodies** (such as the Social Care Institute for Excellence in the UK) **can play a key role in disseminating and promoting the uptake of research in both the policy and practice fields**. Furthermore, there appears to be much to be gained from developing sustained interactions between researchers and research users through the development of partnership arrangements. **Where partnerships operate throughout the research process, from the definition of the problem to the application of findings, they appear to increase both the quality of research and its impact**. Overall, it is easy to be cynical about the prospects for more evidence-based policy making: research rarely provides definitive answers to policy questions and rational decision making rarely lies at the heart of policy processes. However, this **paper argues that neither definitive research evidence nor rational decision making are essential requirements for the development of more evidence-informed policy**.

Excerpt source: Nutley (abstract)
Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 3) Evidence-based Policy / New Modes of Governance

- **NUTLEY, S. WALTER, I. & DAVIES, H**. (2003.) "From knowing to doing: a framework for understanding the evidence-into-practice agenda". *Evaluation,* 9 (2): 125-148

In an adaptation of Weiss' classification, Nutley, Walter and Davies identify four main types of research utilization: 1. **Instrumental**: research feeding directly into decision-making (this is the least common outcome, and is more likely when findings are non-controversial and require little change or support the status-quo); 2. **Conceptual**: change in decision-makers' understanding of a situation, even if the findings themselves don't lead to a change in policy; 3. **Mobilization of support**: research as an instrument of persuasion; 4. **Wider influence**: beyond the institutions and events being studies (by influencing, for example, policy paradigms or belief communities). These authors also identify two main process models: 1. **Research into practice** – the evidence is external to the world of stakeholders, this is a unidimensional, linear and logical process (the underlying assumption being that if an idea/finding is good enough, it will be used); 2. **Research in practice** – evidence generation and professional practice are much more closely involved, the gap between the "two-communities" is effectively being bridged. Research is now conceptualised as a learning process. In this context, "change initiatives need to be considered in relation to the heterogeneous framework of political power, agency interests and professional knowledge in which they are embedded".

Excerpt source: Anne-Marie Schryer-Roy (review)
Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Evidence-based Policy / New Modes of Governance

- **NUTLEY, S. WALTER, I. & DAVIES, H**. (2003.) *Evidence based policy and practice: cross sector lessons from the UK.* Paper presented at the Social Policy Research and Evaluation Conference, Wellington, NZ.

This paper seeks **to draw out some of the key lessons to have emerged from the experience of trying to ensure that public policy and professional practice are better informed by evidence** than has hitherto been the case. It does this by **highlighting four requirements for improving evidence use and considering progress to date in relation to each of these**. Because the use of evidence is just one imperative in effective policy making, and in acknowledgement that **policy making itself is always inherently political**, a caveat seems appropriate at this point. Further, as professional **practice is also most usually heavily contingent on both client needs and local context**, warnings are similarly needed in this area also. The term 'evidence-based' when attached as a modifier to policy or practice has become part of the lexicon of academics, policy people, practitioners and even client groups. Yet such **glib terms can obscure the sometimes only-limited role that evidence can, does, or even should, play.** In recognition of this, we **would prefer 'evidence influenced'**, or even just 'evidence-aware' to **reflect a more realistic view** of what can be achieved. Nonetheless, we will continue the current practice of referring to 'evidence-based policy and practice' (EBPP) as a convenient shorthand for the collection of ideas around this theme which have risen to prominence over the past two decades. On encountering this term, we trust the reader will recall our caveat and moderate their expectations accordingly.

Excerpt source: Nutley et al (introduction) focus on evidence-based policy and practice.
Key themes: 1) Evidence-based Policy / New Modes of Governance 2) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 3) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 4) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing Communication / Media Communication and IT.

- **NUTLEY, S. WALTER, I. & DAVIES, H.** (2003.) Research Impact: a cross sector review. Literature review. Research Unit for Research Utilisation, University of St. Andrews, 55 p.

   This paper reports the results of a literature review conducted as part of a wider project entitled 'Models of Research Impact: a cross-sector review'. This project was undertaken on behalf of the Learning and Skills Development Agency (LSDA) by a consortium of researchers from the ESRC UK Centre for Evidence Based Policy and Practice, Queen Mary, University of London; the Policy Research Institute, Leeds Metropolitan University; and the Research Unit for Research Utilisation, University of St Andrews. In this paper we present the findings from one component of that project: a cross-sector literature review of the research impact field. The **paper provides an overview of the literature on approaches to enhancing research use from the education, healthcare, social care and criminal justice sectors.** The objectives of the literature review were three-fold: • to provide an **overview of the conceptual frameworks and models which guide research impact** thinking and practice • to **provide evidence on the success of different practices** which aim to enhance research impact • to **examine how effectiveness of research impact is best assessed**.
   Data from empirical papers were synthesised thematically. Interventions studied were analysed in terms of their **content and the theoretical frameworks** in which they were implicitly or explicitly embedded. This identified the mechanisms which seemed to underpin interventions. Interventions were grouped according to these mechanisms. **Data on effectiveness and on barriers to and enablers of this effectiveness were then synthesised within each grouping**. 16 papers had inadequate details of methodology to allow quality assessment and were initially excluded from the synthesis. Their findings were then checked against those of the overall synthesis. Only two papers, both describing the same intervention, were considered to add substantially to the findings of the review. Their results were included in the synthesis with a caveat as to the difficulties of assessing the robustness of the evidence given.

   Excerpt source: Nutley et al (introduction, objectives, synthesis)
   Key themes: 1) Research impact assessment / Policy evaluation 2) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance

- **NUTLEY, S., DAVIES, H. & al**. (2000.) "Getting research into practice". *Public Money & Management,* 20: 3-6

- **NUTLEY, S., DAVIES, H., WALTER, I. & WILKINSON, J.** (2004.) *Developing projects to assess research impact*. Report of RURU Seminar 4, 25-26 November 2004, Research Unit for Research Utilisation, University of St Andrews

- **NUTLEY, S., HOMEL, P.** (2006.) "Delivering evidence-based policy and practice: lessons from the implementation of the UK Crime Reduction Programme". *Evidence & Policy: A Journal of Research, Debate and Practice*, Volume 2, Number 1, January 2006 , pp. 5-26 (22)

- **NUYENS, Y.** (2005.) *No development without research: a challenge for capacity strengthening*. Global Forum for Health Research. 44 p.

- **NYDEN, P. & WIEWEL, W**. (1992.) "Collaborative research: harnessing the tensions between researchers and practitioners". *The American Sociologist*, Winter: 43-55

- **O'DOHERTY, D.** (1983.) *The role of the social sciences in policy making : a science policy perspective. Proceedings of a one-day conference at the ESRI, Dublin, Ireland, June 1981.* Dublin: National Board for Science and Technology, 73 p.

- **OECD.** (1979.) *Social sciences in policy making.* Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development; Washington, D.C.: sold by OECD Publications and Information Center, 56 p.

- **OECD.** (1980.) *The utilisation of the social sciences in policy-making in the United States: case studies*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development; [Washington, D.C.: OECD Publications and Information Center, distributor], 392 p.

- **OECD.** (1981.) Social Sciences Policy: Finland. Published by: OECD Publishing.

The social sciences are now linked up to science policy and policy-making in all western nations. This at least is a **presumption of public policies** in most of these countries. But this was not always so. In fact, the **concept of a social sciences policy is by and large an invention of the 1970s**. Its emergence was stimulated by the view-often associated with the Brooks report (OECD, 1971) and the Rothschild principle-that research and development (R and D) should be consistently applied to the achievement of policy objectives in all sectors of society. **Relationships between the social sciences and policy-making now also form a field of study that has attracted the attention of both official bodies and an increasing number of scholars** (Wittrock, 1982). Thus, since the mid-1970s, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development **(OECD) has sponsored both an overview (OECD, 1979) and a number of country reviews**. This recent **report on Finland** is interesting not least because it focuses on a country that is structurally **different from that American scene from which so many of the findings on knowledge utilization derive**. The **review covers the science policy machinery, the available resources, properties of the research community and aspects of utilization**. The study brings out the following well-known **features of Finnish science policy**: (i) **Resources devoted to R and D in general, and to social research in particular, are limited** not only in absolute figures. Also relative to the gross national product, spending is below that of most other northern and central European member states. (ii) **In the early and mid-1970s, efforts were made to launch a co-ordinated national science policy that involved planning and priority programmes** at the level of the central executive (Science Policy Council), the research councils (Academy of Finland), as well as that of the institutions of higher education. Although similar efforts were made in other countries, the Finnish exercise went well beyond the ambitions in for example the other Nordic countries. The OECD report argues that cutbacks in expenditure growth were one of the main reasons for the relative failure to implement these plans. It should be noted that although a central science policy machinery existed, R and D planning in the various individual sectors of public administration appears to have been less developed than in, say, neighbouring Sweden. (iii) **Finnish science policy has evolved in a climate of controversy and politicisation, not least within the academic community**. In the report, this feature is a recurring theme, depicted in a basically negative light but never fully analysed. Two additional points of analysis feature in the review. Firstly, it is noted that the vigorous Finnish policy to regionalize higher education has probably involved some very real trade-offs. **Spreading research resources across more than a dozen-and-a-half universities or university-like institutions** might compensate for regional disadvantages of location. But **it might well have undermined standards of quality and contributed to a fragmentation of research communities** and an erosion of morale in some of them. This is potentially a **key dilemma in higher education and research in a number of countries**, and it is regrettable that the report only indicates the problem in its barest outlines. Secondly, and even more importantly, results on utilization from questionnaires to government officials and researchers are reported and contrasted with roughly comparable data from the USA. The **Finnish situation is characterized in terms of frequent contacts between the worlds of research and administration and of less reliance on in-house research on the part of officials than in the American case**. But despite the high level of contacts, **application of social research is seen as marginal, routinized, of low quality and rarely involving cases of utilization fulfilling an enlightenment function**. This state of affairs is variously ascribed to a **lack of understanding between the two cultures of government and research**, to structural and political features promoting a short-range perspective in the administrative system and to a narrow, technological conception of knowledge utilization on the part of government officials. **The remedies proposed include an increasing role of mediating personnel and more mobility between the two domains**. This might seem reasonable but it highlights what is probably the most serious weakness of the entire report, namely the persistent **failure systematically to elaborate and confront relevant models of knowledge utilization in policy-making and administration.** True enough, there are statements about the unduly narrow and technological view of Finnish officials. However, the examiners themselves discard as irrelevant to policy indirect forms of utilization and implicitly seem to embrace a rather simplistic, decision-driven, engineering conception. This stance, unfortunately, is at odds with one of the

main **results emerging from the current research on knowledge utilization, namely that it is essential to understand all those instances where social research has an influence other than by serving as a basis for a well-defined planning or evaluation process, according to a highly rationalistic conception of policy-making**. **Indirect uses** are, many scholars argue, the really important ones, if we are to understand linkages between research and policy. If so, it might for example well be the case that controversy does not obstruct but rather promotes the uses of the findings of social science (Coleman, 1979). These possibilities are, however, not hinted at in the present report, much less examined in terms of their policy implications. Compared to this, the other two main weaknesses of the report are minor ones. First is its relative complacency about possible negative effects of a growth of commissioned and sectoral research of a short-range nature, at the possible expense of R and D of a more long-term, free-ranging and cross-sectoral nature (Blume, 1982, pp. 166 f.; Wittrock, 1980). **Secondly, the report does not quite convey the feeling of a firm grasp of the current state of Finnish social science.** Its comments indicate a situation of isolation and increasing dislocation. Possibly, this picture is correct, but then again the proposals contained in the report do not seem sufficient to successfully cope with this situation. Possibly also, the review might have underestimated some strong points of Finnish research. After all, Finland has supplied, for example, some of the world's most distinguished contemporary philosophers, some of whom have left a deep international imprint on thinking in a number of social science disciplines. Thus, the OECD has produced a thought-provoking volume which, despite certain weaknesses, deserves to be widely read and carefully examined.

Excerpt source: Wittrock Bjorn (review)
Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 3) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **OECD.** (1999.) *The social science at a turning point?* OECD Proceedings, OECD Publishing, 128 p.
- **OECD.** (2001.) *Social sciences for knowledge and decision making.* OECD Proceedings, OECD Publishing, 212 p.

- **OLA ROBERT F.** (1990.) 'A profile of the higher public servant in the Nigerian government', pp. 49-59. In International Social Science Journal : "Policy actors: Bureaucrats, politicians and intellectuals." February 1990, no. 123.

The article offers an empirically based description of the chief characteristics of the Nigerian higher public servants.

Excerpt source: Georgios Papanagnou (review)
Key theme: 1) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **OLOMOLA, A. S.** (2005.) *An analysis of the research-policy nexus in Nigeria. Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research (NISER)*. Paper for the International conference "African Economic Research Institutions and Policy Development: Opportunities and Challenges". Dakar, January 28-29, 2005 organized by the Secretariat for Institutional Support for Economic Research in Africa (SISERA), Dakar, January 2005, 15 p.

Despite the existence and activities of policy-oriented research organizations in Nigeria public policy decisions seem not to have benefited from relevant research input. This is generating considerable disenchantment among researchers. This paper employs a **multiple case study approach to examine the linkage between research and public policy in the country** with a view to **providing measures for strengthening the influence of research on public policy decisions**. We found major pitfalls in the research-policy nexus including **gaps in policy initiation, poor culture of policy development, policy confusion and uncertainties and inadequate linkage mechanisms**.

Excerpt source: Olomola (abstract)

Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 3) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT 4)

- **OROSZ, E.** (1994.) "The impact of social science research on health policy". *Social Science and Medicine,* 39: 1287-1293

- **OUIST, Paul** (1978.) Epistemología de la investigación-acción. Bogotá: Punta de Lanza.

- **OVERSEAS DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE.** (2004.) *Research and policy in development: does evidence matter? Meeting Series*. 83 p.

  Better utilization of research and evidence in development policy and practice can have a dramatic impact. For example, household disease surveys in rural Tanzania informed health service reforms which contributed to a 28% reduction in infant mortality in two years. On the other hand, the HIV/ AIDS crisis has deepened in some countries as governments fail to implement effective prevention and mitigation programmes, despite clear evidence how to prevent it spreading. **Although evidence clearly matters, there is no systematic understanding of when, how and why evidence informs policy.** This lunch-time meeting series organised by ODI's Research and Policy in Development (RAPID) programme provided an **opportunity for researchers, policy makers and intermediaries in the UK to discuss how and why evidence informs policy**. **Speakers included politicians, bureaucrats, researchers, NGO activists and practitioners from UK government and non-government organisations**. They talked about **how the political and institutional context influences development policy makers**, what **sort of evidence they want and need**, how **research institutes can manage and use their knowledge more effectively**, **how NGO campaigns and think tanks achieve policy influence**, and **what makes a good policy entrepreneur**. This monograph contains summaries of each meeting, full transcripts of each talk and short biographies of each speaker. Full audio tracks and video clips of each talk are available on the RAPID website: www.odi.org.uk/rapid/meetings/evidence/Evidence_Series.html

  INDEX OF MEETINGS DOES EVIDENCE MATTER? Why is evidence important in policy making? What sort of evidence? How do you get it? Is the current emphasis on evidence-based policy in government resulting in better policies? **THE POLITICAL CONTEXT** Are policy makers 'evidence aware'? What sort of evidence gets to them? What other factors influence their decision-making? What room for manoeuvre do they have? **THE ROLE OF RESEARCH** What does DFID want from research? Do they get it? How could research have more impact on policy? How can you measure research impact? What is its relative importance in recent development policy shifts? **NGO CAMPAIGNS** What role do they play in policy processes? Are they evidence based? Are they really effective? How? How do they communicate? How to build coalitions? **THINK TANKS** What role do they play in policy processes? Are they a force for good? Can they be independent? What is the ideal balance between research and communication? How important is reputation? **PUTTING KNOWLEDGE INTO PRACTICE** Do organisations learn? What incentives do people need to learn? How to convert information into knowledge? How to manage knowledge in international networks? Who buys knowledge? The power of networks. **POLICY ENTREPRENEURSHIP** What makes an effective policy entrepreneur? Is it art or science? Spotting policy windows. **INTERNATIONAL POLICIES** What is unique about international and transnational policy processes? The balance between local and international voice and capacity. How can research contribute?

  Excerpt source: ODI (introduction and index)
  Key themes: 1) Evidence-based Policy / New Modes of Governance 2) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 3) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 4) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 5) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy.

- **OZGA, J.** (2004.) *From research to Policy and practice: some issues in knowledge transfer*. Centre for Educational Sociology (CES) Briefings No. 31, April 2004

- **PACKWOOD ANGELA** (2002.) "Review Article. Evidence-based Policy: Rhetoric and Reality." Department of Education, University of Keele. Social Policy & Society 1:3, 267±272 Printed in the United Kingdom.

The drive in the late 1990s for an evidence-based approach to both policy and practice throughout public services has been encoded in a range of articles, **operationalised in funded organisations, and implemented through government policy.** This paper intends to **review some of those articles**, organizations and education policies to give an **overview of the way in which the approach has been constructed and to make problematic some of the underlying assumptions**. **An evidence-based approach to policy is ideological in that it supports particular beliefs and values compatible with the dominant cultural paradigms** that define how people and society function. At present these are determined by **definitions of effectiveness as a quantitative measure, professionalism as performativity**, **teaching as technicist delivery**, research as randomized clinical trials, and `credible' evidence as statistical meta-analysis**. These paradigms will become taken for granted unless they are considered in relation to the alternatives of effectiveness as being determined by both qualitative and quantitative outcomes; professionalism as the freedom to engage critically in debates regarding practice; teaching as a reflexive, dialogic process; research as an eclectic activity, and **evidence as being that which most appropriately answers the questions posed by research**, be that words, numbers, or indeed images as debated in the on-line BERA debate concerning educational research (www.bera.ac.uk). **Strengthening the evidence base for decisions is generally seen as a positive move**. It reflects a model which assumes that evidence, generated through research, should directly influence policy. **Research is valued in relation to its impact on policy**. The ubiquity of this model has been contested in the **health service** through an evaluation of the relationship of research evidence to policy. **In education** the main objections seem to centre on the argument that education is different from healthcare. This is an argument that Hargreaves (1998), Oakley (1999), and Davies (1999) have all countered in some depth, considering it an easily answered polemic. **The more contentious debate seems to focus on the usefulness and relevance of educational research in providing the evidence base** (see, for example, Hargreaves, 1996, 1997; Woodhead, 1998; Tooley and Darby, 1998; Hillage et al., 1998; Clarke, 1998; Mortimore, 1999). **In the health service several studies have considered the impact of evidence in determining practice policies** (use of resources by practitioners), service policies (resource allocation, pattern of services), and governance policies (organisational and financial structures) (see for example Rosen, 2000; Savoie, Kazanjian, and Bassett, 2000; Harries, Elliott, and Higgins, 1999; Raine, 1998; Howden-Chapman, 1996). **The studies have shown that the evidence-based model has worked best for practice policy but the relation between research evidence and service policies is generally weak and the direct influence of research on governance policies has been negligible. Research has only a limited role in governance because these policies are driven more by ideology, economic theory, and political expediency than the need to improve clinical effectiveness** (Black, 2001). This should give cause for the careful consideration of which policies can be most usefully based upon evidence, rather than the apparently unproblematic drive to adopt this approach in all areas of public policy, including policing, defence, and health: an impetus now being applied to other areas of social service including education. **This has led to new highly visible initiatives being substantially funded to provide the sort of credible evidence that evidence-based policy requires**, without the corresponding analysis of the appropriateness of such an approach. **The strength of support for the approach can be determined by the level of funding allocated to evidence-based initiatives**. The **Evidence Based Policy Fund** was launched in response to the Cabinet Office report `Adding It Up' published in January 2000 (www.hmtreasury.gov.uk/) It is intended as a fund to promote **the supply of research and analysis and as a means of strengthening links between universities, research institutes, and government through the financing of applied research on the government's priority topics**, which include: regional differences and national welfare; life trajectories, transitions, and outcomes; conflict and crisis management; and organisational options for outcome delivery ± the latter encompassing ways of making partnerships between policy makers and users more productive, reflecting another aim of the evidence-based approach to policy. The budget is £3.9 million. In 1999 the Economic and Social Research Council decided to fund an initiative on Evidence Based Policy and Practice with a budget of £3 million (www.evidencenetwork.org). **The new Center for Evidence Based Policy arising from this initiative acts as the hub for seven network nodes each focusing on a different area with the aim of acquiring access to major databases and original documents on social science research**. With relation specifically to education there is the **Evidence Informed Policy and Practice in Education Initiative funded by the DfES** and coordinated by the Evidence for Policy and Practice

Information and Co-ordinating Centre (EPPI Centre) (http:// eppi.ioe.ac.uk). This has a funding of £1.9 million, and a director Ann Oakley, who has moved from being a staunch champion of qualitative ways of knowing to an advocate for quantitative methods. In her book Experiments in Knowing she has traced not only the history of the so-called paradigm wars but also the story of her epiphany in which she became a convert to what she calls experimental ways of knowing. The title is an interesting play on `Women's Ways of Knowing' (Belenky et al., 1986) which had such an impact on the social sciences when it was first published. **Oakley's analysis of the impact of gender on method in the social sciences highlights what she believes to be the need to dissolve the false boundaries between ways of knowing and to re-evaluate the experimental, or interventionist methods of the 1960s**, in a move to allow social scientists to make a valid contribution to policy and to `protect the public from the damaging effects of professional and other forms of arrogance' (Oakley, 2000: 323). **In medicine such evidence-based ways of knowing draw on the resources of the Cochrane Collaboration, an international network of healthcare researchers who are carrying out reviews of medical research**. In addition one of the Cochrane Collaboration groups has produced a **database called SPECTR** (Social, Psychological, Educational and Criminological Trials Register) looking at **10,500 controlled trials of interventions in these fields**. Oakley argues that this is evidence that such an approach is feasible (Oakley, 1999) and appropriate to the social sciences (Oakley, 2000). **The new collaboration for systematic research synthesis in the social science and policy fields is called the Campbell Collaboration**. The **EPPI Centre, as one of the Campbell Collaborators, intends to replicate the approach of the US to systematic review, evaluation, and synthesis of current research and provide a centralized resource for those who wish to undertake or use the results of systematic reviews of research**. The aims of the initiative are to: 1) **provide high-quality, relevant reviews of research that are accessible** to teachers, policy makers, students, parents, governors and others with an interest in education; 2) **support collaboration that develops systematic review methodology for educational research and helps ensure the use of review findings**; 3) **ensure a research process that is open to scrutiny, criticism, and development**; 4) **develop a research process that values and takes steps to encourage participation**, at all stages, by anyone with an interest in education. This approach, it is believed, will counter the criticisms of the contribution, or lack of it, to policy made by social science research. In a recent monograph `Evidence-informed policy and practice: challenges for social science', **Oakley (2001) has engaged with the contentious issue of what the terms `evidence-based' and `evidence-informed' mean and moreover what their use signifies for methodological practices in the social sciences.** Her historically based critique of social policy, particularly education, is a precursor to an argument for a systematic review, evaluation, and synthesis of currently available research. This would replace the `selective, opinionated and discursive rampages' that are the current reviews undertaken in social science. At the same time s**he abjures those engaged in scholarship to put their ideological, methodological, and disciplinary `posturing' on one side to produce valid and reliable knowledge. Such knowledge is defined as that produced by meta-analysis of systematic reviews and by controlled experiments based on the randomized clinical trials (RCT) model, these produce `credible' evidence. Research using other methods, such as case studies, produce evidence that rates much lower in the hierarchy of credibility.** Judgements about the credibility of evidence are based on systematic reviews of outcomes and the statistical meta-analysis of the aggregation of several research studies. Education has produced few studies that used RCTs, mainly because of the perceived complexity of the context of teaching. In response to this conceptualisation much educational research has attempted to understand this complexity through an examination of the individual and collective narratives of those engaged in the process. **Therefore for teaching to adopt an evidence-based approach, such as that strongly advocated by Davies (1999), it requires `high-quality systematic reviews and appraisals of educational research' in order to produce the `credible' evidence required for changes in practice**. Davies advocates carefully designed and executed research which is designed to be cumulative to **produce a database suitable for meta-analysis.** There needs, he argues, to be a change in the culture of education so that teachers, as a part of their professional practice, draw on research to inform their pedagogy. This is a view shared by the government in their recent continuing professional development (CPD) policy documents where `high quality professional development will be based on current research and inspection evidence; (DfEE, 2001a: 1:6h. www.teachnet.gov.uk). The planning of which providers will let the school or individual have, `where relevant, the research an inspection evidence which will be informing their input' (ibid. 2:9c); and `the contents of the development activity should be informed by recent, relevant research and/or inspection evidence' (ibid. 4:12e). **In addition the government has clearly stated its intention to `[carry] out good quality research and evaluation into professional development opportunities and their impact on teaching and learning, so we can build up evidence of what works'** (DfEE, 2001b: F). **It is interesting that the government use of `research' evidence seems to equate it, or at least give it equal status with, `inspection'evidence**. Thus government policy is attempting to shift the balance from those traditionally engaged in research located in the academy, towards the teacher as researcher, through initiatives such as the Teacher Training Agency (TTA) Teacher Research Grant Scheme in 1996, now extended as Best Practice Research Scholarships (BPRS) for which

there is £12 million funding over three years for teachers ` . . . to do sharply focused research into key areas of classroom practice' (DfEE, 2001b: B:20). Foster's (1999) evaluation of the research produced by the 1996 pilot scheme raised serious doubts about the quality of what was being produced and disseminated as research. Although many of the reports were relevant he felt that a minority could not be classed as research. In addition there were serious doubts about the **validity of key findings, thus raising grave concerns about whether such an initiative does result in the production of `high quality research' to `add to the existing stock of knowledge available to teachers and the research community'** (TTA, 1996a, 1996b, 1997). **It does not seem that this approach to producing practitioner knowledge will achieve what Hargreaves argues for, `to turn teachers' habitual classroom tinkerings into a much more trustworthy form of research evidence'** (Hargreaves, 1998). Just to put emphasis on the role of research in teaching is not enough. Teachers have to be supported in undertaking research that meets the stringent criteria applied to that which comes out of the academy. However, despite the seemingly wholehearted acceptance of the evidence-based policy development favoured by the government, directors of funded initiatives (Oakley, 1999, 2000, 2001), and members of the educational research community (Hargreaves, 1999) and of the academy (Davies, 1999), **there are several issues that need to be considered.** 1) Firstly, that **it would be more accurate to refer to an evidence-informed approach, as policy is determined according to more than research evidence alone, including financial, economic and strategic factors, and practitioner knowledge**. 2) Secondly, **research evidence may be dismissed as irrelevant if it does not match the preferred outcome.** The government wants to hear about some evidence and not others. We have lots of research gathered together indicating that putting students into ability groups does not help results and can hurt students' self esteem, but the government says grouping is the way forward. (Ball in Plomin, 2001) 3) Thirdly, **who should disseminate the research evidence into the policymaking forum?** If it is civil servants then there are problems in their lack of experience in the field of education. For example the problems with BPRS were caused in part because no-one at policy level seemed to be aware of the implications of the timing of the request for bids in relation to the school term and the workload demands on teachers posed by SATs which were being undertaken at the same time as bids had to be prepared. 4) Fourthly, **although evidence-based policy is predicated on the aim of increasing effectiveness there may be times when other demands ± social, financial, or strategic ± are the real drivers of the policy and so research evidence may be ignored**. For example, research evidence shows that the government's school contracts policy is not effective but it is still in force in order to serve a strategic aim. 5) Fifthly, **there may be a lack of consensus about the nature of the evidence provided by the research because of the complexity of the issue being researched, or because there is controversy over the methods used to gather the evidence or because the evidence is open to different interpretations.** An example of this is the recent Hay McBer report into effective teaching commissioned by the DfEE for a reputed £4 million (Barnard, 2000; DfEE, 2000), over which there is controversy. The BERA methodological seminar on the Hay McBer Report concluded that: We cannot avoid the conclusion that the report Research into Teacher Effectiveness gives only limited insight into the complex and multi-varied work of teachers. It offers hypotheses that need to be tested and a framework that needs to be explored for missing structures, but it falls short of being an authoritative research-based account and may be misleading to anyone who treats it as such. (BERA, 2001) 6) Finally, **policy makers themselves may differ in their interpretation and use of the evidence generated by research**. In conclusion, Coe, Fitz-Gibbon, and Tymms (2000) sum up the paradox of educational researchers faced with the drive for evidence-based policy ± or indeed practice: **if research is to influence practices or policies, this can only be justified on the basis of sound knowledge about their likely effects, i.e. it must be `evidence-based'.** Alternatively, if educational researchers are happy to refrain from giving advice to practitioners or policy makers, then they may be free to conduct whatever kind of research they choose. (Coe, Fitz-Gibbon, and Tymms, 2000: 2.)

Excerpt source: Packwood (text)
Key theme: 1) Evidence-based Policy / New Modes of Governance 2) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 3) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **PAQUET, G.** (1971.) *Social science research as an evaluative instrument for social policy*. Carleton Economic Papers, Carleton University, Ottawa, March 1971
- **PAULOS, R. & ZWI, A.** (2006.) "What exactly is society getting for its research dollars?" *MJA* `5 (6): 252-3
- **PAWSON, R. (**2006.) *Evidence-based policy: a realist perspective*. London: Sage.
- **PEAC (POLICY EXPERTISE AND ACADEMIC CHANGE).** (2005.) *Policy expertise and academic change: transformation of social knowledge in Bulgaria towards expert*

participation in public policies. Policy Expertise and Academic Change (PEAC), FP6-2004-ACC-SSA-2, 38 p. http://www.peac-bg.org/doc/PEAC_project_short.pdf

- **PEARSON, R. W. & SHERMAN, L. W.** (2005.) *The use and usefulness of the social sciences: achievements, disappointments, and promise*. Thousand Oaks, CA : SAGE Publications

- **PEDRAZZINI, Y., ROSSEL, P. et BASSAND, M**. (1994.) Changement social et dynamique culturelle en milieu urbain. Synthèse de la Rencontre de Saint-Sabin à Lausanne. ARCI, IREC, FPH. 133p.

- **PELZ, D. C.** (1978.) "Some expanded perspectives on use of social science in public policy" In *Major Social Issues : A Multidisciplinary View*, New York, J. M. YINGER & S. J. CUTLER (eds), The Free Press pp. 346-357

- **PESTIEAU, C.** (2003.) *Evaluating policy research*. Research Paper W 22, Work Network, Canadian Policy Research Networks Inc., December 2003, 19 p.

- **PETERSON, S B** (1998) 'Saints, Demons, Wizards and Systems: Why information technology reforms fail or underperform in public bureaucracies in Africa'. *Public Administration and Development* 18(1): 37–60.

Peterson asserts that the **great potential of IT for public administrative reforms in Africa has not been realised**, and reviews possible reasons for this. The focus is on both the actors involved and the **importance of the cultural environment**. He argues that information systems development is a highly personalised process, and therefore **individuals can have significant impact both as promoters and as saboteurs**. Thus he classifies the various actors as **saints (pro-reform), demons (anti-reform), and wizards (IT specialists)**, and draws the **conclusion that information systems development in Africa often fails because there are too few saints, too many demons, and inappropriate wizards**. The cultural environment also plays a part. Since African bureaucracies may operate with personalised authority structures and a certain lack of continuity over time, **introducing IT systems may be resisted by those who would lose power as information brokers, and reforms may be short lived**. This illustrates the highly contingent nature of information systems, and their embeddedness in surrounding political structures and human relationships. **Changes in information systems cannot be pushed through without also considering the changes that will ensue in organisational lay-out**, **power structures, and cultural understandings**. Peterson concludes that information systems development is a highly personalised, contingent and political process, and therefore should be treated as a craft rather than a science.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key themes: Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **PHILO, G** (1996) 'Seeing and Believing' in Marris, P and Thornham, S (eds.) *Media studies, A Reader*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

What leads people to accept or to reject the portrayal of an event in the news? Philo analyses a **case study of the television news coverage of the Miners' Strike in the mid-1980s** and the extent to which the news was believed to be 'true' by the audience. The news coverage selectively focused on violent incidents, portraying an image of the picket lines as primarily violent places. In Philo's general audience sample, 54% believed that picketing was indeed mostly violent. **Some important reasons given by the audience for believing the television story were the perceived credibility of the source** (historically and culturally mediated trust in the BBC), as well as the **impact of the visual images – seeing is believing**. However, the remaining **46% of the audience sample did not accept the story as it was portrayed by the ne**ws. One of the most important **grounds for rejection was direct or indirect experience of the issue**, e.g. through having driven past picket lines or through knowing miners. Another ground for rejection was comparison between the television coverage and other sources of information, such as newspapers. In addition, **some people were sceptical due to their perception of the political agenda of the television news**. The portrayal of the miners' strike as violent stuck in the minds of over half the sample audience, strongly influenced by the visual images. **Footage and photographs carry a lot of weight as credible evidence in information societies**,

and **are seen as more 'neutral' or 'true' than written reports**. However, this was not enough to make the news coverage stick as a credible story in all of the sample audience. In sum, **how people understand and interpret news depends on the extent to which the news is compatible with their existing cultural/political beliefs, their direct and indirect experience, and their ability to compare the television account with various other accounts**.

Excerpt source: ODI :   Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **PHILPOTT, A.** (1999.) "Twists in the Mwanza tale: did one HIV research study shift global policy?" *Development Research Insights*, 32: 2–3
- **PINKUS, S.** (2005.) "Bridging the gap between policy and practice: adopting a strategic vision for partnership working in special education". *British Journal of Educational Studies*, Volume 32, Number 4, December 2005, pp. 184-187 (4)
- **PITTMAN P.** (2004.) "Allied research: experimenting with structures and processes to increase the use of research in health policy" In *Global Forum for Health Research – final documents* [CD-ROM]. Mexico DF: Global Forum for Health Research
- **PITTMAN, P. & ALMEIDA, C.** (2006.) "Cross-sector learning among researchers and policy-makers: the search for new strategies to enable use of research results / El aprendizaje intersectorial entre investigadores y creadores de políticas: la búsqueda de nuevas estrategias que permitan el uso de los resultados de investigación". *Cadernos Saúde Pública*, 2006, vol. 22 suppl, p. S97-S108.
- **PLOUFFE, L. A.** (2000.) "Bridging policy research and policy: experience from Health Canada's Seniors Independence Research Program". *Canadian Journal of Policy Research*, 1 (1) (Spring 2000) (also available in French: *Tisser des liens entre les politiques et la recherche*)
- **POPULATION COUNCIL.** (2002.) *Workshop on utilization of research results. San Jose, Costa Rica, June 4–7, 2002*. Population Council Inc., 52 p.

