National Centre for Research Methods (NCRM)
Networks for Methodological Innovation

Dancing with new partners:
Developing novel research methods to establish and monitor
impacts of user engagement in times of austerity

Report on a Series of Agenda-Setting Workshops

Irene Hardill, Jon Bannister and Suzanne Martin

March 2013

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

This National Centre for Research Methods (NCRM) Network for Methodological Innovation project was conceived by three interdisciplinary networks from practice-related disciplines:

- The *Engaging Scottish Local Authorities Programme* (ESLA). ESLA was supported by the ESRC, the Scottish Funding Council (SFC) and the Local Authorities Research Council Initiative (LARCI) (http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/engage/).

- An Anglo-Canadian research project the *Sustaining IT used by older people to promote autonomy and independence* (Sus-IT) project, which was funded by New Dynamics of Ageing Research Programme (NDA) and Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) (http://sus-it.lboro.ac.uk/latestnews.html).

- The learned society *Academy of Social Sciences* (AcSS) which is composed of individual social scientist Academicians and over 40 learned societies (http://www.acss.org.uk/).

The Network is led by Professor Irene Hardill (Northumbria University), with Dr Sue Baines (Manchester Metropolitan University), Professor Jon Bannister (Manchester Metropolitan University), Ann Clark (University of the Highlands and Islands), Ceridwen Roberts (Oxford University), Dr Daniela Sime (Strathclyde University), Professor Richard Thorpe (University of Leeds), Dr Heather Wilkinson (University of Edinburgh) and Dr Rehema White (St Andrew's University) as Co-Investigators.   Suzanne Martin (Senior Research Assistant, Northumbria University) managed the co-ordination of the Network events and production of reports and papers.

The Network received funding during 2011-12 as an *NCRM Network for Methodological Innovation*.   The key theme: '*Dancing with new partners*' examined methods for engaging non-academic users, especially with people who, in our experience, are often resistant to engagement - and for measuring the impact of research on policy and practice.

The specific aims of the Network were to build capacity, develop and critique methods in social science related to user engagement and impact; facilitate the development of a network to consider such issues; support early career researchers and share information and practice. The Network events acknowledged the shift towards deliberative democracy, new modes of social science research and the current era of financial austerity.

The Network commissioned a series of 'think pieces' to inform debate, from Professor David Charles (formerly Curtin University, Australia, now Strathclyde University); Barbara Doig (former Chief Social Researcher Scottish Government); Professor Jon Bannister (Manchester Metropolitan University); Craig McNaughton (former Head of Knowledge Mobilisation,

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, now Policy Horizons, Canada); Dr Jeremy Phillipson and Professor Phillip Lowe (University of Newcastle upon Tyne); John Ramsey (Age UK); Professor Richard Thorpe and Paul Ellwood (University of Leeds); and Dr Glyn Williams (University of Sheffield).

Achievements of the Network thus far have been:

- Evidence of increased capacity building and networking within the Academy and amongst user/stakeholder participants

- Two themed issues of the journal "*Contemporary Social Scienc*e" which will be published in 2013-14; the abstracts for these papers are presented in this Report

- The Network is to work with ESRC and the Academy of Social Sciences to produce a booklet (to be published by the Academy of Social Sciences in their "*Making the Case"* series) for postgraduates on impactful postgraduate research;

- The Network is also working with a major publisher to produce a "Methods" book.

This Report contains eight 'think pieces' (or position papers) which were commissioned for the Launch Conference of the Network. These 'think pieces' and their subsequent presentation and discussion among Network members were used to identify three key themes for further discussion. The three themes were explored in subsequent workshops and summaries of the issues explored and the conclusions drawn are outlined below, along with a summary of the closing conference of the Network and abstracts of subsequent papers.

For more information about the project and all the events outlined in this Report, please visit: (http://www.northumbria.ac.uk/sd/academic/sass/about/socscience/solscres/interdiscnetworks/dancingwithnewpartners/) or contact Professor Irene Hardill (Irene.hardill@northumbria.ac.uk) or Suzanne Martin (suzanne.martin@northumbria.ac.uk)

WORKSHOP 1
WHAT IS KNOWLEDGE? WHAT ROLE DOES USER ENGAGEMENT, CO-PRODUCTION AND IMPACT PLAY?

October 25th 2011, British Academy London

Introduction

The workshop commenced with a series of short presentations. These were intended to outline the groups participating in the network, the overall intentions of the seminar series and the objectives of the first workshop. One of the key elements of the launch conference was the presentation of a series of 'think pieces', these 'position papers' offered academic and user perspectives on user engagement and impact, and included two speakers who offered international perspectives, from Canada and Australia. Their respective authors presented their papers, and they acted as a springboard for delegates to co-produce an agenda for 3 subsequent workshops, which took place during the afternoon session of the launch conference.

A total of eight 'think pieces' were commissioned for the launch conference of the Network (see Box 1 below), and provided a range of views and perspectives on user engagement and impact. Two think pieces offered perspectives from Australia and Canada, a further two were from research 'users', and the remaining four from UK social scientists. We now present the eight think pieces.

Professor David Charles, formerly Curtin University, Australia;

Craig McNaughton, former Head of Knowledge Mobilisation, Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada;

Jon Bannister, University of Glasgow)

Professor Richard Thorpe and Paul Ellwood, University of Sheffield;

Dr Glyn Williams, University of Sheffield (DfID-ESRC Joint Scheme);

Jeremy Phillipson and Amy Proctor, University of Newcastle upon Tyne

Barbara Doig, former Chief Social Researcher Scottish Government;

John Ramsey, Age UK;

Box 1: 'think piece' authors

David Charles
Professor of Regional Economic Development & Policy
University of Strathclyde

Australian perspectives on research impact

Whilst we live in a highly globalised higher education system, there remain significant national differences in the way we manage research, and more particularly in how we evaluate its effects. These differences were brought home to me when I moved to Australia to take up a position as a research dean. Whilst many of the institutions seem similar to the casual observer, there are subtle differences when you look at the detail.

Evaluating research impact is an ongoing concern in many countries. As investment in research has increased and spread across a wider number of universities (some of which were never research-based institutions before) so policymakers have become concerned to ensure value for money, measured by outputs and impacts and to ensure research quality. In Australia there are the same pressures as in the UK. University numbers have increased, to 38 as new institutions have been established and some colleges upgraded. Budgets have risen, and some research is undertaken in all institutions. Parallel concerns about levels of innovation and society's needs for new knowledge have driven successive Australian governments to look to maximise the benefits of their investment in research through a greater focus on impacts. One dimension of this has been the development of standard innovation and commercialisation policies, aimed at universities and very much in line with international trends. Two specific developments are relevant to my argument here today:

1. There has been a long term development of research funding schemes that encourage engagement with users in order to facilitate impact.
2. The concern for research quality has led to the establishment of a system of research assessment, currently known as Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA rather than RAE).

What I want to explore here are the limits to these policies as ways of stimulating impact, and indeed the perverse consequences of some aspects of the policies, and also note that real engagement often occurs in spite of the formal national policies.

Starting with the funding schemes, the Australian Research Council has for many years run two main grant funding schemes in parallel. One, a blue-skies grant scheme called Discovery, is a conventional programme based on excellence. The other, the Linkage scheme, is aimed at collaborative projects with likely impacts and where co-funding with other partners is required. Linkage projects bring together academic research teams with user/partners who have to make a significant financial contribution to the research (equal to or more than the ARC contribution) and are increasingly expected to make a contribution of knowledge also. Successful proposals usually promise that the non-academic partner will undertake some of the work and bring their expertise to bear, and that they will implement the results of the work in ways that benefits Australia. The selection criteria ask the following questions:

- 'does the research address an important problem?
- how will the anticipated outcomes advance the knowledge base?

- are the Project aims and concepts novel and innovative?
- will new methods or technologies be developed?
- will the proposed research provide economic, environmental and/or social benefit to Australia?
- does the Project address National Research Priorities?' (ARC Linkage Project rules for 2012)

This is a very worthwhile programme and funds a considerable amount of interesting and engaged work. Much of this has an industrial focus as would be expected, although a reasonable proportion are in the social sciences and often funded by state governments or other such bodies, who are the potential partners able to meet the costs of participation. The budget for Linkage grants is limited and so consequently are numbers. With two rounds a year, around 400 grants are awarded annually across all disciplines excluding health (Table 1) spread over 38 universities. Of these a relatively high proportion are in the social and behavioural sciences (table 2) and success rates are much higher than the Discovery grants.

Table 1: Comparison of proposal numbers, success rates, requested and allocated funds for successful proposals from *Linkage Projects* Round One 2008 to Round Two 2011

Funding round and year	Proposals considered	Proposals approved	Success rate	Requested funds over project life (all proposals)	Requested funds over project life (approved proposals)	Funds allocated over project life	Allocation as a percentage of request
Rd 1 2008	424	202	47.6%	$140,343,990	$78,546,893	$62,267,846	79.3%
Rd 2 2008	487	208	42.7%	$182,915,040	$93,414,877	$63,717,139	68.2%
Rd 1 2009	441	218	49.4%	$178,815,658	$106,032,303	$71,704,687	67.6%
Rd 2 2009	522	239	45.8%	$201,624,648	$105,186,071	$71,856,782	68.3%
Rd 1 2010	470	211	44.9%	$178,500,521	$94,619,567	$66,827,891	70.6%
Rd 2 2010	512	218	42.6%	$204,496,010	$98,419,105	$66,753,570	67.8%
Rd 1 2011	398	186	46.7%	$157,139,769	$82,443,432	$56,235,992	68.2%
Rd 2 2011	535	219	40.9%	$223,844,995	$104,862,877	$67,393,349	64.3%

Source: http://www.arc.gov.au/ncgp/lp/LP11_rd2_selrpt.htm

Table 2: Numbers of proposals and success rates for *Linkage Projects* Round Two 2011 by discipline panel

Panel†	Proposals considered	Proposals approved	Success rate	Requested funds over project life (all proposals considered)	Approved funds over project life (approved proposals)
BSB	134	52	38.8%	$62,727,091	$19,475,303
EMI	147	59	40.1%	$69,479,782	$19,735,246
HCA	47	20	42.6%	$17,470,279	$5,269,587
PCE	36	16	44.4%	$16,266,614	$6,716,458
SBE	171	72	42.1%	$57,901,229	$16,196,755
Total	**535**	**219**	**40.9%**	**$223,844,995**	**$67,393,349**

†BSB = Biological Sciences and Biotechnology; EMI = Engineering, Mathematics and Informatics; HCA = Humanities and Creative Arts; PCE = Physics, Chemistry and Earth Sciences; SBE = Social, Behavioural and Economic Sciences

Source: http://www.arc.gov.au/ncgp/lp/LP11_rd2_selrpt.htm

Of course the success rates are affected by the application rates, and there tend to be fewer applications for Linkage grants due to the heavy commitment needed from partners. There is another aspect though which is worth examining. All ARC grants place considerable emphasis on the track record of the chief investigator(s), although in linkage grants this only accounts for 20% of the evaluation score (it is 40% for the Discovery grants). Track record as been modified recently to ROPE (research opportunity and performance evidence) which usually means the numbers and quality of recent publications **in the field of the research proposed**, and recent grant performance. I highlight the field issue as this seems to reinforce a focus on specialisation, just as the grant performance criterion rewards the usual suspects. For new researchers the plan seems to be to attach oneself to a team as a junior member and then try and get lots of relevant publications to build an appropriate track record. The emphasis on track record is argued as being necessary given the limited resources available and a consequent desire to play safe by focusing on supporting researchers that are known to deliver. It does seem to support a more conventional form of research though with a high likelihood of academic publication, more than innovation in user engagement.

Impact is assessed for Linkage grants but only at the end of the project – there is no long term monitoring or evaluation 2-3 years after the project has finished. ARC have been keen to identify success stories of impact and publish case studies, but the major focus in the proposal stage and final report on high quality publications does tend to limit the orientation towards impact.

The other major engagement-oriented programme is the Cooperative Research Centre programme. This has been running for many years now and consists of consortia of university research teams and non-university partners with an agreed programme of work over 5 years funded jointly by the Australian government and the non-university partners. Centres are virtual, but typically established as companies which allocate funding to partners according to their contribution to the overall work of the centre. So a university participant might have a member of staff funded as the coordinator of a strand of work, and then be funded for specific projects carried out during the life of the centre.

Again there is an emphasis on industrial partnership in these centres and much of the programme focuses on technology. However there are some social science-focused projects and I will provide the example of one that my former university was involved in which I had some dealings with. This example is the CRC for Remote Economic Participation which is focused on solutions to economic disadvantage in remote parts of Australia, a considerable element of which concerns the needs of indigenous people. The project has over 50 partners including seven Australian universities and three overseas partner universities, plus partners from national and state governments, charities, companies and community groups. Research is focused on understanding the regional economies of remote Australia, developing new economic opportunities and successful models of enterprise development, and improving pathways to employment and educational opportunity for indigenous people. If successful the centre will help to create economic activity and employment in these regions, reduce benefit payments, and improve health and welfare. Central to this though is the active engagement of local communities in the research process with the projects including the training and employment of aboriginal people as paid field researchers.

The practical nature of the research can be seen from the previous Desert Knowledge CRC (a $91 million, 7 year project) which as one major strand looked at the problems of over 1 million feral camels in the Australian desert, and has developed an ongoing government-funded project for the

monitoring and control of feral camels. The research included work to record the impact of feral camels on delicate ecosystems through accessing the knowledge of indigenous peoples who have been the traditional guardians of those lands. Currently as outcomes of this work camel control measures include culling and capture for sale.

The second major development I wanted to mention is ERA. This is meant to be like the RAE, and indeed Gareth Roberts was invited over to give advice during its preparation, although there are some notable differences. An unimplemented predecessor to ERA was the Research Quality Framework (RQF), proposed by the former Liberal administration and then withdrawn when Labor won power and replaced with ERA. The RQF did contain assessment of impact and some effort was spent on developing and trialling impact assessment only for this element to be completely dropped in ERA.

ERA as initially implemented in a trial in 2009 and a full implementation in 2010 was focused primarily on publications and other research metrics such as grant income. Each university had to make a full declaration of all publications over a five year period for all staff present on the census date. Staff were included if they were in jobs that involved research (regardless of their output) or if they had some outputs (regardless of their job). Thus there was no scope to exclude staff who were inactive but still in conventional academic roles, and staff with publications had to be included even if in administrative roles that no longer require research performance. All publications were to be assigned to discipline groupings based on the content of the publication, or if it was a journal article on the assigned discipline of the journal. Staff were also assigned to disciplines, with the implication that staff and their outputs might be allocated to different disciplines, and the submissions typically bore only a very loose correlation to the structure of schools and departments in the university.

Panels assessed the submissions, although fewer and less specialised than in the RAE, and for most of the sciences relied on bibliometrics, with peer review in the humanities and social sciences. Much emphasis was placed on a comprehensive journal ranking exercise across all disciplines, undertaken by the ARC. Journals were ranked C, B, A or A* and there was much speculation how the proportions of journals of different ranking would be used in agreeing a score for a particular disciplinary submission, on a scale from 1-5. At the time there was concern that whilst in the UK RAE an excellent researcher would only have to submit their 4 best articles, presumably all at 4 level, in the Australian equivalent the same researcher would have to submit everything, including any articles they had written in lower grade practitioner journals. Thus an excellent researcher with a mixed profile of high quality academic articles and user-focused practitioner journal articles might be penalised in Australia but not in the UK. How these issues were addressed in ERA is still not clear, although for the next assessment in 2012 the controversial journal rankings have been dropped. Note that another difference with the RAE is the rolling nature of assessment, with the 2012 assessment being just 2 years after the first and overlapping in years. Also with the census date in 2011 there is a significant lag, and changes to the rules were only announced after the census date. The consequence of ERA has been a renewed focus on research quality as measured by journal quality, and a painful switch from the previous policy which was focused on volume of outputs regardless of quality. Previously universities received core research funding according to the volume of publications (plus PhD numbers and grant income) which drove internal incentives for quantity and a thriving local market in establishing new journals.