- **PORTER, R. & PRYSOR-JONES, S.** (1997.) Making a difference to policies and programs: a guide for researchers. USAID, July 1997

    This guide to researchers presents a **practical and collaborative approach to the three-way communication between researchers, policy-makers and communities**. It suggests **specific actions that researchers may take to communicate more effectively at different stages of the research process** (defining the questions, developing the proposal, conducting the study, communicating the results). Suggestions include: **involve potential users in defining the questions, establish relationships of trust, clarify which decisions the research wants to influence, choose appropriate research methods, involve users in data collection and analysis, communicate the results in appropriate ways to the different groups involved, formulate clear recommendations.**

    Excerpt source: ODI :   Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
    Key themes:1) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 2) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 3) Knowledge Management   4) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **PORTER, R. D. & HICKS, I.** (1995.) *Knowledge utilization and the process of policy formation: toward a framework for Africa.* SARA Project, Academy for Educational Development, AFR/SD/HRD

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **POSTLETHWAITE, T.** (1984.) "Research and policy making in education: some possible links" In *Knowledge for policy: improving education through research*, D. S. ANDERSON & B. J. BIDDLE (eds), London: The Falmer Press

There is an implicit belief or hope that decision-oriented **research can come up with results that can be used for resolving current problems or issues in education**. The **following will examine who policy-makers and researchers are, research and research utilisation, the content of 'policy-research', and will include a few words on types of research, monitoring, and technical aspects in this kind of work**. Finally, I **will list a series of points that could serve as a basis for discussing the proposed policy-oriented research in your country**. WHO ARE POLICY-MAKERS AND RESEARCHERS? Policy makers comprise: (a) **politicians-senior members of government and members of parliament**; (b) **senior administrators in ministries and government agencies**; (c) **top people in national associations representing various interest groups**, e.g. trade unions; (d) **academics, serving as consultants or staff members for categories** (a)-(c). **Researchers are academics** at: (a) **research institutions which are part of government agencies** (this is your case); (b) **universities (public and private)**; (c) **private research institutions**; (d) **'middle men'** (see below). I regard the professional members of staff at your R and D institution as academics. They have university training, and the good ones have their doctorates. To conduct research, they must **have a battery of techniques (design, instrument construction, and data analysis procedures**) but, above all, they need open and inquiring minds. And, in this sense they are academics and not bureaucrats. I am not sure where I should place **middle-men, those persons who help translate research findings into policy recommendations (or alternatives).** Martin Trow (1984), in his article 'Researchers, policy analysts, and policy intellectuals' has described these middle-men (and their training at the Center for Studies of Higher Education at Berkeley). But I suppose they come more clearly under 'researchers' than under 'policy-makers'. The **different conditions under which policy-makers and researchers work can often lead to tension between the two groups**. For example, policy makers want research to deal with problems on their agenda. They often **disregard the relationship of their area of interest (e.g. compensatory education problems) to larger societal problems: they are, normally, not social science researchers and are not familiar either with the content, methods or jargon of educational research. Of course, they want the results immediately and are impatient about waiting.** One of the main problems for the researchers is getting the policy maker (when we are thinking of sponsored or commissioned research) to define and redefine the issues in order to make them researchable. It must be clear that research cannot provide answers to the value questions with which social issues, including educational ones, are imbued. For example, it does not make much sense for policy-makers to ask someone to develop the 'best' examination possible for entry to junior high school. The concomitant social issues must all be made clear, e.g. best in the predictive sense irrespective of equal quotas for boys and girls, each province, rural/urban etc.-or must sex, location, province etc. be taken into account and, if so, how? Thus the research question needs redefining. **Researchers tend to operate at a high level of specialisation, to conduct their research according to the research paradigms they know, to be used to getting time extensions to finish their research, and to look to peer review for acceptance of their work and not to their money-giver**, i.e. often the policy-maker for commissioned research. Indeed, **research workers have been known to look upon the government bureaucrats with disdain**. Finally, most researchers write in a particular research jargon and often seem unwilling to write in clear jargon-free language. Within the research community, there is often internecine warfare-or, at least, small squabbles. In some cases, the quarrels are about methods of analysis (e.g. unit of analysis to be used-student, class, or school; form of multivariate procedure to be used-PLS versus LISREL, and the like). Sometimes the quarrels are about the relative merits of quantitative versus qualitative approaches. These last tend to be rather silly arguments because most problems posed can be answered best by a combination of quantitative and qualitative data. For each problem, one must use the 'most appropriate' data. But the International Development Research Center (IDRC) has run 'qualitative' research seminars in Thailand which have caused some of my ex-students to come to me and-in all seriousness-say "In future we shall only do qualitative work. IDRC says that is the best way to do research". Perhaps IDRC was just emphasising qualitative approaches more because such methods were under-repre-sented at that time. But the dangers of what would appear to have been "propaganda" exercises are clear. Finally, there are quarrels **about the role of the**

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

researchers. Should a researcher be an adherent of Max Weber or Jiirgen Habermas? In other words, should the researcher do his work as objectively as possible (with as little emotional involvement as possible), and, then, if he thinks the results are important for society, should he take off his researcher's hat and put on a citizen's hat and attempt to influence policy-making? **An opposing view is that a researcher cannot be truly objective in terms of the choice of problem, the selection of measures, data analyses and interpretation. Hence the researcher throughout his research work should constantly be concerned with the effect his work should have on society**. In other words, **he should set out to have an impact on society. The first viewpoint tends towards the Weber stance and the second towards the Habermas stance** […] **Before leaving the topic of who policy makers and research workers are and how they work it is worth mentioning that there is one thing which can quickly sour the relationship between a research commissioner and a research worker, and that is the suppression of research results.** You will remember my experience in your country with the adult education by radio project where it was agreed before the research project began that the results would be written up in an article that would be published. But when the results were embarrassing for those who had developed the programme, an effort was made by the developers to ban the publication of the article. Your country is clearly not the only country where this has happened. Two of our friends, both eminent in their own countries, have suffered in similar ways. In 1968, a report of mathematics achievement and its determinants in five states in Australia (written by John Keeves) was shredded because of political embarrassment for the Director General of Education in one state. **Other countries have been known to play delaying tactics in terms of publication if there has been the hint of embarrassment for those in authority**. It is as well to have the 'rules' on publication made very clear at the outset both to policy-makers and researchers. The above indicates something of the different worlds the two sets of persons (policy makers and researchers) come from, the way in which they operate and think and the types of mutual tension and distrust which can arise. Such tension should be reduced as much as possible, and I look forward to discussing with you the sorts of measures you might take to accomplish this.

Excerpt source: Postlethwaite
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 2) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 3) Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity.

- **PREMFORS, R.** (1979.) *Social research and public policy-making: an overview.* New Haven, Conn.: Higher Education Research Group, Institution for Social and Policy Studies, Yale University, 26 p.

- **PRICE, N** (2001) 'The performance of social marketing in reaching the poor and vulnerable in Aids control programmes'. *Health Policy and Planning* 16(3): 231–239.

    The **article reviews evidence on the impact and effectiveness of condom social marketing programmes** (CSMPs) in reaching the poor and vulnerable with information, services and products in the context of HIV/AIDS/STD prevention and control. Ideally, the **success of CSMPs would be judged by whether they contribute to sustained improvements in sexual health outcomes at the population level.** Given methodological and attribution difficulties, **intermediary criteria are employed to assess effectiveness and impact**, **focusing on changes in behaviour** (including condom use) among poor and vulnerable groups, and **access by the poor and vulnerable** to condoms, services and information. It remains difficult to reach definitive conclusions about the extent to which CSMPs meet the sexual health needs of the poor and vulnerable, due largely to reliance on sales data for CSMPs monitoring and evaluation. CSMPs (like many health programme strategies) have traditionally collected little information on client profiles, health seeking behaviour, condom use effectiveness, and supply-side issues. Recent data indicate that CSMPs are unlikely to be pro-poor in their early stages, in terms of the distribution of benefits, but as CSMPs mature, then the inequities in access diminish, followed by reduced inequities in condom use. The **paper assesses the extent to which social marketing is effective in improving access for the poor and vulnerable using a number of variables**. In terms of economic access, it is evident that low-income groups are particularly sensitive to CSMPs price increases, and that a cost-recovery focus excludes the poorest. Convenience is significantly improved for those who can afford to pay, and CSMPs appear to be addressing social and regulatory constraints to

access. **Conventional CSMP monitoring systems make it difficult to assess the effectiveness of behavioural change IEC strategies, although data on this dimension of social marketing approach are beginning to emerge.**

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key themes: Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **PROSS, P** (1986) *Group Politics and Public Policy*. Toronto: Oxford University Press. 48

  In **examining the policy process in the Canadian system of parliamentary governance**, Pross found that it was **not sufficient to focus only on the decision-makers themselves**. It is necessary to also **take into account the various interest groups** and even the **larger milieu that has an interest in policy areas** (such as health, transportation) and which exerts some kind of influence on the policy process. Pross **introduced the concept of 'policy communities'** to **incorporate these diverse actors** into the analysis. Within the policy community, he differentiates between the sub-government and the 'attentive public'. The **sub-government consists of influential politicians, departments, strong interest groups, and relevant international organisations**. The **attentive public is made up by any actors with an interest in following current policy-making** and **implementation**, such as **less influential politicians and departments, smaller interest groups, journalists, academics, and citizens in general**. The most interesting difference between the sub-government and the attentive public, is that the **subgovernment actors and institutions have a vested interest in the existing order**. Therefore they will usually support approaches that sustain the status quo. The **attentive public**, on the other hand, have a **greater interest in being critical of the status quo**, and are therefore more likely to produce creative ideas and novel approaches.

  Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  Key themes: 1) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 2) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy. 3) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **PRUETT, K. D.** (2007.) "Social science research and social policy: bridging the gap". *Family Court Review,* Thousand Oaks: Jan 2007, Vol. 45, Issue 1, p. 52

- **PUCHNER, L** (2001) 'Researching Women's Literacy in Mali: A Case Study of Dialogue among Researchers, Practitioners, and Policy Makers'. *Comparative Education Review* 45(2): 242–256.

  In this article Puchner **reflects on the dialogue between her as a researcher in Mali and other practitioners and policy-makers**. Her fieldwork in Mali revealed that the adult literacy programs she observed had little impact; few women became literate, and those who did learn to read did not gain any significant benefits from this. Puchner emphasised, in her research findings, that narrow literacy programs therefore need to be reconsidered and changed. However, **she experienced that dialogue between her as a researcher and policy-makers and practitioners had little effect**. In sum, the **research/policy dialogue was insufficient to bring about change**. Puchner holds herself responsible for this, and puts forward **possible reasons and suggestions**. • First, the **research topic and process was initiated by her, and therefore based on her interests, rather than being initiated by practitioners/policy-makers in Mali.** • Second, **the traditional format of the dissertation she was required to write up is not amenable to communicating with practitioners/policy-makers**, and the work of transforming it into shorter articles takes a long time. She reasons that she should have written it in a different format. • Third, **since she spent some of her time in Mali assisting practitioners, she understood the difficulty of their situation, and was therefore a bit more hesitant to make controversial or 'impractical' policy recommendations**. This was also linked to **cultural differences** between **her as an 'outsider'** and the local practitioners/policy-makers. She concludes that although her research may be of interest to other scholars in the field, it would be far more

useful if the research contributed to practice and policy. In order to bring this about, there needs to be **changes in the relationships between researchers, practitioners and policy-makers, so that each of them incorporates the others in their own projects.**

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy. 3) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 4) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **PURJU, A. et al.** (2005.) *Research policy linkages in the Baltic States: comparative analysis of a natural experiment Final Report*. Baltic International Centre for Economic Policy Studies. 46 p.

- **RAHMAN, MD. ANISUR** (Dir.) (1984.) Grassroots participation and self-reliance. New Delhi, Oxford Publishing.

- **RAWOO** (2001) *Utilisation of Research for Development Cooperation, Linking Knowledge Production to Development Policy and Practice*. Publication no. 21, The Hague: Netherlands Development Assistance Research Council.

This collection of lectures **examines the utilisation of research results from different angles.** They **draw on Carol Weiss' concept of 'knowledge creep'** and highlight that research is not present as a ready packaged set of options for policy makers; rather, **research is there as part of the constant information stream**. They wish to **move away from the linear model of knowledge production**, and instead draw up a **model** that **charts interaction between promises, anticipation and feedback, realisation, and overlapping 'knowledge reservoirs'**. The combined effect of this interaction results in the **co-production of knowledge**. One of the **main challenges** emerging from this model is to **facilitate various actors' access to knowledge reservoirs**. Other models following on from this include the **participatory and the interactive models** of **innovation processes**. Both these models highlight the need for a **shift from research centres to local users** in order to bring about user-led innovation processes, which value trust relationships, mutual learning, and knowledge integration. A case study from a community of slum-dwellers in India is presented. **The case study shows that it is both possible and useful to use the community itself as the site of knowledge production**, which entails locating the design and execution of research processes within the community. The result in this case was a **process where research and political advocacy by the community and its outside partners fed into each other**. The epilogue emphasises that the shift away from a linear model reflects the new mode of production of knowledge in our society. **Research now has to be utilised through networks and dialogue.** This point is brought home through reference to a study of research utilisation among a group of policymakers. This study found that the **one decisive factor influencing research utilisation** was that the **initiative had come from the policy-makers themselves and not from external researchers**.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 3) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy. 4) Knowledge Management

- **REASON, P., TORBERT, W. R.** (2001.) "The action turn: toward a transformational social science". *Concepts and Transformation*, 6 (1): 1-37 (37) (September 2001)
- **REIMERS, F. & MCGINN, N. (**1997.) *Informed dialogue: using research to shape education policy around the world.* Connecticut and London: Praeger
- **REIN, M.** (1980.) "Methodology for the study of the interplay between social science and social policy". *International Social Science Journal*, 32 (2): 361-68

- **REIS ELISA P**., 'Bureaucrats and politicians in current Brazilian politics', pp. 19-31. In International Social Science Journal: "Policy actors: Bureaucrats, politicians and intellectuals." February 1990, no. 123.

  This contribution deals with the interconnection between politics and bureaucracy within the boundaries of emerging democracies (like Brazil in the mid 1980s). The author locates an insurmountable **tension between the world of politics** (defined as an institutional ordering of competing social interests) **and that of bureaucracy** (the technico-rational translations of specific solutions to the interest game of politics). (p. 19). Thus she notes: *If the defence of 'bureaucratic neutrality' was the typical mystification of the military dictatorship, the affirmation of the opposite,* ***'politics above technocracy' does not augur well for democracy****. On the contrary, anything **short of an explicit acceptance of the permanent tension between administration and politics is detrimental to democracy.** (p. 23). he author argues that the recognition of the legitimacy of this tension, and by extension of the fact that the conflict between some competing interests is not detrimental to democracy, enhances the consolidation of democratic institutions in regimes with a bureaucratic-authoritarian past. *The inability – so pervasive the Brazilian political context - of accepting as legitimate the inevitable tension between politicians and administrators derives to a large extent from the very persistence of elitist and authoritarian characteristics.* **The prevailing political culture seems to lack values to sustain the pertinence and legitimacy of interests specific to particular social segments***, which nevertheless do not threaten a minimum core of common interests. Precisely this denial of legitimacy… makes either the bureaucratic or the political element appear as the more capable of conducting public policies to maximize social consensus*. (p. 28).

  Excerpt source: Georgios Papanagnou (review)
  Key themes: 1) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 2) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **RENAUD, M.** (1997.) "Le CRSH, la recherche en sciences humaines et l'élaboration de politiques". *Canadian Journal of Regional Science/Revue canadienne des sciences régionales*, 271-274 (Spring-Summer 1997)

  Depuis 20 ans, le Conseil de recherches en sciences humaines (CRSH) appuie la recherche universitaire, aussi bien fondamentale que ciblée, dans toutes les disciplines des sciences sociales et des humanités. **Selon le modèle traditionnel, les chercheurs précisent eux-mêmes les questions qu'ils étudieront**. Ils abordent ces questions en fonction d'une perspective intellectuelle, disciplinaire ou méthodologique particulière, **dictée avant tout par le besoin de faire progresser les connaissances** dans leur domaine. **Depuis une dizaine d'années, le CRSH s'est associé à divers partenaires canadiens** pour concevoir, **mettre au point et financer des «initiatives conjointes» de recherche dans des secteurs bien définis où les partenaires veulent notamment disposer de connaissances supplémentaires pour enrichir leur processus d'élaboration de politiques.** Ces initiatives tranchent avec les autres programmes du CRSH en ce qu'elles **font appel aux utilisateurs éventuels de la recherche** pour **définir le domaine et les questions de recherche**. Le Projet Metropolis en est un bon exemple. **Les initiatives conjointes reflètent la conviction profonde du CRSH que la recherche en sciences humaines peut et doit s'effectuer à différents niveaux, déborder le simple cadre universitaire et contribuer, entre autres, à l'amélioration des politiques**, des **pratiques et du processus décisionnel dans le secteur public**. Cette conviction s'inspire d'un modèle à plusieurs paliers de la production des connaissances. Au cours des prochaines années et sans pour autant négliger le premier palier **(nous cherchons par tous les moyens à**

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

augmenter les taux de réussite dans nos programmes d'appui à la recherche fondamentale), Certains premiers pas ont déjà été faits dans cette direction. Par exemple, le CRSH et le Secrétariat de la recherche sur les politiques ont conclu une ente**nte d'initiative conjointe pour créer un programme de recherche sur huit grands facteurs de changement ou grandes tendances,** soit la mondialisation, l'intégration nord américaine, les changements technologiques et la révolution de l'information, l'environnement, l'évolution démographique et le vieillissement, la multiplication des centres de pouvoir, la différenciation sociale et les changements de valeurs. **Humanistes et spécialistes des sciences sociales y participent**. Le CRSH créera aussi des centres de recherche d'un nouveau genre visant à rapprocher les chercheurs et les étudiants (les chercheurs de demain) des organismes de la communauté (groupes communautaires, groupes culturels, services publics et entreprises privées). Axés sur les points forts des universités participantes, ces centres examineront des questions clés dans des grands domaines de recherche tels que la jeunesse, les Autochtones, la pauvreté, la violence et d'autres encore. Ils répondront ainsi aux besoins des communautés en matière d'information et de recherche. **Le programme d'activités de chaque centre sera élaboré conjointement par des groupes d'utilisateurs de la communauté et des chercheurs universitaires. De telles activités contribuent à resserrer des liens entre les chercheurs et les utilisateurs de la recherche et à faciliter le transfert ou l'échange des connaissances et des résultats.** Évidemment, ce rapprochement de deux «cultures» différentes et peu habituées à collaborer n'est pas sans susciter certaines **difficultés** et appréhensions, aussi bien à l'intérieur de la communauté des chercheurs que parmi les responsables de l'élaboration des politiques. Voici **quelques exemples**. Les sciences humaines se subdivisent en sciences sociales et en humanités. **Alors que les spécialistes en sciences sociales ont le sentiment que leurs disciplines peuvent être à la fois utiles et pertinentes, la plupart des humanistes semblent convaincus du contraire.** Cette conviction n'est pas fondée, comme nous en avons eu au moins deux fois la preuve au cours du récent Congrès des sciences humaines qui a eu lieu à Ottawa à la fin mai: le Réseau canadien de recherche culturelle, qui comprend une forte représentation d'humanistes, a tenu avec grand succès son colloque inaugural et un autre groupe d'humanistes a organisé un colloque très intéressant sur la santé. Les humanistes ne devraient donc pas hésiter à prendre part à des initiatives de recherche appliquée. **Plusieurs chercheurs éprouvent un malaise face à la recherche appliquée parce qu'ils craignent de la voir se substituer à la recherche fondamentale libre**, dont elle **s'approprierait le financement**. Bien que compréhensible, cette crainte est exagérée. **Le modèle de production des connaissances présenté ci-dessus illustre combien la recherche appliquée doit s'appuyer sur une vaste base de recherche fondamentale et, par conséquent, le CRSH entend protéger et consolider cette base pour assurer le renouvellement continu d'une source de compétences et d'idées à la fine pointe du savoir**, que nous pouvons appliquer à une diversité de fins. **Plusieurs chercheurs voient dans la recherche axée sur les politiques une bureaucratisation du processus d'octroi de subventions**. **L'évaluation par les pairs** – c'est-à-dire des spécialistes des divers secteurs des sciences humaines en fonction de la qualité intrinsèque d'un projet de recherche – a toujours été et continuera d'être la **pierre angulaire de ce processus**. **Le CRSH résistera toujours aux tentatives de la remplacer par une évaluation selon des critères «politiques».** Un mur de préjugés existe entre chercheurs et responsables de l'élaboration de politiques. **La recherche et l'élaboration de politiques sont de fait deux processus dont le déroulement est très différent. Une fois précisées la question et l'approche de recherche, le travail du chercheur devient rigoureux et presque linéaire – presque un rituel immuable. Par contre, l'élaboration des politiques est constamment soumise à l'influence de variables externes qui en modifient sans cesse le déroulement: influence des médias, réactions de groupes d'intérêts divers, modifications apportées aux lois, événements impondérables, etc**. Il en résulte que le chercheur risque de reprocher au praticien un manque de rigueur, alors que ce dernier verra chez le chercheur un certain manque de souplesse et d'adaptabilité à des circonstances changeantes. Dans cet effort de rapprochement entre sciences humaines et élaboration des politiques, nous sommes tous en période de rodage. Nous tentons de **dépasser l'ancien modèle linéaire selon lequel la recherche est «produite» par les chercheurs, «assimilée» par les analystes et «régurgitée» aux décideurs.** Pour en arriver à un modèle plus dynamique et interactif, le CRSH essaye d'instaurer entre les chercheurs et les responsables de l'élaboration de politiques une collaboration, une interface, plus serrée qui remet en question certains aspects de leurs rôles traditionnels respectifs. Cela exige une adaptation à un contexte nouveau dont les balises demeurent encore inconnues. Ce rapprochement entre les deux groupes s'opère graduellement. Pour faciliter le processus d'acculturation pour l'avenir, **le CRSH a commencé à conclure des ententes qui permettront à la prochaine génération de chercheurs en sciences humaines de se «frotter» aux responsables de l'élaboration de politiques au cours de leur formation**. Par exemple, le Service canadien des forêts et le Centre de recherches pour le développement international sont deux nouveaux partenaires qui ont accepté **d'arrondir les bourses du CRSH tout en donnant aux boursiers une expérience dans leur secteur d'activité**. Bref, le CRSH tente activement de favoriser «l'union de fait et la cohabitation des sciences humaines et des politiques publiques» – pour reprendre une expression utilisée plus tôt dans ce numéro spécial. Cette cohabitation est essentielle aujourd'hui. En effet, la recherche universitaire en

sciences humaines peut apporter une mine d'or de renseignements à ceux qui cherchent à répondre de façon pertinente à un questionnement qui devient maintenant incontournable dans le processus d'élaboration de politiques: «**Où allons-nous? Que savons-nous? Que faire? »**

Excerpt source: Renaud (text)
Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy 3) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **RESEARCH ON POVERTY ALLEVIATION (REPOA).** (2002.) *Research on Poverty Alleviation (REPOA) experiences in participatory research and micro-macro policy Linkages.* Contribution for the colloquium organised by Hakikazi Catalyst at Bagamoyo, 12th-14th August 2002 – 'Popularising policy and influencing change through action research advocacy and creative communication'

- **RICH, R. F.** (1981.) *Social science information and public policy making*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 205 p.

- **RICH, R. F.** (2001.) *Social science information and public policy making*. New Brunswick, NJ : Transaction Publishers

- **RIGBY, E.** (2002.) *Assessing impacts of social science research*. Social Science Research Impact – Mapping and Measurement, ISSC Workshop, BBAW. Berlin, 14-15 March 2002

- **RIGBY, E.** (2005.) "Linking research and policy on Capitol Hill: insights from research brokers". *Evidence & Policy: A Journal of Research, Debate and Practice*, Volume 1, Number 2, May 2005 , pp. 195-214 (20)

- **RIGGIROZZI, M. P. & TUPLIN, T.** (2004.) *The influence of research on policy: MIMAP Philippines*. IDRC's Evaluation Unit Report, 31 p.

- **RIHOUX, B.** (2006.) "Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) and related methods: recent advances and remaining challenges for policy-oriented social science research". *International Sociology,* 21: 679-706

- **RIHOUX, B., & GRIMM, H. M.** (2006.) *Innovative comparative methods for policy analysis: beyond the quantitative-qualitative divide*. New York, NY: Springer

- **RILEY, P** (1983) 'A Structurationist Account of Political Culture'. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 28(3): 414–437.

  The **theory of structuration is proposed as a means of studying organisational culture**. This paradigm is used to investigate one of the most significant and fascinating aspects of culture – **organisational politics**. This study co**mpares organisational political symbols from two professional firms – one routinised and one nonroutinised** – in order to investigate **the interrelationships of subcultures and to identify the structures that govern the political nature of organisational culture**. The results suggest that **organisational culture should be viewed as a system of integrated subcultures**, not as a unified set of values to which all organisational members ascribe.

  Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  Key theme: 1) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 2) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy.

- **RIMERS, FERNANDO AND NOEL MCGINN,** 1997. "Informed Dialogue: Using research to shape education policy around the world." Praeger: Connecticut and London.

- **RIST, R**. (1994.) "Influencing the policy process with qualitative research" In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, N. K.DENZIN & Y. S. LINCOLN (dir.),Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage Publications, p. 546

- **ROBERTSON, A F** (1984.) *People and the State: An anthropology of planned development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

In this book **Robertson traces the emergence of the notion that development can be 'planned'**. He maps the **Western historical and cultural context of the current stress on planning**, and shows how planning has **now become one of the principal means of exercising political power**, especially by modern states, and has been replicated almost all over the world. There are several interesting points to note regarding the present ubiquitous discourse of planning development. Firstly, planning was once a novel approach, but is now **often regarded as routine and bureaucracy**, and the political power relations involved are therefore often hidden. Secondly, **although development policies differ across contexts, the wider notion that development can be planned is remarkably unitary**; (at least in the early 1980s when Robertson wrote his book; there is now an increasing focus on process approaches to development). A **necessary precondition for planning is some degree of predictability**. Development policies often 'produce' this predictability through using simplified models of reality. For example, **Robertson explores the models of 'community' used in development**, and finds that they often portray the community as a **harmonious and homogenous group of people that will all react in the same way to an external stimulus** (such as policy implementation). This **model enables policy-makers to draw up coherent plans**. Robertson concludes with some reflections on the **role of (anthropological) research in sustaining or challenging the discourse of planning**. He suggests that research which aims to make certain groups (e.g. slum-dwellers) intelligible to certain other groups (e.g. policy-makers, academics) is corrupt. Instead, **research should attempt to engage in mutual explanation between groups, and broader explanations for popular use** (e.g. making the planning process more accessible and amenable to change).

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: 1) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 2) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 3) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **ROBINSON, D, HEWITT, T AND HARRISS, J** (1999) 'Why Inter-Organisational Relationships Matter' in Robinson, D, Hewitt, T and Harriss, J (eds.) *Managing Development: Understanding Interorganisational Relationships*. London: Sage.

The chapter starts off by describing the way in which the **development arena has moved from practices referred to as serial monogamy to more complex and polygamous behaviours**. With more cooperation between aid agencies, **a shift can be seen from aid-based to rules-based development**. Attention is turned more towards **defining sector-wide programmes and macro level change**. In inter-organisational terms, this might be described as **a move from interaction generated by operational needs, to attempts to build more enduring relationships**. There are major challenges in place trying to make sense of the **underlying politics of the notion of cooperation**, with focus on the real conflicts of interest and agenda which persist in all areas, and how these are managed. The process of negotiation over development lies at the heart of the idea of **'public action'**, as a broad idea covering the **purposeful manipulation of the public environment by a range of actors**. This perspective involves **looking at what strategies for cooperation there are** (collaboration, advocacy, opposition), and choosing between them, as well as the **development of skills for working with the different strategies.** The starting point is that there are **three 'ideal' modes of inter-organisational relationships: competition** (market, firms), **coordination** (state, government at all levels), and **cooperation** (civil society, NGOs, trade unions). The authors recognise that often there are significant **overlaps** between what might be considered **state, market and voluntary organisations, and often they work together in various arrangements**. Competition: **The institutional framework for**

organising competition is provided by the market, thus the World Bank is pointed out as one of the principal proponents of competition as the basis for development. The use of the term is broad, including competition for scarce resources, ideas, constituencies, values and definitions of needs. Coordination: **The most common notion of coordination is rule-regulated and hierarchically organised**, generally associated with the state as a legitimate controller and coercer. In its positive sense, coordination by the state is based on the notion of a liberal state deriving its legitimacy through systems of elected representation. However, coordination, generally associated with hierarchies, is a relationship of power, which can be used or abused. Coordination has been a key form for organising development practice, but the context is changing, and the central actor, the government, has changed from all encompassing provider to that of a regulator. Cooperation: **Cooperation tends to be associated with voluntary organisations, as non-hierarchical and with all parties involved on an equal basis with each other.** Cooperation assumes **power based on knowledge, expertise, and/or contribution, rather than power derived from hierarchy.** On its positive side it is seen as a **process of consensus building** and **sharing in public action**. However, as already indicated, **talk of cooperation frequently disguises power relations in the name of equality.**

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key themes: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy. 2) Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity

- **RODRIGUEZ JACQUES.** (2007.) Le sociologue, l'expert et le moraliste : à propos de la social administration anglaise. *Socio-logos*, Numéro 2. Actualité du groupe expertise du RT 27 « Sociologie des intellectuels et de l'expertise : savoirs et pouvoirs »

En évoquant le cas **de la *social administration*, une discipline académique originale vouée à l'étude des politiques du *welfare state* anglais,** cet article **s'interroge sur le positionnement singulier des chercheurs** qui, dans le sillage de Richard Titmuss, sont intervenus **sur différentes scènes. Universitaires, lobbyistes, experts auprès de autorités, intellectuels engagés** : ils ont **défendu une conception tout à fait singulière de la science sociale**. Cet article souligne qu'en **s'affranchissant de la stricte démarcation entre le « savant » et le « politique »**, les chercheurs se sont sans doute placés dans une position inhabituelle, **s'exposant ainsi à la critique**. Mais il suggère aussi que ce choix n'est pas nécessairement illégitime. Le cas de la *social administration* met en effet en lumière la fécondité d'une conception alternative **du rôle de la science, où les chercheurs, tour à tour experts et moralistes, prennent délibérément en charge la question des valeurs engagées dans la délibération et l'action collectives.**

Excerpt source: Rodriguez (résumé)
Key themes: 1) Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity

- **ROE, E** (1991) 'Development Narratives, Or Making the Best of Blueprint Development'. *World Development* 19(4): 287–300.

Roe argues that development policies are often based on arguments, scenarios and narratives that do not stand up to closer scrutiny. Frequently the narratives are directly contradicted by experience in the field. In spite of this, the narratives persist and continue to inform policy-making. **The most obvious reaction is to dismiss the narratives as myths or ideologies, and to call for more rational policy-making or a more learning-based process**. However, Roe suggests that this will not have any great effect, because the **ideals of rationality and learning would not automatically fulfil the needs that the narratives do**, and thus are likely to be discarded in practice. Instead, it is necessary to **first try and understand why policy so often leans on narratives**, and why **policy-making apparently 'learns less and less' over time, before attempting to reform it**. Narratives have several functions. Importantly, they are a way of dealing with the uncertainty and ambiguity that characterises development activity. There is a **strong pressure to produce and reproduce simplifying narratives, especially in situations where difficult and ambiguous decisions have to be made**. Narratives are able to transform a chaotic reality into an ordered and comprehensible sequence of events. Roe suggests that **the best way of reforming outdated narratives is to engage with them**, either by

trying to improve the narrative itself, or by introducing counter-narratives (i.e. making the best of blueprint development).

Excerpt source: ODI :   Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key themes: 1) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 2) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **ROGER, R.** (2006.) "A decision maker's perspective on Lavis and Lomas". *Healthcare Policy,* 1 (2): 49-54

- **ROGERS, E** (1995) *Diffusion of Innovations*. New York: Free Press.

  Rogers, perhaps the most widely known **diffusion theorist**, in his fourth book presents a **comprehensive overview of issues and problems related to diffusion**. These include the **generation of innovations, socioeconomic factors, the innovation-decision process, communication channels, diffusion networks, the rate of adoption, compatibility, trialability, opinion leadership, the change agent, and innovation in organisations**. The book makes use of the important concepts of uncertainty and information. Uncertainty is the degree to which a number of alternatives are perceived with respect to the occurrence of an event and the relative probabilities of these alternatives. **Uncertainty motivates an individual to seek information. Information is a difference in matter-energy that affects uncertainty in a situation where a choice exists among a set of alternatives**. One kind of uncertainty is generated by an innovation, defined as an idea, practice, or object that is perceived as new by an individual or another unit of adoption. **An innovation presents an individual or an organisation with a new alternative or alternatives, with new means of solving problems**. But the probabilities of the new alternatives being superior to previous practice are not exactly known by the individual problem solvers. Thus, they are **motivated to seek further information about the innovation to cope with the uncertainty that it creates.** Information about an innovation is often sought from near-peers, especially information about their subjective evaluations of the innovation. This **information exchange** about a new idea occurs through a **convergence process involving interpersonal networks.** The **diffusion of innovations is essentially a social process** in which subjectively perceived information about a new idea is communicated. The meaning of an innovation is thus gradually worked out through a **process of social construction.**

  Excerpt source: ODI: Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance
  2) Knowledge Management 3) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **RONDINELLI, D** (1993) *Development Projects as Policy Experiments: An adaptive approach to development administration*. London: Routledge.

  Rondinelli **argues that most development policies are based on the assumptions that reality is manageable and that the future is predictable**. This results in universal and 'technical' solutions to development 'problems', and therefore **many policies are inappropriate and far removed from the reality they are trying to influence.** Rondinelli suggests that a m**ore helpful way of viewing development policies** is **to approach them as 'social experiments'**. Experiments take into account the underlying uncertainty and the necessity of trial and error in order to learn. **Experiments also take into account that the unexpected may happen, and that both problems and solutions may have to be redefined along the way**. Policy-making then becomes **less a matter of prediction and implementation**, and **more a matter of questions and discoveries**. Rondinelli links this to wider concerns about the importance of continuous learning, flexibility, and opportunities for local ownership of the policy process.

  Excerpt source: ODI :   Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  Key themes: Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **ROOS, N. P. & SHAPIRO, E.** (1999.) "From research to policy: what have we learned?" *Medical Care*, 37 (suppl) :JS291-JS305

- **ROPER, L.** (2002.) "Achieving successful academic-practitioner research collaborations". *Development in Practice*, 12 (3 & 4).

  The potential for academic–NGO collaboration is enormous, but such collaboration is far more difficult than it appears on the surface, even when collaborators share a commitment to, and values that support, a particular cause or issue. This paper looks at some of the factors that derail academic–practitioner collaboration. It then identifies five different models of collaboration and makes recommendations that, if observed, should eliminate some of the tensions in collaborative efforts, while at the same time providing a foundation for ongoing learning.

  Excerpt source: Laura Roper (abstract)
  Key theme: Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance

- **ROSE, RICHARD** (1995.) Making progress and catching up: comparative analysis for social policy-making (Faire des progrès, rattraper son retard: les analyses comparatives au service de la politique sociale); International social science journal XLVII, 1;1995; p. 113-125
- **ROSIERS, N.** (2003.) "The journey from research to policy: frictions, impetus and translations". *Horizons*, Policy Research Initiative. 6 (2003): 3-5
- **ROSS, K. & MÄHLCK, L.** (eds). (1990.) *Planning the quality of education: the collection and use of data for informed decision-making*. Paris: UNESCO-IIEP
- **ROSS, S., LAVIS, J. et al.** (2003.) "Partnership experiences: involving decision makers in the research process". *Journal of Health Service Research and Policy,* 8 (Suppl 2 (Oct 2003)): 26-34
- **ROSSI, P. H. & WRIGHT, S. R**. (1977.) "Evaluation research: an assessment of theory, practice and politics". *Evaluation Quarterly* 1 (February, 1977): 5-52

- **RYAN, J** (1999.) 'Assessing the impact of rice policy changes in Viet Nam and the contribution of policy research'. *Impact Assessment Discussion* paper 8. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) (www.ifpri.org/impact/iadp8.pdf)

  The **marketing and policy research on rice of the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) is described**, and the conclusions and recommendations that emerged are discussed in the context of the **decision-making processes in Viet Nam**. From extensive interviews the author describes the **perceptions of partners and stakeholders** of the **influence of the outcomes of the IFPRI project**. They show that the **research was regarded as being of high quality, independent, rigorous, and timely.** A strong foundation of primary and secondary data gathering and analysis from Viet Ham gave the modelling work on policy options a high degree of credibility among key policymakers. Linking the spatial equilibrium model with income distribution analysis based on national household surveys allowed IFPRI to satisfy policymakers that relaxing rice export quotas and internal trade restrictions on rice would not adversely impact on regional disparities and food security and would have beneficial effects on farm prices and poverty. These were major concerns of policymakers prior to the project. The res**earch on these and other policy options gave a degree of confidence to policymakers that relaxing the controls would be in Viet Nam's national interest.** They **made these decisions earlier than would have been the case without the IFPRI research**. A **framework for the evaluation of policy research and advice is described**.

  Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **RYAN, J** (2002) *Synthesis Report on Assessing the Impact of Policy-Oriented Social Science Research*. Washington, DC: International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI).

  Economists have engaged for some time in developing methodologies for assessing the economic impact of agricultural research and in undertaking empirical studies to measure this impact. In recent years they have documented more than 1,800 estimates of rates of return to agricultural research. **Economists have paid little attention, however, to how to evaluate the impact of social science research**. A symposium conducted by the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI®) in 1997 was one of the first attempts to **address this knowledge gap**. In November 2001 the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs and IFPRI brought together a group of researchers to follow up on the earlier symposium. Their **conclusions fall into two broad categories**: **how to measure or value the economic impact of policy-oriented social science research** and **how to enhance the effectiveness of such research in policymaking environments**. The report from a conference on the impact of research, notes that the **key factors determining the impact of research are**: **quality and perception as an honest broker**; **timeliness and responsiveness**; **long-term in-depth collaboration; receptive policy environment; primary and secondary empirical data and simple analysis; trade-offs between immediate and sustainable impacts; choice of partners; consensus for change among stakeholders; cross-country experience**. One participant (at their conference) made the point that **research is often used to confirm, rather than challenge, received wisdom while another claimed that the element of surprise increases the value of research**. Another explained that when engaged in negotiation with policy-makers, it can be imperative to answer questions with research findings within hours or even minutes. **Strengthening the research and policy capacity of developing country institutions was seen as a priority.** A small consortium on Policy-Oriented Social Science Research, led by the International Food Policy Institute, was decided upon.

  Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity 3) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **RYNES, S. L., BARTUNEK, J. M. & DAFT, R. L.** (2001.) "Across the great divide: knowledge creation and transfer between practitioners and academics". *Academy of Management Journal*, 44 (2): 340-455

  Observers have long noted a **considerable gap between organizational research findings and management practices**. Although volumes have been written about the probable causes and consequences of this gap, surprisingly **little empirical evidence exists concerning the various viewpoints**. The articles in this forum **provide data on the role of academic-practitioner relationships in both generating and disseminating knowledge across boundaries**. The contributions of each article are summarized in light of **recent theories of knowledge creation**, and suggestions are made for **increasing the value and relevance of future research** to both academics and practitioners.

  Excerpt source: Rynes et. Al (abstract)
  Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT 3) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **SABATIER, P AND JENKINS-SMITH, H C** (1999) 'The Advocacy Coalition Framework: An Assessment' in Sabatier, P (ed.) *Theories of the Policy Process*. Boulder: Westview Press.

  This chapter **examines the link between research and policy in terms of an 'advocacy coalition' framework**, which aims to **take into account the importance of various coalitions between certain policy-makers, influential actors and pressure groups**. The coalitions form on the basis of **shared beliefs and values**, as actors/institutions who share a similar perspective forge relationships with each

other. **Advocacy coalitions therefore consist of various different actors, including different government agencies, associations, civil society organisations, think tanks, academics, media institutions, and prominent individuals**. There are **competing advocacy coalitions within each policy domain**, and in general one of these coalitions will be dominant and wield greater power over the policy process than other coalitions. **Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith argue that research findings will inevitably be shaped by the competition between the different coalitions**. They also note that **academics and think tanks have a far greater chance of being heard when there are like-minded influential politicians in the dominant advocacy coalition**. When this is said, they see a productive and potentially **influential role for research**, particularly in **assisting coalitions to produce better arguments and to monitor the claims of their opponents**. While actors in advocacy coalitions do not usually relinquish their core values and beliefs, they are open to changes of 'secondary importance' such as **specific policy formulations, and it is here that research has a role to play**.

Excerpt source: ODI :   Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 3) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy.

- **SABATIER, P.** (1987.) "Knowledge, policy-oriented learning and policy change. An advisory coalition framework". *Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization,* 8: 649-692

- **SABATIER, P.** (1991) "Political science and public policy". *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 24 (2): 144-156

Political scientists who are policy scholars often trace their lineage back to the pioneering work of learner and Laswell (1951). But **public policy did not emerge as a significant subfield within the discipline of political science until the late 1960's or early 70's**. This resulted from at least **three important stimuli**: (1) **Social and political pressures to apply the profession's accumulated knowledge to the pressing social problems** of racial discrimination, poverty, the arms race, and environmental pollution ; (2) **the challenge posed by Dawson and Robinson (1963), who argued that governmental policy decisions were less the result of traditional disciplinary concerns such as public opinion and party composition than of socio-economic factors** such as income, education, and unemployment levels ; and (3) **the efforts of David Easton** whose *Systems Analysis of Political life* (1965) **provided an intellectual framework for understanding the entire policy process**, from **demand articulation through policy formulation and implementation, to feedback effects on society**. Over the past twenty years, **policy research by political scientists can be divided into four types**, depending upon the principal focus. 1**) Substantive area research**: This seeks to understand the politics of a specific policy area, such as health, education, transportation, natural resources, or foreign policy. Most of the work in this tradition has consisted of detailed, largely atheoretical, case studies […] Such studies are useful to practitioners and policy activists in these areas, as well as providing potential useful information for inductive theory building. In terms of the profession as a whole, however, they are probably less useful than theoretical case studies (such as Pressman and Wildavsky (1973) on implementation or Nelson (1984) on agenda-setting) which use a specific case to illustrate or test theories of important aspects of the policy process. 2) **Evaluation and impact studies**: Most evaluation research is based on contributions from other disciplines, particularly welfare economics (Stokey and Zeckhauser 1978; Jenkins-Smith 1990.) Policy scholars trained as political scientist have made several contributions. They have broadened the criteria of evaluation from traditional social welfare functions to include process criteria, such as opportunities for effective citizen participation (Pierce and Doerksen, 1976.) They have focused attention on distributional effects (MacRae, 1989.) They have criticized traditional techniques of benefit cost analysis on many grounds. Most importantly, they have integrated evaluation studies into research on the policy process by examining the use and non-use of policy analysis in the real world (Wildavsky, 1966 Dunn 1980, Weiss 1977.) 3) **Policy process**: Two decades ago, both Ranney (1968) and Sharkansky (1970) urged political scientists interested in public policy to focus on the policy process, ie., the factors affecting policy formulation and implementation, as well as the subsequent effects of policy. In their view, focusing on substantive policy areas risked falling into the relatively fruitless realm of atheoretical case studies, while evaluation research offered little promise for a discipline without clear normative standards of good policy. A focus on the policy process would provide opportunities for applying and integrating the discipline's accumulated knowledge concerning political behaviour in various institutional settings. That advice was remarkably prescient; the first paper in this symposium attempts to summarize what has been learned. 4) **Policy design**. With roots in the policy sciences, tradition described

UNESCO

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

by deLeon (1988), this approach has recently focused on such topics as the efficacy of different types of policy instruments (Salamon 1989, Linder and Peters 1989). Although some scholars within this orientation propose a quite radical departure from the behavioural traditions of the discipline (Bobrow and Dryzek 1987), others build upon work by policy-oriented political scientists over the past twenty years (Scheider and Ingram 1990) while Miller (1989) seeks to integrate political philosophy and the behavioural sciences. While all have made some contributions, the third has been the most fruitful. Before turning to a preview of the symposium, **Sabatier mentions some of the tensions that have emerged between political scientists and the subfield of policy scholars.**

Excerpt source: Sabatier (partitions, text)
Key themes: 1) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 2) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 3) Research impact assessment / Policy evaluation

- **SAKS, J.B**. (1996.) 'Because It's There: With Your Superintendent as Surefooted Sherpa, Learn to Scale the Slippery Everest of Education Research", *The American School Board Journal*, marzo: 14-19.

- **SALOMON, JEAN JACQUES** (2001.) Le Nouveau décor des politiques de la science, in : Revue internationale des sciences sociales, juin 2001, 168 (Vol. 53, N°2) p. 355-368. Science policies in a new setting; International social science journal; 53, 2; June 2001; p. 323-335

- **SAMAD MADAR** (2002.) *Social Science Research and Development for Effective Management of Water Resources: Perspectives from IWMI's Research Agenda.* International Water Management Institute Colombo, Sri Lanka. Paper presented at the Conference on the Role of Social Research in the CGIAR 11-14 September, CIAT, Cali, Colombia.

This paper highlights the application of concepts and methods from social sciences by the International Water Management Institute (IWMI) to analyze problems and issues relating to the water sector. In many respects, the closing decades of the twentieth century stand out as the period when social-science research on issues relating to water, especially irrigation, became institutionalized. This arose primarily from the conviction of the need to apply modern management to irrigation and the stress placed upon the socioeconomic nature of irrigation, with incentives becoming a key issue. The **International Irrigation Management (IIMI) was established precisely for determining non-engineering solutions to enhance the performance of irrigation systems, especially the large schemes owned and managed by government agencies,** which were widely believed to be under-performing. The **applications of concepts and methods from the social sciences were central to achieving IIMI's mandate**. The transformation of IIMI to IWMI with a broader mandate encompassing the water sector and not merely on irrigation, strengthened the need for social-sciences applications. This **paper traces the trajectory of social-science research in the transition from IIMI to IWMI**. In the formative years, the prime focus of IIMI's research was on issues at the main system level. The performance of canal-water delivery, institutional and managerial factors affecting water delivery, and agency-farmer relationships were some of the key issues that were addressed. **Management science, organization theory and principles of public administration provided the conceptual underpinnings of the analytical frameworks that were adopted**. The **inclusion of issues relating to farmer-managed irrigation systems in the research agenda of the institute reinforced the application of social-science methodologies, especially for exploring the social organizations and institutions in traditional irrigation communities**. The **paper highlights the results of these studies and outlines their usefulness in formulating policy recommendations** and interventions for improving the performances of the farmer-managed irrigation systems. Institutional reforms in the irrigation sector, especially the transfer of irrigation-management responsibilities from government to farmer organizations and interest in cost-recovery **resulted in additional demands for social-science research. Research on issues relating to user fees, enabling conditions for collective action by farmers, gender impacts of irrigation-management reforms and the impacts of the reforms on the performance of irrigation schemes were some of the prominent issues that the social scientists addressed**. The transformation of IIMI to IWMI reinforced the need for the application of approaches and disciplines from the social sciences. **The need to recognize the economic and social value of water, the social and environmental impacts of water-resources development, a**

comprehensive approach to problems of governance and policy making, the need for stakeholder consultations, gender issues and, more importantly, the renewed global concern on poverty and the need for more pro-poor interventions in the water sector were the prime drivers for greater application of social-science research methods. The paper highlights the range of projects that involved the application of social science research methods at IWMI.

Excerpt source: Samad (abstract)
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy

- **SANDERSON, I.** (2002.) "Making sense of 'what WORKS': evidence-based policy making as instrumental rationality?" *Public Policy and Administration*, Vol. 17, No. 3, 61-75
- **SANGUINETI VARGAS, Yolanda** (1980.) La investigación participativa en los procesos de desarrollo en América Latina. México : UNAM.
- **SANKAR, M.** (2005.) "Bridging the gap between policy, research and practice: experiences from a community economic development action research project in New Zealand". *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand,* Issue 26: 52 (14)
- **SAUNDERS, L.** (2005.) "Research and policy: reflections on their relationship". *Evidence & Policy: A Journal of Research, Debate and Practice*, Volume 1, Number 3, September 2005 , pp. 383-390 (8)
- **SAUNDERS, L**. (2007.) *Educational research and policy-making: exploring the border country between research and policy*. Abingdon, Oxon, England: Routledge
- **SAXE, L.** (1986.) "Policymakers' use of social science research". *Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization*, 8: 59-78

- **SAYWELL, D AND COTTON, A** (1999) *Spreading the Word. Practical guidelines for research dissemination strategies*. Loughborough, UK: Water, Engineering and Development Centre, Loughborough University.

This book offers **a literature review of sources that have provided insights on research dissemination both in the UK and outside**. They conclude that researchers should consider the potential impact of their outputs much more carefully before producing reports. They **identify organisational, practical and psychological barriers** to the **effective dissemination of information** and **four explanations of how information influences policy**: the '**rational' model** (making information available is sufficient); the **limestone model** (information trickles like water through porous rock), **the gadfly model** (information) gets through because dissemination is prioritised as much as research itself), and **insider model** (researchers exploit links with policy-makers). While they found that non-UK researchers planned a strategy for disseminating information, the UK researchers produced lengthy outputs for a homogenised audience with little **strategy for influencing**. There should be more **consultation between information producers and users of research** on th**e types of outputs and strategies required for dissemination**. They argue for (and give examples of) the need for dissemination plans, **designing different kinds of outputs for different audiences** and **considering dissemination from the beginning of a project rather than the end**. Their very varied case studies illustrate which dissemination strategies work in which contexts, ranging from very practical advice about **translating research outputs into local languages**, to more **abstract principles about how dissemination can be useful if seen as a process of mutual learning**. They also offer specific suggestions to contractors and DFID as well as **useful checklists of questions for researchers about planning effective dissemination**, plus **advantages and disadvantages of different dissemination 'pathways'** (e.g., manuals, networks, briefs…).

Excerpt source: ODI :   Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: 1) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT 2) Knowledge Management

UNESCO

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **SCHIRAY, MICHEL** (2001.) : Introduction: drug trafficking, organised crime, and public policy for drug control; Introduction: trafic de drogues, organisations criminelles et politiques publiques de contrôle; International social science journal; 53, 3; Sept. 2001; 2001; p. 351-358, illus.; 3(100)

- **SCHMIDT A. VIVIEN; CLAUDIO M. RADAELLI** (2004.) "Policy Change and Discourse in Europe: Conceptual and Methodological Issues." West European Politics, 2004, 27, 2, 183-210.

  With the **move in EU studies from a focus on European integration to Europeanisation**, that is from the process of EU formation to its impact on member states, the **number and range of theories and methodologies have proliferated**. This **article embraces such pluralism**. Only by considering a full range of factors policy--**problems, legacies, preferences, political and institutional capacity, and discourse**--from a variety of perspectives--i**nterest-based rationality, historical path-dependencies, social constructions of action, ideas and discourse**--can a complete picture of policy change in Europe emerge.

  Excerpt source: Bnet (reference publications)
  Key themes: 1) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 2) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy 3) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **SCHNITMAN, DORA** (1994.) NUEVOS PARADIGMAS, CULTURA Y SUBJETIVIDAD. Paidos.

- **SCHOLZMAN, K. L. Y TIERNEY, J.T**. (1986*.) Organisational Interests and American Democracy*. Nueva York: Harper and Row.

- **SCHOOLER DEAN, JR.** (1973.) Science, Scientists and Public Policy.   Source: Contemporary Sociology, Vol. 2, No. 3 (May, 1973), pp. 327-328.

  Work on science policy has largely been the product of political scientists who are primarily concerned with administrative organization. This contribution is in that tradition. There is a different style between the sociologist and the political scientist which unfortunately makes this book less than useful for the sociologist. **Schooler's style is that of an outsider doing a rationalistic analysis of policy**, **using a number of typologies as his basis for analysis**. His outsider viewpoint is clear in that he depends on newpaper stories, commentaries by participants and secondary analyses for his data. The type of data source is not a problem in and of itself, but **it contributes to the very shallow analysis of the twenty policy cases that he discusses**. Given the **lack of depth, there is little to be gained from the case studies themselves**. It is even difficult to determine whether he has placed the policy areas (or arenas, as he calls them) correctly in his typologies. His analysis is rationalistic in that he **assumes that policy decisions result from a series of pressure that can be summed in a decision calculus**. He argues that scientists have the greatest affect on areas in which they are directly involved (eg particularly in science policy development) ; the least affect on those in which other interests have powerful concerns. **This rationalism seems dictated by the outsider viewpoint**. It personality of particular events, rather than a balance of forces, determine policy, then we need detailed information on those events. Without it, generalization is not possible. Yet we are denied the alternative of examining the data. **Schooler's major analytical effort is the typologies which introduce it. In order to explain the levels of scientists' influence on policy, his dependent variable, he introduces three graduations of that variable**: **high, medium, and low influence**. Nine policy areas are distinguished […] Because **these typologies cannot be a sharp analytical tool**, I will not discuss the matter of whether the different kinds of policy areas are really separate from one another in significant ways. For example, are weapons and defense policy really separate from peace policy? The federal government has divided the tasks in this institutional fashion, but is scientist's influence (which is high on weapons and low on peace) to be seen as a result of real differences in policy or rather of different institutional arrangements and the relative weakness of peace policy versus war policy? Schooler states his hypotheses last. **Scientists have high influence in non-zero sum situations**: **when the Executive Branch is initiating action; when a change in policy is substantive rather than procedural or symbolic; when a decision system being installed needs scientists and either agrees with their**

conclusions or scientists own interests are involved. This unremarkable set of hypotheses results from thinking about the different kinds of policy in which scientists have little influence. In general I do not find this a very useful book for sociologists interested in issues of science and public policy.

Excerpt source: Nicholas C. Mullins (review)
Key themes: 1) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **SCHULTZE, C.E.**, (1968.) *The Politics and Economics of Public Spending*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution.
- **SCHWEINHART, L.J. Y D. P.WEIKART**, (1980*.) Young Children Grow Up: 'be Effects of the Perry Preschool Programme on Youths Through Age 15*. Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Education Research Foundation.

- **SCOTT, A.** (2000.) *The power of ideas. Effective research for decision making: how can researchers most effectively link with decision-makers?* Global Development Network

This review highlights the main issues in the relationship between research and decision-making. By analysing a range of studies from around the world, it sheds light on the **conditions that allow researchers to contribute most effectively to decision-making**. It deals with three crucial issues: **I) The decision-making situation. Issues and recommendations:** 1) Research knowledge is one input among many in decision-making situations ; 2) Decision-making is rarely a rational linear process; 3) There are broadly two schools of through with regard to the role of research knowledge. These can simply be polarised as optimistic vs pessimistic ; 4) Research and ideas need not rapidly effect decision-making, they may gradually diffuse into collective decision-making ; 5) It is important to emphasise the role of the diffusion of knowledge and ideas across complex collectivities of researchers or institutions, rather than focusing on individual researchers processing chunks of information; 6) Certain decision-making scenarios are more susceptible to research interventions ; 7) Some decision making scenarios are more susceptible to research interventions. This may result from policy making communities' 'issue attention cycle'. 8) The impact of research-based knowledge and ideas is more likely to be gradual, diffuse and also difficult to detect in decision-making. **II) Policy recommendations within the decision-making scenario:** 1) Users need to be interested in the results of the research ; 2) In order to be able to take up the researcher, decision-makers need to have the capacity to do so. ; 3) There needs to be open communication between researchers and decision-makers. **III) The characteristics of the research knowledge.** There are three characteristics that seem to be most important in distinguishing effective assessments: 1) Saliency 2) Credibility 3) Legitimacy. **IV) The interactions between researchers and decision-makers.** There needs to be free communication between researcher and policy-maker.

- **SCOTT, A.** (2001.) *The power of ideas: effective research for environmental decision-making*. University of Sussex, Science and Technology Policy Research. Electronic Working Paper Series. Paper no. 63, 49 p.

- **SCOTT, A.** (2003.) *A review of the links between research and policy: draft working paper*. London, Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology, 32 p.

This report reviews the complex topic of the links between research and policy. It is built on a wide-ranging review of policy initiatives, inquiries and reports in the UK and elsewhere, and interviews with around 60 UK policy decision-makers and researchers in various sectors. ***Origins*** The report starts by reviewing more than a dozen recent initiatives on the theme of enhancing the provision and use of scientific advice. BSE was the event that triggered the development of a set of Guidelines and a Code of Practice for scientific advice, and these initiatives and related developments are summarised. [...] ***How does research influence policy?*** A range of different ways of seeing the links between research and policy are outlined, including a rational-linear model, a powerbased/ political/muddling-through model and a network model. Commentators now see policy being influenced by a combination of precedent, information, ideas and interests. Open approaches to policy allow a greater role for information and ideas.

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

Consultation processes similarly offer potential avenues of influence, although big questions remain about how the results of consultation are then taken forward by those making decisions. **What is 'best advice'?** Government says it is looking for the 'best advice', but this is precisely part of the problem – identifying what is the best advice. Connected to this, departments need to be brave to commission risky research on high-stakes problems, particularly when it comes to backing unfashionable theories and research perspectives. The strength of incumbent paradigms can even foreclose the investigation of alternatives, so that if current approaches fail, policy-makers can find that they face a dearth of other routes to follow. In this context, the commissioning of diverse research perspectives represents the creation of 'options value' for future. Such perspectives also warn against 'one-size-fits-all' approaches to policy. **Evidence-based policy:** The report outlines some initiatives on evidence-based policy, and some of its limitations. These are that evidence can be asymmetric – simply because evidence about certain effects of policies may be easier to collect than evidence on others – leading certain options to appear 'better' than others. The implication is that there is still a central place for judgement in designing policies and appraising what is likely to be their complete set of impacts. Some senior officials even suggest that what is needed is 'anecdote-based policy', which brings the power of case studies and 'stories' to bear; these can provide more joined-up assessments of the factors that have led to policy success and failure in the context of complex mixes of economic, social and environmental aims. **Intelligent customers**: Government itself has identified the need to enhance the ability of departments to be 'intelligent customers' for research. This is partly about how generalist civil servants use and commission scientific advice, and ask the right questions, and is also partly about having more trained specialists within government. It could also be complemented by encouraging a larger number of secondments from, for example, universities, into government. Currently, the Treasury runs a scheme for 10 such placements each year; it would seem that this number could usefully be greatly increased, with benefits to all parties concerned. Secondments the other way – of officials taking a sabbatical in a university, for example – might also help develop expertise and networks. **Do heads count?** The 1971 Rothschild Report led to the privatisation of many government research establishments, which in turn led not only to a substantial fall in the number of specialists employed directly by government – something favoured by the Treasury, with its emphasis on minimising the 'head count' in the civil service – but also to a shrinkage in the potential recruitment pool for central government departments. There is a feeling that the emphasis on head count is now counter-productive in relation to departmental research, analytical and research-commissioning skills. **Contracting out knowledge** There is little analysis of whether the emphasis on 'head count' has actually led to cost savings, given that much analysis for government is now undertaken by private consultants at high cost. Officials also report wider costs, such as the de-skilling of research staff who now mainly manage contracts, and also the fact that while the codified knowledge gained through such contracts is reported in traditional form and is therefore theoretically available to officials, the tacit knowledge that is often a crucial part of the outcome of the activity is gained by the consultants rather than civil servants. **Departmental research budgets** As a relatively small proportion of departmental budgets, and because its contributions to policy are often invisible, uncertain or long term, research can be vulnerable in budgetary planning exercises. For all the rhetoric about increasing reliance on research-based information in designing and implementing government policy, departmental research budgets have consistently fallen in recent years. **Organising research in government** Departments need to be able to combine a central overview of their research, while at the same time linking the research directly to areas of policy development or service delivery, so that it can make its optimal contribution in a timely way. There is much variety across government in how research is organised. Most Departments now have a chief scientific advisor who, as a senior official, is in a position to argue the case for research and scientific advice, although various inquiries have found this arrangement to be far from stable and well-organised across government. The introduction of departmental science and innovation strategies may be a mechanism for addressing some of the concerns outlined in the above two paragraphs. **Integrating research into policy-making** There is relatively little analysis of *how* research and the work of specialists can be integrated more closely into the development and delivery of policy. The 'Bill Team' could be a useful model for bringing together different specialists and generalists, driven by the need to deliver a complex result around a short-term 'problem'. Such a model is rarely applied to other tasks, but could be used to enhance 'organisational memory' and the mutual understanding of the role of different officials. **Identifying sources** Officials can find it difficult to identify suitable sources of advice, and few have the time or inclination to read academic journals or books. Research infrastructure such as e-mail groups can help, but officials commonly rely on personal contacts or web searches to find sources of advice. The Learned Societies have a role to play here, although a) inquiries have found them to be an under-valued and under-used source of advice and b) many have traditionally had few resources to devote – or have chosen to devote few resources – to advisory functions, particularly in comparison to a body like the US National Academy of Sciences, which has had this as one of its functions from the outset. **Objectivity or diversity**? Certain individuals can come to dominate advisory positions, becoming the 'default expert' on an issue, and this can have the effect of artificially narrowing the range of policy options examined. Many officials recognise that although research is ideally about the impartial assessment of evidence, researchers themselves cannot be completely objective, particularly where there

are competing explanations of events. In this context, it is vital to consult a range of opinion. Officials also acknowledge that campaign groups, despite their partial commitments, can be a useful source of information where more conservative organisations are less willing to lead debates. **Challenges in using advisory committees** Advisory committees are widely used across government, and their roles have been clarified by the Guidelines and the Code. However, various problems remain. First, remuneration varies across committees, from no pay to the equivalent of low-level consulting fees. Such fees in themselves are a poor incentive to attract the best advice, and can ironically themselves encourage the 'low-price culture' within universities of which the CCR was so critical. Second, researchers face difficult decisions about serving on such committees as pressures on them grow with more students, pressure to do high-quality research, and growing expectations with respect to 'third-stream' funding. **Conflicts of interest:** Partly as a result of the encouragement to university researchers to work more closely with industry, departments are finding it increasingly difficult to recruit members to advisory committees who do not have such affiliations; the latter are seen by some to reduce or eliminate the ability of researchers to provide objective or balanced advice. **Eminence, or evidence?** To what extent are advisors chosen on the basis of their direct knowledge of a topic, or on the basis of their scientific eminence? Officials acknowledge that the more strategic an issue, the more likely it is that advisors are chosen on the basis of their eminence rather than their research-based knowledge of an area. The question then becomes whether this amounts to advice, or as one commentator has put it 'good old boys sitting around talking turkey'. Does the winning of a Nobel prize immediately confer on that researcher wisdom about, for example, science policy? Eminence clearly has its role to play, but it would seem advisable to ensure that eminence is complemented with advice based on evidence, which will often come from younger researchers active in the field. **Aims of science policy** While many science policy initiatives emphasise the relevance of science to wealth creation, few have paid attention to the question of how research can contribute to public policy, and what incentives can be given to researchers to encourage them to develop their activities in this way. Certainly, research organisations can probably do much more to ensure that commercial benefits flow from research investments, but should wealth creation become their dominant aim? Such an emphasis may be harming the potential of research to bring benefits to quality of life and the effectiveness of public policy, the two other aims outlined in the 1993 White Paper *Realising Our Potential*. **Incentives and rewards** Although many researchers clearly regard involvement in policy as rewarding, and some regard it as a public duty in return for public funding for their work, it is by no means clear that the current patchwork of incentives and rewards is sufficient to ensure an optimum outcome for those developing policy. This report identifies many barriers that researchers currently face either in conducting policy-relevant or interdisciplinary, problem-focused research, or in finding the resources (mostly time) to get involved in policy processes. **Dual funding system** The review of the Research Councils found that the dual support research funding system 'is widely considered to be out of balance', finding problems with: research assessment and how it affects the balance of incentives between research, teaching and knowledge transfer; the exploitation of research; incentives for multi-disciplinarity, and; research trajectories – the contrast between tenured university employment and the growth in short-term, project-based funding. **Research Councils** There are clearly, on occasions, tensions between the desire of Research Councils to maintain an 'arms length' relationship with Government in order to ensure the independence of the research they fund, and on the other hand the wish to ensure relevance by becoming involved in public debate. This tension becomes acute when research calls current policy into question. This is especially the case with the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC), which by its nature tends to fund research that is more closely involved in scrutinising policy. The pressure applied to the ESRC's forebear in the 1980s provides a reminder of the difficulties in ensuring that researchers and their funding bodies be allowed an 'independent space' in which to conduct their work. **Funding Councils** The Funding Councils such as the Higher Education Funding Council for England provide the other main stream of funding for universities under the dual support system. Although HEFCE states that one of its strategic aims is to encourage effective interaction between academics and those in industry and other sectors, there is a widespread feeling that the incentive signals it sends are overwhelmingly biased in favour of encouraging academic outputs rather than improved economic or social outcomes. Its Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) is currently under review. **Outputs or outcomes**? The Minister for Science and Innovation has publicly stated that not only does he understand the power of the signals sent by the RAE, but also that the 'culture of the knowledge base' needs to change to reward academic 'reach-out' activities. Again the emphasis is on wealth creation, and the level of funding is modest, but the emphasis seems to be shifting towards encouraging researchers to consider not just the *outputs* of their research but also the *outcomes*. **Fundamental challenges** However, tools such as the RAE are underpinned by the peer review system, which itself has been found to be problematic by tending to discourage problem-centred, inter-disciplinary research. Policy-makers are also finding it hard to arrive at a method for allocating 'third stream' funding to universities. In summary, and as concluded by the 2002 *Cross-Cutting Review,* there seems to be a long way to go before contributions to public policy are seen to be of central importance in the academic sector.

Excerpt source: Scott (executive summary)

UNESCO

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

<u>Key themes</u>: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 3) Evidence-based Policy / New Modes of Governance 4) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 5) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy

- **SCOTT, A., STEYN, G., GEUNA, A., BRUSONI S. & STEINMUELLER, E.** (2001.) *The economic returns to basic research and the benefits of university-industry relationships: a literature review and update of findings*. Brighton, SPRU: Science and Technology Policy Research, 33 p.

1) **CONTEXT**: In order to identify appropriate levels of investment in public sector research, it would be useful to be able to identify the rates of return to public research and to identify the benefits of the relationships between public research and the private sector. It is in this context that this report has been requested by the UK Office of Science and Technology. 2) **AN INTUITIVE APPROACH**: It is intuitively attractive to think of the main output of research to be new and freely available information, which is then taken up and used by industry in innovation. In particular, new scientific information leads to new technologies. This simple 'linear model' indicates that it should be possible to calculate the returns to public research. 3) **INNOVATION IS NOT LINEAR**: Innovation processes are not that simple, however. They are nonlinear, complex and involve a range of interactions with public research. For these reasons and others, some argue that it is impossible to calculate rates of return for public research, and those that try need to interpret their results with great care. To build a full picture of the relationships between public research and innovation requires an understanding of the many benefits of public research for the economy – not just the provision of new information – and the specific mechanisms or channels through which these benefits come about. 4) **A MORE REALISTIC APPROACH**: This review builds on a wide literature that goes beyond the intuitive approach to examine in detail the complex relationships between research and innovation, science and technology. The existence of this rich set of relationships means that the returns to basic research are probably much higher than those envisaged using the intuitive linear approach. However, paradoxically, it also makes it more difficult to calculate convincing and analytically rigorous quantitative figures for the returns to basic research. 5) **CALCULATING THE RETURNS**: Attempts to calculate the returns to public research have generally resulted in high rates – from 20-50% and higher. The report reviews recent literature in the field, showing the diverse economic sectors and country circumstances in which studies have been conducted. Most find substantial returns. 6) **LIMITS TO QUANTIFICATION**: However, attempts to calculate the economic returns to public research have faced strong methodological criticism. There now seems to be a wide acceptance of the limits to quantification. As a consequence, few studies now attempt to calculate a rate of return, but some try to give an idea of more specific partial measures, such as measures of the elasticities of public and private R&D – i.e. what effect does public research have on key variables such as private research. It is therefore important to analyse the other ways in which research benefits the economy: 7) **CREATING STRATEGIC VALUE**: By enhancing capabilities in the economy – and it is important not to forget the vital linkage between research and the supply of skilled graduates – research underpins the knowledge absorption capabilities of the private sector. By creating and maintaining variety, research maintains the diversity of science and technology options vital to a flexible innovation system faced with uncertain future demands and opportunities. 8) **ANALYSING CHANNELS**: As far as we know, this review is the first attempt to bring together all the recent evidence about the great many channels of communication between the research sector and the private sector. Firms see many of these as important mechanisms for deriving value from public research. Information on many of the channels remains sparse. This restricts the ability of policy decisions to proceed on the basis of evidence. 9) **MANY BENEFITS**: Such evidence as does exist, however, demonstrates the many ways in which research benefits the economy, albeit ways that are difficult to quantify in economic terms. This leads us to conclude that the benefits of public research are probably significantly higher than narrow calculations of the returns to public research would suggest.

<u>Excerpt source</u>: Scott et al (executive summary)
<u>Key themes</u>: 1) Research impact assessment / Policy evaluation 2) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **SEBBA, J.** (2000.) "Education: using research evidence to reshape practice". *Public Money and Management,* 20 (4): 8-10
- **SECK, D. & PHILLIPS, L. C**. (eds.). (2001.) "Adjusting structural adjustment: the Research-policy nexus: conceptual and historical perspectives" In *Adjusting*

Structural Adjustment: Best Practices in Policy Research in Africa (Draft Manuscript, July 2001)

- **SELBY SMITH, C** (ed.). (1999.) *The impact of R&D on VET decision-making: a range of case studies*. Adelaide: National Centre for Vocational Education Research

- **SELBY SMITH, C.** (2001.) *The impact of research on decision-making by practitioners and managers.* Department of Management, Monash University, Melbourne, 18 p.

- **SHANKLAND, A** (2000) 'Analysing Policy for Sustainable Livelihoods' *Research Report* 49, Brighton, UK: Institute of Development Studies (IDS), University of Sussex.