So the formal measures introduced to encourage engagement of Australian researchers have had mixed outcomes, with the implementation of these measures still reinforcing some traditional academic behaviours. On the other hand the difficulty of accessing ARC funds for many researchers, particularly in the less research intensive universities has led to creativity in developing local partnerships with the community to undertake research. In some cases large businesses or research foundations have also funded this work – Rio Tinto for example funded a research centre on community engagement in Curtin University. It is in this often poorly funded sector of work perhaps where some of the most creative and interesting projects have been undertaken. One former colleague worked with the community of a small town in monitoring and recording health problems emerging from a local minerals processing plant where the state government refused to accept there were problems with emissions. Projects elsewhere include collaborations with eco-tourism operators to monitor local impacts and work to help identify opportunities for declining settlements in rural areas. Engagement of this kind has useful lessons about o-production of knowledge, but often more limited publication outputs.

Overall I saw in Australia a country that had many needs for more high quality social science research, especially that which draws upon active engagement of the local community, and which aims to make a difference to the lives of those communities. At the same time though the seduction of rankings on international league tables and their implications for the recruitment of international students tended to reinforce national policies which emphasised research quality and academic publication. The tensions between excellence and relevance seemed to be even more visible there than in the UK and ran the risk of weakening the overall quality of social science research.

Craig McNaughton
Director
Policy Horizons Canada

Tracing the demand side of the supply coin
A review of Canadian efforts to connect up research in the Social Sciences
(and Humanities) with government policy-making

Background

I recently started working for Policy Horizons Canada – a Canadian government think tank (http://www.horizons.gc.ca/page.asp?pagenm=pri_index). Horizons is keenly interested in drawing insights from the academic research community – especially as they relate to emerging policy issues over the next 10 to 15 years. In collaboration with a number of comparable agencies in the UK, US, Singapore, France, South Korea and the Netherlands, as well as the OECD and others, Horizons is centrally involved in foresight studies – deliberate exercises designed to push thinking past current assumptions in public policy to identify new insights, opportunities, risks and challenges.

Previously, I worked on knowledge mobilization for the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), Canada's main funding arm for social sciences and humanities research and graduate training.[i] SSHRC has been quite involved in knowledge mobilization since about 1998 – especially in the context of the Council's initiatives to support community-based research partnerships.[ii] The term 'knowledge mobilization' has a wide range of meanings, but centres on efforts to ensure that the results of publicly funded research in the social sciences and humanities (SSH) produce favourable intellectual, economic, social and cultural impacts within government, the business sector and the community at large.

My work at Horizons continues to focus on bringing academic research insights to bear on emerging policy issues, but at this point it is from the "demand" side. This represents an opportunity to articulate strategies for taking advantage of the wealth of research knowledge (SSH and other) from the standpoint of government and its wide range of social, economic, environmental and technological concerns.

In the context of our workshop today, my hope is that these strategies will at the same time serve as useful suggestions on methods for ensuring and monitoring user engagement, co-production and impact.

Joining up the SSH Academy and Government: 15 suggested strategies

Strategy 1   Respect Differences: Government and the academy are not the same. They may talk about the same things at turns, but they do so from different perspectives, operating with different methodologies, time-frames and constraints.

- The academy values intellectual achievement in its own right; government values public service.

- In Canada, we have followed the controversy around the Arts and Humanities Research Council in relation to the UK government's 'Big Society' initiative. The situation in Canada is not that much different: we need to ensure the integrity of the academic enterprise, even as we work to ensure tangible public benefits.

- The Metropolis Project, especially in its earlier years, did a terrific job of separating, yet linking up, the separate perspectives and approaches of the academy, government and community organizations[iii].

Strategy 2   Recognise common purpose: The first strategy should not be allowed to obscure the fact that both the academy and government (and by extension their community and business partners), each in their own way, are dedicated to making valuable social contributions. They all think in terms of positive public impact – just along different pathways.

- Any assumption within government circles that the academy is disengaged from society and the importance of making a social contribution needs to be challenged by the facts. A quick look at university websites can quickly overpower any negative bias.

- Those working in the social sciences are by nature critical – of government, of society, of each other. Social scientists are not in the business of providing uncritical support to the government of the day, nor to each other. They are there to generate alternate ideas, debate and contention. A smart government will simply accept this, finding innovative ways to bring academic points of view to bear within its policy-development process.

Strategy 3   Find common ground in foresight studies: Foresight studies represent a relatively new development in Canada and a number of other countries. Because they try to cast beyond the present to the future, such studies appear to provide government and the academy with a convenient meeting place – a free-wheeling intellectual space that allows all players to make contributions with fewer of the usual constraints in play.

Policy Horizons Canada is part of a National Government Foresight Organizations network that has been meeting since 2009. The UK partner is Foresight (http://www.bis.gov.uk/foresight), which reports to the Chief Scientist who reports directly to the Prime Minister.

- Any assumption within government circles that the academy is disengaged from society and the importance of making a social contribution needs to be challenged by the facts. A quick look at university websites can quickly overpower any negative bias.

- Foresight studies are highly interdisciplinary and integrated, clustering together a range of insights with a view to identifying possible futures. They give participants a chance to challenge their assumptions about the past, the present and especially the future. This is prime intellectual terrain for the academic community. It is a destination to which the results of academic reflection and research should be carried in considerable volume.

- A new book has just been published by Jocelyne Bourgon, a former Clerk of Canada's Privy Council Office: *A New Synthesis of Public Administration: Serving in the 21st Century.* [iv] The publisher offers a synopsis that outlines the opportunity for citizens (including academics and often working through academics) to contribute to public policy that is able to adapt to uncertain futures:

- "In an increasingly interconnected environment, shocks, crises, cascading failures, and surprising breakthroughs are features of our age. The ability to anticipate, intervene, innovate, and adapt is now seen as essential for governments. Public officials serve in an expanded public space that is being reshaped by the rise of social networking and modern information and communication technologies. The desired results on many public issues exceed the reach and resources of government."

- In Ontario, the Mowat Centre for Policy Innovation (http://www.mowatcentre.ca/), linked to the School of Public Policy and Governance at the University of Toronto, is strongly involved in this kind of work[v].

Strategy 4   Take advantage of the investment in community research partnerships: The joint investment by communities, by the academy and by government in various forms of community-based research is substantial. The results of that investment over at least the 13 or so years – in the form of insights, projects, networks, trust and capacity – provide another valuable meeting place for academics and government policy-makers.

- SWHRC has invested heavily in its Community-University Research Alliances (CURA) program since 1999. The list of twenty 2009-10 CURA projects provides a good sense of the impact of the program[vi]

- SSHRC has also invested in a steady series of "CURA derivatives" – programs involving a particularly strong emphasis on solid community relations as a basis for high-impact research: Social Economy, Aboriginal Research, Knowledge Impact in Society, Strategic Knowledge Clusters, Partnership Grants

- The University of Victoria, Carleton University and the Université du Québec à Montréal are collaborating in the Global Alliance on Community-Engaged Research[vii]

- The Monieson Centre at Queen's University sponsors a Knowledge Impact in Society website[viii] that reflects valuable work on economic development done in Eastern Ontario communities. Their model has important implications for building effective links with the business community (SMEs) – and by extension with government.

Strategy 5   Cultivate the link with Deputy Ministers: Deputy Ministers are required to spend some of their time thinking "outside of the box." This creates a valuable opportunity for academic researchers to contribute public value right at the centre of government operations.

- The list of DM leadership competencies provided by Treasury Board[ix] includes a number in the area of strategic thinking:

    - Identifies links between global, societal, and economic trends, stakeholder concerns, the policy agenda, public service values, and departmental, regional and horizontal issues

    - Extracts the key issues from complex, ambiguous, rapidly changing contexts

    - Projects beyond the status quo to the department's potential contribution to society

    - Encourages debate and ideas from across hierarchy, skills sets, and stakeholders

    - Anticipates emerging issues / changing context and develops strategies quickly to solve problems or seize opportunities

- The work of Policy Horizons Canada is guided by a Deputy Minsters Steering Committee that includes the DMs from 9 departments and agencies.[x] This committee is presented with an annual 'Metascan' of foresight studies by Horizons – the first Metascan, presented earlier this month, having been very well received. This annual foresight reporting process provides an exceptional opportunity for high-impact research contributions.

Strategy 6   Emphasise process over product: The genius of SSH research is arguably much more about process than product. SSH scholarship governs the process by which you think through problems and challenges in your job, in the workplace, with citizens and stakeholders, with regions, provinces or countries in conflict, in reconciling of values with expediency, etc.

- Most knowledge mobilization work seems to hinge on the idea that research produces findings or tangible results, that somehow ought then to make their way to market – the main challenge being one of making 'consumers' aware of the products.

- But rather than a consumable you conveniently pick up off the shelf, research is best understood as a conscientious intellectual engagement with problems of interest – one made possible by persistent work on theory and methodology, ongoing questioning of

assumptions, observations and conclusions, continuous experimentation and re-experimentation, and vigorous, unending debate.

- Teaching is not usually understood as knowledge mobilization, but given that it draws its content from research and that it engages hundreds of thousands of students, it should be – and teaching, in its best form, is a dynamic process of questioning and weighing received wisdom.

- A process orientation affects how we measure impact. There is less to quantify (at least at first) and more to describe. Case studies of natural research process, focusing especially on those with whom researchers and their graduates work in surrounding communities of interest, come closest to allowing us to understand and confirm impact, illustrating the kinds of impact that are possible in ever-widening waves of influence[xi].

Strategy 7   Openly invite criticism: Government needs to value criticism more. Since criticism is arguably the life blood of the academy, we can estimate that SSH research will contribute public value in proportion to the government's ability to invite and accommodate criticism, both from external players and from within its own ranks. The academy, for its part, needs to value external criticism. Government is populated by a very large number of SSH alumni, including within its senior-most ranks. This means government is in a position to give professors and graduate students a very good intellectual run for their money. The academy should invite the criticism of government – essentially as a test of the resilience of the observations and conclusions of research in areas of common interest.

Strategy 8   Adjust respective speeds: Government needs to slow down at turns to create time for managers and rank and file to think, to debate – in short to go back to school. The academy needs to speed up at turns to create occasions where the intellectual test is coping with fast-paced, complex and ambiguous phenomena. At the right moment in the cycle of research, it is an excellent test of the viability of research theories and methods.

Strategy 9   Support government champions of academic content and process: From time to time, DMs, ADMs and other senior managers in departments and agencies will mount initiatives to bring in or otherwise engage academic researchers. These initiatives need to be supported and resourced by the SSH community when they occur.

Strategy 10   Build up learning opportunities for public servants: There is always a need to enrich the curriculum offered to public servants – to push past training to continuing education – especially, though not exclusively, in the fields of public administration and public policy

- Because of the pressures of government, there is very little time for thinking and learning. The focus tends to be on the training needed to do the essentials of your immediate job. Government needs to challenge this tradition minimal training even in the midst of the demands of government process. A legitimate part of government process is learning – is a

key foundational element of Treasury Board's Management Accountability Framework[xii] and Public Service Renewal[xiii].

- This is where SSH and wider academic communities can come into play. They are in a position to offer directly, jointly, or via the Canada School of Public Service, both research and teaching content integral to effective, innovative government.

Strategy 11   Open up public, 24-7 spaces for online discussion and learning: Knowledge mobilization strategies tend to focus on generating access to the products of SSH research – and to the researchers themselves. The latter purpose is closer to the mark. We need to work to make research data as accessible and readable as possible, but the resource is residually difficult to interpret and absorb – plus research results are essentially dynamic, not static. People need a chance to ask questions, discuss, debate; explanations and interpretations are needed. So easily accessed discussion forums involving academics and moderated with a view towards a productive, respectful learning exchange – and public value – would be effective.

- Most universities offer one or more kinds of "Ask the Expert" service online. An interesting initiative at Memorial University is the Yaffle site (http://www.yaffle.ca/). The next step is to create discussion spaces for any area of public interest.

- The SSH community has done extensive work on ICTs (including in remote areas), digital technologies and social media. This work can help shape how these forums would work.

- This is a blend of Web 1.0 and Web 2.0 technologies: the forums should be organized in places (websites) that can be easily located, yet they can include Wiki features and all of the various social media.

Strategy 12   Make a video: Visual and other digital tools provide a powerful medium to make the research findings accessible, personal and concise – for those working in government and members of the general public:

- The University of Manitoba website makes very good use of bold photographs, concise messaging and YouTube videos. See, for example, the compendium of tools used at http://umanitoba.ca/rebel/culture.html.

- Webcasts given, and then available afterwards, are effective. See the lunch hour lecture series at University College of London: http://events.ucl.ac.uk/calendar/tab:lunch_hour_lectures/.

Strategy 13   Rely on SSH graduate students and graduates: Students are the natural interlocutors, knowledge mobilizers, and knowledge brokers – both within the university research environment and within government, business and community organizations to which they move as graduates. The government has a keen interest in public service renewal, placing recent graduates at the centre of the knowledge exchange process.

Strategy 14   Include the humanities: Humanities research and teaching can provide powerful contributions to public policy. Digital technologies are increasingly making it possible to accommodate the natural intellectual strengths of the humanities in building public policy – for example, understanding of the complexities and force of languages, words, meanings, images, histories, religions, imagination, logic, etc.

Strategy 15   Include the natural and health sciences: There is an increasing interest in "whole of government" thinking to get good policy. We need a concomitant interest in "whole of university" thinking to get sound knowledge,

- This does not mean that only inter- and multi-disciplinary approaches have merit. It has to do with ensuring the intellectual viability of ideas developed in one discipline, or a group of disciplines, wherever they touch on phenomena that are also studied in other disciplines. The actual trans-disciplinary brokering needed is likely best led by someone skilled in that kind of work.

In Canada, there can be a sense that SSH takes second seat to research in the medical and natural sciences – for example, in the context of the federal government's Science and Technology Strategy.[xiv] This is not to say that SSH goes unfunded – there is actually steadily increasing recognition of the value of SSH research (e.g., in the area of digital economy research[xv]). Yet very few within either government or the academy have worked out how to position SSH as a central player in S&T innovation. It is an uncomfortable fit, despite the fact that it is a major aspect of our society and economy. Some important progress has been provided by the Situating Science project (http://www.situsci.ca/), a strategic knowledge cluster funded by SSHRC.

Overall: We need to create and sustain 'academic spaces' within government

Quite a bit of effort has been made to create 'government spaces' within the academy – witness the plethora of institutes, centres and research projects focused on generating policy-relevant research. Government and academic leaders also have an opportunity to collaborate through policy think thanks and other collaborative projects in the non-profit and business sectors.

But there are also important opportunities to open up 'academic spaces' inside government – through foresight studies, the work of Deputy Ministers, community-based research projects, SSH champions within government, SSH graduates working in government, enhanced Public Service learning, online public discussion sites, and integrated policy-making across disciplines.

These academic spaces within government, built on an appreciation of differences and common purposes, could prove valuable in bringing the insights of SSH research to bear effectively on public policies and programs.

Jon Bannister

Scottish Centre for Crime and Criminal Justice Research
School of Social and Political Sciences
Glasgow University

The Dance

Knowledge mobilisation can be succinctly defined as '*getting the right information to the right people in the right format at the right time, so as to influence decision making*' (Ontario Neurotrauma Foundation, n.d.: 1). However, whilst seemingly straightforward, this definition demands that we consider the following (interlinked) questions:

- What is the right information?
- Who are the right people?
- What is the right format of the information?
- What is the right time?
- How might we assess the influence of knowledge mobilisation on decision making?

Standing alone, the answers to these questions appear to rest upon the specification of a set of compositional qualities, which once secured would facilitate selection of an appropriate strategy or strategies to mobilise knowledge. These strategies might include: dissemination; educational interventions (requiring the active engagement of practitioners); social influence interventions (the use of role models); incentives; reinforcement strategies; collaborations (between researchers and users), and; facilitation (enabling the use of research through technical, financial and organisational support) (Nutley, 2003). However, for any knowledge mobilisation strategy to take hold and deliver beneficial impacts, it requires to be interwoven with the '*priorities, cultures*' and settings '*of organisations and systems*' (Nutley *et al* 2010: 135). This important observation provokes an additional set of questions:

- What organisations and systems are relevant to the decision-making that we are seeking to influence?
- What are the relationships between (and within) these organisations and systems?
- What factors impact upon priorities, cultures and settings and how can we influence them?

These questions provoke consideration of the contextual qualities that require underscoring the compositional qualities of knowledge mobilisation. This paper seeks to begin to address these questions (though it does not treat them with equal weight, placing contextual considerations to the fore) with reference to engaging with public sector professionals. It draws on the findings of the *Building Safer Communities* project[xvi] for illustrative purposes. This was an initiative that sought to stimulate knowledge mobilisation in the field of community safety in Scotland.