  While the **sustainable livelihoods (SL) framework** has proved a valuable way of structuring **microlevel studies of livelihoods**, it gives **little guidance on how to link those findings with macro-level issues or with policy analysis**. Bottom-up livelihoods analysis is **often seen as too context-specific to guide policy making** and **top-down analysis misses the complexity**. To **bridge this gap**, three elements are needed: (i) a **model of interactions between policy and livelihoods**, (ii) a **clearer understanding of the role of social and political capital**, (iii) an **approach to policy analysis that draws on and feeds into SL analysis**. Shankland's suggestions about how to improve policy analysis are particularly useful. He emphasises the need to **distinguish** between institutions (**'rules of the game'**) and organisations (**'players'**) and analyse their relative strength as well as **links with the public in respective countries**. Implementation is part of the policy process, he argues. **Policies are broad statements of intent, while policy 'measures' take specific forms**, e.g. laws, projects. **Policy making works quite differently in different sectors** (e.g. scientific arguments are important in some, lobbying by professional groups are vital in others). Furthermore, **local conditions and power relations often limit or distort the channelling of policy**. The key characteristics of a policy measure are: design, commitment, resources, links (between 'champions' of the measure), and time. He also offers a **checklist for analysing policy for sustainable livelihoods**, with a detailed explanation of the questions, and suggested methodologies in an annex.

  Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  Key theme: 1) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **SHARMA, P. C.** (1974.) *A selected international research bibliography on operations research and the social sciences*. Monticello, Ill.: Council of Planning Librarians

- **SHAXSON, L.** (2005.) "Is your evidence robust enough? Questions for policy makers and practitioners". *Evidence & Policy: A Journal of Research, Debate and Practice*, Volume 1, Number 1, January 2005 , pp. 101-112 (12)

- **SHELDON, B. & MACDONALD, G.** (1999.) *Research and practice in social care: mind the gap*. Exeter: Exeter University, Centre for Evidence-Based Social Services

- **SHELDON, T. A., GUVATT, G. H. & HAINES, A**. (1998.) "Getting research findings into practice: when to act on the evidence"*. British Medical Journal (International edition),* London: 317 (7151): 139 (4 p.) (July 11, 1998)

- **SHERMAN, L. W.** (2003.) *Misleading evidence and evidence-led policy: making social science more experimental.* Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications

- **SHONKOFF, J. P.** (2000.) "Science, policy and practice: Three cultures in search of a shared mission". *Child development*, 71 (1) 181-187

  Research on child development, the design of social policies, and the delivery of human services for children and families reflect three related yet separate cultures. The capacity to navigate across their borders, to understand their different rules of evidence, to speak their distinctive languages, and to achieve credibility in all three worlds while maintaining a sense of intellectual integrity in each, requires respect for their differences and a commitment to their shared mission. **The transmission of knowledge from the academy to the domains of social policy and practice is a formidable task**. This challenge **could be facilitated by a simple taxonomy that differentiates**

established knowledge from both reasonable hypotheses and unwarranted or irresponsible assertions that are made in the name of science. An investment in effective **"cross-cultural"** **translation offers a potent strategy for enhancing both the generation of new research and the application of cutting-edge knowledge** to make a difference in the lives of children and their families.

Excerpt source: Shonkoff (abstract)
Key theme: 1) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT 2) Knowledge Management

- **SILVER, H. J. & LEPKOWSKI, W.** (2001.) *Fostering human progress: social and behavioral science research contributions to public policy*. Washington, D.C. : Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA)

- **SKEDSVOLD, P. R. & MANN T. L**. (1996.) "Affirmative action: linking research, policy, and implementation". *Journal Of Social Issues* , 52 (4): 3-18 (Winter 1996)

- **SMALL, S. A.** (2005.) "Bridging research and practice in the family and human sciences". *Family Relations,* Minneapolis: April 2005. Vol. 54, Iss. 2, p. 320 (15 p.)

- **SMIRCICH, L** (1983) 'Concepts of Culture and Organisational Analysis' *Administrative Science Quarterly* 28: 339–358.

This paper **examines the significance of the concept of culture for organisational analysis**. The **intersection of culture theory and organisation theory** is evident in five current research themes: comparative management, corporate culture, organisational cognition, organisational symbolism, and unconscious processes and organisation. Researchers pursue these themes for different purposes and their work is based on **different assumptions about the nature of culture and organisation**. The **task of evaluating the power and limitations of the concept of culture must be conducted within this assumptive context**. This review demonstrates that the concept of culture takes organisation analysis in several different and promising directions.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: 1) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **SMITH, R.** (2001.) "Measuring the social impact of research". *BMJ,* 323 (7312): 528

- **SMITH SELBY CHRIS.** "The impact of research on decision-making by practitioners and managers." Department of Management, Monash University, Melbourne. Director of the Monash University-ACER Centre for the Economics of Education and Training.

Does research have an impact on decision-making at the level of practitioners and managers; and, if so, **through what pathways**? Previous studies have shown that the relationships between research and its decision-making outcomes are almost always complex and not easily discerned. The idea of a one-to-one relationship generally has been discredited, although individual studies can have an impact. **Studies have concentrated at the policy level rather than on practitioners and managers**. This **paper draws on a range of recent Australian studies in VET and healthcare**. The second section of the **paper outlines a framework for analysing the relationships between research and decision making by practitioners and managers, distinguishing between the decision making domain, the research domain and the linkages between them.** It also discusses the definition of research; and draws a **distinction between 'use' and 'influence'**. Section 3 outlines the relevant studies in VET from which evidence was drawn, while Section 4 outlines the sources from which evidence was drawn for Australian healthcare. **Section 5 considers the similarities and differences in the relationships between research and decision-making by practitioners and managers in the two sectors**. There are five concluding comments in Section 6.

Excerpt source: Smith (abstract)
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **SMITH G.D, EBRAHIM S., FRANKEL S**., (2001.) "How policy informs the evidence: Evidence based thinking can lead to debased policy making" BMJ Volume 322, January 2001.

  Who would not want health policy to be based on evidence? "**Evidence based medicine" and "evidence based policy"** have such reassuring and self evidently desirable qualities that it may seem contrary to question their legitimacy in relation to reducing health inequalities. However, **these terms are now so familiar that it is easy to forget the important question about what sort of data provide appropriate evidence for particular types of decisions**. The sort of evidence gathered on the benefits of interventions aimed at individuals **may not help in guiding policies** directed towards reducing health inequalities.

  Excerpt source: Smith et al. (abstract) focus on health inequalities and evidence-based policy.
  Key theme: Evidence-based Policy / New Modes of Governance

- **SMYLIE JANET, CARMEL MARY MARTIN, NILI KAPLAN-MYRTH, LEAH STEELE, CAROLINE TAIT, WILLIAM HOGG**, (2003.) Knowledge translation and indigenous knowledge. Nuuk : Circumpolar Health, 2003.

  Objective. We wanted to evaluate the interface between knowledge translation theory and Indigenous knowledge. **Design.** Literature review supplemented by expert opinion was carried out. **Method.** Thematic analysis to identify gaps and convergences between the two domains was done. **Results.** The theoretical and epistemological frameworks underlying Western scientific and Indigenous knowledge systems were shown to have fundamental differences. **Conclusion.** Knowledge translation methods for health sciences research need to be specifically developed and evaluated within the context of Aboriginal communities.

  Excerpt source: Smylie et al (abstract)
  Key themes: 1) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 2) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance

- **SOBHAN REHMAN**, 'The social role of the economist in Bangladesh', pp. 69-77. In International Social Science Journal: "Policy actors: Bureaucrats, politicians and intellectuals." February 1990, no. 123.

  The author examines the status of the social role of economists in Bangladesh. He finds that Bangladeshi economists, despite their growth in numbers and the improvements in the quality of their work, **stay aloof from the world of politics**. He contrasts this image with the mu**ch more active role played by economists during the movement of independence from Pakistan.** The author argues that **economic theories are inherently political and that thus the economist has an obligation to participate into politics and to contribute to the political debate**. *The basic proposition is to focus on the self evident idea that economics is a discipline which constantly impinges on issues of public life and political debate. It is no more meaningful therefore to ask professional economists to stay aloof from political activity than it is to ask an engineer to stay in the classroom and design bridges*. (p. 74). **The author then goes on to propose certain directions for the future of the discipline in Bangladesh**. Thus, he argues in favour of the **multiplication of fora as a space for the projection of research findings to policy makers**. (p. 71-72). He equally **proposes that economists should popularize their research findings in order to reach out to the public** ('ordinary people'). Furthermore, he advocates an explicit and clear political engagement on the part of economists (at least for those who wish for it). "*Some should not hesitate to join the ruling party. There should be no sense of embarrassment, or charge of opportunism, to such acts…*". (p. 74). Finally, **he calls for a re-direction of research towards issues that deal macroscopically with the great social problems that plague Bangladesh** – poverty, external dependence of resource mobilization – and thus towards offering diagnosis and policy alternatives to policy makers. (p. 75).

  Excerpt source: Georgios Papanagnou (review)
  Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy

- **SOCIAL SCIENCE REFERENCE GROUP.** (2001.) *Connections, resources and capacities: how social science research can better inform social policy advice*. Report from the Improving the Knowledge Base for Social Policy Reference Group, Wellington, 47 p.

  This report is from an **eight-member social science reference group charged with making recommendations on how to secure more effective social policy advice from social science research available within New Zealand**. Our underlying goal as a group charged with improving linkages within the context of the **Improving the Knowledge Base for Social Policy project** is: "To **ensure social science research can better inform social policy** development and implementation." In addressing this goal, the reference group has found it useful to structure its report around the following **key strategies**. "**Improving connections, increasing resources and enhancing capacities**. We argue that these strategies will promote linkages between the social policy research agendas of departments, agencies and ministries, and the research activities of the broader social science community." The three elements underlined form a strategic whole, which is designed to maximise and to expand existing capabilities in New Zealand. Our recommendations will ameliorate the problems that exist between and within the social science and social policy sectors.

  Excerpt source: Social science reference group (executive summary), institutional programme
  Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **SOLESBURY, W.** (2001.) *Evidence based policy: whence it came and where it's going.* The ESRC UK Centre for Evidence Based Policy and Practice, Queen Mary, University of London
- **SOLESBURY, W.** (2002.) "Evidence-based policy: the continuing search for effective policy processes". *Planning Theory and Practice,* B 3, 1: 96
- **SOLINÍS, GERMÁN** (1995.) Recherche et action dans les sciences humaines. Article inédit. 23p.

- **SQUIRE, L.** (2002.) *Bridging research and policy. An overview*. Paper prepared for ABCDE, Europe, Oslo, June 2002, Global Development Network, 13 p.

  I do not want to take the position that every single piece of research has to be directed to a policy question, nor that every single output of research has to be presented in a way that best meets the needs of the policy- maker. But, on the other hand, **we would probably all agree that policy-making based on evidence accumulated by means of good empirical research is in our best interests**. Now consider these facts: In a recent **survey of policy-makers in developing countries** undertaken by the World Bank, **more than two-thirds expressed a need for more input from national researchers as opposed to international ones**. Another **survey**, this time of **research institutes** throughout the developing world undertaken by the Global Development Network, found that **three quarters of respondents sought to influence policy- makers through research**. Given these results, one might expect a smooth flow of ideas, analyses, evaluations, and projections from the research community to the policy-making community throughout the developing world. And yet, researchers consistently complain that their work is ignored by policy- makers, or, even worse, is misinterpreted. At the same, time **policy-makers question the relevance, usefulness, and overly academic orientation of most research.** Indeed, the common perception seems to be one of a large and possibly widening gap between the output of researchers and the needs of policy makers. Thus, neither the need expressed by policymakers for research, nor the reported interest of researchers in fulfilling that need, are being met. Since its inception, **GDN has had as its main goal to support and link research and policy institutes involved in the field of development.** GDN's work strives to **make better use of research to produce well- informed and effective policy.** Work in this area springs from the realization that quality research offers a key to understanding the world we live in. At the same time, **policy provides the instrument with which we respond to this world and tackle the challenges which it presents.** However, between research and policy there is often only a tenuous link which means that policy formulation is seldom informed by quality research and the contribution of research in the policy process remains weak. It is possible to point to a number of factors that account for this weakness. Policy makers often fail to commission appropriate research or they may ignore and subvert results they are given. O**n the other side of the equation, researchers may pursue their own interests that do**

not always coincide with policy imperatives. It is likely therefore that both sides will fail to communicate effectively regarding their activities. The **purpose of this paper is to describe an effort under the auspices of GDN to better understand the link between research and policy and to identify those factors likely to strengthen the link.** The paper first **describes the background and early development of the project**. It then **outlines the main research questions and discusses some aspects of methodology**. For reasons to be explained, a conventional research methodology is not well suited for the task at hand. Sections IV and V then describe the two phases of the project. **Phase I is designed to generate sufficient information about the link between research and policy as it actually unfolds in practice so that we can specify some well-grounded hypotheses.** And **Phase II is then designed to explore the selected hypotheses by a mixture of techniques.** The last section of the paper describes the management structure for the project.

Excerpt source: Squire (introduction)
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **SQUIRE, L., DINELLO, N.** (2002.) *Survey of policymakers*. Global Development Network. Bridging Research and Policy, 18 p.

  A survey of policymakers in developing and transition economies has been implemented as part of the GDN Global Research Project, Bridging Research and Policy. Administered by country offices of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the **survey aimed to understand the policymakers' awareness and evaluation of local research and its contribution to decision making.** The questionnaire solicited information on the **attitudes of policymakers toward the research community** as well as **their actions and constraints in developing a mutually beneficial relationship.** The respondents' approaches to overcoming barriers between research and policy were also probed. The UNDP survey will be complemented by a survey of researchers from developing and transition economies being conducted electronically by the Center for Economic Research and Graduate Education–Economics Institute, based in Prague (Czech Republic). Results of the two surveys will enable us to **compare perspectives of policymakers and researchers and formulate practical recommendations on closing the gap between ideas and their application**. In addition to the surveys, **GDN is currently collecting 50 narratives of cases in which research has or has not influenced policies**, to **shed light on the factors that determine the impact of research on policymaking and vice versa**. Conducted at the first stage of the implementation of the Bridging Research and Policy project, the surveys and narratives are intended to **help formulate hypotheses that will be subject to further investigation in the second stage of the project (2003-2004).** Findings of the survey of policymakers are mostly exploratory and descriptive, although they contain a few explanatory elements. **Data analysis will expand knowledge about the challenges that researchers and policymakers experience in working together and will highlight their perceptions of the paths to better collaboration**. Generating tentative observations and explanations, the survey will prepare the ground for further testing of the carefully selected hypotheses. **Subsequent research will have a stronger focus on cause-effect relationships**. The ensuing case studies will explore the research-policy link and its outcomes at different levels—local, national, regional, and global—and in different sectors of the economy, including the energy sector, health care, education, and agriculture. **Overall, it is expected that the project will lead to a better understanding of the research-policy nexus**. By providing practical recommendations on improving links between researchers and policymakers, the project should contribute to better policies for advancing sustainable development and alleviating poverty. *Research questions and hypotheses:* The survey of policymakers addresses three major research questions: 1) **Do policymakers rely on research results and, if so, why? 2) What research characteristics do policymakers value? 3) What factors are associated with a research community that policymakers deem useful?**

  Excerpt source: GDN (purpose and significance)
  Key themes: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy 2) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 3) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **STACEY, R** (1995) 'The Role of Chaos and Self-Organisation in the Development of Creative Organisations' in Albert, A (ed.) *Chaos and Society*. Amsterdam: IOS Press.

Drawing on chaos theory (transported from the physical sciences to social science issues), Stacey discusses the **possibilities of moving away from 'equilibria' models of organisation to models** that **focus on nonlinear networks.** He argues that the '**nonlinearity' of networks – e.g. the spontaneous relations formed between people, the irregular sharing of information, the informal learning processes that occur through interaction, etc – is precisely what makes networks such valuable sites for innovation**. In formal institutions, the networks that form often function as 'shadow organisations' that creatively interpret and modify official strategies. More importantly, the **informal networks continuously generate new and alternative strategies**. Those unofficial strategies that survive and are picked up by various actors through the informal channels and networks will **normally after a time become institutionalised**, thus making them official. This **reinforces the control of the formal management and provides some stability**. However, new unofficial ideas and responses will already be forming. Stacey **argues that this constant interaction between stable organisational elements and unstable informal networks is vital if an organisation wishes to succeed.**

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy. 2) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **START, D. & HOVLAND, I.** (2004.) *Tools for policy impact: a handbook for researchers, RAPID toolkit*. London: ODI (Overseas Development Institute), RAPID (Research and Policy in Development)

- **STEIN, J.** (2003.) "How can our research be improved to better ensure that results are translated into action?" *AIDS Bulletin*, AIDS and Society Research Unit, the Centre for Social Science Research, University of Cape Town, 12 (1) (April 2003)

- **STEINBRUNER, J. D.** (1974.) *The Cybernetic Theory of Decision: New Dimensions of Political Analysis*. Princeton University Press.

- **STEPHENSON, R. & HENNINK, M.** (2002.) Moving beyond research to influence policy: barriers and strategies for developing countries. Opportunities and choices. Working Paper No. 2002/05, University of Southampton, UK, 20 p.

This paper examines issues of communication across the researcher-policymaker interface in four countries: **Malawi, Tanzania, India and Pakistan**. In-depth interviews were conducted with researchers working in health issues, and policymakers responsible for the formation of health policies at the local and national levels. **The range of strategies used by researchers to disseminate research** outputs to policymakers was similar across all study countries: **most researchers disseminated their findings through research reports and workshops, and there was a heavy reliance on dissemination through academic circles.** Policymakers reported difficulties in accessing research outputs, particularly when disseminated through academic channels. **The interviews identified a number of barriers to effective communication between researchers and policymakers**. The lack of clear communication channels between researchers and policymakers and the **lack of a central depository for research outputs, restricts the dissemination of research outputs**. **Researchers felt that policymaker's lack of understanding and respect for research limited the extent to which research is used in policy formation**, whilst their own lack of skills and resources for dissemination restricts the effectiveness of their dissemination efforts. **Policymakers felt that the research outputs they receive often lack policy recommendations, were of poor quality and were presented in academic formats**. The results of this study highlight a communication gap between researchers and policymakers. Whilst reducing this gap requires **long-term attitudinal change** and an increase in investment in the research sector in these countries, other barriers are more easily surmountable. **Training in communication skills is necessary to allow researchers to target their research towards a policy audience,** whilst policymakers need to take steps to inform researchers of their information needs. A greater understanding of the potential contribution of research to policy and the

constraints of policy formation could arise from closer collaboration between researchers and policymakers.

Excerpt source: Stephenson et al (executive summary)
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance
2) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT
3) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 4) Knowledge Management

- **STEPHENSON, R. & HENNINK, M.** (2004.) Using research to inform Health policy: barriers and strategies in developing countries. Opportunities and choices. Working Paper No. 9 March 2004, University of Southampton, UK, 37p

  This paper examines the dissemination and uptake of health research into policy and program delivery in four developing countries. In-depth interviews were conducted with health researchers, policymakers and practitioners at both local and national level. The study highlights the **similarities across the study countries in the barriers to effective dissemination and uptake of research results**. A fundamental barrier to the uptake of research by decision-makers is the **lack of appreciation of the important contribution that research can make to policy and program development**. A further barrier is **researcher's lack of appropriate 'packaging' of research findings which consider the needs of different policy audiences.** Dissemination within academic circles also restricts access by decision-makers and practitioners. Overcoming the barriers requires effort on behalf of researchers, decision-makers and donor agencies. **The strong presence of donor agencies in developing countries places them in a position to both enable and to encourage dissemination activities and communication between researchers and policymakers or practitioners**. Increased collaboration between all three parties is one of the key strategies towards increasing the uptake of research into health policy and program development.

  Excerpt source: Stephenson et al (abstract) focus on health policy
  Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 3) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 4) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT 5) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy

- **STERN, N AND FERREIRA, F** (1997) 'The World Bank as an 'Intellectual Actor'' in Kapur, D, Lewis, J and Webb, R (eds.) *The World Bank – Its First Half Century*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

  Admirers and critics of the **World Bank** commonly agree on a **surprising view of the institution**: the **principal function of each loan is to serve as an ideological Trojan horse**. It is the critic who will term this ideological and having pejorative intent. The admirer will make the same point using different language, speaking of the Bank as not mere bank but a 'development agency', citing **the technical assistance, training, and advice that it provides, as well as its contributions to development research**. Both **critics and admirers see loans as lever and packaging for the transmission of those ideas**. The chapter provides an examination of the Bank as a **source and a transmitter of thinking on economic development**. The main author (Stern) looks for originality and scientific power in the Bank's work as a creative centre of development studies. He also examines the way in which ideas about development have been part of the Bank's practical, operational life – including a large part of 'operations' that consists of doctrinal persuasion. Stern is unable to cite any significant, pioneering scientific contribution. Loosening the criteria, however, he speaks of the **Bank's 'intellectual leadership' with respect to structural adjustment** during the 1980's. But Stern admits, the Bank's analytical role was not path breaking, the underlying theories and views were not new.

  Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  Key theme: Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **STINE DEBORAH D**. (2008.) "Science and Technology Policymaking: A Primer." CRS (Congressional Research Service) report for congress. Updated April 22, 2008

  Scientific and technical knowledge and guidance influences not just policy related to science and technology, but also many of today's public policies as policymakers seek knowledge to enhance the quality of their decisions. Science and technology policy is concerned with the **allocation of resources for and encouragement of scientific and engineering research and development**, the use of scientific and technical knowledge to enhance the nation's response to societal challenges, and the education of Americans in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. Science and engineering **research and innovations are intricately linked to societal needs and the nation's economy in areas such as transportation, communication, agriculture, education, environment, health, defense, and jobs.** As a result, policymakers are interested in almost every aspect of science and technology policy. **The three branches of government** — executive, congressional, and judiciary — depending on each branch's responsibility, **use science and technology knowledge and guidance to frame policy issues, craft legislation, and govern**. The **science and engineering community, however, is not represented by one individual or organization**. On matters of scientific and technical knowledge and guidance, its opinions are consensus-based with groups of scientists and engineers coming together from different perspectives to debate an issue based on the available empirical evidence. In the end, **consensus is achieved if there is widespread agreement on the evidence and its implications, which is conveyed to policymakers.** Policymakers then determine, based on this knowledge and other factors, whether or not to take action and what actions to take. If there are major disagreements within large portions of the community, however, consensus is not yet achieved, and taking policy actions in response to a concern can be challenging. Several organizations, when requested by the federal government or Congress, provide formal science and technology policy advice: federal advisory committees, congressionally chartered honorific organizations, and federally funded research and development corporations. **In addition, many other organizations and individuals — international intergovernmental organizations, policy institutes/think tanks, the public, professional organizations, disciplinary societies, universities and colleges, advocacy, special interest, industry, trade associations, and labor — also provide their thoughts**. **These organizations may agree on the scientific and technical knowledge regarding an issue, but disagree on what actions to take in response, as their values on a proposed policy may differ**. Policymakers may be overwhelmed with an abundance of information from these organizations. Despite these challenges, scientific and technical knowledge and guidance can **provide policymakers with an opportunity to make their decisions based on the best information available, along with other factors they might take into account, such as cultural, economic, and other values, so that societal and economic benefits are enhanced and losses are mitigated.**

  Excerpt source: Stine (summary)
  Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy

- **STONE, D, MAXWELL, S AND KEATING, M** (2001.) *Bridging Research and Policy*. An international workshop, funded by DFID, 16–17 July. Warwick University,

  This paper is about the **relationship between research and policy** – specifically **about how research impacts on policy**, and about **how policy draws on research**. It might be thought that the relationship is straightforward, with good research designed to be relevant to policy, and its results delivered in an accessible form to policy-makers – and with good policy-making securely and rationally based on relevant research findings. In fact, this is far from the case. As a taster, Box 1 gives **ten reasons why the link from research to policy might not be straightforward**. Sometimes **research is not designed to be relevant to policy**. Sometimes **it is so designed, but fails to have an impact because of problems associated with timeliness, presentation, or manner of communication**. Sometimes (probably quite often) **policy-makers do not see research findings as central to their decision-making**. The relationship between research and policy is often tenuous, quite often fraught. To observe as much is not new. There are literatures on the question in many social science disciplines – in political science, sociology, anthropology, and management, to name a few. Our purpose here is **to review some of these literatures and to draw out the implications for both researchers and policy-makers**. The starting point is a discussion of **what is meant by 'policy' and the 'policy process'**. The **rational, linear model of policy-making** – which summarises a logical sequence from problem definition, through analysis of alternatives, to decision, implementation, and review –is the traditional approach. We will see shortly what is wrong with this. Accordingly, the paper begins (Section 2) with a brie**f review of thinking on policy, presenting alternative models, and setting out a framework for thinking about the**

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

interaction between research and policy. It then deals successively with the **challenge facing researchers** (Section 3) **and policy-makers** (Section 4). **Can the range of advice already offered to researchers be extended?** And **can policy-makers be helped by new ideas such as evidence-based policy-making** and performance-based evaluations? The Conclusion (Section 5) draws these threads together, suggesting that the **impact of research is uncertain and contingent on social and political context.**

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 3) Evidence-based Policy / New Modes of Governance

- **STONE, D.** (1996.) *Capturing the political imagination: think tanks and the policy process*. London: Frank Cass

- **STONE, D.** (2000.) *Learning lessons, policy transfer and the international diffusion of policy ideas*. Centre for the Study of Globalisation and Regionalisation, February 9, 2000 http://poli.haifa.ac.il/~levi/res/stone-2000.pdf

  The literature on policy transfer, diffusion and convergence as well as lesson drawing is burgeoning. The common theme among studies in this field is the concern with '***knowledge* about how policies, administrative arrangements, institutions and ideas in one political setting (past or present) is used in the development of policies, administrative arrangements, institutions and ideas in another political setting.**' With the specific focus on knowledge actors, **this paper highlights the roles played by non-state actors** who act as '**policy entrepreneurs'** and **interact with officials** in government and international organisation in the international spread of ideas and information. Second, **it suggests that transfer is a process that is often facilitated within networks**. Third**, incorporating concepts about social learning helps account for when transfer is effective or not**. Finally, the discussion advocates a more global focus – rather than the focus on transfer within or between OECD countries – to draw greater attention to the coercive character of transfer.

  Excerpt source:
  Key theme: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy 2) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT 3) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **STONE, D.** (2001.) *Getting research into policy?* Paper presented to the third Annual Global Development Network Conference on 'Blending Local and Global Knowledge', Rio De Janeiro, 10th December 2001

  Bridging research and policy is predicated on the notion that there is a 'weak link' between these two elements. This **chapter investigates a number of views seeking to explain this weak link**. Often, the lack of impact of researchers is located in their **poor understanding of policy-making dynamics.** Accordingly, a **second focus** to the discussion here is upon the **policy process**. However, there are **no clear steps, strategies, tool-kits or guidelines that will guarantee successful use of research by decision-makers**. Instead, the **method and degree of 'knowledge utilisation' is shaped by a host of factors** that are peculiar to **leadership styles**, institutional **architecture and political culture** of a country or policy domain.
  KNOWLEDGE FOR DEVELOPMENT: Over the past decade, there has been an extraordinary degree of interest in the way knowledge can be used in policy development. Moreover, the pressing policy problems confronted by developing and transition countries are increasingly represented as a lack of knowledge or as difficulties in accessing knowledge. More specifically, addressing the impact or relevance of *research* to policy is a fashionable subject. Into the new millennium, the relevance of research has been recognized by a number of development agencies. **Why, at this point in time, has knowledge come to play such a central role in development questions?** There are a **number of factors**. 1) Firstly, over the past quarter decade, there has been the **withdrawal of the state from the production, financing and delivery of public services.** More **emphasis has been placed on the private sector**, the **role of civil society** and **partnerships in the delivery of development programmes**. This has necessitated development of a research and/or analytic capacity within NGOs and private contractors. This is

compounded by demands from donors and governments for improved transparency, monitoring and evaluation and dovetails with the trend towards professionalization in many NGOs. 2) **Secondly, as funding towards development assistance has declined in OECD countries, financially strapped development agencies have needed to 'reinvent' themselves in a manner commensurate with fewer resources at their disposal.** Partnerships to promote '**knowledge sharing'**, the discourse of '**knowledge for development'** or the emphasis on '**knowledge management'** and '**evidence-based policy'** is **symptomatic of funding constraints** as well as a move towards development assistance that draws upon the resources, expertise and local knowledge of target communities. 3) **Thirdly, development matters and transborder policy issues involving a high component of technical and scientific knowledge give individual experts and scholarly associations indirect entrée into policy making.** Societal and policy/political understanding of matters such as genetically modified organisms, the impact of TRIPs on developing countries, the merits of different telecommunications infrastructure, policy crises wrought by developments such as HIV/AIDS, pollution and ecological destruction rest upon (social) scientific knowledge. **Policy making increasingly relies upon the expert judgments and policy recommendations of scientists and advisors** where **elected representatives and 'generalist' bureaucrats do not have the scientific knowledge of a highly technical policy issue** and are making policy decisions in circumstances of relative uncertainty.

4) **Finally, development questions are increasingly questions of global concern that are met with responses on a multilateral basis.** However, collective action at the global level is frustrated by the lack of global institutions of global governance and regulation along with continued strength of state sovereignty. **Consequently, more informal partnerships, alliances, coalitions or regimes fill the institutional void for global public policies.** One of the binding agents, or glue, for these arrangements is the sharing of knowledge. Advances in communication technology and the transnational mobility of development professionals have made knowledge sharing more feasible. **Research is recognised as an important form of codified knowledge that is incorporated into policy deliberations.** It helps establish standards and modes of verification in service design and delivery. However, research capacity and quality remains under-developed in a number of developing countries.

Summarized versions of Stone's *Twelve Ways of Conceiving Research-Policy Dynamics.* **There are a number of different perspectives and explanations as to why research is or is not utilised in policy making.** These perspectives are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Taken together they provide a multi-faceted picture of the research-policy nexus indicating that there are many possible routes to 'bridging' research and policy. This is because the starting point, or guiding assumptions, about the nature of the problem differ dramatically :1. The problem can be defined as **a *public goods problem***, where there is an inadequate supply of policy relevant research. 2. Rather than a lack of research, the problem can be portrayed as one of a ***lack of access*** to research, data and analysis for both researchers and policy makers. 3. The problem can be defined as the ***poor policy comprehension of researchers*** towards both the policy process and how research might be relevant to this process. 4. The problem can be represented as ***ineffective communication by researchers*** of their work. 5. The problem can be identifeed as the ***ignorance of politicians*** or over-stretched bureaucrats about the existence of policy relevant research. 6. There is a tendency for ***anti-intellectualism in government*** that mitigates against the use of research in policy-making, while the policy process itself is riddled with a fear of the critical power of ideas 7. The problem can be conceived in terms of **policy makers and leaders being dismissive, unresponsive** or incapable of using research. 8. The problem can located in the ***politicisation of research***. The rhetoric of research is often one that is claims to be 'neutral', 'objective' or at least dispassionate. 9. The problem can be defined as ***societal disconnection*** of both researchers and decision-makers from each other and from those who the research is about or intended for, to the extent that effective implementation is undermined. 10. The problem can be conceived of as **not simply a question of research having a direct policy impact**, but one of broader patterns of socio-political, economic and cultural influence over the long term. 11. The problem can be defined as one of **power relations**. 12. The problem can be viewed as one of the **validity of research**, and problems relating to the question: what is knowable?

Excerpt source: Stone (main points)
Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy 3) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 4) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 5) Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity

- **STONE, D.** (2002.) "Using knowledge: the dilemmas of 'bridging research and policy'". *Compare*, 32 (3): 285-296

- **STONE, D., MAXWELL, S**. (eds). (2005.) *Global knowledge networks and international development: bridges across boundaries*. New York Taylor & Francis Routledge

- **STRIGL, A. W.** (2003.) "Science, research, knowledge and capacity building". *Environment, Development and Sustainability,* Dordrecht: 5 (1-2): 255

- **STRINGER, E. T.** (1996.) *Action research: a handbook for practitioners*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications

- **STROMSDORFER, E. W.** (1979.) "The impact of social research on public policy" In *Applied Research for Social Policy*, K. J. ARROW, C. C. ABT, & S. J. FITZSIMMONS (eds), Cambridge, MA: Abt Books

- **STRUYK, R** (2000) *Transnational Think Tank Networks: Purpose, Membership and Cohesion*. Washington DC: Urban Institute.

This short paper provides a **brief overview over issues related to think tank networks**. **Think tank networks are different from public policy networks** in that think tank networks are usually made up of organisations with more or less the same interests and fundamental views. In this respect they are **similar to epistemic communities**. Think tank networks are typically characterised by **webs of relatively stable relationships and informal interactions based on these relations**. They are also **generally non-hierarchical**, and attempt to **pool and share resources** in a mutual manner. Struyk lists **four criteria** that can be used to **classify different types of networks**: (i) **Objective**. This can be for example efficient flow of knowledge among members, or specific spheres of influence; (ii) **Incentives** for participation. The costs involved can be miniscule, or can increase as members are required to attend conferences and contribute regularly. These different types of effort required also bring different types of benefits, ranging from access to information to greater visibility and influence; (iii) **Basis for membership**. Networks can be completely open, or restricted in various ways; (iv) **Network coherence**. This refers to the degree to which the network manages to build effective working relations and a sense of community amongst its members. **Struyk goes on to apply these criteria to various existing networks**. He highlights the fact that **two thirds of the networks have a specifically regional focus**, which **may be an advantage as far as knowledge sharing and policy influence are concerned**.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy.

- **SUNDQUIST, J. L.** (1978.) "Research brokerage: the weak link" In *Knowledge and policy: The uncertain connection*, L. E. LYNN, Jr. (ed.), Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences

- **SURR, M., BARNETT, A, DUNCAN, A., SPEIGHT, M. & al.** (2002.) *Research for poverty reduction: DFID research policy paper*. DFID, 91 p.

- **SUTTON, R.** (1999.) *The policy process: an overview.* London: ODI (Overseas Development Institute) Working Paper 118, 35 p.

The **paper offers an introduction to analysis of the policy process**. It identifies and describes **theoretical approaches in political science, sociology, anthropology, international relations and management.** It then reviews **five cross-cutting themes**: a) the **dichotomy between policy-making and implementation**; b) the **management of change**, c) the **role of interest groups** in the policy process; d) **ownership of the policy process**; and e) the **narrowing of policy alternatives**. The paper concludes with a **21-point checklist of 'what makes policy happen'**. A glossary of key terms is also provided. The key argument of the paper is that **a 'linear model'** of policy-making, characterised by objective analysis of options and separation of policy from implementation**, is inadequate**. Instead, policy and policy implementation are best understood as a '**chaos of purposes and accidents'.** A **combination of concepts and tools** from different disciplines can be deployed to **put some order into the chaos, including policy narratives, policy communities, discourse analysis, regime theory, change management, and the role of street-level bureaucrats in implementation**.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key themes: Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **SWOPE, J.** (1999.) *Closing the gap: new ways of strengthening the link between educational research and decision making on educational policies*. Global Development Network (GDN)

- **TABOR, S. R. & FABER, D. C**. (1998.) *Closing the loop: from research on natural resources to policy change*. Maastricht: European Centre for Development Policy Management, Policy Management Report No. 8

- **TANGUY, L.** (1995.) "Le sociologue et l'expert: une analyse de cas". *Sociologie du travail*, 37: 457-475.

  A partir de l'examen critique d'une mission portant sur l'enseignement professionnel, **l'auteur compare systématiquement l'activité d'expertise avec le travail scientifique normal destiné à une communauté scientifique**, en attirant l'attention sur **les tensions qu'ils entretiennent**. Elle montre que les **contraintes particulières qui caractérisent l'expertise n'empêchent pas la production de connaissances**, **pour autant que les questions posées par le commanditaire soient problématisées**, que les limites d'une analyse orientée vers l'action soient identifiées et que le chercheur mobilise les références théoriques des spécialités concernées. Si les démarches et les méthodes adoptées et la manière dont les obstacles ont été franchis est explicitée, **l'expertise est susceptible de devenir un type particulier d'activité scientifique**, et devrait être reconnue comme telle.

  Excerpt source: CNRS (abstract)
  Key themes: 1) Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity 2) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 3) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy

- **TARAS, DAPHNE**, (2007.) Public Policy: Choice, Influence, Evaluation. Symposium public policy : choice, influence, evaluation. Journal of Labor Res (2007) 28:567–572

  This symposium **celebrates the entire policy-making process**, from the **initial development of a policy problem, its recognition and framing as an issue, the gathering of resources to study it, the development of research, the selection of policy choices, and recommendations, implementation plans, and evaluation**. Consider now the **four contributions to this symposium**. Each study **illustrates a different way of presenting policy and asks different questions**, at **different levels of analysis**, in **different countries by different disciplines**. Here the intent is to applaud diversity. The home disciplines are economics (Gunderson), law (Estlund), history (Logan) and labor relations within business schools (Lansbury,Wailes, and Yazbeck). The authors have diverse nationalities, with quite an international contingent of scholars (Gunderson in Canada; Estlund in the US; Logan in the UK; and Lansbury, Wailes, and Yazbeck writing from Australia). And the topics are diverse, as is evident from the summary of each contribution.

  Excerpt source: Taras (abstract)
  Key theme: 1) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **TAVARES DE ARAUJO JOSÉ, ERBER FABIO STEFANO** (1985.) Science and technology policies and the latitude principle: an application to the Brazilian case; Meeting of Experts on Social Assessment of Technologies in a Number of Developing Countries, 34p.

- **TAYLOR, B. M., ANDERSON, R. C., AU, K. H., & RAPHAEL, T. E.** (2000.) "Discretion in the translation of research to policy: a case from beginning reading". *Educational Researcher*, 29 (6): 16-26

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **TAYLOR, B., GREEN, W., PHIPPS, H. L. & FRANCES, P.** (2004.) *Missing links: connecting science with environmental policy*. Wellington, N.Z.: Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment

- **TEATER, B. A. & KONDRAT, D. C.** (2005.) "Connecting policy to practice: analyzing the variables of the Section 8 housing program policy process". *The Social Policy Journal*, 4 (3/4), 69-92

- **TEISMAN , G. R.** (2000.) "Models for research into decision-Making processes: on phases, streams, and decision-making rounds". *Public Administration,* 78 (4): 937-956.

  This article elaborates on the question of how complex decision making can be analysed. **Three conceptual models are compared**: the **phase model**, the **stream model** and the **rounds model**. Each model is **based on specific assumptions about what decision making is and how it should be analysed.** The phase model focuses on successive and distinctive stages in a process, i.e. defining a problem, searching for, choosing and implementing solutions. The stream model emphasizes concurrent streams of participants, problems and solutions, defining decision making as the connection between these streams. The rounds model combines elements of the other two models, in assuming that several actors introduce combinations of problems and solutions, and create progress through interaction**. Each model generates specific insights,** as is shown from the example of the 'Betuwe line', a railway line intended for the transport of cargo, in the Netherlands. **The phase model concentrates on decisions taken by a focal actor; the stream model focuses on the coincidental links between problems, solutions and actors; and the rounds model on the interaction between actors**.

  Excerpt source: Teisman (abstract)
  Key themes: 1) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 2) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **TERET, S.** (2001.) "Policy and science: should epidemiologists comment on the policy implications of their research?" *Epidemiology*, 12 (4), 374-375

- **TEXEIRA GONCALVES, J**. (1996.) "Politica brasileira de bem-estar: relacoes entre Estado, formuladores de politicas e clientela. Um instrumento analitico para formulacão de politicas". *Revista de Administracao Publica*, 30 (2): 71-106

- ***The handbook of research impact assessment.*** 7th ed., Arlington, Va.: Office of Naval Research, ADA-296021, May 1997

- **THE NETHERLANDS DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE RESEARCH COUNCIL RAWOO.** (2001.) *Utilization of research for development cooperation, linking knowledge production to development policy and practice*. Publication no. 21, The Hague

- **THORNTON, M.** (2004.) "Does academic publishing pass the real market test?" *Public Choice*, vol. 120, no. 1-2, p. 41-61

- **TILLY, C** (2000.) 'Introduction: Violence viewed and reviewed' *Social Research* 67(3).

  In this brief introduction, **Tilly outlines three broad approaches to explaining why people choose certain actions**: the **ideas approach**, the **behaviour approach**, and the **relations approach**. Tilly concentrates on explanations of **why people choose to use violence**, but the **three approaches are transferable to other areas as well**. 1. The **ideas approach stresses the importance of people's environment** for how they perceive the world and choose to act. **People acquire beliefs, values, rules, and goals from their environment**, and consequently try to act out various socially acquired ideals. 2. The **behaviour approach focuses on people's motives, impulses, aggressive drives, and general needs for domination, control, respect, and protection**. Some proponents of this approach base their arguments on evolutionary biology, while others refer more generally to psychological theories.

3. The **relations approach highlight interchanges between persons and groups**. They claim that **people develop their identity and choices through various relations with others**. This perspective privileges an inevitable degree of **unpredictability and creativity in people's decision-making**, since interpersonal or inter-group relations are inevitably dynamic.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy. 2) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **TIMMER, P. C.** (1998.) *Adding value through policy oriented research: reflections of a scholar practitioner*. Impact assessment discussion paper no. 4, International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), 34 p.
- **TIMMERMANS, S, MAUCK, A., GELIJNS, A. C. & BROWN, L. D.** (2005.) *Putting evidence into practice: evidence-based medicine, a unified approach*. Congers, N.Y.: Project Hope
- **TONMYR, L., DE MARCO, R., HOVDESTAD, W. E. & HUBKA, D.** (2004.) "Policy makers' perspectives on the utility of a national study of child maltreatment". *Child Maltreatment*, 9 (3): 304-308 (August 2004)
- **TOYE, J. F. J. & TOYE, R.** (2005.) *The World Bank as a knowledge agency*. Geneva: UN Research Institute for Social Development

- **TROSTLE, J., BRONFMAN, M. & LANGER, A**. (1999.) "How do researchers influence decision-MAKERS? Case studies of Mexican policies". *Health Policy And Planning*, 14 (2): 103-114 (June 1999)

Though the problems translating or applying research in policy-making are legion, solutions are rare. As **developing countries** increase their capacities to develop effective local solutions to their health problems, they **confront the research/policy dilemma**. Yet few descriptive studies of research-policy links can be found from developing countries, and the **relevance of European and North American models and data is questionable**. We report the results of a **descriptive study from Mexico** of the relationship between health researchers and policy in four vertical programmes (AIDS, cholera, family planning, immunization.) **We interview 67 researchers and policy-makers** from different institutions and levels of responsibility. We analysed interviewee responses **looking for factors that promoted or impeded exchanges between researchers and policy-makers**. These were, in turn, divided into emphases on **content, actors, process and context**. Many of the promoting factors resembled findings from studies in industrialized countries. Some important **differences** across the four programmes, which also distinguish them from industrialized country programmes, **included extent of reliance on formal communication channels**, **role of the mass media** in **building social consensus** or **creating discord**, **levels of social consensus**, r**ole of foreign donors and extent of support for biomedical versus social research**.
We **recommend various ways to increase the impact of research on health policy-making in Mexico**. Some of the largest challenges include the fact that **researchers are but one of many interest groups**, and research but one input among many equally legitimate elements to be considered by policy makers. Another important challenge in Mexico is the relatively **small role played by the public in policy-making**. Further democratic changes in Mexico may be the most important incentive to increase the use of research in policy-making.

Excerpt source: Trostle et al (abstract)
Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **UHEREK, Z.** (2004.) "Use of social science research on migration policy in the Czech Republic". *International Social Science Journal*, Paris: Mar 2004. Vol. 56, Iss. 1, p. 101 (13 p.)

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **UK NATIONAL AUDIT OFFICE**; (2003.) *Getting the evidence: using research in policy making*. London: National Audit Office. REPORT BY THE COMPTROLLER AND AUDITOR GENERAL HC 586-I Session 2002-2003: 16 April 2003

  This report presents the results of a value for money examination of how government departments commission research and how well that research is being used to improve service delivery and develop policies. The aims of the study were to assess how government departments are procuring research against the background of the Office of Science and Technology's programme of rolling reviews of department research, as recommended in the "Cross-Cutting Review of Science and Research" and in the government's science strategy, "Investing in Innovation". The **report is based upon an assessment of research activities in three government departments** and an **international review comparing how five other countries procure research**, as well as discussions with other departments and stakeholders. The **report is structured around three different stakeholder perspectives** – **research managers, research providers and research users** - and draws out **wider messages about the management, provision, dissemination and use of research.** The report makes a **number of observations** (**on strategy, on statistics, on commissioning , on quality assurance, on knowledge transfer, on evaluation**) that are applicable to research managers, research providers and research users, and we have **identified areas of best practice** based on innovative examples of how departments manage research. The **report outlines key findings and conclusions.** In summary, these are: 1) **Departments**, with the support of the Office of Science and Technology, **need to be clear about their strategic research aims and establish coherent systems for procuring research - including its commissioning, quality assurance and use**. 2) Departments, with the support of the Office of Science and Technology, nee**d to be proactive and innovative in the way they disseminate and use research findings**. 3) Departments, with the support of the Office of Science and Technology, **need to identify and share best practice and thus improve the effectiveness of commissioning, managing and using research.** This report makes **recommendations** for the Office of Science and Technology, departments who procure research and the Office for National Statistics. Part One explains the motivation for the study and our methods. The remainder of the report is structured around three different stakeholder perspectives - research managers (Part Two), research providers (Part Three) and research users (Part Four). In addition we have published a supporting paper, "An international review on Governments' research procurement strategies", comparing how five other countries procure research, which is also available on the NAO (www.nao.gov.uk) and RAND Europe (www.randeurope.org) websites. The **report identifies good practice that might be followed by departments that are involved in commissioning and managing research and ensuring that it is used effectively to inform service delivery**.

  Excerpt source: NAO (parts of foreword, executive summary)
  Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy 3) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 4) Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity 5) Knowledge Management 6) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **UK NATIONAL AUDIT OFFICE**; (2003.) An international review on Governments' research procurement strategies. A paper in support of Getting the evidence: Using research in policy making. London: National Audit Office

  This report presents **the results of an international review of how the governments of five countries in North America and Europe procure and manage research to improve service delivery and policy development**. It complements the National Audit Office report, "Getting the evidence: Using research in policy making", which provides an assessment of the research activities of UK government departments and examines **how research is used to improve service delivery and inform policy making in this country**. **2** The main objectives of this paper are twofold. First, **it aims to describe how research and development is commissioned**, **managed and used in a number of different countries**. Second, **it provides a basis for examining the research and development activities of the UK within an international context** and for learning if and how innovative elements from other countries may be incorporated into or modified to suit the UK research and development model. Unlike "Getting the evidence: Using research in policy making", the **international review covers science based activities as well as research commissioned by Government departments for policy making**. This is because these two elements of publicly funded research are not always as easily

distinguishable as they are in the UK. **3** Countries were selected according to several criteria. First, only countries with sizeable investments in research and development (at least exceeding 1.75% of GDP) were considered. Second, in order to examine the effects of institutional context on research and development activities and outcomes, countries were selected with a range of government structures. Finally, in order to present comparisons relevant to the UK context, selected countries did not differ fundamentally from the UK on any of the previous criteria. **4 Application of the selection criteria led to a comparative examination of the following five countries: Canada, Finland, Germany, the Netherlands and the United States (US).** Information gathering mainly comprised desk research supplemented by additional, targeted interviews. The **organisation and analysis of the information was based on a conceptual framework and issues that emerged during the course of the overall study**. **5** The executive summary first presents the main findings from the international review. It then briefly reviews the significant similarities and differences in research and development practices among the selected countries and between the countries and the UK. First, **research and development investment level is summarised, then priority setting and coordinating processes are compared**, followed by **selecting and commissioning practices** and, finally, **evaluation approaches and research transfer are examined.** More details on the practices of each individual country are provided according to the same structure in the subsequent chapters.

MAIN FINDINGS : The main findings from the international review are as follows: 1) Government **departments in the selected countries struggle with the complexity of how best to determine research priorities and set appropriate research strategies**. New organisations and structures emerge to cope with these complexities, some moving towards centralisation and concentration, some towards decentralisation. Either way, these changes aim to stimulate new ways for departments to think about research and development and policymaking, to prioritise research decisions and to set research strategies. 2) The **need for more and improved information systems to provide comprehensive overviews of diverse research and development commissioning practices and options is apparent in the selected countries.** Ideally, such information systems could serve several important objectives by maintaining and sharing information for analysis, thus improving coordination activities and increasing transparency. 3) **Evaluation of the quality of the research process is well established. However, there is a strong and developing emphasis on evaluation to encompass research relevance and value for money**, as the link between research results and policy formulation increasingly becomes the focus of attention. As yet, obvious models or practices that support the link are not readily available. Similar findings emerged from the UK-based study of research and development transfer into practice. 4) **As in the UK, government departments and research organisations in the selected countries strive to provide value for money in terms of research output**. However, there is widespread understanding of the need for "bluesky" research that brings no, or little, short-term return on research investments, but is essential for long-term development. Balancing these often competing demands proves difficult. 5) **In Canada, the "Linkage and Exchange" model provides an interesting example of research implementation in the health services policy arena**. It proposes that involving eventual end users at all stages of the research process will result in an increased impact of research on policymaking.

Excerpt source: NAO (Executive summary and main findings), institutional programme
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Management 2) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 3) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 4) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **UNDP** (Programme for Accountability and Transparency. Bratislava Regional Office). (2003.) *Thinking the unthinkable: from thought to policy: the role of think tanks in shaping government strategy: experiences from Central and Eastern Europe*. Bratislava : UNDP

- **UNESCO,** (1977.) "Expert meeting on the role of social sciences policies." Final report. Paris, 25 November 1977. Réunion d'experts sur le rôle de la politique des sciences sociales. Rapport final. 9p. annexes.

- **UNESCO,** (1998.) "Rapport mondial sur la science." Paris, UNESCO-Elsevier, 1998. 300p. Hirschon Weiss, Carol: Research policy linkages: how much influence does social science research have? World Social Science Report 1999. Paris, UNESCO-Elsevier, 1999. p. 194-205 ; Kazancigil, Ali;Makinson, David: Les Sciences sociales dans le monde; Whittaker, Elvi : Towards the ethical practice of social science. World Social Science Report 1999. Paris, UNESCO-Elsevier, 1999. p. 213-219.

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **UNESCO,** (1999.) "Round table on scientific expertise and public decision-making in the Twenty-first Century**.**" 30e Session General Conference (30C/INF.47), 9 November 1999.

- **UNESCO,** (1999.) "Ethics and the Responsibility of Science**.**" Background Paper. ICSU's Standing Committee on Responsibility and Ethics in Science (SCRES) 1999.

- **UNESCO,** (2000.) Main ideas from conference: "Social Science and Governance" (Zeist, 20-21 March 2000). See also Henke Roger: International Conference on "Social science and governance" Final Report. UNESCO/MOST, Zeist, March 2000.19p

  Research is only one of the factors that influence policy. Characteristics of research as positively influencing its use by policy makers: High methodological quality; Clear action implications, research that points towards something policy can change, providing directions for the next step to take; Synthesizing research, policy favors "one-handed" research that summarizes the weight of the evidence. **Ways for scientists to improve the influence of their research:** Address issues that policy makers care about; look at facets that policy can influence; Realize that policy issues may change during the study and be prepared to adapt the research ;Have intermediary linkages with the policy world; Include policy makers in the research process, better quality research; use language that communicates; Improve dissemination; Collaborate on pushing the idea of evidence based policy, have realistic expectations about what research can accomplish. **Issues at stake when discussing policy- research linkages are different for third words contexts:** Practical and conceptual relevance of social science research should not be limited to the collaboration of social scientists with the policy world; NGO's, media, interests groups not only feed policy but also the general public. Co-operation between researchers, policy makers and stakeholders in policies is not self evident; it needs an explanation of the basic premises, rules and tools, practice of such co-operation is determined by institutional settings**. In the triangular relation connecting politicians, researchers and stakeholders, each should stick to the tasks attributed to him/her**. Nonetheless, these three actors have to play on a "common ground" where are established the kinds of research that are to be led: They are to be both directly policy relevant as well as adding to the social science knowledge bank. Also, there is a need for a relationship of mutual trust and shared responsibility (common and understandable language, common priorities, including all relevant interest into the design of research and policy). **The factors that promote long term interactive relationships, on the research side are**: Good timing of the presentation of results; translation of these results into policy and common terms; willingness to take pressing policy problems as the starting point for research questions and to cross disciplinary boundaries. As for the policy side, there needs to be a willingness to accept the warning role of social science.

  Excerpt source: De Kochko, Unesco internal document.
  Key themes: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy. 2) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 3) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **UNESCO,** (2000.) Main ideas from conference: "World Conference on Science: Debt relief for Science and Technology" (March 2000). See also Debt Relief for Science and Technology. Proposal and guidelines for stakeholders. UNESCO, 2000, 25p.

  Why science and technology is essential for the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries: S&T is critical for poverty reduction. Poor countries are in need for **scientific knowledge and technological knowhow to generate local solutions to their pressing problems**. It's the necessary input for economic development; it can help the traditional sectors to identify appropriate technologies to improve productivity. S&T helps poor countries to come out of isolation and marginalization. Technology can also help countries to leapfrog directly to more sophisticated technology. Countries cannot rely forever for development on producing primary goods or low quality manufactured goods. Every country has its own peculiar set of impediments to specialized knowledge and understanding to resolve them. **Countries should adopt best practices for advancing innovation in a manner best suited to their needs and resources**. Specific **policy instruments should be developed taking into account global economic and technological changes.** Science policy should promote the incorporation of knowledge into social and productive activities.

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

Excerpt source: De Kochko, Unesco internal document.
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance
2) Evidence-based Policy / New Modes of Governance

- **UNESCO,** (2001.) Main ideas from "Lisbon Declaration (8 November 2001) *launched by the OECD but taken up by UNESCO"*

  Social science knowledge is a powerful resource for understanding uncertainties and risks in our world. Governments should make a systematic use of social sciences as providers of expertise on societal issues as well as of citizens' participation in governance. **Social Sciences should make every effort to further open up to society; strengthen their capacities for interdisciplinary cooperation and foster quality assessment. In order to achieve these objectives social sciences need to articulate policy relevant work with reflexive and critical dimension**. Scientists need to participate more than ever to public debates as well in decision making. They also need to open up for true internationalization (attention to ethical issues, narrow N/S &E/W gaps, eliminating inequalities, multilinguism). Universities should encourage interdisciplinary; Governments should give adequate resources and due recognition the key role social sciences have to play in the acquisition of knowledge and understanding of society and in contributing to all policy making processes. Finally, International organizations should stimulate social science programmes and participatory research on problems of global interest.

  Excerpt source: De Kochko, Unesco internal document.
  Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy. 3) Social uses that are made of social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity

- **UNESCO,** (2002.) Main ideas from conference: "International Conference on Social Science and Social Policy in the 21st Century" (8-11 December 2002) see also Cetto, Ana Maria (ed): Science for the Twenty-first Century. A new commitment. Proceeding of the World Conference on Science. London, Banson-UNESCO 547p.

  Policy makers need the benefit of social science research which offers findings that are clearly articulated and effectively disseminated. MOST programme has a goal "to promote a better use of the social sciences by decision- makers and enhancing research-policy linkages". Social science research should also contribute to meet the UN MDGs to implement the outcomes of the other major UN conferences. **Promoting social sciences worldwide by involving different partners. social scientist can identify the paths down which policy- makers must proceed to deal with challenges in a more knowledge based style.**

  Excerpt source: De Kochko, Unesco internal document.
  Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Knowledge Management 3) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy.

- **UNESCO,** (2002.) "Harnessing Science to Society." Analytical report to governments and international partners on the follow-up of the World Conference on Science. Paris, UNESCO-ICSU 2002 41p.

- **UNESCO,** (2003.) Main ideas from "ISSC: Social Science at the Crossroads" (Vienna 9-11 December 2002) see also KOSINSKI, Leszek and PAWLIK, Kurt (ed): Social Science at the Crossroads. Proceedings of the International Conference on Social Science and Social Policy in the 21st Century. ISSC, 2003. 119p.

  Pierre Sané states that the world is changing fast. This is why critical observations of social transformations and in-depth assessments of current trends in social behavior have become so crucial. MOST was established as an intergovernmental social science programme of UNESCO. The programme has strengthened the role of the social sciences within the Organization. It has enabled

UNESCO to support the formation of a number of research networks across the world to address problems of multiculturalism, urban processes, migration, governance, and social exclusion. It's current goals are: 1) To foster international, interdisciplinary, and comparative research to generate new knowledge that is also policy relevant; 2) To promote better use of the social sciences by decision-makers and enhance research-policy linkages; 3) To build capacity in the areas of the programme, especially in developing countries. **The link between research and policy, is what he personally finds the most pertinent aspect of the MOST Programme in order to carry out its tasks effectively, UNESCO needs to work with non-governmental organizations like the ISSC**. The UNESCO-ISSC cooperation under the current Framework Agreement is focusing *inter alia* on priority issues for international social science research such as sustainable development, human rights, poverty eradication, urban problems and multi-ethnicity, and ethics of science. **Information technologies are expected to build new political structures, which enable direct political and social participation and more diverse representation**.

Excerpt source: De Kochko, Unesco internal document.
Key themes: Unesco Most programme, International Social Science Council, Bridging research and policy.

- **UNESCO**, (2006.) Main ideas from forum on HE, R&K "Innovational Workshop on the Comparative Analysis of NRS" April 2006.

  In any given society, research takes place under a variety of conditions and institutional arrangements, some of which are associated with the system of higher education, some of which are not. Some of these arrangements are under public, some under non-governmental, and some under private auspices. **Similarly variable are the organizational arrangements for conducting research (research governance), the staffing of research tasks (research personnel), the financing of research (research funding), and the performance of research systems (research output).** The entirety of these arrangements makes up a country's research system and could benefit from being studied in systemic terms, i.e., in terms that focus on **the linkages, interaction and synergies between the different components of a national research system**. The **benefit of studying research systems** as systems lies in its holistic nature and thus in the possibility of ascertaining how one part of the system relates to another part and to the system as a whole, and how the conditions under which the research system operates determine its outcome*.*

  Excerpt source: De Kochko, Unesco internal document.
  Key themes: Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **UNESCO,** (2007.) Main ideas from conference : "Social Development: From research to policy action" (Nairobi, 22-24 January 2007)

  Policy makers need enhanced links with research because in their absence policies are unlikely to attain their objectives. The research policy nexus is an encounter between processes that respond to different dynamics: it requires serious attention to questions of accountability and empowerment within the process of producing knowledge for policy. Governments, academics and civil society should work together to establish new modes of governance that enhance rather than dilute political responsibility.
  The knowledge appropriate for accountable policies that actually work is necessarily co-produced by governments, academics and civil society. By discussing how to establish innovative social policy partnerships and how to make them work, it should be possible to establish a better platform for exchange between actors and between regions, to clarify institutional best practices and, by preparing appropriate publications to disseminate lessons to wider audiences.
  Rethinking social policy and social development requires relevant knowledge to be produced and to be made available to policy-makers in forms they can understand and use. It is common for research to deal with questions that are of no policy interest and for policy-makers to ask questions that researchers do not recognize as valid at all.
  The research-policy nexus can flourish only if it is generally accepted that social science can contribute usefully to a better society. The main challenge for social science is to be at once *more social* and *more scientific*. **Policy failure tends to correlate with an excessive focus on mid-range, broad-brush approaches that are neither sufficiently global nor sufficiently local.** Enhancing international research capacities calls for: 1) innovative procedures to ensure technical comparability and quality in large-scale international collaborative projects; 2) acceptance of the inevitable gap between social science questions and policy questions, along with appropriate spaces of mediation to enable such questions to cross-fertilize; 3) creating synergy between existing, primarily national, research

programming and funding mechanisms; 4) recognition that expertise is neither subversive of nor subordinate to politics. **"Evidence-based" policy specifies what constitutes "wise" and "effective" use:** the policy process needs to be open to knowledge produced in a manner that is at once independent, rigorous and relevant. Evidence can only be persuasive, not conclusive. **It is technocratic to view the research-policy "nexus" in terms of bilateral relations between academics and policy makers.** Expert-led governance is likely to be practically inoperative. Social development objectives depend ultimately on ordinary people. A more satisfactory governance model must therefore take seriously the multifaceted role of civil society within the research-policy nexus. **The policy process needs the active participation of the people affected by policy in its implementation.** Without the organized structures of civil society, this is highly unlikely to be attainable. Civil society associations as knowledge producers in their own right should not be underestimated. **A viable research-policy nexus is a triangular relationship contributing to the co-production of the knowledge necessary for effective action.** More effective procedures rely on the existence of "hybrid" fora, bringing together researchers, policy makers and the whole range of social actors to formulate questions and to ensure wide circulation of available knowledge, such fora should not be subjected to strict sectoral demarcations.
Achieving participation and democratic scrutiny in practice is undoubtedly harder than getting academics and policy-makers talking to each other. But solutions can be imagined and good practices do exist

Excerpt source: De Kochko, Unesco internal document.
Key themes: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy. 2) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 3) Evidence-based Policy / New Modes of Governance 4) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 5) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

- **UNESCO MOST (MANAGEMENT OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS),** (1999.) MOST Discussion Paper N°40 (1999.)The comparative social science approach. Outline for a debate on methods and objectives based on three MOST projects carried out by international networks of researchers Cynthia Ghorra-Gobin. (also available in French)
- **UNESCO MOST (MANAGEMENT OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS),** (1999.) MOST Discussion Paper N°37 (1999.) Amérique latine : Les discours techniques et savants de la ville dans la politique urbaine H. Rivière d'Arc, J. Bitoun, M. S. Martins Bresciani, H. Caride, D. Hiernaux, A. Novick, S. Jatahy Pesavento. (French only)
- **UNESCO, MOST (MANAGEMENT OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION),** (1999.) "Amérique latine : Les discours techniques et savants de la ville dans la politique urbaine" Rivière d'Arc, H. Bitoun, J., Martins Bresciani, M. S., Caride, H., Hiernaux, D., Novick, A., Jatahy Pesavento, Document de discussion MOST N° 37. 1999.
- **UNESCO, MOST (MANAGEMENT OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION),** (1999.) "Science, Economics and Democracy: Selected Issues" Foray, Dominique and Kazancigil, Ali MOST Discussion Paper N°42, 1999.
- **UNESCO, MOST (MANAGEMENT OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION),** (1999.) "The relationship between research and drug policy in the United States. " Laniel, Laurent. MOST Discussion Paper N°44, 1999.
- **UNESCO, MOST (MANAGEMENT OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION),** (1999.) Session IV of the MOST Intergovernmental Council (IGC), 1999. Panel on Social Sciences and Decision-making: the role of the MOST Programme (Jean-Eric Aubert, Luk van Langenhove, Achille Mbembe, and Alejandra Toreno Toscano) Rapport final, annexe N°III du Rapport final. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0011/001169/116957eo.pdf

UNESCO, Scientific and Cultural Organization
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **UNESCO, MOST (MANAGEMENT OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION),** (2000.) "The interaction between social science research and policy under the conditions of societal transformation." Genov Nikolai, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. Project coordinator of the UNESCO-MOST Research Project "Personal and Institutional Strategies for Coping with Transformation Risks in Central and Eastern Europe"(1997-2000).

   I **collected the experience I am going to share as project coordinator of the UNESCO-MOST Research Project "Personal and Institutional Strategies for Coping with Transformation Risks in Central and Eastern Europe"**(1997-2000). From the very beginning, **the project was intended to be truly interdisciplinary, internationally comparative and policy oriented.** In fact, in **the course of the project implementation cognitive resources from economics, sociology, political sciences and sciences of culture were systematically used**. At various stages and with a variety of tasks social scientists from Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Poland, Romania, Russia and Slovenia participated in it. **The policy relevance of the project was a strategic issue. It was intentionally included in the conceptual framework of the project**. The **design and the implementation of the research tasks were closely coordinated with local policy makers**. A series of **internal reports and book publications made the practically oriented results of the project public** (See Genov, 1998; Genov, 1999a; Genov, 1999b). The research results were used in communal decision-making. The **experience of the project coordinator was utilized in the preparation of national decisions and in international activities** – for instance, in the preparation of the official position of the Council of Europe for the World Summit for Social Development (Copenhagen+5, Geneva, 2000). **The experience from the research project was disseminated by the channels of teaching at several universities, the EU Socrates Project "Transformations in a Comparative European Perspective" as well at the first UNESCO-MOST Summer School** "International Comparative Research Programmes in the Social Sciences (Sofia, 2000).

   Excerpt source: Genov Nikolai (introduction)
   Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **UNESCO MOST (MANAGEMENT OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS**), (2001.) Programa MOST-Universidad de Harvard: Factores que mejoran la utilización de las investigaciones para la política social. Estudio de Caso Uruguay. Carol Weiss.

   El **artículo centra su reflexión en torno a los factores que mejoran la utilización del conocimiento en Ciencias Sociales para la formulación de la política social en Uruguay**. Esta cuestión general se aplica al **caso particular de los Observatorios**. Se trata de instrumentos implementados en organismos públicos uruguayos con el cometido de generar conocimiento sistemático y útil para la toma de decisiones. Concretamente se estudiarán dos Observatorios: el Observatorio de Mercado de Trabajo (Dirección Nacional de Empleo, Ministerio de Trabajo y Seguridad Social) y el Proyecto Observatorio Cultural de Montevideo (Departamento de Cultura, Intendencia Municipal de Montevideo - IDES, Instituto de Investigación y Desarrollo). **A través del estudio se busca responder a la pregunta de si estos particulares dispositivos institucionales constituyen un instrumento real de generación de conocimiento y si contribuyen a la toma de decisiones por parte de los gestores públicos.** La pregunta central que guía este Estudio es **si la existencia de estos Observatorios ha producido cambios en el diseño, implementación y evaluación de Políticas Públicas Sociales en los sectores específicos** (Empleo, Cultura) y, si lo ha hecho, cuáles han sido.

   Excerpt source: Luis Carrizo, Ana Laura Rivoir (summary)
   Key themes: 1) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 2) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 3) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 4) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy

- **UNESCO, MOST (MANAGEMENT OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION),** (2001.) Session V of the MOST Intergovernmental Council (IGC), 2001. Scientists and policy makers towards a new partership. Keynote address by Kenneth WILTSHIRE Chercheurs et décideurs : pour un nouveau partenariat. Allocution prononcée devant le Conseil intergouvernemental de gestion et transformations sociales, programme MOST. Rapport final, annexe N°II. UNESCO, 2001. p.19-39. (http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001233/123349e.pdf

  Teaching public policy in a university, especially at the postgraduate level, provides a unique vantage point to observe the educational journey followed by many scientists, particularly natural scientists. Those with ingenuity discover before too long that the economists are over-riding the scientists, because the scientific innovations they have proposed are not considered economic – so their next step is to do an economics degree. Within a short space of time they learn that the economists are actually beholden to the administrators because the scientific proposal is valid, it is economic, but there is not enough in the budget for it, or it cannot be addressed in the context of a corporate or strategic plan – so they do a degree in administration or management. Before too long the reality finally hits them that i**t is the policy makers/politicians who are trumping the administrators because the proposal has scientific validity, is economic, and can be administratively accommodated, but will not win votes (or may even lose votes) for the government of the day – so finally, it is out to the campus again to undertake a degree in public policy.** I have never been sure about the next step in this process – I suspect it is probably a divinity degree! This anecdote is highly pertinent to the potential scientist/policy-maker partnership because, in these study patterns, the learning journey from the world of science to the world of policy is very instructive. There is a spectrum, a pathway. F**rom science to policy is a continuum from the narrow and deep to the broad and shallow, from the impersonal to the personal, from the exact to the inexact, the predictable to the unpredictable, from the closed to the open system, from the world of facts to the world of values.** Most of all, it is a journey, in search of the **locus of power in a human environment**, where the **lessons of science are only one input into the decision making process**, **no matter how overwhelming the scientific evidence may be**, or **how persuasive the accompanying arguments**. To **explore the framework for this partnership let us consider the world of science, then the world of policy-making**, and then the **interface between them**, as well as the interface between the leading practitioners who inhabit these worlds. For it is a dichotomy and we need to **understand the elements of that dichotomy before we can explore the potential for partnership.**

  Excerpt source: Wiltshire (introduction ISSJ)
  Key themes: 1) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 2) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 3) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance

- **UNESCO, MOST (MANAGEMENT OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION),** (2001.) Session V of the MOST Intergovernmental Council (IGC), 2001. Panel on "Research-Policy interactions from the perspective of the MOST Programme: François Hainard, Charly Gabriel Mbock, Nikolai Genov and Wanda Capeller Paris, UNESCO, 2001. p.41-61. (http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001233/123349e.pdf

- **UNESCO MOST (MANAGEMENT OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS).** (2002.) *Bridging research and policy: MOST annual report 2001* (Un Pont entre la recherche et la prise de décision: rapport annuel MOST 2001; Un Puente entre la investigación y las políticas: informe anual MOST 2001). 77 p., illus., map., SHS.03/CONF.201/3; SHS.2003/CONF.201/CLD.3

  Le Rapport annuel 2001 du Programme pour la gestion des transformations sociales (MOST) contient des informations sur les nouvelles orientations des travaux de recherche et les recommandations à l'adresse des décideurs ; y sont également présentées les **différentes activités de MOST concernant les sociétés multiculturelles et les migrations internationales, l'aménagement urbain, la mondialisation, la gouvernance et la durabilité**. Les réseaux MOST de

recherche et de formulation des politiques analysent la **relation entre les sociétés multiculturelles et les migrations internationales**, générant des connaissances et des recommandations de politique générale sur la cohésion sociale et les droits citoyens des groupes migrants au sein de telles sociétés. En ce qui concerne **l'aménagement urbain et la gouvernance**, **l'accent est mis sur l'émergence de villes socialement et écologiquement viables** ainsi que sur la revitalisation socioéconomique des centres historiques dans les régions côtières. Au **chapitre de la mondialisation**, on étudie **les politiques et les mécanismes institutionnels qui contribueraient à rendre la gouvernance mondiale plus transparente et participative**, de façon que la mondialisation profite à tous les pays et à tous les groupes sociaux, en parvenant à mieux concilier la recherche de l'efficacité économique et la volonté de **justice redistributive** - deux impératifs souvent contradictoires. **La valeur ajoutée du programme MOST réside dans le fait qu'il poursuit, au sein de chacun de ses réseaux et projets, un double objectif: favoriser la recherche endogène à long terme et fournir base de connaissances pour la formulation des politiques**. Parallèlement, le programme s'attache à promouvoir la **coopération entre spécialistes en sciences sociales du Nord et du Sud** pour une recherche multilatérale véritablement internationale, dans laquelle **tous les partenaires sont associés, sur un pied d'égalité, au travail de conceptualisation et d'élaboration**. Dans ce contexte, le **renforcement des capacités scientifiques et institutionnelles est l'une des priorités fondamentales pour MOST**. Toute la question est de savoir si les activités menées ont une **incidence sur la production du savoir et la formulation des politiques** et contribuent à les influencer. **Un tel impact est difficile à évaluer sur le plan quantitatif et, a fortiori, sur le plan qualitatif.** Toutefois on observe **certaines retombées**, qu'il s'agisse du renforcement des infrastructures et des institutions, du développement des capacités méthodologiques ou encore de la participation des réseaux MOST à la formulation et à l'évaluation des politiques : **c'est ce que nous sommes attachés à démontrer dans le présent rapport.** MOST a grandi très vite et est devenu **l'un des cinq grands programmes scientifiques de l'UNESC0**, les quatre autres portant sur l'écologie, la géologie, l'hydrologie et l'océanographie, respectivement. Tous entretiennent des liens étroits afin de favoriser la recherche et les politiques centrées sur le développement durable. Tous participent en outre activement à la **coopération inter institutions à l'échelle de l'ensemble du système des Nations Unies** sur les **questions relatives à la politique sociale et au développement**. MOST travaille avec de **multiples partenaires** aux **niveaux national, régional et international, notamment les grandes universités, les ministères de la recherche et les conseils nationaux de la recherche en sciences sociales**, les organisations qui s'occupent de sciences sociales telles que le **Conseil international des sciences sociales (CISS), ainsi que CODESRIA en Afrique, CLACSO et FLACSO en Amérique Latine, AASSREC en Asie, et différents organismes des nations Unies tels que le PNUD, le PNUCID et l'Université des Nations Unies**. . En **2002**, MOST fera l'objet d'une **évaluation externe** qui permettra de dresser le bilan de ses réalisations sur la période 1994-2001 et de réfléchir aux activités futures. Dans un monde caractérisé de façon croissante par la trans-nationalisation, lai complexité et l'incertitude, les sciences sociales sont plus que jamais nécessaires pour cerner, les transformation sociales et les défis à venir, les comprendre et y faire face. Nous sommes certains que dans la seconde phase de ses travaux, qui s'étendra sur la période 2002-2009, MOST continuera d'offrir un cadre de coopération utile pour les chercheurs en sciences sociales et les décideurs dans le monde entier.