The Partners and the Music (Issues of context and composition)

A first step in exploring the contextual issues underpinning the knowledge mobilisation endeavour is to identify the system and settings that require to be engaged. Building on Levin's (2004) endeavour to conceptually model research impact we can specify a system (the governance and delivery of public policy) comprising multiple settings (which in turn may contain multiple organisations), these being: research use (policy and practice – the settings that have an interest in the application of research); research production (what research gets done and who funds it); research mediation (the connections and interactions between research use and research production); and, broader societal influence (inclusive of governance structure and economy). Each of these settings will have generic qualities as well as specific qualities relating to the focus (in this case community safety) of the knowledge mobilisation project. Furthermore, these qualities will inform the various formal and informal relationships within and between these settings, the nature of which vary through time. The following sections of this paper will examine the settings of knowledge mobilisation (of community safety) and their relations.

Research Use

Community safety emerged in the 1980s as an endeavour to improve safety and well-being in the home, on the road and in the neighbourhood. As such it requires multiple local authority agencies (police, housing, health, fire etc.) to work in partnership (drawing in third sector organisations where appropriate) to deliver integrated interventions focused on individuals, families and the community. However, there is no statutory responsibility (or partnership framework) for the delivery of community safety in Scotland and no governmental definition of its object. That said, recent years have witnessed several key policy developments that serve to frame the potential of community safety and its direction.

First, and following the election to office of the minority Scottish National Party administration in 2007 a set of five strategic outcomes, inclusive of a 'Safer and Stronger' Scotland, were introduced and underpinned by a set of national outcomes, which were designed to guide and focus public policy. At least two of these outcomes can be argued to relate to community safety, namely:

> *(9) We live our lives free from crime, disorder and danger; and,*

> *(11) We have strong, resilient and supportive communities where people take responsibility for their own actions and how they affect others.*

Second, 2007 also saw the establishment of the Community Safety Unit within Scottish Government, with policy responsibility for community safety, anti-social behaviour and public (as opposed to domestic) violence. The unit holds the objectives of: improving the evidence base; disseminating throughout the sector what works best; and, to support the sector my nurturing greater capacity and expertise by disseminating guidance and knowledge (Scottish Government, 2010). One way in which the Community Safety Unit has attempted to achieve this has been through the core funding of the Scottish Community Safety Network (SCSN). The SCSN (now a registered charity) supports a membership comprising the 32 local authorities in Scotland (see research mediation, below).

What should we take from these observations? The lack of a statutory responsibility (out with the statutory responsibilities of local authorities in relation to housing and health etc.) coupled with the

lack of a clear object of, and delivery mechanism (a national and local partnership framework) for, community safety presents a significant contextual challenge to the development of a knowledge mobilisation strategy. However, the adoption of an outcome oriented approach to service delivery provides direction to its potential format. Further, and with reference to the objectives of the Community Safety Unit (and its funding of the SCSN), Scottish Government holds an evident appreciation of knowledge mobilisation and a desire to support local policy and practitioner groups to engage with the evidence base.

Societal Influence: devolution and fiscal crisis

Holding a significant impact upon *Research Use* (indeed upon all settings and their relations with each other) is the setting of *Societal Influence*. Here, two issues are of key import: devolution and fiscal crisis.

In 2007, a concordat was agreed between the Scottish Government and the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (CoSLA), leading to local authorities being given the responsibility for identifying local priorities (in relation to the previously stated strategic and national outcomes) and allocating funding to meet these needs (Scottish Government, 2007). Essentially, the impact upon *Research Use* has been to create a greater distance between national policy-making and local policy and practice. Specifically, and for our purposes, there has been a devolvement of strategy and funding for community safety (to a significant extent) to local government, where it has had to compete with other local priorities. A further consequence of the devolvement of priority and resource was the potential of local authorities to operate in isolation of one another. This raises a question as to whether local authorities hold comparable capacity to engage with the evidence bases (though they might be interested in different things), and crucially, under this form of devolution, whether they hold a capacity or opportunity to learn from one another.

The growing fiscal crisis has been well documented; its impact upon knowledge mobilisation (and with particular reference to community safety) less so. Local authorities have faced significant budget cuts and have had to consider what services to prioritise and how to undertake their delivery. Community safety posts have been cut (unevenly across Scotland) and there has been a tendency to revert to 'silo' working, meaning a renewed emphasis upon core service delivery rather than partnership working. More than this, under these conditions the ability of local authorities (of their constituent organisations) to devote scare resources to staff training, evidential reviews and the undertaking of monitoring and evaluation as an addition to core service delivery has been severely curtailed. That said, in this climate, the requirement to ensure and demonstrate that projects are engaging in cost effective best practice has also been heightened, as had the need to rationalise the development of programmatic responses.

What can we conclude from these observations? Taken as a whole, devolution and the fiscal crisis have served to raise the *need* for local authority organisations (local policy and practitioner groups) to engage with knowledge mobilisation. At the same time their capacity to engage in partnership (locally and nationally) and knowledge mobilisation practices have been severely hampered. Crucially, these factors have influenced the type and format of information sought and the time frame available to practitioners to undertake these searches.

Research Mediation

One way to increase the likelihood of research utilisation is through recruiting knowledge brokers or establishing knowledge brokerage organisations, who effectively construct a bridge between the research and other communities (Nutley *et al*, 2007: 63). Knowledge brokers (of various forms) can assist the identification of information and training needs to help improve research capacity, and serve to identify relevant materials and key messages, provide indicators of research reliability and support evidence integration (Buckley and Whelan, 2009).

The Scottish Community Safety Network (the partner organisation of *Building Safer Communities*) holds such a knowledge brokerage role. It has identified its responsibility as being to help simplify and clarify the complex policy landscape of community safety and support the development of effective partnership working. At the commencement of the *Building Safer Communities* project, the chair of the network identified its ambition as being:

"…*to influence national policy and practice, and support the professional development of practitioners by linking academic research* [and] *promoting good practice … this entails providing evidence of what works in community safety and the support in undertaking community safety endeavours…Effective knowledge transfer that improves the skill-set of community safety managers … by offering a repository of appropriate interventions and skills to allow them to monitor and evaluate their operations as well as to communicate their experiences*" (Urquhart, 2009: 1).

For such an organisation to exist (with a remit of knowledge brokerage) and for it to appreciate the complexities of service delivery (see *Research Use* and *Research Production*), whilst not essential to engaging in knowledge mobilisation with the public sector, provides significant advantage when attempting to do so. Moreover, the Scottish Community Safety Network held direct access, via its membership of the 32 local authorities in Scotland, to those endeavouring to address community safety (the target public sector professionals). Therefore, the *Building Safer Communities* project benefited from resources well in excess of those required to advance a *Knowledge Exchange* application.

Similarly, the Scottish Community Safety Network was attracted to engage with a set of academic partners in the delivery of their remit. University partners were seen as affording (at least potentially) both independence (from Scottish Government) and a stamp of quality to the resources, training and support that they hoped to offer the practitioner community. In a sense, this introduces the issue of trust underpinning the relationship between knowledge brokers and research users and between knowledge brokers and the academy. In this setting, the delivery of independent quality assured, and most important, appropriate resources can be seen to underpin the former, and longstanding (formal and informal) relationships between the knowledge broker and the academy the latter. Finally, it is important to note that the resource base (staff and project capacity) of the Scottish Community Safety Network (in this its early stage of development) was such that engaging in partnership with a Universities team via the Economic and Social Research Council, Scottish Funding Council and Local Authority Research Council Initiative, '*Engaging Local Authorities Scheme*', afforded a significant expansion in the capacity to deliver its remit.

Research Production

Across all areas of public policy, the 1980s and 1990s witnessed a shift towards 'evidence based' and, more recently, 'evidence informed' policy and practice (Cabinet Office, 1999; Nutley *et al*, 2002), as many practitioner professions increasingly sought evidence to support a 'rational and optimal approach to public service delivery' (Walter *et al*, 2003: 2). The academy has responded by debating evidential thresholds and compiling, via evidence assessment, various compendia of 'what works' (see *inter alia* Sherman *et al*, 1998; Fitch *et al*, 2000). However, and as a tendency, social science is not able to unequivocally say 'what works' and especially so within a timeframe compatible with public policy. Further, these endeavours do not necessarily take account of the goals of policy, public opinion, the resource base or the broader policy environment. Recognising this, Duncan (2005) has argued for academics to support evidence-*inspired* policy making:

"We are not simply purveyors of facts; we need to go further and have a strong role in using our knowledge to play an active role in policy development and review. I want to see more social researchers use their knowledge in this way to offer interpretations of what data actually means for policy" (Duncan 2005: 11).

There are two conclusions that we should draw from this. First, academy requires to *join-the-dots* between evidence and policy, in other words, to recognise the complexities and interface between *Research Use*, *Societal Influence* and *Research Production*. Second, and crucial to the engagement of practitioner communities, academy requires to *join-the-dots* within *Research Use*, in other words, to recognise the contextual qualities that govern the interface between policy and practice. The information demands that (at least currently) hold primacy in this relationship are the capacity to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness on the one hand, and the capacity to articulate programme development, demonstrate emerging benefits and disseminate models of good practice on the other (see Martin and Sanderson, 1999). These contextual information demands impose quite distinct compositional qualities on the type of information sought by knowledge mobilisation partners: they require different tools.

Returning to the Dance

The overarching aim of *Building Safer Communities* was to use knowledge mobilisation as a vehicle for improvements in the practice and delivery of community safety. Specifically, the project held the objectives of co-producing and promoting the exchange of knowledge and understanding of what makes for effective partnership working in community safety and, what works, where and why in the deployment and evaluation of community safety interventions. The initiative was possible because it was timely. The shifting contextual qualities of *Research Use*, *Societal Influence*, *Research Mediation* and *Research Production* supported not only its inception but also its capacity and potential. Crucially, and with a healthy degree of hindsight, these contextual qualities governed the compositional qualities of the knowledge mobilisation process, the resources it generated, and the willingness of the practitioner community to engage as designers, co-producers and users of evidence.

At this stage it is worth outlining a few examples to illustrate the nature of the resources developed and of the engagement of practitioners:

(1) The creation of a working *definition of community safety*, sensitive to the policy and practitioner environment in Scotland.

Recognising the lack of a statutory definition of community safety the initial proposal developed a working definition. In doing so, the project team (inclusive of the Scottish Community Safety Network manager) were sensitive to Ekblom's (2004) observation that it is important to set a clear and consistent definition, which can link to measurable indicators, and which can serve as a 'precision tool' for thinking, communicating, evaluating and sharing knowledge of practice and policy. Consequently, the agreed definition was sensitive to the national outcomes (in particular 9 and 11) underpinning the delivery of the concordat between Scottish Government and CoSLA (Scottish Government, 2007). Thus community safety was defined as an endeavour to ensure that:

People are safe from crime, disorder, danger, and free from injury and harm; communities are socially cohesive and tolerant; and are resilient and able to support individuals to take responsibility for their well-being.

This definition has been formally adopted by the Scottish Community Safety Network and its partners.

(2) The production of *Effective Intervention Reviews and Practice Notes*.

Effective Intervention Reviews (55 completed) afford a synthesis of existing research evidence to provide an accessible and comprehensive guide to effective community safety interventions. These reviews are framed by guidance on selecting interventions, monitoring and evaluation, and partnership working. Prior to adoption, each intervention was subjected to a Rapid Evidence Assessment protocol. *Practice Notes* examine innovative local practice in community safety. Each *Practice Note* (35 completed), developed by practitioner organisations, details the aim of an intervention, mode of delivery, staffing, funding, monitoring practices, evaluation, and contact details of the project manager. The design of these resources was supported by focus groups of practitioners. The content of these resources was informed via a survey of informational needs of the Scottish Community Safety Membership at the commencement of the project and repeated formal and informal audit thereafter.

(3) The design, launch and maintenance of the *Safer Communities Scotland* website.

This resource holds each of the above listed findings as well as a membership directory, a regular audit of community safety news and policy developments, and a listing of both training and job opportunities. Its intention is to become a *one-stop-shop* for those engaged in the delivery and management of community safety in Scotland. This resource was designed in partnership with a panel of community safety practitioners. It has attracted a membership of over 400 practitioners.

In conclusion, we return to two of the questions asked at the commencement of this paper, one contextual the other compositional:

- What factors impact upon priorities, cultures and settings and how can we influence them?
- How might we assess the influence of knowledge mobilisation on decision making?

What binds these questions is the issue of *influence*. In relation to the first question, influence was undoubtedly enhanced by the resources attracted by the *Building Safer Communities* project, though it was built upon longstanding personal and professional relationships. Yet this project is subject to the same challenges that confront community safety across all jurisdictions: it has been dependent upon project-based rather than mainstream funding. This funding is now coming to an end, though it is a stated intention of the Scottish Community Safety Network to maintain the *Safer Communities Scotland* website and incorporate the further development of *Practice Notes* as part of its core business strategy. In relation to the second question, whilst it has been possible to demonstrate significant levels of practitioner engagement with knowledge mobilisation, it is more difficult to demonstrate its influence on decision making. Participants have reported personal and professional development, but what of the organisations themselves? Last year, Scottish Government launched a programme of Community Safety Awards, serving to reinforce practitioner use of the evidence base in justifying, explaining and evaluating interventions. Many of the organisations who had engaged in the *Building Safer Communities* project submitted applications and were successful in attaining an award. This development serves to reinforce practitioner use of knowledge mobilisation resources in their decision making. In an increasingly competitive funding environment, this may help organisations (through being able to claim best practice) protect their investments in community safety.

References

Buckley, H. and Whelan, S. (2009) Putting Research Evidence to Work: Key Issues for Research Utilisation in Irish Children's Services . CAAB Research Report no. 2.

Cabinet Office (1999) *Professional Policy Making for the 21st Century,* Report by the Strategic Policy Making Team, Cabinet Office, September, London: The Stationery Office.

Duncan, S. (2005) Towards evidence-inspired policy making. *Social Sciences* (news from the ESRC September), 61: 10-11.

Fitch, C., Rhodes, T. and Stimson, G. V. (2000) Origins of an epidemic: the methodological and political emergence of rapid assessment. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 11 (1-2): 63-82.

Levin, B. (2004) Making Research Matter More. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 12 (56): 1-20.

Martin, S. and Sanderson, I. (1999) 'Evaluating public policy experiments: measuring outcomes, monitoring processes or managing pilots?', *Evaluation*, 5(3), 245-58.

Nutley, S. M. (2003) *Increasing Research Impact: Early Reflections from the ESRC Evidence Network*. Queen Mary, University of London: ESRC UK Centre for Evidence Based Policy and Practice. Working Paper 16, http://www.EvidenceNetwork.org., accessed 08 September 2011.

Nutley, S., Davies, H. and Walter, I. (2002) Evidence based policy and practice: Cross sector lessons from the UK. Paper presented at a Seminar on 'Evidence-Based Policy and Practice'; July, organised by the Royal Society, Wellington, New Zealand, http:// www.ruru.ac.uk/discussion_papers.html., accessed 08 September 2011.

Nutley, S. M., Walter, I. and Davies, H. T. O. (2007) *Using Evidence: How Research Can Inform Public Services* . Bristol, UK: The Policy Press.

Nutley, S., Morton, S., Jung, T. and Boaz, A. (2010) Evidence and policy in six countries: Diverse approaches and common challenges. *Evidence and Policy* 6 (2): 135-136.

Ontario Neurotrauma Foundation. (n.d.) *Definition of knowledge mobilisation*, http://www.whatiskt.wikispaces.com/Knowledge+Mobilization, accessed 11 May 2011.

Scottish Government. (2007) *The Concordat between Scottish Government and Local Government*, Scottish Budget Spending Review Edinburgh, UK: Scottish Government, http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/923/0054147.pdf, accessed 15 April 2011.

Scottish Government. (2010) *The Community Safety Unit: Who We Are and What We Do*. Edinburgh, UK: Scottish Government, http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/254432/0086492.pdf, accessed 7 March 2011.

Sherman, L. W., Gottfredson, D. C., MacKenzie, D. L., Eck, J., Reuter, P. and Bushway, S. D. (1998) *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising*. National Institute of Justice: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

Urquhart, D. (2009) *Statement in Support of the Building Safer Proposal*. Inglewood, UK: Scottish Community Safety Network.

Walter, I., Nutley, S. and Davies, H. (2003) Developing a taxonomy of interventions used to increase the impact of research. University of St. Andrews: Research Unit for Research Utilisation. Discussion Paper 3, http://www. .ruru.ac.uk/discussion_papers.html., accessed 08 September 2011.

Professor Richard Thorpe & Paul Ellwood
University of Leeds

Research Education for User Engagement

Knowledge Translation Value-Chain

The starting place for this contribution to the debate about user engagement and research education is work conducted following the 2008 research assessment exercise by members of the Business and Management RAE sub-panel. Those involved conceived knowledge transferring from academic endeavour and research in the form of a knowledge translation value chain. Originally conceived of for use in the research excellence framework (REF) the notion of a value chain (Thorpe et al, 2011) speaks to the longstanding debate on the relevance of management research, but does so without championing a specific method of undertaking relevant management research - more of that later.

Its appeal (judged from how it has been received in the business school community) appears to be founded on the model not being dogmatic about particular research philosophies. Instead it captures the longitudinal nature of user-engagement; something which appears to be central to establishing the link between rigour and relevance in research. By de-emphasising the methodology to be followed in any given interaction with user groups it offers a conceptualisation of how new knowledge is configured and reconfigured through repeated engagements. The perspective the model takes is less about the relevance of a specific research project and more about the relevance of researchers themselves during a lifetime's scholarship. As a consequence, different points of entry for the researcher become possible, rather than simply entry at the stage of the original research.

The depiction of knowledge flows as a value chain (with, in practice, various feedback loops) where the knowledge adapts and changes through the engagement process, offers a perspective that more realistically mirrors practice and helps researchers move their thinking beyond characterisations of 'production and implementation' approaches to knowledge diffusion. The chain builds from combinations of specific knowledge translation activities and their associated outputs, with the outputs from one knowledge translation episode providing input to the next. Rather than simply being an endpoint in themselves outputs are seen as "boundary objects" that allow new organisational knowledge to be developed in more specific and narrower terms. Through this chain, knowledge is created and accumulated through a process of translation between actors engaged with a particular challenge. Although presented in relation to the unfolding of codified knowledge, this process is equally dependent on the tacit knowledge of the actors engaged in the translation episode as it is on the formal outputs.

Although it is realised the figure below suggests the process as linear, in reality it is recognised that there will be present complex flows involving the co-production of knowledge and multiple feedback paths. Viewed in this way knowledge can be seen to be less about the transfer of the 'findings' from research into a specific context, and more to do with how these findings are or can be used as a vehicle for engagement.

Implications for REF

The implications for impact in relation to the Research Excellence Framework of the above would a number of different identifiable impact types as indicated below.

I: Basic Research undertaken with a clear view of translation to types II-IV	II: Theory to Practice Focused Research	III: Practitioner Located Research	IV: Directly useable output

Significance and Reach

In this conceptualisation, type I focuses on the theory development, where impact from the research will come about as a result of grants from research councils and where contributions to theory have as an explicit aim of having potential benefit for users. The output of type I research will be likely to have been shown through others using it to drive practice, for example through, types II, III and IV. Type II impacts might be characterised as thought experiments where there is an expectation of engagement around knowledge transfer processes by academics and between academics. This type of impact might still involve academics, but this time the endeavour is to construct meaning for practice and the beginnings of a strategy for engagement, for example where the focus relates to translating theory into policy advice. Evidence for impact of this kind might be output in practitioner journals where there is a clear articulation of how knowledge links to practice. Type III impact would be where the research involves an explicit engagement with users and where this engagement is increasingly interactive. It might still be the case that the groups are small (perhaps even on a one-to-one basis). The output of such engagement might be either policy papers or changes within organisations as a result of the interaction. Type IV translation might be indicated by widespread dissemination and what might be characterised as directly usable output. Examples of this might include tools or computer programs or commercial products, teaching and text books.

Widening the definition of impact

With a continual and enduring interest in the research assessment exercise (which is one of the problems to be addressed later) it is sometimes easy to forget that other aspects of impact are important within an academic context. Whilst the REF concentrates almost entirely on what might be defined as instrumental impact (which might also include policy impact) other bodies such as the ESRC value impact in the context of the development of theory or conceptual impact. In addition bodies such as research councils are also interested in the building of capacity and the sustainability of disciplines, where knowledge and research expertise can both build capacity and over time lead to cultural change. Common in all discussions on how impact can be best embedded is the issue of relationships and impact that emerges during connectivity with user communities. Of course, impact can also be negative. It is not gone unnoticed that the preoccupation on aspects of finance and accounting, particularly in North America was the activity that led to the development of new financial products such as derivatives which some have argued are at the root of the current financial turmoil.

The challenge to the kind of scholars we want to be

Operating at different stages of the knowledge translation value chain raises the question of what kind of scholars we wish to be? In an interesting and influential publication, Boyer (1990) dares to question the priorities of the professoriate by highlighting a number of different perspectives on scholarship that emphasise different ways in which academics engage with knowledge. His categorisation of scholarship includes that of *integration*, emphasising context, and connections that helps those as academics focus on problems rather than stay rooted within disciplines. It is through connectedness he argues that research ultimately is made authentic. A second kind of scholarship he identifies as the scholarship of *discovery*. Here the commitment is to knowledge for its own sake and fashioned in a disciplinary way wherever it may lead. This knowledge adds to the development of an intellectual stock but the focus is on what is to be known and what still needs to be known, rather than what do the findings mean (which is the purpose of scholarship through *integration*). A third construct in relation to scholarship is that of *application*. This third element moves away from investigation and synthesis, and suggests that individuals need to take responsibility for taking action on the issues they observe. This action might take the form of an interest in the application of the ideas or even beyond (as in Mode 2 research) to consider the implications of applications proposed. Finally, Boyer identifies the scholarship that occurs from *teaching* where the academic both educates and 'excites' future students. Here teaching is also seen as transforming and extending, connecting and integrating. Pettigrew (2011) develops this theme by distinguishing between academics who might choose to focus their careers on teaching and learning, researchers or public intellectuals. The point is made that the duty of intellectuals and academics is to use the privilege of their opportunity to go beyond merely writing papers and to see output as making a difference, whether this be through argument and debate, for a new generation of academics through teaching, or through application and engagement with policymakers and user groups.

What kind of research training and education do we need to have to bring about this change?

Research methods training has perhaps too often been seen (particularly in the US) as being similar to research in the physical sciences. Here there are seen to be objective truths and universal laws that govern the topics under investigation. Increasingly, in the management discipline, suggestions have been made that management research as a field of study is distinctive from other disciplines in its pluralism, transdisciplinarity and non-reductionism. Acceptance of different perspectives implies an increased need to be open to new ideas and adopt different worldviews, methodologies and methods in order to answer the problems and challenges faced. Whilst methodological debates are often presented as the difference between irreconcilable schools of thought many different approaches are seen, on the face of it, as having equal rigour. The current privileging of publication in specific North American journals, coupled with (RAE/REF) performance requirements surrounding the volume of the publications is driving particular behaviours, where one consequence is that research that aspires to both knowledge production and social action is often not a realistic option. As a consequence, the skills to undertake this kind of research are often those not included on doctoral programs, or even on professional doctorates.

Our experience of delivering seminars and workshops on research impact for social science doctoral students has proved revealing of the challenges we face in incorporating such considerations into doctoral training programmes. During our workshops it was not unexpected to discover that doctoral students, in the main, possess only a hazy knowledge of the Impact policy debates triggered by the prospect of new assessment criteria in REF2014. However, we were surprised at the degree of disconnect between the research practice they were being asked to embrace in these formative years and the user groups who might have a reasonable claim on - or at least passing interest in - their scholarship. The approach they were being encouraged to take could be characterised as: keep your academic focus, become accomplished in your research methods, do what's necessary to get your PhD and put off any consideration of impact until later.

Students adopting methodologies (e.g. ethnographies) that bring them into contact with user groups have an inevitable degree of engagement, but such interactions appear limited to considerations of what user-groups can do for the research, rather than more reciprocal or mutual benefits being pursued. Even where research methodologies would intuitively allow it, a more engaged form of scholarship is something that few of our doctoral programmes (or possibly doctoral supervisors) seem to encourage. For those whose research methods involve the interrogation of large numeric datasets then the disconnect is more extreme. At one workshop, after two days of presentation and discussion, when asked to sketch out an "Impact Project" based on doctoral research, one third-year econometrician was only able to suggest making a presentation to an academic conference. To us his work seemed to speak to interests of government agencies charged with encouraging Foreign Direct Investment, and yet such agencies were not even recognised as a relevant audience.

In persuing more engaged forms of research; we do not wish to diminish, to any degree, the importance of becoming skilled in the art of academic research methodologies. It is in the rigorous execution of such methodologies that resides our claims to making a contribution to the concerns and purposes of user groups. It is not necessary, indeed it is crucially important, not to dilute the rigorous foundations of our scholarship. However, we have to recognise in our research practice that the world, and our datasets and analysis of the world, are not the same thing. Other sources of

knowledge such as those of practicing managers (in the case of our own business-related research) have a valid claim to contribute to an understanding of management. It is for this reason that we advocate a more longitudinal process view of research practice; one that provides opportunities for our insights to be challenged and reconfigured by other (non-academic derived) knowledge. In terms of the types of engagement, long term close relationships appear central to knowledge transfer and sharing as do networks and the potential for practitioners overseeing the research, particularly if they assist at the problem definition stage. In terms of methods of engagement, research might be jointly designed, outputs might be jointly authored and practitioners might be involved in validation through the analysis of their own practice and trained in the use of the finding. In terms of outputs, very much in keeping with the development of professional knowledge required in professional doctorates, outcomes might take the form of 'tools' or 'products' and theory intrinsically relevant to practitioners. In relation to funding, academics perhaps need to be able to connect better to the new range of engagement and impact initiatives that are a recent feature of research council funding. All such processes are recognised to take time, and it is often difficult to introduce a student to all options within the constraints of a three or four year PhD programme? What we suggest is possible however is for students to observe this variety in the context of a research group.

For many completing a PhD in social research is a lonely activity. A narrative of pursuing 'your own original contribution' can make for a research process in which the student is shielded from the influence of all others bar their supervisors. Ironically, laboratory-based natural science is a far more social research process. One answer to how this agenda might be taken forward is through the establishment of research centres. Typically centres encompass staff with a range of backgrounds and agendas and at different stages of their career. These stages might well relate to individuals focusing on different activities but in the context of a coherent agenda that includes engagement and impact.

Are conditions right for a paradigms change?

Kuhn in his paper on the nature of scientific revolutions speculated on how paradigms change, and progress. He argued that change comes about following a period where novelty and ambiguity is continually overlooked, whilst tensions persist from the status quo not addressing underlying issues and problems. The context he argues is crisis and revolution. Such crises could be of major significance such as those often referred to as grand challenges, or the crises surfaced by the Arab spring, global warming and the demographics of ageing. At a different level the crises might be those faced by an academic a community that has become too self referential. An additional feature of paradigmatic change relates to the role played by impressive individuals who offer alternative ways of working and modes of operating. Management and business has not been short of these as every president of the Academy of Management over the last 10 years has exhorted the Academy to become more engaged and to become more relevant. What might be argued is the need for a renaissance to take place, to go back to what scholarship meant in an earlier period, scholarship without the continual pressure to publish or perish, that engaged with society and enriched and informed itself from other social science disciplines. This is not to say that individuals are unwilling or not persuaded by the arguments put forward, rather they remain inhibited by a system that insists on seven papers in seven years and prescribes the methodology in order to achieve this.

Conclusion

In our efforts to educate the next generation of researchers the overriding message is that they should view their academic journal papers as *work in progress*. Such papers need to be seen, not as an end point in scholarship but rather a means to an end: a basis from which they can make an authentic contribution to the communities in which they live and work. It is the role of the doctoral research programmes to prepare the groundwork to make this possible and to achieve this successfully emphasis needs to be placed on the context of a researcher's research. This does not mean that we should lessen the expectations we have of PhD students but rather that they become more aware of the responsibilities and privileges they have as academics.

Glyn Williams
Director of Learning & Teaching

Department of Town & Regional Planning
University of Sheffield

The disciplining effects of impact evaluation practices: negotiating the pressures of impact within an ESRC-DFID project

The possibilities, pressures and power of impact evaluation

Measuring the impact of academic research is understandably a subject of great current interest within British universities. Pressures on higher education funding mean that academics are increasingly being asked to demonstrate the public benefit of their work (Maddrell, 2010), and the UK's forthcoming Research Excellence Framework (REF) will, for the first time, attempt to assess the social and economic impact of research. Although, as Staeheli and Mitchell (2005) note, Geographers have long been concerned with questions of relevance, the UK's current turn to impact has sparked debate within the discipline over the values and valuation of research. Whilst Tariq Jazeel sees the UK's impact evaluation practices as part of an "increasingly economistic, social and institutional valuation of knowledge production" (Jazeel, 2010, np), Rachel Pain and her co-authors remind us that emphasising impact could deliver much that is positive. If impact were conceived as part of a two-way coproduction of knowledge, they argue, this could recognise and reward research processes which build the capacities of researchers and non-academic research participants alike (Pain, Kesby and Askins, 2011).

A turn to impact could, therefore, encourage academics to engage more closely with wider processes of social transformation, and attributing value to impact is certainly intended to change our research culture. But what are the effects of impact evaluation practices on 'our motivation and our intellectual compass' (Philips, 2010 p.451) as academics, and on those with and for whom we research? Here, I reflect on my own experiences of managing a research project[1] to examine these questions. Specifically, it addresses two ethically complex boundary crossings, the movement of research 'beyond the academy', and the effect of impact evaluation on the conduct of research in places far beyond their point of origin – in this case, in rural India. Although the project was shaped by its particular position within the UK Higher Education system, this reflection aims to highlight wider issues about the incentives, required performances, and disciplining effects of impact agendas, and the ways in which they reshape these boundary crossings.

---

[1] The project is *Embedding Poor People's Voices in Local Governance*, which has been funded under the ESRC-DFID scheme on poverty alleviation (Grant Ref. RES-167-25-0268). The project has involved collaboration with two partner institutions, CDS (Centre for Development Studies, Trivandrum), and CSSSC (Centre for Studies in Social Sciences Calcutta), and the core project research team has comprised of myself; Dr Binitha V Thampi (IIT Chennai); Dr Sailaja Nandigama (Forest and Nature Policy Group, Wageningen University); Dr Dwaipayan Bhattacharyya (CSSSC) and Prof D Narayana (CDS). Importantly, all of the observations which follow are my own *personal* reflections on the research process, developing those published elsewhere (Meth and Williams, 2010): they do not necessarily represent the views of others within the team.

At the outset, it is important to note that the emergence of an 'impact agenda' within the UK is not unique: managerial encouragements to make university research more relevant are nothing new, nor are they necessarily tied to the particularly neoliberal valuation of knowledge production that Jazeel describes. Since 2006, the Netherlands has also been developing its own processes to evaluate research impact, and significantly its *Evaluating Research in Context* project has been forward-looking and emphasises institutional reflection, learning and sharing of best practice (Grant et al. 2009). Impact evaluation within the UK's REF chose instead to draw heavily on Australia's proposed *Research Quality Framework*, within which impact scores contributed to research performance rankings that were, in turn, to determine future funding allocation.[2] This choice, which is perhaps indicative of a deeply-ingrained 'target culture' within the UK's public sector, cements and supports an increased emphasis on impact throughout the research process. Applications for research funding from the Research Councils UK must therefore now include an extended statement of a potential project's 'Pathways to Impact', and these impact statements are central to one of four criteria on which reviewers evaluate grant applications. Similarly, peer-review of narrative accounts of research impact will contribute to 25% of the rating given to each unit of assessment[3] within the REF.

These changes are consciously designed to effect this essay's first boundary crossing – to change academic culture by rewarding those researchers whose work has relevance beyond the immediate confines of academia. The Higher Education Funding Council for England has attempted to repond to a number significant technical difficulties around defining appropriate evidence, the timescale over which impact should be measured, and in attributing impact to particular researchers and institutions, which it has itself identified within the REF evaluation process (HEFCE, 2010a; 2010b). Beyond these practical issues, however, are more fundamental concerns about the incentivising 'relevant' research, many of which will resonate with the management of higher education elsewhere. Most generically, the UK's framing of the impact agenda as a whole relies on a underlying assumption of difference between the 'creators' and 'users' of knowledge, and further embeds a separation of 'research' from 'education' within Universities' activities: it is primarily researchers and their 'results' that have to cross boundaries here, rather than the two-way traffic of co-produced knowledge envisaged by Pain, Kesby and Askins.