Excerpt source: Ali Kazancigil (message du secrétaire exécutif, avant propos)
Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance

- **UNESCO MOST (MANAGEMENT OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS).** (2003.) *Research-policy linkages: MOST annual report 2002; Working document* (Les Liens entre la recherche et l'élaboration des politiques: rapport annuel 2002 du programme MOST, document de travail; Un Puente entre la investigación y las políticas: MOST reporte anual 2002, documento de trabajo). 22 p. SHS.03/CONF.201/4

This report presents ongoing activities within the MOST Programme for 2002. It offers **policy guidance and research recommendations** based on this year's achievements. The title of this foreword interprets **the Programme's key objective**, notably to function as a **bridge from *research* to *policy* to *practice***. As Executive Secretary a.i. of the MOST programme, I herald the achievements of this programme over its past decade. My duty is to look to the future of this programme, so as to ensure its relevance within the international community. I therefore **wish to recall two principles embedded within UNESCO's mandate**: - the *first* is that UNESCO is the UN Agency with a constitutional **mandate for developing, promoting and fostering the importance of economic, social, and human science research and teaching**; - the *second,* **is that there is a need to make known the assets of social and human science research for the design of policies that promote democracy,**

the eradication of poverty, the respect for human rights and the drive for social equality. Accompanying these objectives is the **necessity to design projects that strengthen the teaching of social and human science disciplines world-wide**. After reviewing the numerous accomplishments to date by the MOST Programme, the importance of centering the Programme's thrust around the quest for bridging efficiently research, policy and practice (as suggests the title of this foreword) cannot be sufficiently stressed. Following the in-depth consultations and debates concerning *MOST's* eight-year evaluation (2002), the retooled programme should operate as a **better-structured and coherent framework which emphasizes the policy and social research interface as its distinctive feature and major *raison d'être***. The post- Johannesburg context calls for tackling the sustainability of social transformations. This implies action at normative, analytical and strategic/political level and redefines the MOST label accordingly: **"Moving towards Sustainable Transformations"** (without changing the acronym). Existing MOST networks shall be tapped for research, **capacity-building and identification/dissemination of best practices, to yield proper insights into the use of social science in evidence-based policies and to experiment with new intermediary set-ups/institutions**. This entails harnessing the skills amongst government representatives, academics, and civil society representatives who use or produce research on key social issues. **The MOST Programme should become a platform for assisting research councils, universities and development NGOs in translating the results of their research efforts into sustainable policy options**. As you read these pages, you will notice that the **research programme is driven primarily, but not exclusively, by the corpus of social and human science disciplines**. It is also obvious that the natural and basic sciences, environmental sustainability, educational science, architecture and archaeology intrinsically accompany the projects. The results – either preliminary, medium term, or final, are embedded in concerns of human rights, traditional knowledge and the need to focus on particularly vulnerable groups, such as children, youth and women. **The projects thus provide the international community with an interdisciplinary richness that transcends traditional academic disciplinary barriers - a *sine qua non* for addressing today's multifaceted societal problems**. We invite the international scientific community to continue to support the MOST Programme so as to further understand, and cope with social transformations in a changing world.

Excerpt source: Timothée Ngakoutou (executive secretary, foreword)
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance

- **UNESCO MOST (MANAGEMENT OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS**), Working Group, Articles : « Rapports entre la recherche, la politique et la gouvernance » (publication en préparation). Coordination : G.Solinís et C.S.Milani.

- **UNESCO MOST (MANAGEMENT OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS),** (2005.) *Management of Social Transformations Programme: MOST 2*. UNESCO, SHS.2005/CONF.205/CLD/3; SHS-05/CONF.205/5, 25 p.

- **UNESCO MOST (MANAGEMENT OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS),** (2005.) "Evidence-based policy research: critical review of some international programmes on the relationship between social science research and policy-making." By Carlos R.S Milani, Federal University of Bahia, Brazil. Policy Papers / 18.

The report has two main objectives. Firstly, to **critically present current programmes implemented by international organizations**, which **seek** to **enhance the interconnections between social scientific research and policy**. Secondly, to highlight a series of critical issues with regards to the **nature of the linkages between the two domains**. This double venture and the debate it provokes ultimately aim to **enable the MOST Secretariat to carve out its own niche in relation to other major organizations working in this field**. The first part proceeds to offer an empirical overview of the different ways that international multilateral organizations (**United Nations University, the European Union, the World Bank, and OECD) build bridges between social scientific research and policy**. Via this examination the paper reaches the conclusion that what one largely deduces from these ventures is that they **are based on a rather positivist social scientific vision**. Hence they, more often than not, **lead to** (with varying degrees) a rather c**onformist understanding of the link between the domains of research and policy** (i.e. **the emphasis is on evidence based research – with a strong quantitative dimension – providing solutions to problems**). In the second part, the MOST Policy Paper via an exploration of the complex links between politics and social scientific knowledge convincingly argues that **the aspiration to universal applicability** (and by extension to an ultimately benevolent problem solving character) **on the part of evidence based policy making is problematic**.

Consequently, the author suggests that **alternative social scientific perspectives are legitimate** and that the accumulation of scientific evidence that, nevertheless, does not address conditions of unequal distribution and/or disempowerment will not lead to significant social improvements. ***It is possible to have bad evidence-based policy making if the evidence used is biased, flawed or incomplete***. *One could also say that, depending on the purposes of data collection,* ***evidence may serve unfair and unjust policy objectives***. *Statistical data as well as cartography are "texts", and may be skilfully controlled and technically manipulated. (p. 45)* The text promotes a vision of a critical and engaged social science that problematizes current policy practices and visions and, thus creates the possibility for social transformation: ***"... research for policy is not so much about providing answers as about changing the way questions are understood,*** *so that people (researchers and policy-makers, but other publics too) can begin to think differently, thus* ***critically building the contours and contents of social problems"***. (p. 49) On the basis of this discussion, **a series of research questions are opened up which could guide the work of MOST and the methodology it wishes to create and promote.** These fall, mostly, in **two categories**: Questions that deal with the **historical trajectory of the institutionalisation of instrumental social scientific research in international organisations and national research-policy set ups**. And questions that pertain to the **policy implications of a new, more critical, problem building research-policy paradigm** (e.g. a new role for politicians, the inclusion of civil society in the making of decisions, creating a public sphere for the dissemination of social scientific results and preoccupations which can thus reach a wider public).

Excerpt source: Milani (executive summary)
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Evidence-based Policy / New Modes of Governance 3) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy

- **UNESCO, MOST (MANAGEMENT OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION),** (2005) "Social Science and Social Policy: From National Dilemmas to Global Opportunities" Richard E. Lee, William J. Martin, Heinz R. Sonntag, Peter J. Taylor, Immanuel Wallerstein and Michael Wieviorka

  SOCIAL SCIENCE AND SOCIAL POLICY: THE NATIONAL DILEMMAS. *One might think of the continuing relation between social science and social policy as a sort of tumultuous marriage, in which the rules of conjugality were never fully established or agreed to by both parties.* There were **two noteworthy theoretical contributions to the elucidation of this relationship** – those of **Max Weber and of Antonio Gramsci** – two positions which continue to be discussed today. **Weber is regularly cited as the champion of value-free social science, in which the scholar/ scientist rigorously segregates his role as researcher and his role as citizen, and Gramsci as the champion of the organic intellectual, who is committed to the objectives of the/a social movement and considers that he works in its service.** This is often presented as two quite distinctive positions, but in fact the story is more complicated than that […] From within their different national contexts, Weber and Gramsci highlighted the basic dilemmas of twentieth-century social science. **Weber was struggling against the intellectual control of the German university by right wing nationalist forces** and **found value-neutrality to be his weapon**. Antonio Gramsci was fighting the control of Italian intelllectual life by centrist liberals, who precisely espoused value-neutrality. His weapon was the concept of the "organic intellectual"[...] But in the twenty-first century, does one have to continue to choose today between Weber's heritage of value-neutrality and Gramsci's organic intellectual? Or should one try to combine the two approaches? Or should one somehow move beyond the two concepts? **We outline a programme in two steps**: first, presenting what we **consider the four essentials of social science** in the twenty-first century; and second, outlining the global opportunities that would in consequence be available in imagining the future relation of social science and social policy.

  FOUR ESSENTIALS OF SOCIAL SCIENCE IN THE 21ST CENTURY, 1) *THE UNIT OF ANALYSIS: LARGE SPACE AND "LONGUE DURÉE": The most important consequence of the intellectual discovery of "globalization" may well be a renewed understanding of the real parameters and temporal scope of our multiple social modes of participation and insertion in the world in which we have been living [...]* In the widespread discussion of "**globalization**" beginning in the late 1980s, the most common premise has been that **we are talking of something radically new which puts into question** *for the first time* **the primacy of the State as the unit of social action** and **therefore as the unit of analysis** […] **The questions of social policy are questions in which State decision making plays a significant role,** but in which there are many other settings in which groups seek to promote their interests.

2) Hype versus reality in social science: theoretically-sound concepts and conceptually-sound measurements: Why has the term globalization come to be widely used only in the very recent past? Posing this question broaches a much broader issue: the need to distinguish hype from reality in social science. **The hyping of globalization arose from a specific historical contingency** that created a **political opportunity to restructure the world economy.** The three-worlds model that structured Cold War thinking disintegrated at the beginning of the 1990s with the demise of the "second world" leaving the erstwhile "third world" without an "ally" to face a now seemingly all-powerful "first world" […]**The political rhetoric of globalization** has made it possible to put forward an economic threat as though it were a given of social science: "There is no alternative" – if a country wishes to avoid (still further) economic decline […] In using this highly-contested concept, **social scientists have been generally divided into three groups**: 1) **hyper-globalists** who accept the idea that we are living in a new "post-state" global era; 2) **the sceptics** who argue that the present enhanced "internationalism" is no different from previous such periods (such as that just before the First World War); and a group in-between, sometimes called 3) **"transformationists",** who do think the present is a distinctive period but do not go as far as eliminating the State from the social matrix (see Held et al, 1999) […]**To be proactive in understanding social change is never easy. The starting-point is to identify the basic unit of change which is the modern world-system. But this system by its very nature is highly dynamic: the reality is that social change in its many manifestations is ceaselessly ongoing. Thus within the system, institutions such as nationstates, large corporations, and political parties, will be very different at any given point in time from what they were, say, thirty years earlier.** *The conundrum for any study of social change is therefore,* ***how to distinguish ordinary change within the system wherein institutions adapt to ever-changing circumstances*** *from extraordinary/structural change which is undermining the system to such a degree as to change its very nature.* ***Does contemporary globalization mark a period of extraordinary/structural change? And, if so, what are the crucial characteristics that make it so world shattering?*** To answer such critical questions requires cutting through the hype by **using theoretically-sound concepts for which empirically-sound measurements can be constructed** […] The fundamental requirement for defining theoretically-sound concepts is to **focus on processes rather than outcomes**. **Theoretically-sound concepts are a necessary but not sufficient condition for rigorous social science**. Such concepts need to be continually evaluated empirically. There is an evidential presumption behind social science knowledge. Unfortunately, conceptually-sound measurement of macro-social change is by no means straightforward. The main reason is that processes, the mechanisms of social change, cannot be directly measured. What can be measured are events and outcomes at a specified time. Such cross-sectional measures can be combined to show trajectories of change but it is unlikely that quantitative measurement of the full complexity of macro-social change is possible. In other words we measure surface features of social activity, but are unable ourselves to observe the deeper processes that underpin those measures […]A secondary, but still important, reason for difficulties in producing conceptually-sound measurements in social science is that the State is the prime provider of statistics […]Quite simply, most official statistics are attribute data, whereas most social science research requires relational data. This is because most State needs can be satisfied by counting, answering the question "how much where?" […] **It is social relations, however, that are central to all social science understanding**. **This requires data that answers the question "how much difference between here and there, and why?"** Of course, official statistics do provide some relational data, for instance on migration and trade. But even when such data are available, they are not necessarily in an appropriate format for social science research. […]

What social science needs is the creation of new data bases that are designed specifically for deriving empirically-sound measurements for theoretically-sound concepts. The key starting-point is to **specify a process and then identify outcomes** that will inform our understanding of that process. A process requires agency and therefore the next step is identification of agents, individual or collective institutions), whose actions constitute the process.

3) Fact and value: an imbricated pair: *Eventually, from the mid-nineteenth century, the objective, value-neutral, problem-solving spirit adopted by natural science was transmitted to social science. This social science in turn would be used to underpin social policies seeking to achieve orderly change in the name of "progress" through scientific control exercised by "experts" and based on so-called hard facts, quantification, and the use of both chronological time and undifferentiated space as unanalysed parameters of value-neutral social analysis.* **One of the fundamental features of the modern world has been the progressive separation of the domain of facts from the arena of values: what is**

"true" is deemed independent of what is "good". This primary assumption of the structures of knowledge of the modern world found expression in the **separation of the sciences from the humanities** both as intellectual disciplines and as university faculties. […]Furthermore, the **pursuit of "objectivity" has been a direct product of this divorce of facts from values and arose parallel to the process of rationalization, or the progressive privileging of formal over substantive rationality. [...]**The moment of greatest intellectual and institutional success of this structure was the period immediately after 1945. But no sooner had this kind of social science been fully institutionalized than the scholarly legitimacy of the **premises underlying the partitions separating the disciplines and the practical usefulness of the distinctions began to seem less and less self-evident. After 1968, they were openly challenged**. From the 1960s on, work in diverse fields of the social sciences and the humanities, coming together under the rubric of "cultural studies", **suggested possibilities for developing a non-reductionist, non-positivist human science, which challenged both the fact/values and subject/object antinomies as well as all essentialist categories. [...]**During the same period, the emergence of complexity studies in the natural sciences with its **emphasis on contingency, context-dependency, and the "arrow-of-time" denied "objectivity" as a form of externalism [...] These two new knowledge movements** are evidence that the long-term processes structuring knowledge formation as "two cultures" that are epistemologically counterposed had reached an impasse […] *Instead of construing human values simply as a matter of individual ethics or morality in the creation of authoritative knowledge of the social world, it is more useful to conceive them as integral to a historical social science whose primary mission in our time, a period of systemic transformation, should be to imagine and evaluate possible futures and modes for their attainment.* Such a historical social science **would be historical** in the sense that it **takes into consideration the differences that past reality has created** as well as the fact that **change is socially produced**. And it would be scientific in that it maintains a commitment to the production of authoritative knowledge of long-term regularities.

 4) ACTORS IN SOCIAL CHANGE: THE CONSTRAINTS OF STRUCTURES AND THE POSSIBILITIES OF AGENCY. **Change does not depend on our normatively-motivated action for its initiation**. By the same token, however, the **direction of change will, as complexity studies show, be completely dependent on small fluctuations resulting from all of our multiple value-laden decisions and actions**. […] Systemic transformation is not immediate and abrupt but, in the language of the sciences of complexity, takes the form of a bifurcation occurring in a period of transition characterized by chaotic fluctuations […] **Thus, the creative practices involved in making a new world can be expected to find greater latitude and the potential effects of even seemingly isolated acts will multiply. [...]** *It is becoming clear that the social analyst needs to be aware that he/she is a participant in the "reality" being studied.* The **first step is to realize that the modernist imperative of producing (objective) knowledge of "who, what, when, where, why" with a "view from nowhere" is yielding less and less**, both in theory and in practice, and that we must turn our attention to producing knowledge that considers the (**situated) questions of "for whom, for what, for when, for where" and "from whose viewpoint" as an inseparable part of the analytic project** and not merely a matter of the individual analyst's concerns. This is **particularly true for the policy analyst**, whether working for governmental and intergovernmental agencies, NGOs, or social movements. Since **the definition of "problems" represents an arbitrary (or perhaps not so arbitrary) closure isolating them from the complex interplay of the multiple social processes of which they are outcomes**, the idea that one can simply intervene to solve them needs to be replaced by the realization that definitive "action" by specialists or those in positions of power needs to be replaced by **a "practice" of constant, incremental, iterative negotiation** (no "quick fix") and both insistent and persistent challenge to, and re**definition of, the analytic codes and concepts that limit capacity to imagine possible futures.** […]. It would (also) be social scientists using an **analytic strategy that avoids reification** and is cognizant of the pitfalls of reductionism and dualism.

IMAGINING THE FUTURE: THE GLOBAL OPPORTUNITIES: *Whose Social Policy? Who Sets the Priorities?* **Political decisions about social policies rarely are the direct outcome of social science research.** They are **more usually the result of conflicting pressures by social actors – entrepreneurs, workers' organizations, religious authorities, special interest groups, the media.** To be sure, sometimes prominent social scientists influence or advise particular political leaders. But even then, it is less their specific research results than their general orientations that are being invoked. And of course occasionally there are social scientists who themselves enter the political arena, sometimes in the process repudiating their own prior work. […] **Are there ways in which social scientists can today have a**

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

sounder impact on social policy-making, whether that of governments or that of social movements? And **who will be setting the priorities**? **Social science research is not expensive,** compared with the research costs of the physical, biological, and medical sciences. **This protects it in part from too much direct control by the powerful.** Nonetheless, much social science research does require some resources, and these must be supplied by someone – governments, intergovernmental agencies, foundations, universities, NGOs, social movements. **And each of the potential donors/sponsors will consider the utility of the research in terms of its own objectives**, which will not necessarily be the same as those of the social scientist. It is here that we come back to the stylized Weber-Gramsci debate – the social scientist as expert versus the social scientist as committed analyst. We can see today that the **involvement of the social scientist in policy-making requires a constant reflexivity on his or her own position** and a certain long-term understanding of the source and the impact of the analyses being proffered. **Moral choices by the scholar can consequently never be avoided**, and least of all in a period of fundamental social transformation. *The question for the social scientist is not merely what moral choices he/she will make, but how, in the process, to maintain the integrity of the intellectual analysis on which it is based.*

THE POSSIBILITIES OF POLICY-MAKING: *The struggle between newly powerful global actors and globally-oriented local and national movements is transforming the issues and objects of social policy. It is not only that social policy is more openly debated, given the withering away of the liberal State and the efforts to entrench neo-liberal policies. It is also that, as these struggles indicate, the rigorous social science we need must forthrightly address the global roots of social problems as we move, amidst great uncertainty, towards a new, postliberal world-system [...]These choices and dilemmas are increasingly evident as we confront the emergence of vigorous, and contentious, global social policy-making.* This is a marked reversal of the past century of emphasis on national development, national social science, and national social policy. **From the social actors who press policy concerns onto our agendas**, **to the institutions that forge social science and social policy, policy-making will be increasingly centred consciously on global social processes and inequalities in our transition to a new world-system.** This constitutes a major break with the past and frees us to confront **major future opportunities. [...]** Indeed the nature of today's actors and the objects of policy indicate a radical shift from twentieth-century patterns. On the one hand, **the recognition of the global foundations of social inequalities and instability has stimulated the number and power of supranational institutions directly concerned with social policy**. [...] **Even more notable has been the explosion of international, networked NGOs, which exist both above and below national States, and are deeply involved in social policy-making and the production of knowledge**. Unlike the national States and the international organizations of the immediate post-war period which coordinated national policies, **these actors target global issues and operate transnationally**.

Excerpt source: Wallerstein et al (partitions, text)
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy 3) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **UNESCO, MOST (MANAGEMENT OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION),** (2006.) *International Forum on the Social Science - Policy Nexus.* Argentina and Uruguay, 20-24 February 2006. *Final report*. UNESCO, SHS/2006/PI/H/3, 16 p.

- **UNESCO MOST (MANAGEMENT OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS).** (2007.) *Social development: from research to policy to action*. Le développement social: de la recherche aux politiques et des politiques à l'action. Document de référence préliminaire, SHS-07/CONF.205/04 Draft, 11 p.

Within the framework of the MOST programme, UNESCO is committed to an ongoing effort to strengthen the research-policy nexus, acting in particular through the International Forum on the Social Science – Policy Nexus (IFSP) and the Regional Fora of Ministers of Social Development. This "nexus" is a profoundly practical concern: whether they realize it or not, policy makers need enhanced links between research and policy because, in their absence, policies are unlikely

to attain their objectives [...] Furthermore, **commitment to a more dynamic and better integrated research-policy nexus has normative significance**. Governance templates that base policy exclusively on "expertise" implicitly dismiss the contribution of participatory mechanisms to policy development. There are reasons to regard such a perspective as favouring specific forms of policy failure. Dealing with them, conversely, **requires serious attention to questions of accountability and empowerment within the process of producing knowledge for policy and, in particular, to the role of civil society in promoting non-technocratic forms of expertise**. Governments, academics and civil society organizations can and should work together to establish new modes of governance that enhance, rather than dilute, political responsibility. **The purpose of this document is to review the empirical and conceptual basis for such new modes of governance, focusing in particular on the problems of social policy**. The key principle can be stated very simply: **the knowledge appropriate for accountable policies that actually work is necessarily** *co-produced* **by governments, academics and civil society. Justifying, qualifying and elaborating this claim, however, requires considerable social science work.** Furthermore, what remains to be clarified in at the policy level constitutes the distinctive objective of the MOST programme: the innovative mechanisms that might make such co-production possible. **By discussing how to establish innovative social policy partnerships and how to make them work, it should be possible to establish a better platform for exchange between actors and between regions, to clarify institutional best practices and, by preparing appropriate publications to disseminate lessons to wider audiences**, to facilitate movement towards a shared agenda on the issues raised by the Buenos Aires process. Thi**s agenda gives rise to practical challenges at four distinct levels**, which cannot be addressed if they are kept separate:

1) knowledge for policy (The connection between producing knowledge and making it available tends to break down for reasons of format (language, style, timing, etc.), but there are also substantive issues. It is common for research to deal with questions that are of no policy interest and for policy-makers to ask questions that researchers do not recognize as valid at all [...] There are significant *institutional* factors that tend towards awkward relations between social science and social policy. Practical proposals can be relevant only if they address the credibility gap from which the social sciences observably suffer [...] Research needs to address two deficits that are, in a sense, mirror images of one another: on the one hand, there is a dearth of robust generalizations that operate across a wide range of countries and time frames; on the other hand, there is insufficient context-sensitive research into specific cases and situations. **2) evidence-based policy** (Even assuming that research produces knowledge that is relevant for policy, there is no guarantee that policy-makers will use it, and still less that they will do so wisely and effectively. The currently fashionable call for "evidence-based" policy (the phrase derives from a questionable analogy with "evidence-based medicine") responds to this concern by specifying what constitutes "wise" and "effective" use: policy designed by reference not to "common sense" or to ideological preconceptions but to prior practical experience. [...] But what conditions favour the take-up of appropriate evidence and the policies based on it by particular policy-makers or policy configurations? [...]It is helpful first to consider generically the characteristics that promote or block research use. These fall into four main categories: A) the characteristics of the research and the researchers who conduct it; B) the characteristics of modes of dissemination or linkage between researchers and the policy arena; C) the characteristics of potential user groups; and D) the characteristics of the political domain that the research enters [...]More specifically, the factors conducive to policy failure to take up relevant knowledge seem to fall into three main categories: A) Lack of policy-level interest in research, which is commissioned not in order to have access to its results but for other reasons, including habit, symbolic legitimization and patronage; B) Lack of interest in policy impact on the part of researchers who prefer, for whatever reason, to stay at one remove from the policy process; C) Lack of effective communication to bridge the divergent languages, timetables and interests of policy-makers and researchers. **3) the relation between advocacy and action** (It is excessively technocratic to view the research-policy "nexus" in terms of bilateral relations between academics and policy makers. Regardless of normative considerations, expert-led governance is likely to be practically inoperative. Social development objectives (including particularly literacy, primary health care, environmental protection, sustainable urbanization, etc.) depend ultimately on ordinary people behaving in certain socially desirable ways [...] A more satisfactory governance model must therefore take seriously the multifaceted role of civil society within the research-policy nexus [...] The policy process also needs the active participation of the people affected by policy in its implementation. Social development objectives are ultimately achieved when ordinary people take ownership of their own development. Without the organized structures of civil society, this is highly unlikely to be attainable. In addition, the role of civil society associations as knowledge producers in their own right should not be underestimated. **4) participation and governance** (A viable research-policy nexus – one that is efficient *because* it takes account of the need for participation and empowerment – is a triangular relationship in which all three summits engage in two-way exchange with each of the others, thereby contributing (ideally) to the *co-production* of the knowledge necessary for effective action [...]New and more effective procedures would necessarily rely heavily on the existence of "hybrid" fora, bringing together researchers, policy makers and the whole range of social actors to formulate questions and to ensure wide circulation of available knowledge. The key to such fora is to avoid

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

a priori definition of what counts as "expertise" for policy purposes and, further, to set them up at a stage in the policy process when options are still genuinely open. This implies, among other things, that such fora should not be subjected to strict sectoral demarcations.

Excerpt source: John Crowley (partitions, text)
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 3) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy 4) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 5) Evidence-based Policy / New Modes of Governance

- **UNESCO**, **INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SCIENCE JOURNAL,** (1975.) "New forms of collaboration in development research and training"; (Nouvelles formes de collaboration dans la recherche et la formation en matière de développement); *International Social Science Journal* XXVII, 4;1975; p. 790-795

- **UNESCO**, **INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SCIENCE JOURNAL,** (1989.) "Le savoir et l'État." Discours des sciences sociales, savoirs professionnels et politiques publiques. Revue internationale des sciences sociales, novembre 1989, 122 (Vol. XLI, N°4) p. 550-709.

- **UNESCO, INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SCIENCE JOURNAL**, (1990.) "Policy actors: Bureaucrats, politicians and intellectuals." February 1990, no. 123.

The contributions to this volume deal with the relationship between the world of politics and that of bureaucratic administration. They offer **historical examples** of the development of national bureaucratic structures (India) and are **concerned with the characteristics of the 'bureaucrat' in different national contexts** (Nigeria, India, Germany, USA). They seem to be preoccupied with the consequences that certain types of interconnection between the two domains might have for new democracies (in Brazil for example) and they **more generally examine different patterns of relations between politicians and bureaucrats**, and the **gaps that might thus appear in the application of policies**. As such they are not of direct relevance to a social science-policy nexus approach; although an **understanding of the tensions between political decisions and their application might be beneficial for the social scientist who wishes to understand why certain scientifically informed decisions ultimately fail**. Partial exception to the above is the contribution by Rehman Sobhan, who examines the **social role of economists in Bangladesh**. The author notes that despite the very immediate involvement that economists had in the struggle for independence (vis-à-vis Pakistan), in his days (late 1980s) they had become politically invisible. Arguing in favour of a more political role for economists (partly because of the political consequences of economic theory) he proposes **certain measures for enhancing their visibility and engagement**. These include the **wider dissemination and popularization of findings, active participation by economists in political parties and the redirection of research towards issues of a greater national importance**.

Excerpt source: Georgios Papanagnou (review)
Key themes: 1) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 2) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **UNESCO**, **INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SCIENCE JOURNAL,** (2003.) "Social sciences futures" / Devenirs des sciences sociales / Los futuros de las ciencias sociales. *International social science journal,* 55 (177): 369-527

- **UNESCO, INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SCIENCE JOURNAL,** (2004.) "*Excellence in social science". International Social Science Journal*, 56 (180) June 2004

- **UNESCO**, **INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SCIENCE JOURNAL,** (2004.) "*Tracking impact." Case studies on the research policy nexus/Usages et effets du savoir. Articuler sciences sociales et politiques publiques/Los efectos de las investigaciones*

en la política: Monografías en torno a los vínculos entre ciencias sociales y políticas públicas. International Social Science Journal, 56 (179) March 2004

- **UNESCO**, **INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SCIENCE JOURNAL,** (2009.) "Articuler recherche et politique. Forum international sur les interfaces entre politiques et sciences sociales" (IFSP). Revue internationale des sciences sociales, No. 189.
- **UNESCO**, **INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SCIENCE JOURNAL,** (2009.) "The Rights of Women: Activism, Research and Policy / The Uses of Michel Foucault in Political Science." International Social Science Journal, No. 191.

- **UNESCO, SHS newsletter.** (2004.) Issue 7, Oct. – (Dec. 2004), 24 p.

En cette année 2005, **l'Unesco entend bien prendre acte de la nouvelle priorité définie dans le domaine des sciences sociales lors de la 31e Conférence générale**, à savoir, **le renforcement des liens entre la recherche et la politique.** Le point fort de cette nouvelle orientation sera le Forum international sur les liens entre recherche et politique, que l'Unesco organise conjointement avec le Gouvernement argentin à Buenos Aires du 5 au 10 septembre 2005. **Ce Forum sera l'occasion de réunir des experts en sciences sociales, des décideurs politiques, des organisations et des réseaux de professionnels des sciences sociales, des bailleurs de fonds nationaux et internationaux, ainsi que les ONG actives dans le domaine**. Si ses critères sont bien ceux de l'excellence universitaire, le Forum n'a pas vocation à être un séminaire universitaire. En quête d'un discours et de critères d'engagement communs, il a pour objectif d'associer plus étroitement la recherche en sciences sociales et la politique. Le **Forum abordera quatre thèmes majeurs** : **l'intégration régionale, les politiques sociales, la décentralisation et l'urbanisme et, enfin, la dynamique de la mondialisation, domaines dans lesquels le rôle des sciences sociales est essentiel à l'efficacité de l'action politique.** Outre des réunions plénières, le Forum sera l'occasion d'organiser des ateliers thématiques auxquels participeront les experts de renommée internationale, des ateliers animés par des universitaires, des militants et des décideurs venus du monde entier, et enfin des rencontres à huis clos afin de faciliter les consultations entre les intervenants majeurs de l'interface politique/recherche. En **diffusant les conclusions de ses travaux dans les cercles universitaires et politiques, en favorisant la constitution de réseaux d'acteurs de premier plan et en jouant la carte de la continuité, le Forum international se propose de consolider les liens entre la recherche en sciences sociales et les politiques sociales.** Bien que les défis que pose la mondialisation de la société sortent du cadre des seules sciences sociales, sans les sciences sociales, il sera impossible d'y répondre. Le **Forum donnera toute sa visibilité au programme de la gestion des transformations sociales (most)**, programme scientifique inter-gouvernemental établi en 1994 dans le but de promouvoir la recherche internationale, interdisciplinaire et comparative en sciences sociales. Outre le Forum dont il est question plus haut, **le programme most a apporté son soutien au « Forum des ministres du développement social en Amérique latine et dans les Caraïbes » ainsi qu'à l'initiative semblable prise récemment en Afrique australe – des voix se sont en effet élevées en Afrique de l'Ouest et en Asie du Sud afin que soit établi un forum similaire.** Il s'agit de créer des ponts entre ces forums et les nouveaux réseaux de recherche d'échelle régionale qui seront édifiés autour des thèmes prioritaires définis en commun accord avec les ministères. La recherche comparative et l'analyse politique comparative au niveau régional devraient contribuer à renforcer l'impact des politiques sociales, créant une convergence essentielle entre politique et recherche.

Excerpt source: Sané Pierre
Key theme: Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance

- **UNESCO, SHS newsletter.** (2006.) Issue 12, Mar. – May (2006), 32 p.
- **UNESCO, SHS Views** (2007.) No. 18. "Dialogue between Researchers and Policy Makers. What is the Role of UNESCO?" (2007), p32.

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **URZÚA, R.** (2000.) "International migration, social science, and public policy". *International Social Science Journal*, Volume 52, Number 165, September 2000, pp. 421-429(9)

  As was to be expected, the **political significance of international migration** has attracted the **attention of demographers and social scientists**. Despite their interest and the resulting increase in research on the topic, however, the policy recommendations of international organisations and the policies **adopted by countries often fall short of expectations** because they are **based on mistaken or incomplete definitions of the problem**. This **article seeks** to **identify** some of the **challenges of international migration for the social sciences**, in order for social scientists to play a more influential role in policy-making in the area. I shall begin by outlining the overall context of international migration, then give an example of an erroneous definition of the problem. **I shall thereupon address some more general issues on the inter-relationship between researchers, experts and policy-makers** and **propose a number of practical solutions to strengthen such relations**. [...] *Conclusion*: Whether we like it or not, international migration will continue. While the free movement of people is still a right for which we are not prepared, and perhaps never will be, understanding the processes involved and ensuring the peaceful coexistence of people from different regions and cultures are essential in today's new—and still emerging—global society. This also constitutes a major challenge for the social sciences. Like the problems creating this challenge, it cannot be taken up by a single country or a single discipline; **international, interdisciplinary cooperation is crucial**. **Improving sources of data**, **sponsoring comparative research projects** and **changing curricula** and **training programmes**, while **establishing the necessary networks** for the purpose, are tasks that we just cannot put off.