More specifically, the implementation of this agenda inevitably brings particular pressures to bear upon researchers, four of which I highlight here. First, impact has moved from an aspiration ('research should move beyond academia') to a key performance criterion ('research must provide evidence of its impact'). This in turn requires practices of measurement and/or judgement which will, inevitably, be partial: they will emphasise some aspects of impact whilst downplaying others. Second, there is a strong narrative that good research should create 'real-world change.' For the social sciences changing public policy is heavily emphasised, and here a simplistic understanding of 'research-led policy' – as a linear progression from research, through dissemination of evidence, to policy change – seems to inform and justify impact measurement, a cause for serious concern, given that policy formation rarely works in this way. Third, there is clear sense within this agenda that

---

[2] Australia's trials, which ran from 2005-7, were suspended due to a change in government – the application of these ideas within the UK's 2014 REF is, therefore, a journey into uncharted territory.
[3] 'Units of Assessment' are usually a department, school, or research centre – evaluation of research performance within the REF is collective, in contrast to other systems such as South Africa's National Research Foundation ratings, which are individual.

'more' impact is better. While this may seem reasonable, we need to question the power relations this will put in to play: incentives to develop and maintain close relationships with 'users', or to 'maximise' our visible and demonstrable impact may be politically questionable in some instances. Fourth, academics will increasingly be asked to perform and package our 'impact', and we should think critically about the consequences – both intended and unintended – of these performances. I look at how these four issues play out in practice. Following the trajectory of my own research project, I trace their effects in the writing of grant proposals; the conduct of dissemination work; and the production of 'impact narratives'.

Reflections on a Research Project

The project in question was part of the *ESRC-DFID Joint Scheme on Poverty Alleviation*, which is joint-funded between the Economic and Social Research Council and the Department For International Development, the Ministry responsible for the UK Government's aid budget. The scheme, initiated in August 2005, had the intention of promoting 'blue skies' thinking about poverty alleviation.[4] It is specifically research-led, and although it has given greater freedom for projects to collaborate with 'non-standard' research partners within the Global South, it is otherwise administered as per other Research Council UK funding. A project within this funding stream therefore provides a useful vantage point from which to consider the disciplining effects of the UK's impact agenda. The ESRC-DFID scheme explicitly stresses the need for its research to demonstrate 'potential for impact on policy and practice for poverty reduction' (ESRC, 2010: paragraph 1.1), an emphasis on moving research results beyond Northern-dominated circuits of academic knowledge production that is both reasonable and well-intentioned given its subject matter. But even though this is an appropriate context for research to cross boundaries and show its applicability to a wider world, *incentivising* research to do so remains ethically and politically complex throughout the project process.

Writing the Grant Application

The project grant application (2006) mapped out a 'user engagement' process containing a series of dissemination workshops (Figure 1), beginning with the research participants, the bulk of whom were drawn from politically and economically marginalised groups in rural Kerala and West Bengal. Research findings would be discussed with them, modified and extended by their input, and then relayed to progressively 'higher' levels of debate with government officials and other users. This workshop activity was specifically linked two of the project's overall research aims, developing opportunities for research participants' political empowerment, and contributing to policy development around governance reform (Box 1).

Reflecting on these user engagement plans from the (still uncomfortably close) distance of the present, I accept that a 'Pathways to Impact' statement is arguably a useful and productive disciplining device. It stresses the importance of communicating and using research, and it requires applicants to envision from the outset how research can travel beyond the confines of academia. But as pressures to demonstrate impact within grant applications increase, elements of this disciplinary device should give us pause for thought. First, 'Pathways to Impact' are linked to projects of fixed and relatively short duration, an issue of timescale I address below. Second, they require applicants to devise their own performance criteria, but in areas where researchers cannot ensure delivery.

---

[4] The second phase of the scheme (2010-) has been more prescriptive, inviting bids around specific thematic priorities.

Looking back at my own proposal, there is a significant difference between the project's 'user engagement' goals and those relating to its academic content. While the latter, such as engagement with a defined set of academic debates or undertaking a particular form and quantity of fieldwork, could be (largely) controlled within the research team, the former inevitably depend on the actions of others and could not. Third, these statements reinforce a rather exclusionary model of what constitutes worthwhile research. Two Indian Government Ministers and a senior member of DFID-India with whom I had had prior contact about the planned research were named research users within my grant application: this helped to strengthen a narrative about the project's potential for impact, but should it count significantly? If funding success depends in part on having the social networks to produce a credible impact statement, this is likely to work against new researchers, and/or those who are relatively isolated in institutional terms. Enlisting 'high profile' users also reinforces a particular politics of scale, whereby a project's 'reach'[5] is confirmed by the status of the people with whom it engages.

Undertaking 'user engagement'

Unsurprisingly, this planned 'upward cascade' of information and reflection from grassroots participants to a national policy community didn't happen perfectly in practice, but for reasons which indicate some generic concerns about delivering 'high-impact' research. First, the project timeframe was too ambitious: undertaking the research, conducting the analysis, and replaying this back in appropriate ways to our research participants within a two-year project was tough. What *could* be delivered within this timetable was discussion about how elements of development policy were working, giving useful feedback, but at a somewhat nuts-and-bolts level. Thus the project was able disseminate information on the proper functioning of local government to our research participants in West Bengal, and discuss the details and shortcomings of an anti-poverty programme with a 'policy audience' in Kerala. Deeper reflection, called for within the ESRC-DFID proposal's 'blue skies' thinking, does however take time, and the full working through of the empirical research's practical and academic significance will continue well beyond the formal project end.[6]

Second, 'user engagement' is highly contingent on particular personalities, connections, and opportunities. The project proposal's 'high profile' names were thus not necessarily central to dissemination and engagement activities: in some cases, new and ultimately more relevant individuals and institutional connections took their place. Finally, much of what the project team would have liked to say within dissemination activities was incredibly sensitive. A major part of the project's analysis addresses the ways in which local political culture and party institutions re-shape official plans to improve poor people's 'voice' in local government. Placing grassroots research participants in the uncomfortable position of articulating this in 'higher level' workshops was abandoned as a result. 'Speaking truth to power' was also problematic for the research team: understandably, the project's Indian partner institutions needed to be cautious about what was said

---

[5] 'Reach' (along with 'transformation') is a criterion used to judge impact narratives in REF 2014. The equivalent measure of 'significance' already applied to academic publications has been defined spatially ('international', 'national', 'sub-national'), with 'international' significance showing heavy Euro-American bias: there are therefore concerns that transformative *local* research impacts may be under-valued (HEFCE, 2010: 5; Pain, Kesby and Askins, 2011: 186).

[6] The quick and positive response of the ESRC-DFID to my requests for zero-cost extensions to the project is gratefully acknowledged here: these enabled the project to be extended through to November 2010 and further dissemination work to take place.

in their name, and debate about our findings was often more candid (and critically incisive) the further removed we were from the research settings themselves.

The ethical problems raised by requirements to undertake 'high impact' research were illustrated well by an incident that occurred during a dissemination workshop with a mixed audience of local academics, politicians and civil servants. Soon after the meeting, one of our team was approached by a senior opposition politician, who was likely to be returned to government in the forthcoming State Assembly elections: could she write for him something on the difficulties faced by the current government's anti-poverty programme which we had critiqued in our work? Being unsure of his motives, or the use which would be made of our work, she refused. Researchers have always faced difficult ethical decisions such as these, of course, but the pressures of an impact agenda complicate these further, and it is worth reflecting on the consequences of the strong 'push' it gives to researchers to take up opportunities such as this.

Working with a member of the opposition front bench in Kerala could have become an important part of the project's impact narrative, providing ideal opportunities to demonstrate its findings' 'reach' and 'transformation'. The actual effect, however, would in all likelihood have been far more questionable. The project's 'international' status would have been deployed to discredit current policy, but the politician's own agenda was pre-formed around other interests, not least in undermining a government programme that had done much to extend the support of his political rivals across Kerala. Our research would almost certainly have been used instrumentally in supporting this agenda, rather than in the production of 'evidence-based policy'. This engagement would have also labelled Indian members of our team as open critics of the (outgoing) government, a risk that would be entirely borne by Southern institutions and academics, for the sake of benefits accruing to their northern counterparts.

Producing an 'Impact Story'

Making impact a performance criterion requires new practices of measurement and evaluation to judge project 'success', and within UK these now operate at two separate scales: that of the individual project via end-of-project reports, and the longer-term collective assessment of the Units of Assessment within the REF. At the project scale, two points are of importance. The first is that reporting timescales within an individual project can clearly limit what the demonstrable effects of research might be, yet the strong push to show concrete outcomes remains. The result is a pressure to search for 'quick wins', where elements of research are taken up within the media or by policy makers even though, as noted above, the lasting value of research may only come through a longer period of reflection. Second, although UK Research Council reporting practices currently distinguish between social and economic 'impact' and non-academic 'outputs', there is a danger that the latter may be unduly prioritised in a context where the long-term intention to move towards metrics in impact assessment has already been strongly signalled. This was brought home to me by a DFID-ESRC programme requirement to fill out an output matrix, which included a record of the numbers of media interviews, newspaper articles, and web links generated by the project. The disconnect between this spreadsheet and the experience of dissemination within the project itself was dramatic: there was no space to record the state-level workshops described above, still less the detailed discussion of our research results with research participants in rural study areas which had informed them. These activities remained invisible in the DFID spreadsheet, and whilst they have not had 'policy impact', sharing our analysis directly with our rural research participants was work of

ethical, political and intellectual value, and as such seems a more important part of the project's official record than logging the team's number of media appearances. The worry here is not how this particular project is being scored, but rather that spreadsheets such as these are treated as 'objective indicators' that may in future be a proxy for a more nuanced assessment of impact. Clearly, the move to quantify can all too easily produce a rather strange statistical base on which to make a set of judgments about the quality of research output. Devices such as these can become even more corrosive, however, if they begin to set detailed performance targets for researchers' behaviour. If a spreadsheet such as this was used by principal investigators to decide where and when the results of their research should be 'plugged', this would quickly replace genuine engagement with myopic self-publicity.

In its defence, the 2014 Research Excellence Framework partially corrects this myopia by requiring narrative case studies of impact over a longer timeframe. While individual projects may contribute to these, case studies can also be wider collective research endeavours. Pilot examples now exist of the case study format which academic institutions are required to produce, but within these the preferred evidence of effect appears to confirm the concerns about evaluation the 'reach' of impact noted earlier: citation of research by high-profile public figures or within policy documents, international exposure and invitations to join 'exclusive policy networks' appear to be the new hard currency of 'high impact' research. Inevitably, there are strong incentives to produce positive messages within these case studies. This will certainly mean the erasure from the official record of the messy and contingent nature of user engagement referred to above: there will also be individual and collective pressures to stretch claims of how much grassroots users have benefited, or how much policy has been influenced. It is noteworthy that only one of the [Social Policy] pilot case study argues for its impact in *resisting* a public policy initiative, and within this, 'objective' indicators of success are much harder to demonstrate: below I reflect on the implications of this for both the border crossings with which I began.

Conclusions: Impact Agendas and Research in the Global South

Many of the questions the impact agenda raises are generic, and are concerns for academics across the UK and those elsewhere who may become subject to equivalent processes of research evaluation. By way of conclusion, however, I highlight some particular concerns this agenda holds for research in the Global South. Here, the impact agenda seems set to exert two particularly undesirable pressures on research conduct. First, it provides strong incentives to claim that we will deliver change in highly charged political situations from which we as individuals are often distanced and/or insulated. Researchers are directly instructed to make 'Pathways to Impact' statements innovative, bold and ambitious, providing welcome encouragement to 'think outside of the box': however, this also incentivises forms of risk-taking whose negative consequences are likely to fall most heavily and directly on local research institutions and field assistants, or still worse vulnerable research participants themselves. This unequal distribution of benefits and (potentially life-threatening) costs has uncomfortable neo-colonial overtones, particularly as it is being driven by a research management regime that aims to demonstrate the 'excellence' of UK academic knowledge production.

Second, an impact agenda encourages us to perform our relevance by demonstrating our interaction with and influence upon certain groups of people – particularly policy makers, and other powerful agencies – through which we can demonstrate the 'reach' of our 'transformative' research. In the

context of my own research in India this pressure seems doubly misplaced. It is misplaced politically because the pressure to continually nurture and develop contacts with these people can directly constrain our ability as academics to openly criticise public policy. It is misplaced conceptually in that it targets an assumed gap between researchers and those 'users' who can deliver policy change.

Arguably, it is not this 'academic to policy community' gap that is the most important one to bridge in poverty research in contemporary India. In Kerala in particular, there is a porous interface, if not a revolving door, between these two communities: across the country as a whole, academics, social activists and civil servants contribute to an elite-dominated yet public debate on social policy through media such as the Mumbai-based *Economic and Political Weekly*.[7] What is far more apparent is the gap between the 'middle class' lifestyles researchers share with policy makers, and the altogether different life worlds of those on whose behalf poverty policy is being made. Academics working in the Global South can make an important contribution by bridging *this* gap, and the long tradition of ethnographic research offers one way of doing so. Taking time to listen to the voices and perspectives of marginalised groups, and using this to question assumptions built in to poverty alleviation programmes and governance practices, is one possible pathway towards the blue-skies thinking on poverty that the ESRC-DFID joint scheme calls for. It is certainly a pathway fraught with contradictions – not least about the position of the academic as an 'expert' and as an interlocutor – but these are at least familiar discomforts, where we have over a generation of previous scholarship to guide us. Where I see greater risk is in the often unacknowledged incentives, timescales and required performances of an impact agenda. When faced by their pressures we may discipline ourselves into collapsing whatever space we currently have for independent academic reflection.

References

ESRC 2010. *ESRC-DFID Joint Scheme for Research on International Development (Poverty Alleviation) Phase 2 Specification of second call for applications*. Accessed on line at http://www.esrcsocietytoday.ac.uk/ESRCInfoCentre/Images/Call%202%20-%20ESRC-DFID%20-%20Scheme%20Specification%20Phase%202%20(PDF)_tcm6-36869.pdf, access date 07/01/2011.

Grant J, Brutscheer P-B, Kirk S, Butler L, and Wooding S 2009. *Documented Briefing: Capturing Research Impacts – A Review of International Practice*. HEFCE ref: DB-578-HEFCE. Accessed on line at http://test.hedd.ac.uk/pubs/rdreports/2009/rd23_09/, access date 07/01/2011.

HEFCE 2009 *Research Excellence Framework: Second Consultation on the Assessment and Funding of Research*. HEFCE ref 2009/38. http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/hefce/2009/09_38/.

HEFCE 2010a *Research Excellence Framework consultation outcomes Circular Letter 2010/4, Annex A: Initial Decisions on the Research Excellence Framework*. http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/circlets/2010/cl04_10/.

---

[7] India's public sphere has long been described as divided between and English-medium and national elite, and its more localised, vernacular 'others' (Kaviraj, 1991). *Economic and Political Weekly* is a useful reminder of the diversity of the former: its contributors include academics, civil servants and a range of 'public intellectuals', its content is often self-consciously left-of-centre, and its readership (print and electronic) is in order of several hundred thousand.

HEFCE 2010b *Research Excellence Framework Impact Pilot Exercise: findings of the expert panels*. Accessed on line at http://www.hefce.ac.uk/research/ref/pubs/other/re01_10/, access date 13/07/2011.

Jazeel T 2010 'Impact: an introduction' *Social Text: Periscope* August 2010. Accessed on line at http://www.socialtextjournal.org/periscope/impact/, access date 07/01/2011.

Meth P and Williams G 2010 'Researching the Global South in an Age of Impact' *Social Text: Periscope* August 2010. Accessed on line at http://www.socialtextjournal.org/periscope/impact/, access date 07/01/2011.

Pain, R; Kesby, M and Askins, K 2011 'Geographies of Impact: power, participation and potential' *Area* 43(2): 183-188.

Philips R 2010 'The Impact Agenda and Geographies of Curiosity' *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 35(4): 447-452

RCUK 2010 *Guidance for Completing the Pathways to Impact*. Accessed on line at http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/kei/impacts/Pages/Guidance.aspx, access date 07/01/2011.

Box 1: Excerpts from Project Aims and Objectives (emphasis added)

Objective 3	*Objective 4*
To contribute to local user communities by highlighting areas where the poor have opportunities for furthering their political empowerment, and strengthening links with potential partners in this process....	**To contribute to policy development** via structured interaction with a wider policy community... [B]y engaging these users in high-level dissemination events focused around critical appraisal of current participatory governance initiatives, the project aims to significantly contribute to policy development.
Indicators of Success: **Sustained engagement of local beneficiaries** within dissemination events; **development of their opportunities for activism, networking, and contribution to policy debate**.	*Indicators of Success:* **Continued engagement of expert users** throughout the project's lifespan**; uptake of project data, findings, or recommendations within policy review**.

Jeremy Phillipson & Amy Proctor
Centre for Rural Economy
Newcastle University

Knowledge Exchange for Impact: Perspectives from the UK Research Councils' Rural Economy and Land Use Programme (Relu)

Emerging pressures to demonstrate impact and engagement in research

Though efforts to enhance the relevance and uptake of research are by no means new, over the past decade aspirations for research impact, evidence-based policy and the knowledge economy are being deployed more and more to justify public investment in research. In the UK, this change reflects intensified government effort to steer science towards economic and social betterment, and to gauge its achievements accordingly. Funding of the science base is not considered sufficient, on its own, to realise social and economic benefit. The challenge is to "ensure that research outcomes are exploited" (RCUK, 2004). But how should these aspirations be incorporated into the conduct of research and its interaction with fields of application?

Under pressure to justify and demonstrate the impact of investment in science, research funders have focused attention on potential users of research, in an effort to deliver a "step change in economic impact" of what they fund (Research Council Economic Impact Group, 2006). There has been growing emphasis upon directed (or themed) research programmes, like the UK Research Councils' Rural Economy and Land Use Programme (Relu). Research projects are increasingly required to identify the potential beneficiaries of their work and develop strategies for knowledge transfer and pathways to impact.

However, research funders are often reproached for presiding over research communities that are poorly motivated and equipped to address matters of relevance and impact, or for being biased towards facilitating academic 'push' rather than user 'pull' (House of Commons Science and Technology Committee, 2006; External Challenge Panel, 2006). Such criticisms reveal much about prevailing conceptions of, and claims for, knowledge transfer, as being logically distinct from knowledge production. This divide is encapsulated in the terminology of '(end)-users' and in models of research utilisation that segregate the scientific process from subsequent communication and application of the results. The divide lies at the heart of performance measurement, in separate metrics for scientific output, knowledge transfer and impact. It implies a unidirectional and sequential staging, from the conduct of research in the laboratory, leading to scientific discoveries and technological breakthroughs, which are then disseminated to potential users at the end of the research through an evidence based process, when science outcomes are popularly communicated or technologically diffused.

If this separation is not accepted, then the possibility is opened up of interactive models of knowledge production, in which knowledge transfer might be a more complex, multi-directional affair. There is therefore an emerging realisation, albeit not commonly reflected in practice, that research impact may be built upon a foundation of, and will occur through, active knowledge exchange and stakeholder engagement during the process of knowledge production itself.

This realisation revives the long-established discussion regarding contrasting ways of conceiving of the relationship between science and society. On the one hand, the scientific process may be viewed as hermetic and self-referring, albeit shaped at its beginning and end by wider societal preferences and contexts. Knowledge production and its application should therefore be conceived of as logically distinct and separate. From this perspective, the prospect of stakeholder engagement in knowledge production is typically viewed, at best, as a distraction and, at worst, as undermining scientific integrity. Alternatively, scientific knowledge production can be conceived of as creatively open to, or even dependent upon, non-scientific sources of expertise. The distinction between knowledge producers and users is seen as being fluid and the boundary between them permeable. In this view, the generation, diffusion and use of scientific knowledge and techniques are an iterative and networked process, built on adaptations, innovations and exchange of expertise from multiple sources.

However, we think what is often lacking in the welter of normative claims about the potential for interaction and mutual enrichment of scientific and non-scientific knowledge is systematic appreciation of the specific practices of knowledge exchange and their relative merits. Stakeholder engagement in research is thus widely pursued, but is rarely subject to systematic analysis (Abreu *et al*., 2009).

Relu's approach and philosophy of knowledge exchange

The Rural Economy and Land Use Programme (Relu) is a £27million research programme funded by the UK Research Councils (ESRC, BBSRC and NERC), Defra and the Scottish Government. It was launched in 2003 to support interdisciplinary research on the multiple challenges facing rural areas. The programme has involved 94 research projects, 50 universities and research institutions and 450 researchers. From the outset it has had a strong mandate for stakeholder engagement and has gone on to involve several thousand of them from the public, private and third sectors at all stages and levels. All too often research programmes segregate scientific research and knowledge transfer functions. Relu systematically integrates the two, in the conduct of its projects and in programme structures. There are four core dimensions to the Relu approach (Phillipson and Liddon, 2007):

1. A practical philosophy of knowledge exchange was developed and promoted widely across the programme and in calls for proposals and assessment processes, in an effort to encourage a culture of engaged research. Its core principles emphasise the importance of close involvement of stakeholders at all stages of the research process. It entailed an inclusive view of 'stakeholders', spanning institutions, organised interests, businesses, broader publics, local communities and residents. It emphasised how the transfer of ideas and results is often through multiple channels, including informal networks and the movement of people between research and practice.

2. The programme pursued a sustained approach to strategic influencing and relationship management. We made a conscious effort to broaden out the strategic advice to the programme through a series of national stakeholder forums involving experts from commercial, public and voluntary sector organisations. We built communities of 200 to 300 key stakeholders around each major cluster of projects, with an orchestrated succession of targeted events, internal policy briefings and synthesised outputs.

3. The programme focused on building networks for knowledge exchange. We experimented in the design of interactive workshops and events and established schemes for people exchange in the form of work shadowing and visiting fellowships. These have funded researchers to spend time work shadowing in settings in which their research may be relevant, and for stakeholders in turn to visit projects. Researchers have found the experience beneficial in focusing their research and methods and in providing privileged insights and access to potential resources and contacts. Stakeholders have an opportunity to inform the direction and focus of research. It brought an outside perspective and enhanced their analytical capabilities and strategy development.

4. Relu pursued a distinctive approach to science communication. A central mechanism has been publications which draw out key messages for target audiences in an accessible format. Relu actively targets links with knowledge brokers as dissemination partners, such as agricultural journalists, field advisors, and interest groups. Communications are directed at the specialist and technical press that is key to the knowledge renewal of tens of thousands of land managers and other rural professionals.

An experimental approach to collaborative knowledge production was encouraged across the programme's projects. Projects actively pursued stakeholder engagement throughout the research process, adopting varied approaches, including different forms of action research, the development of decision-support systems and various types of participatory modelling involving researchers and local communities. Various stakeholder analysis techniques have been deployed for identifying and investigating relationships between stakeholders (Reed *et al.*, 2009). They have tried out new approaches to citizen participation in science. One team has used catchment management in Loweswater to investigate ways in which communities can take control of environmental problems, setting up a knowledge cooperative in the process (Tsouvalis, 2009). Another has established 'competency groups' and involved residents in modelling flood management in their own backyards (Odoni and Lane, 2010; Whatmore *et al*., 2008).

Accounting for knowledge exchange

As well as finding the best means of promoting knowledge exchange, how can we tell if we are being effective? There are several thousand stakeholders involved in Relu projects. We developed a new tool, the Stakeholder Impact Analysis Matrix (SIAM), to track their involvement in the research. It is based on a survey of Relu Principal Investigators. SIAM holds data on the stakeholder contacts of each Relu project over the course of a reporting year. It focuses on real time impacts and records researcher perceptions of how stakeholders impact research and how research might be impacting upon stakeholders' knowledge and practices (Phillipson *et al*., in press).

The tool provides a number of diagnostic benefits. It enables stakeholder mapping (and a picture of how stakeholder constituencies evolve) and identification of key gaps, as well as analysis of how stakeholders are involved in research, with a view to improving future approaches. It identifies stakeholders around which to plan and seek feedback and offers insight into the scale and extent of short term impacts. The tool provides data for targeting and accounting for longer term impact analysis.

Taking the short term view

The data show how knowledge exchange and its impact in terms of new connections, perspectives and understandings can occur during the knowledge production process itself. They reveal stakeholder engagement is to be desired; researchers report its positive impact on the quality and relevance of research. There were also important but fewer effects on stakeholders, with perceived impacts of research on stakeholder knowledge and understanding outstripping impact on policies and practices.

It is hard to judge how enduring early effects will be over time. These impacts may be fleeting, or formative, laying a foundation for future impacts and knowledge exchange processes – only time will tell. However, longer term impact analysis faces possibly insurmountable difficulties, none more so perhaps than the challenge of attributing effects back to specific research endeavours. Such retrospective attributions will always be acts of imaginative reconstruction. That can be like throwing a pebble in a pond and trying to detect the ripple some time later and some distance away, a task made especially difficult when other people are also hurling pebbles and stones into the water.

We see advantages in considering early formative effects before the links of causality are lost or have become opaque. In this way, processes of knowledge exchange can be exposed. An 'audit trail' of early encounters between researchers and stakeholders may give a clearer steer about where to look for longer term research impacts and a head start in chasing up causality. The approach runs counter to the prevailing consensus among researchers and funding organisations, which suggests that impact analysis should be left until many years after a research project has been completed.

Making engagement more 'efficient'

The data demonstrate a complex and diverse range of relations taking place between stakeholders and research projects. Different stakeholder relationships were found to be associated with particular contributions to the research. Most stakeholders were involved as research subjects (providing information and assisting in data collection) or as event participants (receiving and giving feedback on project findings). Despite the fact that the Relu programme actively promoted stakeholder engagement, these rather traditional and hierarchical relationships between researchers and stakeholders predominated, at least numerically. Nevertheless, large numbers were also involved in the research process itself, including involvement in shaping the direction of research. They were taking part as members of advisory groups, as project partners, as work shadowing hosts, or as visitors to projects, where they were making a variety of contributions.

The most pronounced impacts on research were perceived to take place when stakeholders contribute to objective setting, project design, knowledge production and provide access to facilities. In contrast, gaining feedback on findings and involving stakeholders in dissemination are associated with impacts on their practices and understanding. Two way impact, where both stakeholders and researchers are benefitting, generally comes out of a more active and sustained relationship. Membership of steering and advisory groups is important and processes involving people exchange. Other relationships are more one-sided. There are also skewed engagement tendencies in different sectors. Private and societal stakeholders (the public, consumers) tend to be

involved as research subjects. On the other hand, fewer public and third sector stakeholders were involved in providing enabling functions within projects – providing information, data or access.

Though research impact can be more about serendipity than design - a chance change of policy or institutions, an unexpected event or crisis – it is also evident that the way in which research engages with stakeholders has an influence over the sorts of knowledge exchange outcomes that are likely to emerge. It follows that research programmes and projects should pay more systematic attention to approaches to stakeholder engagement within the design and conduct of research in order to improve the efficiencies of knowledge exchange.

Analysis not evaluation

Our main interest is in understanding the patterns and processes of engagement in research. There will be a temptation to use tools such as SIAM in performance measurement. There are implicit dangers in taking such an approach, given the likely effect on reporting bias and also, more fundamentally, the contingent nature of research impact. We know that no measurable impact may result from even the most highly relevant, cutting edge and expertly communicated research. The use of evidence is highly contingent upon social, political, economic, environmental or cultural context and contingencies and we need to further explore and understand its contingent qualities. Some types of evidence simply have more political weight than others. The more we *require* researchers to demonstrate impact, the greater the prospect of stifling the contestation and risk taking that are essential to scientific advance.

A related point concerns corroboration or triangulation of research impact – this involves comparing researchers' perceptions of knowledge exchange and its effects with those of stakeholders in order confirm impact claims. This is an important issue, but one which requires research investigation into the way in which different parties may construct and contest knowledge exchange processes and impacts. We would expect impact to be *seen* differently. A stakeholder may think research has no impact if it doesn't meet their own needs, even if it is of great value to other users. Researchers and stakeholders may interpret what constitutes impact differently. Impact will always be in the eye of the beholder.

To conclude

Knowledge exchange is a practical philosophy for academic engagement that implies that we should do things differently. It dissolves sharp distinctions between who are the producers and users of knowledge. It also breaks down segregation between the scientific process and subsequent communication and application of research results. It occurs during the research, in the form of new connections and perspectives, and involves diverse sources of expertise. It represents a different way of doing science.

We hope to have demonstrated that there are creative ways of accounting for knowledge exchange activities and impacts. While the opportunity to do this is provided by the demands of the moment for judging the value of research, this shouldn't be seen as simply a measuring and assessment exercise – a wearisome impact calculus. That exercise is only worthwhile if it gets us thinking about the wider purpose and value of our work, and in opening up new avenues for engaged research.

References

Abreu, M., Grinevich, V., Hughes, A., Kitson, M., 2009. Knowledge Exchange Between Academics and the Business, Public and Third Sectors. University of Cambridge and Imperial College London.

External Challenge Panel, 2006. Independent External Challenge Report to Research Councils UK "Knowledge Transfer in the Eight Research Councils". April. RCUK, Swindon.

House of Commons Science and Technology Committee, 2006. Research Council Support for Knowledge Transfer. Third Report of Session 2005-06. HC 995-1.

Odoni, N., Lane, S., 2010. Knowledge-theoretic models in hydrology. Progress in Physical Geography 34 (2), 151–171.

Phillipson, J., Liddon, A., 2007. Common Knowledge: An Exploration of Knowledge Exchange. Rural Economy and Land Use Programme Briefing Paper 6.

Phillipson, J., Lowe, P., Proctor, A., Ruto, E., in press, Stakeholder engagement and knowledge exchange in environmental research. Journal of Environmental Management.

Reed, M.S., Graves, A., Dandy, N., Posthumus, H., Hubacek, K., Morris, J., Prell, C., Quinn, C.H., Stringer, L.C., 2009. Who's in and why? Stakeholder analysis as a prerequisite for sustainable natural resource management. Journal of Environmental Management, 90, 1933–1949.

Research Council Economic Impact Group, 2006. Increasing the Economic Impact of the Research Councils. Advice to the Director General of Science and Innovation, DTI from the Research Council Economic Impact Group. July.

RCUK, 2004. Material World: Knowledge Economy, Research Councils UK, Swindon

Shove, E., Rip, A., 2000. Users and Unicorns: a discussion of mythical beasts in interactive science'. Science and Public Policy, 27(3), 175-182.

Tsouvalis, J., 2009. Loweswater Care Project Minutes of the 7th LCP Meeting / Tuesday, 14th July 2009, 17.30-21.00 / Loweswater Village Hall. http://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fass/projects/loweswater/noticeboard.htm

Whatmore, S., Landström, C., Bradley, S., 2008. 'Democratising science', Science & Public Affairs, British Association for the Advancement of Science, June: 17.

Barbara Doig
Former Chief Social Researcher Scottish Government

Research Impact: Perspectives from the devolved administrations

Introduction

1.   I am grateful to the ESRC, NCRM and the leaders of the Dancing with New Partners Initiative for the opportunity to reflect on, and take forward, issues surrounding impact. I have found again that one of the most striking characteristics of impact is the dichotomy in interpretation and approaches taken on the one hand by those working in academia who produce research, and on the other those, like myself, who take the user perspective. All dancers in the impact arena must constantly be alert to these different perspectives; we speak different languages, write differently, have different purposes in mind, demonstrate different behaviours in delivering and receiving outputs and operate to different timescales. The need for knowledge brokers cum translators in the role of intermediaries to encourage producers and users to dance, and to choreograph their efforts to add value, is increasingly recognized but not always valued. I am very grateful to Diana Wilkinson AcSS who provided a sounding board for my thinking and rescued my analysis from paralysis; any errors are of course my own.

2.   Nicolas Poussin's famous painting "Dance to the Music of Time" is reproduced at Annex A. The four dancing figures represent "poverty", "labour", "wealth" and "pleasure". These themes all resonate with social scientists. Add in "stages of life" and "passing of time" and the picture's impact on generations of viewers can be taken as a metaphor for the ambitions of this ESRC Initiative on Dancing with new partners There is a repeating story of social science not achieving the status and respect it deserves for its contribution to policies and practices, and for wheels to be constantly reinvented. We can only hope that social science's time has come, and that this initiative will play its part in social science outputs securing significant and wide ranging impacts, and heightened and sustained recognition for social science itself.