  Excerpt source: Urzua (Introduction and Conclusion exercpts), focus on international migration
  Key theme: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy 2) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 3) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **VAN DE VALL, M. & BOLAS, C.** (1982.) "Using social policy research for reducing social problems : an empirical analysis of structure and function". *Journal of Applied Behavioral Scientist*, 18: 49-67

- **VAN de VALL, M.** (1975.) "Utilization and methodology of applied social research: four complementary models". *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 11 (1): 14-38

- **VAN KAMMEN, J., De SAVIGNY, D. & SEWANKAMBO, N. K.** (2006.) "Using knowledge brokering to promote evidence-based policy making: the need for support structures". *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, Volume 84, Number 8, August 2006, 589-684

- **VAREY, R J** (2002) *Marketing Communication – Principles and Practice*. London and New York: Routledge.

  The book takes an interesting **look at traditional marketing communication theory and seeks to challenge the models used**. It points to the **relative stagnation in the understanding of communication issues in marketing theory**, and the need to draw lessons from communication and cultural theory in order to arrive at a more useful and interesting approach to communications. The author is particularly **critical of the linear transmission** (transactional) **approach to communication** (as seen for instance in Kotler's work). Furthermore, he emphasises that **communication must be seen as a social process consisting of individual and collective communicative activities**, with tangible and intangible exchanges in social relationships by creating, maintaining or altering attitudes and/or behaviours. Whereas the traditional models emphasise individual behaviour, he **points to the fact that identity, meaning and knowledge do not arise in the individual's mind in isolation from their environment**. **Traditional marketing communication theory focuses on the individual**, with a simple stimulus response model. It considers primarily the effects of single messages or campaigns on identified individuals. **Audiences are seen as passive**, with no active interpretation or power to challenge the message content. C**ontemporised marketing communication theory focuses on cognitive and critical perspectives on the cultural effects of advertising on social reality, beliefs, values, knowledge claims, socialisation and hegemony**. The theory assesses the cumulative effect of marketing communication as central to **meaning production** in our post-industrial consumer

society. This implies a **view of communities as interpretative** using an interactive model. **Meaning is not transferred or shared**, but **jointly produced in social 'interaction'**. In an assessment of the politics of communication models, the author argues that most of us are still operating in outmoded instrumental-technical modes of communication in pursuit of control. Communication is seen as a conduit for the transmission of information, but information conceptions only work in situations in which consensus of meaning, ideas, identities, and construction of knowledge can be taken for granted; far from the real world of today. The author argues, furthermore, that **language is contextual**, and that we are responsible for creating our own context for understanding. He also provides some indication as to what the key factors ensuring the **success of communicating a message** are: **communicator credibility, communicator attractiveness, and communicator power.**

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key themes: Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **VAUGHAN, R. J. & BUSS, T. F.** (1998.) *Communicating social science research to policymakers*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications

- **VÄYRYNEN, RAIMO** (1983.) Military R and D and science policy (La R-D militaire et la politique scientifique) (Investigación y desarrollo militar y política científica); International social science journal XXXV, 1; p. 61-79

- **VIANA, A. L. D'Á. et al.** (2006.) "Research for decision-making: a case study in Brazil". *Cadernos Saúde Pública*, 2006, vol. 22 suppl, p. S57-S67

- **VINCENT ROBIN** (2005.) "Communicating health research: how should evidence affect policy and practice?" *Findings Paper Number* 5 April 2006. Based on Dr Robin Vincent's paper for the Global Forum for Health Research, Mumbai, September 2005. Findings papers are snapshots of key areas of health communication to inform development practitioners and policy makers and to stimulate critical reflection.

  Interest in evidence-based policy and practice has grown in development circles. Recent studies exploring the factors that affect the influence of research on policy suggest that there is both the potential to negotiate and communicate more effectively in policy networks on the one hand, and a **pressing need to address the dominance of policy making processes by powerful elites on the other**. There is a need to: 1) **strengthen the networking** between **researchers, policy makers and practitioners** in a way that promotes ongoing dialogue throughout the research process. 2) **Improve the dissemination** and **repackaging of research** for a range of different audiences. 3) **Strengthen southern research** capacity. 4) Find appropriate ways to **promote networking that counter-balances the power of prevailing policy networks** in policy making 5) Learn from work at the 'research–practice boundary' and the various forms of **'embedded' critical enquiry beyond formal academic research programmes**. 6) **Evaluate research impact** more robustly.

  Excerpt source: Vincent (introduction and key points) focus on health research and communication
  Key themes: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy. 2) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 3) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 4) Evidence-based Policy / New Modes of Governance 5) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 6) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **VOLKOW, N** (1998) 'Strategic Use of Information Technology Requires Knowing How to Use Information' in Avgerou, C (ed.) *Implementation and Evaluation of Information Systems in Developing Countries.* Proceedings of the Fifth International Working Conference of the International Federation for Information Processing (IFIP) IFIP WG 9.4. US: NCP.

Information technology is often promoted as the solution to most of the information and communication problems that organisations face today. IT is marketed as a technology with the competitive advantage in terms of increasing productivity and communication efficiency, and in facilitating responsiveness. **Volkow argues that these assertions are myths, and that use of IT is not enough to improve performance**. She looks at the importance of the wider national context as well as the specific organisational history and management style. **If organisations are to benefit from IT, they have to consider to what extent their structures and practices are geared towards handling information itself** (quite apart from which technology is used), and how favourable the organisational culture is for learning from errors. She also **points out that information systems are social systems. Therefore information systems change must be developed in tandem with investment in the people who are to use the systems**, because they are at least as important to ensure the efficient working of the system as the technology itself. The human element in the use of information and IT means that information systems are inevitably 'messy' processes, and this is best dealt with if the people concerned are viewed as valid contributors to the process, rather than attempting to rule them out through relying on top-down implementation models.

Excerpt source: ODI :   Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT

- **VOLMINK, J. & al.** (2004.) "Research synthesis and dissemination as a bridge to knowledge management: the Cochrane collaboration". *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, 2004, 82 (10), pp 778-782

- **WAGNER PETER** (1989.), 'Social science and the state in continental Western Europe: the political structuration of disciplinary discourse', pp. 509-529. In International Social Science Journal, November 1989, no. 122. "Knowledge and the state: social scientific discourse, professional knowledge and public policies."

  The article, again, aims to trace the historical development of the social sciences and their relation to the state. The approach here is informed by a **comparative examination of social science developments in different national contexts** (the cases studied are France, Germany, Italy). The **point the author i**s making is that the cognitive orientations of **social science discourses are shaped by the complex interplays of intellectual traditions and the impact of political structures**. In these processes of interaction **discourses are shaped by their societal contexts**, but at the same time the **discursive interaction among social scientists**, and of social scientists with their interlocutors in society, **contributes to reproducing and restructuring these very contexts** – shaping the scientific field.

  Excerpt source: Georgios Papanagnou (review)
  Key theme: 1) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 2) Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity

- **WALKER, R.** (1987.) "Perhaps Minister: The Messy World of «In-House» Social Research ". En: *Social Science Research and Government*, PP. 141-65 Martin Bulmer (comp.). Cambridge University Press.
- **WALT, G.** (1994.) "How far does research influence policy". *European Journal of Public Health*, 4: 233-235
- **WALTER, I., NUTLEY, S., PERCY-SMITH, J., MCNEISH, D. & FROST, S.** (2004.) *Improving the use of research in social care*. Knowledge Review 7, London: Social Care Institute for Excellence

- **WATZLAWICK, P** (1978) 'One Cannot Not Communicate' Watzlawick interviewed by C Wilder, in *Journal of Communication* 28(4).

  Watzlawick **disputes the notion that communication is a deliberate exchange of information that only happens as a result of intentionality.** Instead, he **expands the concept** of communication to include all behaviour in the (physical or virtual) presence of another person. **The tacit dimensions of communication can be unintended, but still have an enormous impact** on the reaction and subsequent behaviour of the other person. **Behaviour can only be 'non-communicative' if there is no other person present in any way.** Once another person is present in some way, all behaviour becomes communicative; hence the axiom '**one cannot not communicate**'.

  <u>Excerpt source</u>: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  <u>Key theme</u>: 1) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT 2) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy.

- **WEBB, S. & IBARZ, T.** (2006.) "Reflecting on 'what works' in education research-policy/practice relationships". *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, Volume 58, Issue 2 June 2006 , p. 205 - 222

- **WEBBER, D; J.** (1991.) "The Distribution and use of policy knowledge in the policy process". *Knowledge & Policy*, 4 (4): 6-36

- **WEBER, MAX**. (1959.) Le savant et le politique. Une nouvelle traduction. La Profession et la vocation de savant. La Profession et la vocation de politique. Catherine Colliot-Thélène. Paris : La Découverte, 2003.

  La Profession et la vocation de savant (7 novembre 1917) et *La Profession et la vocation de politique* (28 janvier 1919) ont été prononcées à près de trois années d'intervalle alors que désormais, l'habitude est prise de les publier ensemble. De même, l'habitude est prise d'opposer les deux vocations. Sur ce point, C. Colliot-Thélène est catégorique : **le recours au vocable *beruf* pour l'un et l'autre professionnels n'est pas qu'un jeu de mot, ni une métaphore (heuristique)** ; il s'agit bel et bien d'une tonalité religieuse. Le **métier est une vocation à entendre comme passion** et Weber en fait l'éloge puisque **rien de grand ne se fait sans passion**. Être dévoué à une cause est une vertu authentique (ce que l'on avait déjà chez Hegel). De ce point de vue, l**e savant et le politique vivent une étroite affinité en étant habités l'un comme l'autre par le sentiment aigu du tragique de l'existence**. Le **savant doit composer avec le progrès infini de la science**, ce qui ôte tout sens à la mort. **Le politique doit composer avec les incertitudes des effets de l'action,** ce qui rend son destin paradoxal puisqu'il est une conséquence, pour partie incertaine, de son action plus que de ses intentions. **Seule, donc, la passion peut les aider à surmonter le fossé grandissant entre le dilettantisme inspiré et la spécialisation sans esprit, ce fait civilisationnel, généralement dénommé « désenchantement du monde ».** De même, l'habitude est souvent prise d'opposer éthique de la responsabilité et éthique de la conviction (ou de l'intériorité selon les traducteurs), en particulier par les interprètes qui veulent faire de Weber un libéral opposé à Marx, comme ils opposent le politicien gestionnaire au révolutionnaire (« le sérieux » *versus* « l'utopie »), alors que Weber ne cesse d'en appeler à la conviction, au risque de passer pour un partisan des chefs autoritaires. L'interprétation qui consiste à essayer d'enraciner Weber sur le pôle libéral ne laisse pas de surprendre au regard de sa définition de l'État, comme le rappelle C. Colliot-Thélène. **Qui ne voit pas que faire de l'État le monopole de la violence physique légitime est anti-contractualiste ! Ce qui n'empêche pas Weber de prendre tout aussi bien ses distances à l'égard de Marx en refusant de définir téléologiquement l'État par quelque finalité que ce soit.**

  <u>Excerpt source</u>: Charles Henry (note de lecture)
  <u>Key theme</u>: 1) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 2) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change.

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

- **WEIL, PATRICK**. (1998.) Le chercheur et la décision politique in : Critique internationale N°1, automne 1998. Paris, Presses de Sciences-Po. Pp 44-53.
- **WEISBROD, B. A. & WORTHY, J. C.** (1997.) *The urban crises: linking research to action*. Illinois: Northwestern University Press
- **WEISS C. H.**, 1989. "Congressional Committees as Users of Analysis", *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 8, 3: pp. 421-431.

- **WEISS, C** (1977) 'Research for Policy's Sake: The Enlightenment Function of Social Research'. *Policy Analysis* 3(4): 531–545.

  For a long time the perception of how research related to policy was strongly influenced by linear and rational models, which focused on overcoming the distance between **'knowledge-producers'** (researchers) and **'knowledge-consumers'** (policy-makers). The assumption was that research is directly useful to policies, and therefore the **solution lies in engineering the flow of knowledge from researchers so that it reaches policy-makers intact**. Weiss disputes the traditional model, and **instead argues that social science research influences policy in other and less direct ways.** Importantly, **research introduces new concepts and thus incrementally alters the language used in policy-circles**. Also, glimpses of **new ideas and approaches may slightly alter the perception and understanding of policy-makers and advisors**. Therefore, even though **research findings** are not directly employed in a specific policy, they still **on the whole exert a relatively powerful influence over the terms used and the way issues are framed and understood.** Weiss calls this the '**enlightenment function' of research**. She also introduces another visual image to describe the process, namely '**percolation'**, which refers to the **way in which research findings and concepts circulate and gradually infiltrate policy discourse.**

  Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **WEISS, C.** (1978.) "Improving the linkage between social research and public policy" In *Knowledge and Policy: The Uncertain Connection*, L. E. LYNN, Jr. (ed.), Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences, pp. 23-81
- **WEISS, C.** (1982.) "Policy research in the context of diffuse decision making" In *Policy Studies Annual Review*, R. C.RIST (dir.), Beverley Hills, CA, Sage Publications
- **WEISS, C.** (1990.) "The uneasy partnership endures: social science and government" In *Social Scientists, Policy and the State*, pp. 97-137, B. STEPHEN & A. GAGNON (eds), New York: Praeger

- **WEISS, C.** (1991.) "Policy research as advocacy: pro and con". *Knowledge & Policy*, 4 (1/2): 37-56

  This article addresses how the results of policy research enter the policy milieu and influence policy decisions. It begins with a discussion of policy research as data, ideas, and arguments, and extends it to include the need for an advocacy role. The author interprets the **role of policy research through normative, empirical, and process frameworks**. This article addresses the question of how the results of policy research enter the policy milieu and influence policy choices. I **examine the influence on policy of three forms of policy research**: **(1) data and findings, (2) ideas and criticism, and (3) arguments or briefs for policy action.** Whereas the traditional output of a policy study is a report of the first kind, heavy on data, statistics, interpretations, and conclusions, a review of the available evidence suggests that in some settings **research has greater impact when it becomes part of advocacy for a preferred position.** The next section then wrestles with the normative question: **What stance should policy researchers adopt? Can they become advocates and still be fair to the complexity of their knowledge?** I confront the question of **whether advocacy has a legitimate place in the policy researcher's kit**. Policy research is a close relative of social science, and even

though it has put on its working clothes, rolled up its sleeves, and gone out to labor in the offices, legislative chambers, and corridors of government, it has not relinquished the "science" label.

<u>Excerpt source</u>: Weiss (abstract)
<u>Key themes</u>: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 3) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT 4) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **WEISS, C.** (1991.) "Policy research: data, ideas, or arguments" In *Social sciences and modern states: National experiences and theoretical crossroads* (pp. 307-332), P. WAGNER, C. H. WEISS, B. WITTROCK & H. WOLLMAN (eds), Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Modern social sciences have been committed to the improvement of public policy. However, doubts have arisen about the **possibility and desirability of a policy-oriented social science**. In this book, leading specialists in the field **analyse both the development and failings of policy-oriented social science.** In contrast to other writings on the subject, this volume presents a **distinctively historical and comparative approach.** By looking at earlier periods, the contributors demonstrate **how policy orientation has been central to the emergence and evolution of the social sciences as a form of professional activity**. Case studies of rarely examined societies such as Poland, Brazil and Japan further demonstrate the various ways in which intellectual developments have been shaped by the societal contexts in which they have emerged and how they have taken part in the shaping of these societies.

Social science, economics and policy science: Two notes on the title of the book and the delimitation of its subject : at one point, we **planned to use the words "policy-sciences" rather than social sciences in the title.** However, in some parts of the world the term "policy sciences" has not yet come into currency. We therefore retained the older locution, with the understanding that our referent is the tradition within the social sciences that seeks relevance to contemporary affairs. **In the historical and comparative perspectives the book takes these social sciences can mainly be understood as the disciplines of economics, sociology and political science** in the way they emerged throughout and specifically towards the end of, the nineteenth century in their particular shapes, and which they achieved academic institutionalization in the twentieth century. **Some of the chapters, like those by Schwartzmann (chapter 11) Watanuki (chapter 10), Wittrock et al. (chapter 2), try a full analysis of this tripartite set of social sciences; some, like those of deLeon (chapter 3), Jann (chapter 4), and Blume et al. (chapter 7), look specifically at policy-oriented social sciences and, thus, do not stress the disciplinary boundaries and focus on the interdisciplinary nature of this type of knowledge instead**. Many other contributions, however, put an explicit or implicit emphasis on political and social knowledge as generated in the traditions of political science and sociology broadly understood. One can argue, we think, that these two disciplines have a history from that of economics. When attempts, towards the end of the nineteenth century, were made to propose sociology as a science of society and the political science as the professional knowledge of the administrator, the discourse of the economic sciences was already well established. Economics in that period underwent a major transformation from classical political economy to neoclassical economics, with the latter becoming a firmly established scientific discipline. By the time of World War II, when political science and sociology were finally institutionalized in most industrial societies, economics in its Keynesian and econometric guises had become a master tool for analysis and intervention in a modern welfare state. **Knowledge utilization, a field of study that developed in the 1960's and 1970's, formulated its main problem as "underutilization." Thus it did not specifically focus on the successful discipline of economics but on the seemingly more problematic knowledge provided by sociologists and political scientists**. Given that perspective of this book is shaped, though in a critical mode, by the experience of utilization research, the parameters of the latter subject are to some extent reproduced in its chapters. Thus individual chapters may often focus on sociology and political science and as a consequence may not always apply to the same degree or in a similar manner to the case of economies.

Social science, public policy and the state: The ideas articulated in the *Policy Sciences* did not spring full blown from the minds of a small group of scholars, however brilliant. They grew out of decades of experience of social science with government, largely in the United States in the early years of the twentieth century, an interaction that increased in intensity during World War II. In the forty years since the call for a policy orientation was published, many major changes have taken place. The **aim of this volume is to review the experience of the policy sciences to analyse the historical contexts that shaped them in different societies**, and to see **how their development varied under different state auspices**. **Part I is devoted to this analysis of changing relationships between the social sciences and national states**. **Part II represents and efforts to think the premises and practises**

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

of the policy sciences themselves. Although our forefathers pointed out the path with knowledge and astuteness, the intervening years have shown that some of their assumption were faulty. Certain perils that they warned against have not been serious, and some things that they failed to foresee have plagued and bedevilled us. Perhaps more importantly we can now put flesh on the bare bones of their arguments and shift emphasis in ways that make more sense in the last decade of the century.

Excerpt source: Wagner et al, (book) not specific chapter from Weiss (excerpts from Part I: National experience in comparative perspective.)
Key theme: 1) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age. 2) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance

- **WEISS, C.** (ed.). (1977.) *Using social research in public policy-making*. Levington MA: Levington Books

- **WEISS, C. H. & BUCUVALAS, M. J.** (1980.) "Truth tests and utility tests: decision-makers' frames of reference for social science research". *American Sociological Review*, 45: 302-313

In an effort to contribute to an empirically based **"sociology of knowledge application,"** this **paper explores the frames of reference that decision-makers employ in assessing the usefulness of social science research for their work**. Analysis of responses of 155 decision-makers in mental health fields to 50 actual research reports reveals **five frames of reference: 1) relevance of research topic, 2) research quality, 3) conformity of results with expectations, 4) orientation to action, 5) and challenge to existing policy**. All frames are positively associated with perceived likelihood of using a study. Two significant interactions among the frames suggest that, in essence, **decision-makers apply a "truth test"** and a **"utility test" in screening social science research**. They judge truth on two bases: research quality and/or conformity with prior knowledge and expectations. They also assess utility on alternative bases: **feasible direction for action and/or challenge to current policy.** The ways in which they apply research conclusions to their work is a broader, more diffuse, and wider-ranging process than many earlier investigators have recognized.

Excerpt source: Weiss et al. (abstract)
Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 3) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **WEISS, C. H. & BUCUVALAS, M. J.** (1980.) *Social science research and decision-making*. New York: Columbia University Press
- **WEISS, C. H.** (1999.) "The interface between evaluation and public policy". *Evaluation,* 5 (4): 468-486
- **WEISS, C.H.** (1986.) "The Many Meanings of Research Utilization" En: *Social Science and Social Policy*, pp. 30-40 M. Bulner (comp.). Londres: Allen & Unwin.

Weiss provides a useful roadmap to the various meanings of research utilization, which he defines as the use of social science research in the sphere of public policy. 1. **Knowledge-Driven Model** (linear): New research findings lead to new applications and new policies. The existence of knowledge is seen to lead directly to its use; 2. **Problem-Solving Model** (linear): direct application of results to solve a problem that was previously identified by the 'user'; 3. **Interactive Model**: policy-makers seek information from a variety of sources, including social scientists, and the process of decision-making and research-to-policy dynamics involves interconnectedness and multiple-way exchanges; 4. **Political Model**: constellations of interests or opinions predetermine the positions of policy makers, and research is used as ammunition to support these positions; 5. **Tactical Model**: research is not being used for its content, but rather the fact that it is being done is used by policy makers when pressed to take action on a particular issue;
6. **Enlightenment Model**: concepts and theoretical perspectives that social science research has engendered permeate the policy-making process.

Excerpt source: Anne-Marie Schryer-Roy (review)

Key themes: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance

- **WEISS A JANET.** (1979.) Access to Influence Some Effects of Policy Sector on the Use of Social Science. *The American Behavioral Scientist;* Jan/Feb 1979; 22, 3; ABI/INFORM Global. pg. 437

  Discusses **five characteristics of policy making** within governmental sectors and the **consequences of each for the social sciences**: (1) **degree of centralization**, (2) **characteristics of major policy actors**; (3) **characteristics of major institutions**, (4) **nature of decisions** made by the sector, and (5) **availability of alternate source of information**.

  Excerpt source: Education Resources Information Center (abstract)
  Key themes: 1) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 2) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **WEISS, N. S.** (2001.) "Policy emanating from epidemiologic data: What is the proper forum?" *Epidemiology*, 12 (4), 373-374

- **WERNECK VIANNA, L., REZENDE DE CARVALHO, M. & PALACIOS CUNHA MELO, M**. (1994.) "Cientistas sociales e vida pública". *Revista de Ciencias Sociales*, 3 (37): 357-403

- **WHEELAHAN, L.** (2001.) *Research, policy, and practice: how do they fit together?* A case study on pathways and articulation at Victoria University of Technology. Centre for Educational Development and Support, Victoria University of Technology, 9 p.

  The relationship between research, policy and practice in tertiary institutions is complex. Policy-makers like linear relationships: first there is research, which develops policy, which in turn directs practice. The 'action research spiral', favoured by reflective practitioners, is similarly staged: **reflection, planning, action, observation, then reflection again.** The **reality is more incoherent**, with **research, policy and practice muddled together**; and the prominence of one or the other is just as often the outcome of institutional political imperatives as of the need to develop grounded policy to underpin practice. Yet, it is possible over time to see the translation of research into policy and practice, and to observe how the latter acts as the impetus for further research. **This paper examines the relationship between research, policy and practice through a case study at Victoria University of Technology.** The University introduced a key strategic policy in 1997 that was (and is) predicated on learning pathways and student articulation between its TAFE and higher education sectors.

  Excerpt source: Wheelahan (abstract)
  Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **WHO.** (2006.) *Turning research into practice: suggested actions from case-studies of sexual and reproductive health research*. Geneva: World Health Organization, 99 p. http://www.popcouncil.org/pdfs/frontiers/reports/TRIP_WHO_rpt.pdf

- **WHYTE, W. F.** (1991.) *Participatory action research*. Participatory action research

- **WILENSKY, H. L.** (1997.) "Social science and the public agenda: reflections on the relation of knowledge to policy in the United States and abroad". *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law,* Durham: 22 (5): 1241 (25 p.) (October 1997)

  It is tempting to **oversell the practical value of applied research**. A hard **look at the effects of US social science on public policy in areas** such as active labour market policies (training, job creation, placement, etc.), crime prevention, fiscal policy, poverty reduction, and health care reform **suggests an inverse relationship between social science consensus and policy and budgetary decisions**. **Fragmented and decentralized political economies** (eg the United States) foster **policy segmentation** and isolated, short run **single-issue research—often politicized and misleading**. More **corporatist democracies** (such as Sweden, Norway, Austria, and Germany) **evidence a tighter**

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

relation between knowledge and power in which a wider range of issues is connected, longer-range effects are sometimes considered, and **research is more often actually used for planning and implementation**. Even in less hospitable societies, however, social science does make its way in the long run. Favourable conditions and examples are discussed.

Excerpt source: Wilensky (abstract)
Key themes: 1) Social uses that are made of the social sciences / Expertise as a commissioned activity 2) State and Bureaucratic cultures /Social psychology – perception and decision-making / Interpersonal communication and Advocacy / Organisational management, learning and change. 3) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 4) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance

- **WILENSKY, J.** (2001.) "How research informs policy". *Human Ecology,* Ithaca: 29 (3): 16 (3 p.) (Summer 2001)
- **WILLENSKY, J.** (2000.) *If only we knew: increasing the public value of social science*. London: Routledge
- **WILLIAMS, H. A. et al**. (2002.) "The contribution of social science research to malaria prevention and control". *Bulletin of the World Health Organisation* (WHO): *the International Journal Of Public Health*, 2 p.

- **WILLIAMS, R** (1973) 'Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory'. *New Left Review* 1(82): 3–16, November-December 1973.

Williams **develops a model for examining cultural formations in a society,** in order to **explore the interplay between power relations manifested in cultural understandings** (drawing on Gramsci's concept of hegemony) and **in the everyday lived experience of these cultural understandings** ('common sense'). Williams suggests that it is useful to approach this topic through looking for **three different forms of cultural formations**: dominant, residual and emergent. 1) **Dominant cultural formations control most of the field**, but never all of it. 2) **Residual formations are carried over from the past and are usually rooted in religious or rural practices**. 3) **Emergent formations are those that present previously unimaginable social practices** (the classic example being the early feminist movement). Residual and emergent formations can be either 'alternative' or 'oppositional'. Alternative cultural suggestions seek to adapt to the general framework of the existing dominant formation, whereas oppositional trends seek – at least originally – to replace dominant practices.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
Key theme: Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **WILLIAMS, W.** (1971.) *Social Policy Research and Analysis*. New York: Elsevier
- **WILLIAMSON, J** (1996) 'Decoding Advertisements' in Marris, P and Thornham, S (eds.) *Media studies, A Reader*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Since different product brands within any one category (deodorants, paper towels, chocolates, etc) are not actually very different, the **first thing an advertisement must do is to create a differentiation**. This is done through **constructing an image attached to the commodity itself**. The image (e.g. 'French chic') conjures up a range of properties that the commodity (e.g. a perfume) is then implicitly associated with. This is a **process of transferring meaning from one realm and attaching it to a product.** Advertisements attempt to transfer meaning for example through the way they locate images next to each other on a page. This **meaning transference only works if the target group are able to understand the meanings of the implied associations** (the associations of French chic), and are **able to make the meanings their own** (identifying with the ideal type as desirable, and making it confirm attributes of one's own identity). In sum, **advertisements work because they do not attempt to sell a product; instead they sell an image, associations, meaning, ideal identity, and confirmed identity**.

Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young

Key theme: 1) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT 2) Knowledge Management

- **WILTSHIRE, K.** (2001.) "Scientists and policy makers: towards a new partnership". *International Social Science Journal*, 170: 621-635 (September 2001)

- **WIMBUSH, E., HARPER, H. & al.** (2005.) "Evidence, policy and practice: developing collaborative approaches in Scotland". *Evidence and Policy: A journal of Research, Debate and Practice,* 1(3 (Sept)): 391-408

- **WINTER, R. & BURROUGHS, S.** (1989.) *Learning from experience: principles and practice in action-research*. New York: Falmer Press

- **WITTROCK, BJORN** (1989.) 'Social science and state development: transformations of the discourse of modernity', pp. 497-509. In International Social Science Journal, November 1989, no. 122. "Knowledge and the state: social scientific discourse, professional knowledge and public policies."

  The purpose of the article is to trace the development of the social sciences via their historical relation to the state. In doing so however, the author aims to **avoid the pitfalls of functionalist/evolutionary and politico-institutional explanations** and thus offers a discursive structurationist perspective.

  Excerpt source: Georgios Papanagnou (review)
  Key theme: 1) Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **WORLD BANK**, (1998.) "Rapport sur le développement dans le monde : le savoir au service du développement" ; ed Eska, World bank (BIRD.)

  Dans la présente étude, nous **nous proposons d'aborder les problèmes que pose le développement sous un angle nouveau, celui du savoir**, qui peut présenter des visages multiples. Nous nous limiterons ici à **deux formes de savoir et à deux types de problèmes**, qui sont d'une importance capitale pour les pays en développement. 1) **Les savoir technologiques** que nous appelons aussi connaissance technique, ou simplement, savoir-faire, telles que la nutrition, les méthodes contraceptives, le génie logiciel ou les techniques comptables. En règle générale, ce savoir-faire est moins répandu dans le monde en développement et existe moins chez les pauvres. C'est ce que nous appelons **les inégalités face au savoir**, qu'il s'agisse de déséquilibres entre pays ou entre catégories de personnes.
  2) **L'information socio-économique**, comme la qualité d'un produit, l'efficacité d'un employé ou la solvabilité d'une entreprise, dont dépend le bon fonctionnement des marchés. Nous qualifierons de **problèmes d'information** les difficultés résultant d'une connaissance imparfaite de ces paramètres. Les moyens d'y remédier—par l'application de normes de qualité, la validation des acquis professionnels ou l'évaluation de la capacité d'endettement, par exemple—sont plus rares et manquent d'efficacité dans les pays en développement. **Les problèmes d'information et les dysfonctionnements du marché qui en résultent pénalisent surtout les pauvres**. L'étude aborde successivement la question 1) de la **réduction des inégalités face au savoir** (pouvoir et portée du savoir, acquisition des connaissances, assimilation des connaissances et transmission des connaissances). L'étude s'attache ensuite à exposer 2) les **remèdes face aux problèmes d'information** (faire circuler l'information : structures, normes et incitations ; mettre l'information financière au service de l'économie, développer les connaissances sur l'environnement, remédier aux problèmes d'information qui pénalisent les pauvres). Enfin l'étude consacre une attention particulière 3) **à fixer des priorités** (que peuvent faire les institutions internationales, que doivent faire les États ?
  Excerpt source: World Bank (summary, main points)
  Key theme: Knowledge Production/ The New Production of Knowledge/ Research Funding Systems / Current Policy Discourse and Information Age.

- **WOOD, G** (1985) 'The Politics of Development Policy Labelling'. *Development and Change* 16(3): 347–373.

  Wood argues that **all social communication makes use of 'labelling', and that development policies are themselves eminent examples of this**. **Policies ascribe labels to groups** and situations (e.g. 'the poor', 'the landless', 'the women', etc), and **this is an act of simplification** that highlights one dimension of people's lives while covering over several other aspects. **To a certain extent, simplification and labelling are necessary in order to make sense of the world**, and **everyone who communicates uses labels.** But it is important to be aware that **labels are also elements of a power relationship** in which whoever successfully imposes labels on a group has the means to (unwittingly) control and regulate the situation. **Therefore, when analysing a policy process or a policy domain, it is useful to examine firstly whose labels prevail**, and **secondly what type of policies the labels are seen to justify**. In conclusion, Wood suggests that **research could aim at 'democratising' the labels used in development policies in three ways**. First, it is important to **draw attention to those labels that enjoy a monopoly**, and to examine whose labels they are. Second, it is often possible to **identify contradictory elements within the policy labelling process**, and such contradictions **provide good opportunities for raising questions about the issue**. Third, **research can produce alternative labels** in order to encourage debate and to support a more democratic policy process. Wood emphasises that this third step should ideally be **undertaken together with the groups in question, i.e. the target group** or 'beneficiaries' of the policy.

  Excerpt source: ODI : Bridging Research and Policy: An Annotated Bibliography Maja de Vibe, Ingeborg Hovland, John Young
  Key themes: 1) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 2) Dissemination Strategies / Marketing and Research Communication / Media Communication and IT 3) Knowledge Management

- **WOODING, S. & GRANT, J.** (2003.) *Assessing research: the researchers' view*. Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND
- **WOOLCOCK, M.** (2004.) *Social capital for social policy: lessons from international research and policy, exploring new approaches to social policy.* World Bank and Harvard University, PRI, Ottawa, 13 December 2004
- **WYATT, A**. (2002.) "Evidence based policy making: the view from a centre". *Public Policy and Administration*, vol 17, no. 3, pp 12-28
- **YIN, R. K. & GWALTNEY, M. K.** (1981.) "Knowledge utilization as a networking process". *Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization*, 2 (4): 555-580
- **YOUNG, E. & QUINN, L.** (2002.) *Writing effective public policy papers: a guide to policy advisers in Central and Eastern Europe*. Budapest: LGI

- **YOUNG, J. & COURT, J**. (2003.) *Bridging research and policy: insights from 50 case studies.* London: ODI (Overseas Development Institute), 56 p.