3.   The time is certainly right for this Dancing with New Partners Initiative. The United Kingdom research policy and funding regimes are awash with high level strategic statements and rhetoric about the value of the social science contribution to the evidence base for policy and practice, and the importance of knowledge mobilisation in getting the best evidence to decision makers in an accessible and timely format. Speaking at a recent Alliance for Useful Evidence conference hosted by NESTA(1), the UK Minister for Science David Willetts spoke about the importance of the social science contribution to the evidence base for policy and practice in an increasingly complex and diverse world where there is less tribalism, and we cannot assume shared beliefs; he noted the important role of evidence and its contribution to reasoned public debate, while clearly articulating the role of elected politicians in decision making, and the other factors apart from research which shaped that process. The Chief Executive of NESTA Geoff Mulgan, at the same event, highlighted various difficulties associated with evidence namely that it could be ignored, not lived up to, and was not always available.

4.   From a funder's standpoint the Economic and Social Research Council's Annual Report for 2011-12 emphasises that creating, assessing and communicating impact is central to all their activities (2). The ESRC requires applicants for funding to prepare an impact strategy which identifies how applicants will work to secure impact and how they measure success; and end of award reports are required to demonstrate how the researchers have secured impact. The ESRC has supported a range of knowledge exchange activities across the United Kingdom, and the Devolved Administrations have all participated in ESRC programmes to secure impact. Although a different definition of impact is used, there will also be an explicit element in the forthcoming Research Excellence Framework(3) to assess the "impact" arising from excellent research, alongside the outputs and environmental elements; in 2014 impact will account for 20% of the assessment and this proportion will rise in future quality assessment exercises. Researchers are therefore now expected to plan how to obtain impact from their work, know and understand how their research achieves impact, and place it in a body of knowledge which learns from the past and applies it to future scenario building. And the funders and commissioners of social science are equally accountable for securing an accurate and useful contribution to the evidence base.

5.   There is also increasing understanding of the importance of impact amongst the Learned Societies and the umbrella social science organisations, and the role such institutional stakeholders can play in research securing impact . Sue Duncan formerly UK Government Chief Social Researcher and currently President of the Social Policy Association, has set out a range of reasons why research struggles to have impact including information overload and inconvenient truths and she encourages researchers to promote understanding and engage more proactively in policy debates; she identifies the importance of the role of the Social Policy Association (4). Other Learned Societies including the British Sociology Association, The British Psychological Association, the Political Studies Association, the Royal Geographical Society and the umbrella Academy of Social Sciences (5) have raised their profile over the last few years to promote the social science contribution to the evidence base across the United Kingdom.

6.   The pressure is therefore on, and indeed amplified, in an age of austerity, for academics to apply their skills to demonstrate impact particularly to the analysis of policy options. There are of course costs associated with obtaining fit for purpose good quality social science. But there are also costs associated with not harnessing the social science contribution. There are indeed enhanced opportunities for social science research to contribute to getting more effective policy expenditure when resources are scarce, for example on advising on spending to prevent downstream social problems, to contribute to "what works" debates, and to relate different costs to standards and quality issues.

7.   The work which has been reported in the course of the Dancing with New Partners programme clearly demonstrates the range and depth of topics which have been researched, the multiplicity and diversity of partners who have taken part in the studies and ensured sustained engagement with getting the results into policy and practice. This paper teases out some of the differences in the environment of the Devolved Administrations, and the relationships between stakeholders, which can affect whether impact is achieved. It looks at the dances which have been executed in Scotland over the last few decades, and identifies some key issues for Scotland to improve its dancing performance.

The Devolved Administrations

8.   The term devolved administrations has been in general use for over a decade since the devolution of powers from the Westminster Parliament to Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales following the 1997 election. But Scotland has long had its own distinctive historical, social, economic and cultural identity and has punched above its weight since the Scottish Enlightenment in the 18th century; and supported by a wide Scottish Diaspora continues to excel in some fields of scientific innovation. Enric Miralles, architect of the Scottish Parliament Building described Scotland as "a mental place" (6) based on his study and knowledge of the Scottish Enlightenment and literature; and he was alert to the debate and decision making required to resolve the social challenges faced in a post industrial society. The positive aspects of Miralles's description include some 15 Universities, of which four were founded in the 15th and 16th centuries, within a resilient cultural and political environment supported by distinguished intellectual networks of the Royal Society of Edinburgh and the David Hume Institute, as well as newer groupings such as the Scotland's Futures Forum set up by the Scottish Parliament to develop strategic thinking about the issues which will shape the country's future.

9.   Wales and Northern Ireland share much of Scotland's Celtic fringe background while having their own distinct histories and paths to devolution. The countries of the United Kingdom have significant relationships with each other and, post devolution, a complex pattern of policy relationships has developed in parallel with increasing policy divergence in health, education, housing and justice etc to meet the different countries' needs. Providers and users of social science are gradually capturing the differential impacts of policies, and lessons are emerging on "what works" in the different countries of the United Kingdom and internationally. In times of austerity it is particularly important for social science to demonstrate how it can support policy development drawing on comparative studies. The Academy of Social Sciences has published a series of Making the Case booklets which demonstrate the impact made by social science to topics such as Well-being and Management and these incorporate the outputs of researchers based in all four countries. The Academy is also publishing a new booklet on social science in Scotland later in 2012, and is intending to collate Welsh based material (7).

10.   However the way in which impact is secured in the devolved administrations varies. In terms of research capacity there are considerable differences with only 2 universities in Northern Ireland (8) and in Wales the 11 universities and associated colleges are being reduced to 6 with a clear focus on consolidating Cardiff institutions. With relatively limited numbers of local research producers within populations of 3 million in Wales and just under 2 million in Northern Ireland there is potential for a relatively easily managed direct productive relationship between government and academia. This compares with Scotland's dispersed network of 15 universities serving over 5 million people. The scale of engagement required to maintain effective relationships between research providers and users is demonstrated by the fact that in 2004 different government users working on the 5 main Partnership themes across the Scottish Executive would have had to maintain links with nearly 400 university departments and research institutes (9).

 11.   The vitality of stakeholder networks are also different and work differently in geographical terms, for example in Northern Ireland there is a dearth of think tanks to encourage debate around the evidence, while in Wales there is a handful of active organisations such as the Institute of Welsh

Affairs largely focussed in the south east around Cardiff. In Scotland while there is a concentration of such activities in Edinburgh, there is a continual pressure on Learned Societies to meet members' needs and secure public engagement outside of Edinburgh where the Scottish Parliament is based, for example in the west of Scotland with its larger population, and in the fragmented Highland and Island communities dispersed over a large area. While Scottish Universities have established units which support thinking and host events on aspects of public policy, and there are some think tanks and individuals with declared political stances, independent think tank capacity in Scotland is limited since the demise of the Scottish Council Foundation in 2009.

12.   There are also differences in the level of upfront political commitment to the social science contribution to the evidence base, and the size and organisation of devolved governments' own social science base. All the Devolved Administrations pay some attention to the social science research contribution to evidence based policies, and all government web-sites have high level statements about the importance of evidence based policy and the research contribution (10). Wales is the only one however which expresses a headline commitment to evidence based policy. Both Northern Ireland and Wales concentrate their professional government social research capacity into centralized units with some bedded out capacity. (NISRA, the Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency, and the Welsh Social Research Division). In Scotland in contrast, the majority of social researchers are now located with other analytical colleagues in Analytical Services Divisions in the main policy Directorates and the central cross cutting and professional capacity has been reduced.

13.   The paths to devolution have been different in the three Devolved Administrations, the cultural context is different, and the organisation and intensity of provider-user relationships are at different stages. However it is interesting to note that although research capacity is less in Northern Ireland and Wales than Scotland, the stakeholder networks in the former, offer more potential for research to have impact more easily than the dispersed capacity in Scotland.

The Evidence about Impact

14.   Much of the internationally recognized theoretical and empirical work on knowledge transfer and research utilisation and impact in recent years has been conducted in Scottish research communities for example Nutley and Davies (11), Lyall and Meagher (12), the Centre for Research on Families and Relationships at Edinburgh University (13), and in the research user communities in the Scottish Office and Scottish Government over several decades. Publications refer to the "Scottish Model" of knowledge exchange and securing impact (14); and the ESRC's UK 2010 Expert Seminar on Impact Evaluation drew heavily on Nutley and Sanderson's work. The latter synthesized the determinants of impact including co-production, contextual understanding, knowledge translation, leadership and culture of the use of evidence which have entered current thinking about how to secure impact across the United Kingdom. (15),

15.   The interest in Scottish academic and user communities in impact stretches back to the 1960s and 1970s and the way in which knowledge about research utilisation and the importance of the research producer-user relationship was transferred between key academics in the United States and Scotland , and highlights the importance of international collaborations and personal contact. So Carol Weiss's seminal work on research utilisation (16) and Nathan Caplan's description of "trust, confidence and empathy" (17) entered Scottish producer and user communities in early and timely

fashion, and influenced the ways of working and producer-user dialogue of subsequent generations of social scientists in Scotland.

Changed times; changed dances

16.   In describing the evolution of our dances I will focus mainly on the impact of social science research on policy in recent times. The three main eras are firstly pre- the 1999 establishment of the Scottish Parliament and a devolved government in Scotland; secondly from 1999 until 2007 when there was a Labour-Liberal Democrat coalition government in Scotland accountable to the Scottish Parliament; and thirdly when the government in Scotland changed from being unionist to Scottish Nationalist (the latter was a minority government until 2011 and then a straight majority). The types of dances executed between providers and users changed over these three periods and the steps, I would suggest, have become increasingly complex and executed on an increasingly crowded stage.

17.   In the decades before 1999 there was a general acceptance that no matter the political complexion of the UK government, Scotland was special, for example there was merit in centralized planning and, perhaps reflecting the Scottish scientific tradition, there was a degree of rationality to policy making albeit slightly detached. Much of the contextual change in the first few years after devolution was influenced by the practicalities which had to be resolved, and the new relationships which had to be developed between Ministers in the Scottish government and civil servants, between the Executive and Parliament and its new staff and structures. Scrutiny of the government in Scotland was not far away in Westminster, or through the occasional forays of the Scottish Grand Committee into Scotland, but took place weekly in Chamber debates and Committee meetings at Holyrood in Edinburgh; and an energetic Scottish media reported extensively and often aggressively on the new Parliament.

18.   Post devolution the coalition government was united through a Partnership Agreement incorporating some 400 separate targets which drew on the respective parties' manifesto commitments.   In terms of government, an essentially Whitehall model was rolled out in Scotland with Ministers based in Scotland for most of the week compared to a few hours on Mondays and Fridays before devolution. All of these new legislative, political, and governmental arrangements, as well as the practicalities, resulted in a hugely increased demand for knowledge and analysis. There was however no debate about the merits of evidence based policy or the social science contribution. There was implicit agreement with the developments on modernising government (18) including professional policy making and the role of evidence based policy (19) and the contribution of social research and analysis (20) emanating from the UK Cabinet Office, possibly reflecting for the most part the similar political complexion of UK government.

19.   In terms of the dance analogy, the position until 1999 can be summarized as providers who wanted to dance were able to do so; and the users were well disposed to receive unsolicited, relevant outputs from academia and to commission a modicum of social research. While there may not have been regular weekly dances there were certainly occasional "hops". Overall government obtained results from commissioned research, and some work in academia got through the various permeable layers into user communities especially in central and local government. Social research informed changes in laws, in the allocation of resources, in the practices, processes and procedures in public service delivery; overall policy makers were better informed. In the 1990s evaluation

became increasingly important as a focus for social science to contribute to the evidence base (21). The Strictly Come Dancing score was a 5 based on worthy engagement.

20.   There was a gradual move from fairly simple dances along the lines of stately minuets and waltzes towards quicksteps and a bit more variety over the decade to 2007; the dances became more complex in response to the demands of the new Scottish Parliament and Government and the dances showed more complex Scottish country dancing steps along the lines of the reel of the 51st. But the dance was still possible because both providers and users knew the people involved, and the evolving "rules" of the dancing relationship. There was increased demand for more research as part of consultation and evaluation and for joined up analytical contributions; and the UK Cabinet Office report on "Adding it up" about organising analytical services to support policy (22) was adopted. Eventually all Scottish Departments had an embedded Analytical Services Division with inter disciplinary teams of economists, statisticians and social researchers who were supported by capacity in the centre on cross cutting policies and professional issues. The Office of Chief Researcher led on strategic external engagement with an emerging group of University Deans for Research and knowledge exchange professionals. In the early years of the new millennium this certainly represented a practical recognition of the framework provided by the phrase the evidence base for policy.

21.   The network of research providers, users and stakeholders became increasingly congested post devolution with more distinctly Scottish focussed organisations especially in the public and third sectors. Reflecting the Partnership Agreement between political parties, collaborative working across policy and academia was encouraged. Sometime over the middle years of the decade the language around impact gradually changed from knowledge transfer to knowledge exchange and knowledge mobilisation, which are resonant of a more collaborative and dynamic relationship.

22.   A more formal top down approach to knowledge exchange emerged in 2004/05 with Further Education bodies wishing to raise the profile of the social science knowledge exchange agenda. This brought new stakeholders in at the policy interface initially through the Funding Council and supported by the Royal Society of Edinburgh. From the producer end, this movement was based on the science model of knowledge transfer, and it took a little time to understand the impact agenda in terms of public policy. Similarly users of research were required to adjust their preconceptions on engagement. There were signs of a greater openness of users to securing impact but it was difficult for government to identify who and what providers there were, even in the main policy areas, as Universities established interdisciplinary units with titles which did not necessarily match up with policy issues as defined by users of research. The Scottish Government made a useful attempt to map providers of social research in 2004 (23) and to think about knowledge transfer in new ways (24). This marked a change in the tempo and style of dance at the strategic and operational level and the emergence of a new and different set of relationships. The ESRC initiated knowledge exchange programmes to support the policy making world in Scotland post devolution (25). Scotland's score in this second period from 1999 through to 2007 probably increased to around a solid 7, based on growing confidence and willingness to engage in a collaborative way within a defined Scottish structure of accountability,

Research Impact from 2007

23.   The Scottish Nationalist Party came to power in 2007, initially forming a minority government and, following the 2011 election, a majority government, in the Scottish Parliament. With its built-in commitment to Scottish independence providing a strong overarching ideological framework, and with a focus on the economy and a National Performance Framework with single outcome agreements, there has been little, if any, room for high level political attention to social issues and consequently the social scientific evidence base. There has been an emphasis on research contributing to the how policies work rather than to new policy thinking. Sue Duncan has referred to the problems at UK level of getting social science findings into policy and describes the perceived advantages for a government in particular circumstances of "keeping your powder dry" and "the circus moves on" as far as social policy areas concerned (26). This appears to be what has been happening in Scotland over the last few years.

24.   In 2009 Professor Ian Sanderson summarized the positives and negatives of where social research was able to contribute in Scotland based on his experience in Scottish Government (27) and he has developed his views for the purposes of the Dancing with new Partners Initiative (28). The SNP Government's concordat with Scottish Local Authorities stimulated growth in delivery, practice orientated research with multiple stakeholders and co-production of policy at delivery level. Especially important was Sanderson's conception of "impact" through a network model encompassing a multiple types of producers, users, professional groups, think tanks, learned societies. This reflected the development of a looser and more informal models of collaboration, multiple stakeholders and co-production of policy at delivery level. Given this network model, the changes in client capacity within government in recent years, and the absence of top down commitment to the utility of social research at the strategic level, local government and third sector users have assumed higher profiles as users of research.

25.   So complex dances have continued to take place across a broader and deeper stage since 2007 and Scotland has continued to be at the forefront of developing new and intricate dance steps. The collaborative approach required to work effectively in complex environments is well exemplified in Scotland. Work carried out for the ESRC on providing a route-map for researchers wishing to make impact on central government, identified the importance of the highly collaborative way of working in Scotland, and the easier access for academics to government social researchers and into policy communities (29) than in England. The maturing of the Parliament and its Committees, and the increasing sophistication of those seeking to influence policy, increased the numbers and range of opportunities for social science providers to directly participate. The ESRC has continued its knowledge exchange programme. And impact is also much to the fore in the minds of academic producers with Universities gearing up to submit their research outputs to the REF process.