  Reducing poverty and meeting the Millennium Development Goals will require improved policies around the world. **Research is one way for policy-makers and other stakeholders to identify which policies are most effective and how they can best be implemented in different contexts**. Yet there remains **no** *systematic* **understanding of what, when, why and how research feeds into development policy**. While there is an extensive literature on the research–policy links in OECD (Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development) countries, there has been **much less emphasis on research–policy links in developing countries**. The massive diversity of cultural, economic, and political contexts here makes it especially **difficult to draw valid generalisations and lessons from existing experience and theory**. In addition, international actors have an exaggerated impact on research and policy processes. A better understanding of how research can contribute to pro-poor policies, and systems to put it into practice, could improve development outcomes**. As part of the first phase of the three-year Global Development Network (GDN) Bridging Research and Policy project, the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) was responsible for the collection and analysis of 50 summary case studies on research–policy links**. This **paper reports on the process, findings and implications of the case study work.** The process of case study collection was transparent and bottom-up – local insights have helped inform a global project. The case studies were

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

designed to **capture existing experiences and relate them to streams in the literature**, and to identify specific hypotheses for further investigation in the second phase of the project. The 50 cases represent an interesting range of evidence and experience about research–policy links from around the world. They include examples of a wide range of types of research undertaken by a variety of organisations. **A few cases describe situations where research had an immediate and direct impact on policy, although in most cases the impact was less direct and took some time**, requiring strenuous advocacy efforts. The **cases also illustrate different types of policy impact**. Some **resulted in clear changes in public policy, others in changes in policy implementation, and a few describe how action research caused substantial change on the ground, with little change in public policy**. In terms of cross-cutting analysis, the cases have been examined to address the question: **why are some ideas that circulate in the research–policy arenas picked up and acted on, while others are ignored and disappear?** We structure the discussion around a **framework of three interlinked domains:** context, evidence, links. We refer also to other issues that emerge from the cases, particularly the role of external influences and donors. **1) CONTEXT: This emerged as the most important domain in affecting the degree to which research has an impact on policy**. Key issues concern prevailing narratives and discourse among policy-makers; the extent of demand for new ideas (by policy-makers and society more generally); and the degree of political contestation. Political resistance often hindered change, despite the existence of clear evidence, and **bureaucratic factors often distorted public policies during implementation**. At its broadest level, it seems that the degree of **policy change is a function of political demand and contestation**. The nature of **political culture** and degree of openness are also significant in enabling the use of research in development policy-making. The **cases supported much of the existing theory on policy processes (for example, Kingdon, 1984), and the percolation of ideas (Weiss, 1977).** However, they identified **major gaps in the theory,** which fails to address the political complexity of developing countries. There are **three main remaining challenges** here: how can contexts be categorised and how best can stakeholders operate to influence policy in these different contexts? **How do research–policy processes work in situations with democratic deficits?** What can realistically be done to improve the context for the use of research in policy-making and practice? **2) EVIDENCE:** The findings from the case studies were clear. **The key issue affecting uptake was whether research provided a solution to a problem**. Policy influence was also affected by **research relevance** (in terms of topic and, as important, operational usefulness) and **credibility** (in terms of research approach and method of communication). In particular, the cases highlighted the **impact of participatory approaches and the value of pilot schemes** that clearly demonstrate the importance of new policy options. **Policy uptake was greatest if the research programme had a clear communications** and influencing strategy from the start, and if the results were **packaged in familiar concepts.** Strenuous advocacy efforts were often required to convince policy-makers of the value of more theoretical research. In this domain, there is **still need for work on two main sets of issues**. First, regarding the **role of research units** – either independent or inside government – **what institutional characteristics and activities help foster research impact on policy?** Second, what practical advice can be provided on what could work most effectively in different contexts? **3) LINKS:** The extent of **links and feedback processes** between researchers and policy-makers are clearly important. **Issues of trust, legitimacy, openness and formalisation of networks** emerged from the cases. The cases supported existing theory about the **role of translators and communicators** (Gladwell, 2000) and the **value of informal networks**, but there were no clear conclusions about the nature of the links – this arena in particular needs further investigation. **How do different types of network and policy research communities influence policy-making in developing countries?** Do different sorts of policy networks, work better in different environments? Do legitimacy and trust make a difference, and how can they be strengthened? Answers to some of these questions would provide practical advice to researchers and research institutes on what could work in different contexts. **4) EXTERNAL INFLUENCES:** The **impact of external forces (socio-economic and cultural influences) and donor funding certainly enabled research to have an impact on policy**. Broad incentives, such as EU access or the poverty reduction strategy paper (PRSP) process, can have a substantial impact. The cases also highlight a number of innovative ways to ensure research has a greater policy impact. But much more systematic evidence is needed. As policy processes become increasingly global, this arena will increase in importance. **Future research might address the impact of international politics** and processes, as well as the impact of general donor policies and specific research-funding instruments. The cases provide a fascinating insight into research–policy links around the developing world. Although too early to make extensive recommendations, the analysis of the theory and preliminary case studies undertaken so far already provide some useful lessons, recommendations and practical tools for policy-makers, researchers and donors. **While the literature review, framework and cases discussed here are useful, it is also clear that current understanding in this area remains thin**. More systemic research to advance knowledge on research–policy dynamics is needed. First, there is a **need for comparative analyses of factors in each of the three domains in the research–policy framework, and the role of external influences**. Second, there is a need for **analyses of specific examples where research has influenced policy in order to assess the**

relative impact of factors from all three domains, as well as from external forces. The next phase of the GDN Bridging Research and Policy project will undertake more thorough systematic research on the issues identified in this paper. Synthesising these different perspectives would enable the project to draw robust and consistent conclusions and make practical recommendations.

Excerpt source: Young et al (executive summary)
Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy

- **YOUNG, J. & COURT, J.** (2003.) *Research policy linkages in policies for food security in Southern Africa*. Paper presented at the Forum for Food Security in Southern Africa, June 2003, 6 p.

The Forum for Food Security in Southern Africa has brought together a wide range people from governments, academic institutions, NGOs and international institutions to discuss these issues in greater depth, and has generated some clear evidence-based policy recommendations. The challenge now is to get them adopted and put into practice. This **paper reviews the current understanding about how evidence contributes to policy processes** and makes some specific **recommendations about how Forum for Food Security processes could be extended to better promote policies for poverty reduction** and food security in Southern Africa now and in the future. **The role of research-based evidence in policy:** Although research-based evidence clearly matters, there **remains no** *systematic* **understanding of what, when, why and how research feeds into development policy**. While there is an extensive literature on the research-policy links in OECD countries, from disciplines as varied as economics, political science, sociology, anthropology, international relations and management, there **has been much less emphasis on research-policy links in developing countries**. The massive diversity of cultural, economic, and political contexts makes it **especially difficult to draw valid generalizations and lessons from existing experience and theory.** In addition, international actors have an exaggerated impact on research and policy processes in developing contexts.

Excerpt source: Young et al (introduction and abstract)
Key themes: 1) Set of actors/ Inter-organisational linkages/Network of actors, co-producers of public policy 2) Evidence-based Policy / New Modes of Governance 3) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points 4) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance

- **YOUNG, J.** (2001.) *Bridging research and policy: from workshops to an international programme.* 8 p. http://www.gdnet.org/pdf/BridgingYoung.pdf

This proposal describes a **participatory 4-month process to develop a bridging programme to improve linkages between development research and policy**. The process will continue the discussions started at the Global Development Network conference in Tokyo (December 2000), and continued at the workshop on Bridging Research and Policy in Warwick (July 2001), to **develop a programme including a number of fundable proposals** for specific activities with wide ownership. The bridging programme will **engage individuals and organisations involved in development policy, implementation and research** in a wide range of activities including **research, networking and capacity-building**, designed to add value to existing initiatives in this area.
The **main conclusions and achievements from the conferences were** : 1) **The relationship between research and policy is often tenuous, quite often fraught**. There is a substantial literature on the subject in many social science disciplines – political science, sociology, anthropology, management and others. 2) **The rational "linear model" of policy making, from problem definition, analysis of alternative solutions, decision-making, implementation and review rarely holds true** - real-life policy making can be better characterised as a 'choas of purposes and accidents'. 3) **The contribution of research to the policy process is weak**. Policy makers often fail to commission appropriate research, and/or ignore or subvert the results. Researchers often pursue their own research interests which may not coincide with current policy imperatives. Both sides often fail to communicate effectively. 4) **Contributors to the workshop however described a number of case-studies where research had contributed effectively to the policy process, and a number of useful approaches to improve research-policy linkages** (e.g. research results contributing to parliamentary vision group discussions on power sector reform in Morocco, and the role of researchers in helping poor people to articulate their concerns during the PRSP process in Bolovia). 5) **Additional work is urgently needed to improve research-policy linkages, and participants identified a number of specific tasks including: Identification and analysis of case-studies to better understand how and when policy research can make a difference to policy making and meet the needs of decision makers. Establishment of a network**

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

of organisations across countries and sectors interested in collaborating on this work, including resource people with expertise in research, policy-making and linkages between the two and a resource centre or "hub". A) **Capacity-building** for policy makers to help them identify, commission and absorb appropriate research. B) Capacity building for researchers in communication skills. 6) An **initial focal point is needed for this work**. The Global Development Network was identified as the most promising at this stage, especially if it succeeds in its plans to involve more policy-makers in the network.

7) **Further work is needed to develop these ideas into a concrete 'bridging programme' containing fundable proposals for a number of specific activities to be presented to donors** at and around the next Global Development Network Conference in Rio de Janeiro in December 2001. A number of participants expressed willingness to contribute to developing the programme and proposals, and approaching potential donors. Lyn Squire (Global Development Network) also offered secretarial and organisational support. 8) It is vital that the development and subsequent implementation of the bridging programme continues to involve participants from the Warwick workshop (and those who could not attend) in an open participatory process, that policy makers are also involved, and that there is genuine ownership by all stakeholders.

There was **general agreement that a major component of the work programme** would be the **development of case studies of the policy research nexus**. Some of these are itemised below **Implementation phases were suggested**: 1) **Aim**: reconstructing the decision-making process through case-studies to better understand how and when policy research can make a difference to policy making and meet the needs of decision-makers. 2) **Empirical review** (to match the background paper) and a preliminary proposal. This review could also assist in the selection of case-studies for detailed study by generally surveying multiple cases and establishing those meeting the criteria (below) 3) **Developing a network of organisations across countries and sectors** with an organisational 'hub'. A possible name would be: RAP Net (ie. research and policy network) 4) **Identifying resource people** – with expertise in both/either the sector or the policymaking process 5) **Engage in country research**. The method could be interviews of both participants and observers of policy cases. This phase might be limited to (for example) 4 countries; 6 sectors. 6) **Outcomes** – including reflecting on the case studies to further develop the conceptual framework in relation to bridging research and development. Practical implications for research and policy-maker training and for important resources that should be widely available or incentive structures that might be encouraged (below) 7) **Procedural time-table**: Initial meeting establishing parameters of the programme and common questions; first research phase; mid-project meeting; second research phase; final meeting to synthesis results of case-studies. **Criteria for Case-studies**: 1) **Policy issue of cross-country relevance and scope for comparison** 2) **Existing knowledge available** within both the workshop research-group and more generally 3) **Cross-sector relevance** 4) **Local dimension** 5) **Feasibility of policy-maker input** 6) **Fairly recent policy episode reflecting evidence of change/reform** 7) **Specificity of topic** 8) **Case studies of policy change** that reflect research into policy successes; some studies of policy research failures.

Excerpt source: Young (summary)
Key theme: 1) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance 2) Policy Process / Public Policies / Potential access points

- **YOUNG, J.** (2005.) "Research, policy and practice: why developing countries are different". *Journal of International Development,* Chichester: Aug 2005. Vol. 17, Iss. 6; p. 727 (8 p.)

- **YOUNG, J**. (2005.) *Bridging research and policy: The RAPID approach*. Paper for the International conference "African Economic Research Institutions and Policy Development: Opportunities and Challenges". Dakar, January 28-29, 2005 organized by the Secretariat for Institutional Support for Economic Research in Africa (SISERA), Dakar, January 2005, 14 p.

- **YOUNG, K., ASHBY, D., BOAZ, A. & GRAYSON, L.** (2002.) "Social science and the evidence based policy movement". *Social Policy and Society*, vol 1, no 3, pp 215 -24.

There is a growing interest in `evidence-based policy making' in the UK**. However, there remains some confusion about **what evidence-based policy making actually means**. This paper **outlines some of the models used to understand how evidence is thought to shape or inform policy** in order to explore the assumptions underlying `evidence-based policy making.' By way of example, it considers the process of evidence seeking and in particular the **systematic review as a presumed `gold standard' of the EBP movement. It highlights some of the **opportunities and challenges represented in this approach for policy research**. The final part of the paper outlines some

questions of capacity that need to be addressed **if the social sciences are to make a more effective contribution to policy debate** in Britain.

<u>Excerpt source</u>: Young et al. (abstract)
<u>Key themes</u>: 1) Evidence-based Policy / New Modes of Governance 2) Knowledge Utilization / Dissemination of SHS research / Research Relevance

- **ZUCKERMAN, D.** (2001.) "Linking research to policy to people's lives". *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 1 (1): 187-190 (December 2001)

RELEVANT LINKS and PROGRAMMES

The African Capacity Building Foundation (ACBF) is a network that brings cooperation agencies and experts together with national and regional institutions working in various areas of development. ACBF's principal objectives include investing in the capacity of its members for macroeconomic policy analysis and development; channeling funding; encouraging the development of research communities in the region; facilitating and investing in local initiatives in the area of research and training; and helping bridge the gap between researchers, trainers and governments.
Visit: http://www.acbf-pact.org

The Alliance for Health Policy and Systems Research aims to promote the generation, dissemination and use of knowledge for enhancing health system performance. It has recently set up a section of the site with a range of information on how to promote impact of research on policy.
(http://www3.alliance-hpsr.org/aspfiles/production/rtophomems.asp?language=en).
Visit: http://www.alliance-hpsr.org/jahia/Jahia/

Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives
Visit: http://www.policyalternatives.ca/

Canadian Policy Research Network
Visit: http://www.cprn.com/

Centre for Knowledge transfer This is a national training centre in knowledge utilization and policy implementation in the areas of health services research. They provide training to researchers and students (capacity building) and also engage decision makers. They also aim to increase knowledge transfer skills among managers and professionals.
http://www.ckt.ca/

Canadian Coalition for Global Health Research The Coalition has a 'task group' that focuses on linking research into action. Specifically, they: - Serve as a "broker, linking providers, funders and users of research to bridge the gap between research production and its practical application, and; - Promote best practices in translating knowledge into policies, programs and action." Their activities include: - Linking researchers with KT experts and building capacity in Knowledge Translation (summer institute, mentoring exchange via web-based discussion); - Create an inventory of best practices in KT, communicate and make this available to a network and provide a clearinghouse function.
http://www.ccghr.ca/

Centre for development studies: Bridging Research And Policy: Introduction and Key Themes.
Visit: http://www.swan.ac.uk/cds/ARCHIVED-RESEARCH/SDRC/bridgingresearch.htm

Centre of African Studies' Project (University of Edinburgh): Learning to Make Policy.
Visit: http://www.cas.ed.ac.uk/

Chair on Knowledge Transfer and Innovation – Utilisation des Connaissances (KU-UC).
Visit: http://kuuc.chair.ulaval.ca/english/index.php

The Council for Health Research for Development COHRED was established to improve links between research and policy in health sector. COHRED has undertaken important work in this field over recent years in both developed and developing countries.
Visit: http://www.cohred.ch/

The UK Department for International Development DFID is active in sharing its knowledge such that policy makers and practitioners can use it to have a positive impact on people's lives. DFID has set up a Knowledge Policy Unit (KPU), whose purpose is to enhance the use of knowledge by DFID and others in support of the elimination of poverty. The KPU seeks to coordinate DFID's existing knowledge activities more effectively and to initiate new activities that will add to the impact of DFID's knowledge programmes.
Visit: http://www.dfid.gov.uk/

The Economic & Social Research Council (ESRC) provides high-quality research on issues of importance to business, the public sector and government. It also funds research and training in social and economic issues.
ESRC Genomics Policy and Research Forum
The ESRC Genomics Policy and Research Forum aims at connecting social science research on genomics with public policy debates and decision making. The site provides access to reports, policy briefs, research summaries and the Genomics Network Newsletter, as well as events information. http://www.genomicsforum.ac.uk/
Visit: http://www.esrc.ac.uk/ESRCInfoCentre/index.aspx

Evidence Network. The Network for Evidence-Based Policy and Practice was established in 1999 by the Economic and Social Research Council, the UK's largest funding agency for research and postgraduate training in social and economic issues to bring social science research much nearer to the decision making process.
Visit: http://evidencenetwork.org/Mission.html

The Getting Research into Policy and Practice (GRIPP) website is a practical resource to support researchers maximize the impact of their research on policy and practice. While the tools are generic, the case studies are mostly on the topic of family planning. The website1 had two functions: to build an online evidence base of GRIPP case studies and to provide a web portal via which GRIPP resources could be accessed. The GRIPP case studies were completed by researchers and documented the activities they undertook to maximise the impact of their research. The structure for these case studies evolved from a workshop held in 2001 at the University of Southampton and a subsequent on-line conference on 'Bridging research and policy'. The GRIPP project was a partnership between Population Council, John Snow International (Europe) and two DFID funded research programmes, *Opportunities and Choices* and *Safe Passages to Adulthood*. The following were identified as components of the GRIPP process:
• Development of the research question
• Identification of target audiences
• Interpretation and communication of results
• Increasing the utilisation of research findings
• Evaluation of research uptake
• Facilitating factors
• Barriers
• Reflections

The case studies received during the course of the project were essential in illustrating
activities undertaken to increase the impact of research. Through JSI Europe's experience managing the GRIPP project, it was invited to be involved with the WHO (Department of Reproductive Health and

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

Research) Turning Research into Practice (TRIP) Task Force. The Task Force developed the TRIP toolkit to foster increased research utilisation. The toolkit serves four functions: 1. As an evaluation tool so donors can more easily examine the impact of their research. 2. As an aid to programme design and policy formulation 3. For research design and planning – part of this function is the completion of case studies thus adding o the evidence base on research utilisation.4. As an educational tool.

There are many elements of the original GRIPP case study common to the Conceptual
Framework proposed for the WHO TRIP toolkit, but the latter is a more comprehensive and sophisticated entity. In the Conceptual Framework, the GRIPP process is divided into 3 stages:
1. Research – This is divided into 3 phases: Pre-research; Research; Postresearch
2. Scale-up
3. Application/Utilisation – This stage looks at the impact of the study at different levels: the contributions made to the evidence base, uptake at the advocacy level, impact on policy, programmes, and practices on the ground.

Unlike the original GRIPP case study which focuses on only the researcher's perspective, the case study based on the TRIP guidelines is comprised of three perspectives: that of the researcher and two other stakeholders. The stakeholders are those who have a vested interest in the outcome of the study and could be, for example, a ministry of health official, a national pharmaceutical association, or members of the community that is being studied.

The GRIPP website design has the opportunity to evolve in line with the WHO framework and support WHO in their collection and management of case studies. However, prior to applying for additional funding to further develop the GRIPP website, it was considered prudent to examine how to achieve a greater variety and number of case studies and the cost of doing so. With this aim in mind, JSI Europe approached the Population Council's FRONTIERS programme for funding for a shortterm period (project hereafter referred to as GRIPP II). Lessons learned from this exercise would determine the value of this initiative and whether it would be worthwhile continuing with it. In line with the WHO TRIP initiative all the case studies sought were to be from the arena of reproductive health, including STI/HIV, and maternal health. The duration of GRIPP II was initially 1 January – 30 June
2005. It was later extended to 31 August 2005 to give more time for collecting researchers and lead stakeholder inputs prior to finalising the case studies. It is intended that all the case studies collected during GRIPP II will subsequently be included in WHO's TRIP Toolkit on Evidence Based Practice.
Visit: http://www.globalhealth.org/view_top.php3?id=186

The Global Applied Research Network GARNET at the Water, Engineering & Development Centre (WEDC), Loughborough University is a mechanism for information exchange in the water supply and sanitation sector using low-cost, informal networks of researchers, practitioners and funders of research.
Visit: http://www.lboro.ac.uk/garnet/

The Global Development Network (GDN) was established in 1998, with the goal of supporting and linking research and policy institutes involved in the field of development and whose work is predicated on the notion that ideas matter. RAPNet is the web site of GDN's Bridging Research and Policy Project (http://www.gdnet.org/rapnet/index.html)
Visit: http://www.gdnet.org/

The Global Knowledge Partnership is a "network of networks" with a diverse membership base comprising public, private and not-for profit organizations from both developed and developing countries. The Partnership was born as a result of the 1997 Global Knowledge Conference in Canada, hosted by the World Bank and the Government of Canada. At present there are 45 members and 48 pending members.
Visit: http://www.globalknowledge.org/

The Global Social Policy Journal (SAGE publications.) The journal advances the understanding of the impact of globalization upon social policy and social development. It welcomes scholarly articles and policy reports from a variety of disciplines that address social issues and policies in the context of an international analytical framework. The journal aims to contribute to the making of global social policy and to serve the cause of social justice within and between countries. It constitutes a most welcome global opening of social policy studies out of their national confinement, it provides a forum for rigorous analysis and creative proposals, and is an important step forward in understanding the transnational dimension of social policies. Research based evidence will contribute to policy if it fits within the political and institutional limits; if its credible and convincing and if both parties share common networks and communicate effectively.

The Cochrane Collaboration International network of individuals and institutions committed to preparing, maintaining and disseminating systematic reviews (which are "like scientific investigations in themselves, using pre-planned methods and an assembly of original studies that meet their criteria as 'subjects'. They synthesize the results of an assembly of primary investigations using strategies that limit bias and random error") of the effects of health care. It promotes the results of its reviews (which they see as "unbiased reports of evidence obtained using rigorous methods") as a resource for policy recommendations.
http://www.cochrane.org/index0.htm

Globalism and Social Policy Pogramme GASPP is an Anglo-Finnish collaboration investigating the impact of globalization upon social policy. It's a research, advisory, education and public information programme. The programme aims to contribute to the: 1) Understanding of the political processes at a global and supranational level; 2) Improvement in the practice of international organizations; 3) Dialogue concerning the nature and regulation of human and social rights; 4) Global governance reform agenda. Though not a consultancy company, GASSP endeavors to make its research findings as widely available as possible and offers advice to organizations involved in the making of social policy. GASSP has a maintained database of scholars working; networking is facilitated by means of an e-newsletter.

School for International Training (Training programme brochure 2000)
"The Building Global Capacity for NGO Policy Advocacy Training" project is designed to facilitate global networking, collaborative sharing and joint planning among civil society organizations engaged in training citizen organizations to be effective policy advocates. The project's ultimate goal is to assist civil society organizations in developing their capacity to influence public policies and institutions in the areas of sustainable development, human rights, community action. Participants learn from the collective experiences of policy advocacy trainers through the exchange of information on an electronic list serve.

The Institute for Development Studies at the University of Sussex host several useful resources. id21 (http://www.id21.org/) is a fast-track research reporting service and ELDIS (http://www.eldis.org/) is a gateway to information on development issues, providing free and easy access to wide range of high quality online resources.
Visit: http://www.ids.ac.uk/ids/

The International Development Research Centre (IDRC) is a public corporation created in 1970 to help developing countries find long-term solutions to the social,

economic, and environmental problems they face. IDRC's architects believed that the powers of science and technology could be harnessed to promote economic growth and development in the South. *"IDRC will foster and support the production, dissemination, and application of research results that lead to changed practices, technologies, policies, and laws that promote sustainable and equitable development and poverty reduction."* Among the organisation's objectives: "Research to strengthen capacity: skilled researchers, strong institutions"; "Research to influence policy: informed decisions, effective change" Visit: http://www.idrc.ca/index_en.html

---

(*Annual Report Abstract 2007-2008*) **IDRC has looked closely at the interface between research, policy, and practice.** A **study of policy influence carried out from 2001 to 2007** looked at **how governments in developing countries formulate policies and how IDRC-supported researchers influenced government decision-making**. The **23 case studies** covering projects in all regions **conclude that researchers' strategies should reflect the government's level of receptivity**. The **windows of opportunity for policy influence open only slightly and occasionally** and researchers need to be poised to take full advantage of them.

IDRC regularly transmits its learning on policy influence to its research partners. **Research-to-policy discussions** are typical among staff and partners, especially **in the project development stage**. Together they consider **how to consult with policymakers**, involve them in research activities, and **inform them of results**. **Guidelines for grant competitions factor in policy influence** and in some cases, such as the Focus Cities Research Initiative, strongly **encourage the inclusion of government representatives in research teams**. The study also concluded that **communication is essential to exerting influence**. In recent years IDRC has **increased support for researchers to improve their communication skills**. During 2007–2008, for example, IDRC's Communications Division developed a **set of tools** to improve communications planning, **the writing of policy briefs, media relations, and other skills among staff and the researchers it supports**.

IDRC's support for networks also contributes to policy influence. Many networks include government representatives and **serve as a forum for research-to-policy interaction**. The IDRC-supported Regional East African Community Health policy initiative, for example, brings together health authorities and researchers in Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda to determine the best means of bringing relevant research to the attention of policymakers. The goal is to improve people's health and health equity in East Africa. **Several other IDRC projects directly address the need for researchers and policymakers to understand each other**. For example, Research Matters, a joint initiative with the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, bridges the gap between policymakers, practitioners, and IDRC-supported researchers studying effective public healthcare service delivery. Since 2003, **Research Matters has awarded 80 grants to projects that promote new ways of connecting researchers and research-users**, consolidate existing knowledge on health issues, and **widely disseminate evidence based research**. IDRC has also learned that **policy influence takes time and demands patience.** The Centre has struck lasting relationships that see researchers through to the policy-influence stage. The Latin American Center for Rural Development (RIMISP) based in Chile is one example. IDRC has supported RIMISP for more than 20 years in its efforts to develop and implement practical ways to reduce poverty and inequality in rural areas throughout Latin America. RIMISP has also **used IDRC funding to develop research tools that evaluate how government policies affect these populations**. And in 2007, IDRC support enabled RIMISP to contribute to the World Bank's *Development Report 2008: Agriculture for Development*. Those contributions resulted in significant changes to the report's key messages and in the inclusion of new sections, such as one on the importance of policy in advancing an "agriculture for development" agenda. IDRC provided RIMISP with core funding in 2007 to further its work on informing Latin American policymakers. **IDRC's in focus collection is another means by which the Centre seeks to inform policy**. This **suite of information products presents research findings on pressing issues**. This year's in focus, *Competition and Development: The Power of Competitive Markets*, distils important lessons and recommendations on how to enact and implement the policies that foster fair competition in the marketplace. **Policy influence is rarely direct**. It is **often difficult to attribute a policy change to specific research results**. Still, even when influence seems partial and diffused, IDRC has found that the **interaction between researchers and policymakers, in and of itself, improves the decision making process**. When policymakers listen to researchers, they open the door to new ideas, broaden their consultation process, and begin to weigh evidence. **These practices are the building blocks for sound policy development and good governance.**

International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) is exploring the impact of economic policy research and ways of evaluating this. They have held a workshop on assessing the impact of policy-oriented social science research in November 2001, in which a number of ways for enhancing impact were identified. These included identifying a communications strategy, understanding policy processes, strengthening national and international research capacity, and presenting research as policy options.
Visit: http://www.ifpri.org/

Learning and Skills Development Agency (LSDA) is a strategic national resource for the development of policy and practice in post-16 education and training'. Its headquarters are located in London. They have set up a Research and Development Programme called Research Impact, and the first paper to be produced was Walter & Nutley's literature review, 'Models of Research Impact', in April 2002.
Visit: http://www.lsda.org.uk/home.asp

The Netherlands Development Assistance Research Council (RAWOO) was established to (1) issue recommendations regarding research priorities and to put forward proposals for long-term research programs, and (2) foster communication among the various parties involved in research for development: researchers, policy-makers and end users, both in the South and in the North.
Visit: http://www.rawoo.nl/home.html

ODI Overseas Development Institute
Click on the following links for more information on lessons so far:
programme background (http://www.odi.org.uk/rapid/Background/Index.html);
current, and past projects (http://www.odi.org.uk/rapid/Projects/Index.html);
meetings, seminars and workshops (http://www.odi.org.uk/RAPID/Meetings/);
bibliographies (http://www.odi.org.uk/rapid/Bibliographies/Index.html); and
links to related work (http://www.odi.org.uk/rapid/Links/Index.html).

Overseas Development Institute (ODI), UK, Research and Policy in Development (RAPID) Programme (http://www.odi.org.uk/RAPID/Index.html)

ODI's Research and Policy in Development (2004) programme was made to improve the use of research and evidence in development policy and practice trough research, advice and debate. It's 4 main themes are: (i)Use of evidence in policy identification, development and implementations; (ii)Improving communication and information systems for development agencies;(iii)Better knowledge management to enhance the impact of development agencies; (iiii)Promotion and capacity building for evidence based policy. According to ODI and RAPID, researchers must to three things for successful bridging: 1) Develop a detailed understanding of the policymaking process, the nature of the evidence they have and get hold of all stakeholders involved. 2) Develop a strategy for their work. Researchers need to ensure the evidence is credible and practically useful. 3) Need to be entrepreneurial: work with policy makers. The impact of research on development policy is crucial. Links between policy and research are often seen as linear when in fact it is dynamic in two way processes. Interrelated factors determine whether research based evidence is likely to be adopted by policymakers: political context, evidence, links between policy and research and external context (donor support).

Visit: http://www.odi.org.uk/

ODI Overseas Development Institute's Bridging Research and Policy project (http://www.odi.org.uk/RAPID/Projects/R0040a/index.html) has been researching how research-based evidence contributes to policy processes in developing countries.
The project included a literature review (http://www.odi.org.uk/RAPID/Projects/R0040a/Biblio_Intro.html), the development of a new framework (http://www.odi.org.uk/RAPID/Projects/R0040a/Framework_Intro.html) for analyzing and strengthening research-policy links and four in-depth case studies. This seminar provided an opportunity to learn about and discuss the results. (Meetings).
Visit: http://www.odi.org.uk/rapid/

The Program in Policy Decision-Making at McMaster University in Canada maintains a comprehensive Web site. The site describes the program's work to improve understanding of factors that influence policy decision-making and to suggest ways to transfer and facilitate the use of research knowledge in policy decision-making environments.
Visit: http://www.researchtopolicy.ca/
Research in practice
Visit: http://www.rip.org.uk/
Research mindedness in social work and social care
Visit: http://www.resmind.swap.ac.uk/index.htm

The Research Unit for Research Utilisation (RURU) was recently set up by the University of St Andrews affiliated to the ESRC Network for Evidence-based Policy and Practice. They aim to look at how to enable evidence to inform policy and professional practice, and their main areas of interest are key public sectors such as health care and social care.
Visit: http://www.ruru.ac.uk/

The Support for Analysis and Research in Africa (SARA) project is managed by the Academy for Educational Development, Washington DC. Its aim is to improve policies and programs in health and basic education. Together, AFR/SD and SARA aim to improve the link between research, policy development and program design and implementation in Africa.
Visit: http://sara.aed.org/

The United Nations Research Institute on Social Development (UNRISD) has ongoing work on Improving Research and Knowledge on Social Development in International Organizations (http://www.unrisd.org/80256B3C005BB128/(httpProjects)/5CCCB80CEC61136380256B5D0045A6EF?OpenDocument) and recently held a conference on Social Knowledge and International Policy Making: Exploring the Linkages (http://www.unrisd.org/80256B3C005BD6AB/(httpEvents)/A22EAFB757CBFAA4C1256E7700425840?OpenDocument).
Visit: http://www.unrisd.org/

The World Bank has a number of useful resources. The World Development Report 1998/99 focused on 'Knowledge for Development' (http://www.worldbank.org/wdr/wdr98/index.htm), and dealt with the broad issues of narrowing knowledge gaps, addressing information problems, and policy priorities. The World Bank also has a Knowledge Sharing webpage (http://www.worldbank.org/ks), and is a member of the Global Knowledge Partnership (GKP) (http://www.globalknowledge.org) The Poverty Reduction Group's approach to Poverty and Social

Impact   Analysis   (PSIA)
(http://lnweb18.worldbank.org/ESSD/sdvext.nsf/81ByDocName/PovertySocialImpactAnalysis)   aims   to
improve links between research and policy for poverty reduction.
Visit: http://www.worldbank.org/

The Knowledge Utilization and Policy Implementation (KUPI) research program is
a five year (2002-2007) CIHR funded program. Dr. Carole Estabrooks is the Principal
Investigator and the Co-investigators are Dr. Rejean Landry, Dr. Harley Dickinson and Dr.
Karen Golden-Biddle. A resource guide was developed as part of the KUPI research
program. It provides a list of resources (key journals, articles, monographs) that offer
general and introductory information about the field of Knowledge Utilization (KU). It
provides a list of key people, in addition to a selection of useful Internet resources. There
are subject-specific resources in the areas of: nursing and health sciences, social
sciences/humanities, organization studies, and policy studies.

UNESCO
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

By way of conclusion: *Excerpt from Diane Stone: "Getting research into policy?" (2001.).p7.*

"BRIDGING" POLICY AND RESEARCH. The relationship between researchers (social scientists) and policy-makers (governments) is an uneasy one. **Both researchers and policy-makers might be accused of holding unrealistic expectations of the other.** Yet, it is frequently stated that research has a great deal to contribute to policy formulation and improve decision-making. Indeed, **many governments and international organisations devote considerable financial resources to both in-house and contracted research.** For example, the Danish Commission stated that research could 'safeguard the quality of aid' through both the 'accumulation of experience and scientific knowledge' as well as through 'knowledge management'. This ideal picture is quickly qualified by the Commission recounting the perceptions of the two different communities of researchers and policy makers. That is, **researchers often consider that there is no political audience for their work despite the important observations they make and policy relevant explanations they develop. By contrast, policy-makers often consider that what researchers contribute is not relevant, too esoteric and asking theoretical questions that do not resonate with the needs of policy makers. 'Where the one group feels nobody listens, the other feels their opposite numbers have little to say**' (Danida, 2001: 9). There has been much written on this dilemma. The **sociology of knowledge** is a well establishedfield of inquiry. More recently, the 'ideational turn' in political science and international relations has resulted in **some wider studies of 'ideas and politics'**. Increasingly **psychology is addressing practical applications of theories about cognition with real-world decision-making**. Exploration of how business and political leaders make decisions in the face of high levels of risk would rest to a large extent upon cognition that is, the processes through which we perceive, reason about and act. **Two social science journals – *Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion and Utilization* and *Knowledge,Technology and Policy7* – have addressed the research/policy nexus for decades**. More recently, the '**knowledge management' literature (often with roots in organisation theory) has burgeoned**. Economics is often considered to have huge impact on policy. There is, however, less reflection within the discipline of when, how or why (see Bergik *et al*, 1997). Instead, renditions of John Maynard Keynes' famous dictum tend to suffice as an explanation for the influence of economics. "The ideas of economists and political philosophers… are more powerful than is commonly understood. Indeed the world is ruled by little else. Practical men who believe themselves to be quite exempt from any intellectual influences, are usually the slaves of some defunct economist. Madmen in authority who hear voices in the air are distilling their frenzy from some academic scribbler of a few years back" (Keynes 1936: 383).

Nevertheless, there have been studies of **some types of organisations that seek to 'bridge' the policy and research worlds. 'Think tanks', for example, are a form of research organisation that directly seeks to influence policy on which there is an extensive literature** (see *inter alia*, McGann & Weaver 2000; Stone 2000; Stone, Denham & Garnett 2002). There is **also a relatively extensive literature on the activities of philanthropic foundations in both advancing knowledge and in its utilisation** (Gemelli 1998; Berman 1983). **Universities, in contrast, have often been stereotyped as engaged in the disinterested pursuit of knowledge.** Little attention has been paid to other types of research organisation. **Consultancy firms,** for example, are involved with public policy as a consequence of the '**new public management'**. Furthermore, there are many large and globally **active non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and pressure groups** (such as Greenpeace and Transparency International) which both undertake research and attempt to use the findings to influence policy-making. Also overlooked is the policy role of government research bureaux, both those within departments, and autonomous non departmental public bodies (quangos) (but see Stares and Weaver, 2001).

As noted earlier, there is a research endeavour here and considerable scope remains to synthesise elements of these social science literatures to address the **contemporary policy roles of experts and research organisations**. Moreover, a corrective is needed for the overwhelming **bias towards analysis of OECD policy systems and knowledge structures** to recognise the different circumstances and constraints faced by developing countries. Yet, an evaluation of the research functions of these different organisations would seem to provide one basis for contesting the commonly held view articulated by Danida and others that researchers and policy makers live in different worlds. **One task of the researcher is to critically contest established assumptions.** Increasingly, a capacity to not only understand but also **undertake rigorous research is a professional requirement for NGO leaders, officers of professional associations and government bureaucrats. More researchers are becoming practitioners** – co-**opted onto advisory committees**, joining government for limited terms or **acting as consultants to international organisations**. The dividing line is very **blurred in many policy instances**. Furthermore, a synthesis of various academic perspectives and of analyses of organisations would highlight the lack of communication between disciplines and the **existence of different 'communities of practice'** in **addressing the research/policy nexus**. Different groups of researchers and practitioners have addressed similar questions in isolation from each other. This has **resulted in different conceptualisations of the relationship between research and development** and generated different recommendations for 'bridging research and policy'."