26.   However there have been some discordant notes sounded in the background music for dancing. No Scottish Ministers have supported joined up social science in Scotland other than the role of economics advice in policy, the status of social research in government has declined, and there has been a decrease in user capacity to act as intelligent users. In a recent publication by the Institute for Government Sir John Elvidge (Permanent Secretary 2003-2010) reviewed the lessons learned from the first twelve years of devolved government in Scotland (30). He describes the abolition of an organizational structure of Departments which had been integral to the development

of The Scottish Office and carried over into the post devolution arrangements, changes in financial accountability, and the redefinition of senior management roles away from Head of Department to primarily organisation wide responsibilities; between March 2010 and the end of that year, he and the majority of the senior team left the organisation.

27.   There appear to have been unintended consequences for social science as a result of these changes. The role redefinition of senior management was highly significant in the new model of government and it is difficult to see how the contribution of social research to the evidence base for policy and practice can overcome the double whammies of negligible political and policy support, and the loss of leaders and champions who had an understanding and appreciation of the actual and potential impact of social science in the short and long term. The new generations of political and policy leaders tend to have little direct experience of a range of social science disciplines and what they can offer. Also the internal professional cohort of government social researchers has suffered fragmentation and declining influence in recent years, with the abolition of the Chief Researcher post in Scottish Government in 2010. The move away from Departments, along with the dominance of economics in analytical service divisions, has resulted in the loss of a distinctive and focussed research capacity which had traditionally been strong in the central, infrastructure and resource and planning arenas. The pressure on expenditure adds another dimension to this apparent lack of appreciation of social science.

28.   There has also been a drift away across the United Kingdom from general acceptance of the better policy making model in use since 1999. In Whitehall there is "noise" around the possibility of contracting out policy making, and interest in evidence centres about what works (31). Such changes will re-write the landscape for providers and users of social research and therefore the map for achieving impact. There has not been a parallel governmental interest in contemporary policy making in Scotland, in where the evidence base could be developed and considered, and in who carries out the challenge function. This leaves a gap which could be filled by default by advisers with policy agendas, rather than neutral advocates of the social science contribution to the evidence base.

28.   Within Parliament there have also been emerging signs of a lack of respect for the academic contribution with a dispute around the scope and political context of work by two academics giving evidence to a Committee (32). A seminar at the Royal Society of Edinburgh in 2011 under the auspices of the David Hume Institute on Early Years Intervention generated considerable audience support for action on delivering services rather than any more research; a more complex and subtle message however came through at a linked event at the Scottish Parliament, where the need for research and academic input on a daily basis was identified along with the importance of actually pulling in knowledge (33). When research budgets are under pressure it is important that there is no doubt about the value of the social science contribution.

29.   Yet within the last year there have been some glimmers of resurgence. Social science has come out fighting; The Select Committee on Science and Technology received several submissions from, inter alia, the Academy of Social Sciences, about the need for Departmental Chief Social Scientist capacity across the United Kingdom and its report supported the re-instatement and development of such posts (34). The Scottish Government has taken steps to re-introduce a Chief Social Research post; there is increasing recognition of the usefulness of research outputs for

practice development from organisations such as the Institute for Research and Innovation in Social Services (IRISS), and Evaluation Support Scotland; the Alliance for Useful Evidence held its first seminar in Scotland in September 2012 on how to embed evidence to innovate in the policy and practice process; and this Dancing with New Partners Initiative demonstrates research making an impact. A recent study for the ESRC in Wales has drawn attention to the valuable role played by social scientists in bringing evidence to the policy process and the value of short term placements in government offices for academics (35).

30.   So the overall performance continues from 2007 continues to be around a 7 but in dancing terms it conceals a patchwork of good and bad. On a crowded stage with so many dancers "clubbing" without clearly defined leadership and agreement about the value of their activities, there are challenges for both producers and users in securing impact when attention is focussed on the forthcoming referendum on Scottish independence in 2014.

A Look Ahead

31.   Given the absence of senior political and policy support for joined up social sciences' contribution to the evidence base, it is ironic that social science research methods will be very important in shaping the format of the referendum, and in measuring the views and attitudes of people Scotland before and after the referendum. Also the ESRC is taking forward a major programme of robust independent research addressing issues around the future of Scotland (36). The research will aim to both inform the debate in the run-up to the referendum and assist in planning across a wide range of areas which will be affected by the outcome of the vote, whether for independence or the Union.

32.   Bob Black, former Auditor General for Scotland, wrote very recently that "the first decade of devolution was the most benign period for the public finances in living memory, with budgets growing close to 5 per cent per year in real terms. We are now into the most challenging period in living memory, with the current spending plans providing for reductions of over 12 per cent by 2014-15 and the prospect of further reductions beyond that." (37). In a complementary lecture he suggested that the scale of the financial challenges in Scotland in an age of austerity leaves less space to address the great public expenditure challenges we are facing in an age of austerity. He proposed adding "safe space" in the form of a commission on resources and performance to provide analytical reports for the Scottish Parliament to conduct a rigorous evidence-based review across the public sector. While he only mentioned economists and performance auditors, other social scientists could have an important contribution to make, particularly in evaluating the effectiveness of policies in terms of quality and exercising a challenge function in terms of social impacts (38).

33.   While prolonged austerity should increase the demand for relevant social science to contribute to the evidence base, and challenge the status quo of policies and practices, it is also likely to exacerbate its volatility. There will be a tension around whether the environment for social science supports a breakthrough in appreciation and understanding so that maximum impact can be achieved; or whether the potential for science to improve its impact will be lost as expenditure pressures intensify on policy and research programmes.

34.   **Are you dancing?** The answer looks as if it continues to be yes, given that it is unlikely that pressure to secure impact will lessen, even although the amount of dancing might be under pressure

as research budgets take their share of cuts and there is uncertainty about the type of dance, and how will providers, users and knowledge brokers dance together. There are however two main questions, the answers to which will determine whether future social research will have impact. The first is, given the increased complexity of the dance steps, **where will the lord of the dance come from?** In other words where will social science leaders come from? Who will the champions be for joined up social science? The second question is **will the dancers be professional?** Will research providers, commissioners and users be professional in terms of their methods, standards and ethics, communications? Will their training and development support enhanced skills development? Will the infrastructure in terms of reliable data be available? Will new dance callers emerge from the Learned Societies or think tanks or commissions? Annex B teases out a research programme on impact that might lead to answers to some of these questions. The strictly come dancing judges are out.

ANNEX A

Artist	Nicolas Poussin
Year	1634-1635
Type	Oil on canvas
Dimensions	82.5 cm × 104 cm (32.5 in × 41 in)
Location	Wallace Collection, London

RESEARCH IMPACT IN FUTURE

Thinking on what has happened to social research and its impact over the last few decades suggests that there are two main headings overarching the likely future of impact in Scotland:

1. What might happen to each of the key elements of impact ie the providers, users, their relationship and the role of leadership and facilitators/Intermediaries?

2. What impact might there be on impact of future changes in the political, policy and managerial/organisational environment.

1. Issues around Providers of research

- How do the **expenditure cuts** affect social science in Scotland and the other countries of the United Kingdom? In the Higher Education sector, government departments, local authorities, third sector (staff and research
- How will academia respond to the first parts of the **REF?**
- Will there be clarity on who the providers are? Will the practitioner sector survive with distinctive Scottish capacity?
- Are there further innovations in the measurement of impact?

Issues around Users of research

- How do users **value** research in the age of austerity; do they discover/re-discover its usefulness? Or regard it as an easy option for expenditure reductions?
- Are there **champions** of social research
- Are users of social research intelligent commissioners and will they have the **skills** to recognise and assess impact

Issues around the relationship and accompanying communication

- What effect is there on **trust, confidence and empathy** from the providers and users perspective? Will there be more or less disconnect between providers and users?
- Which sector will **leadership** of the social science contribution to the evidence base come from and how will it be demonstrated?
- Will social scientists be **at the table** to help frame the questions rather than simply be technicians? Will providers challenge users on their use of social science?
- Will the **motivations and behaviours** of providers of research change in response to the impact agenda?
- Will there be more innovative **communication** and ways of supporting dialogue across boundaries?

Issues around Intermediaries

- Does the role and scale of University based **knowledge brokers** and units change?
- Does the role of **Learned Societies**, Think tanks, etc change?

2. Issues around the Environment of Social Research

- How does the **nationalist policy** agenda in Scotland play out in terms of the valuing and use of social science; for example will ideology be regarded as more important than evidence based/inspired policy; an emphasis on public attitudes and opinion polls.

- Will there be an equivalent event in Scotland to the English riots which will give an **opportunity for social science** to be required by policy makers and valued?

- Will the debate on **preventative spend** (John Swinney's speech to SNP conference October 2011) lead to demand for social research findings?

- Will **pressure to measure impact** intensify, or will over analysis of impact reduce support for research? How will demand for measuring impact vary between the UK and Devolved Administrations?

- Is it possible that **calls for action** rather than more research will squeeze funding and debate in Scotland?

- Can Scotland be **more nimble** than other countries of the UK about social science research impacting on the evidence base of policy and practice?

- Will there be divergence between the countries of the United Kingdom in the way in which social research is organized to maximise impact, the value placed on research, and the nature of the producer-user relationship; and how will the Scottish experience relate to International developments on impact?

References

(1) Video of speeches available at:
http://www.nesta.org.uk/events/previous_events/assets/events/alliance_for_useful_evidence_summer_networking_event

(2) Economic and Social Research Council *Shaping Society ESRC Annual Report And Accounts 2011/12.* HMSO 12 July 2012. Available online at:
http://www.esrc.ac.uk/publications/annual-report/index.aspx

(3) REF 2014 *Assessment framework and guidance on submissions.* July 2011 HEFCE et al. Available online at: http://www.ref.ac.uk/pubs/2011-02

(4) Duncan, S (2011) *Eat your greens: why doesn't social policy research have more impact? Policy World*, Autumn 2011, Social Policy Association.

(5) Benyon, J and Miriam David. Academy of Social Sciences and ESRC Project. *Learned Societies in the Social Sciences: Developing Knowledge Transfer and Public Engagement* June 2008.Available online at:
http://www.esrc.ac.uk/_images/Developing_Dialogue_tcm8-4628.pdf

(6) EMBT/RMJM Initial proposal for design of Holyrood Parliament Building 1998.

(7) Academy of Social Sciences *Making the Case for the social sciences series*. First one on *Wellbeing* available online at:
http://www.esrc.ac.uk/_images/Making_the_cases_for_Social_Sciences_tcm8-4620.pdf

(8) Duncan, S. *Social Science Matters: the challenge of using social science in policy.* Institute for Research in Social Sciences Annual Lecture University of Ulster 20 March 2012

(9) Derek Stewart, Chris Atkinson, Bishops Consulting and Jane W Denholm, Appendix 2 Critical Thinking *Mapping Social Science Research Provision in the Higher Education Sector in Scotland.* 2004 Annex Available online at:
http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2005/09/15144540/45413

(10)   Devolved Administrations Websites available at
  http://www.nisra.gov.uk ;
  http://www.scotland.gov.uk/topics/research and
  http://wales.gov.uk/about/aboutresearch/social/?lang=en

(11)   Nutley, Sandra M., Isabel Walter, H. T. O Davies *Using Evidence: How Research Can Inform Public Services.* The Policy Press, 2007 and others.

(12)   Meagher, Laura, Catherine Lyall and Sandra Nutley *Flows of knowledge, expertise and influence: a method for assessing policy and practice impacts from social science research Research Evaluation*, 17(3), September 2008, pages 163–173.

(13)   The Centre for Research on Families and Relationships (CRFR) is a consortium research
     centre based at the University of Edinburgh. Available online at http://www.crfr.ac.uk

(14)   ESRC *The Scottish Government Knowledge Transfer, Knowledge Exchange and Knowledge Brokerage in Scotland: The Map, the Model, the Model and the Territory 2005-2010* Mapping the Public Policy Landscape Series. Available at
http://www.esrc.ac.uk/_images/Scotland%20Report%202005%20-%202010_tcm8-13754.pdf

(15)   Report of the ESRC's *Impact Evaluation Expert Seminar*, 16th December 2010, MRC, 20 Park Crescent, London available online at: http://www.esrc.ac.uk/_images/Rpt%20of%20Impact%20Evaluation%20Seminar_tcm8-14877.pdf

(16)   Weiss, Carol H. *The many meanings of research utilization*. *Public Administration Review* **39** (5): 426–431. 1979.

(17)   Caplan, N. (1976), *Factors Associated With Knowledge Use Among Federal Executives. Policy Studies Journal*, 4: 229–234. doi: 10.1111/j.1541-0072.1976.tb01558.x A version of this paper was presented at the Conference on Social Values and Social Engineering, International Sociological Association, Warsaw, 1975.

(18)   Modernising Government White Paper 1999. Available online at: http://www.archive.official-documents.co.uk/document/cm43/4310/4310.htm

(19)   Strategic Policy Making Team *Professional Policy Making for the 21st Century*. Cabinet Office 1999. Available online at: http://www.civilservant.org.uk/profpolicymaking.pdf

(20)   Campbell, Siobhan, Siobhan Benita, Elizabeth Coates, Phil Davies and Gemma Penn *Analysis for policy evidence-based policy in practice.* Government Social Research Unit HM Treasury 2007. Available online at http://www.civilservice.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/Analysis-for-Policy-report_tcm6-4148.pdf

(21)   Doig, Barbara and Judith Littlewood Editors. *Policy Evaluation: The Role of Social Research.* Department of the Environment HMSO. London 1992.

(22)   Performance and Innovation Unit, *Adding It Up - Improving Analysis and Modelling in Central Government.* Cabinet Office 2000 Available online at: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/upload/assets/www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/strategy/coiaddin.pdf

(23)   Derek Stewart, Chris Atkinson, Bishops Consulting and Jane W Denholm, Critical Thinking *Mapping Social Science Research Provision in the Higher Education Sector in Scotland.* 2004 Available online at: http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2005/09/15144540/45413

(24)   Clark, Gill and Liz Kelly *New Directions for Knowledge Transfer and Knowledge Brokerage in Scotland.* Office of the Chief Researcher and SEHD Scottish Executive Social Research. 2005. Available online at: http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2005/09/2782919/29199

(25)   Economic and Social Research Council *A showcase of ESRC research; Knowledge Transfer in Scotland; Spreading the spirit of enterprise et al in The Social sciences in Scotland Scene Issue 1* Autumn 2006*.

(26)   Duncan, Sue. Social Science Matters: the challenge of using social sciences in policy making University of Ulster Faculty of Social Sciences Institute for Research. Annual Lecture 2012.

(27)   Sanderson, Professor Ian *Evidence Based Policy or Policy Based Evidence? Reflections on experience in Scottish Government. Public Policy Network* Edinburgh University May 2009. Available at http://www.publicpolicynetwork.ed.ac.uk/events/2009/evidence-based_policy_or_policy-based_evidence_reflections_on_experience_in_the_scottish_government

(28)	Sanderson, Professor Ian *Ensuring Impact of Research on Policy and Practice: What can be achieved and how? NCRM Seminar* University of Strathclyde January 2012. Available at http://www.northumbria.ac.uk/static/5007/sasspdf/sanderson

(29)	Doig, Barbara. *Pathway To Impact To Central Government: A Route-Map* Final Report to the ESRC. November 2011. Summary available online at: http://www.esrc.ac.uk/_images/Getting%20social%20science%20research%20into%20the%20evidence%20base%20in%20government_tcm8-20047.pdf

(30)	Elvidge, Sir John. *Northern Exposure: Lessons from the first twelve years of devolved government in Scotland.* Institute for Government September 2011. Available at http://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/publications/northern-exposure

(31)	HM Government. *The Civil Service Reform Plan.* June 2012. Available online at: http://resources.civilservice.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/Civil-Service-Reform-Plan-acc-final.pdf

(32)	Reported in *Devolution Matters Blog* by Alan Trench 14 January 2011. Available online at: http://devolutionmatters.wordpress.com/2011/01/14/how-not-to-do-business-holyrood%E2%80%99s-scotland-bill-committee/

(33)	Early Stage Intervention/Early Years – Evening Seminar on 12th October 2011 at RSE organized by the David Hume Institute Speakers Professor Ann Buchanan and Professor Susan Deacon and chaired by Sir John Elvidge.
Buchanan, A. *Maximising the potential of children in the Early Years*. David Hume Institute paper. Available online at:
http://www.davidhumeinstitute.com/images/stories/Seminars/Early_Years_Paper_final_version.pdf
Also seminar on 13th October 2011 at Holyrood Early Years Seminar Report - GGis (Goodison Group in Scotland) and SFF (Scottish Future Forum) in association with DHI. Contribution by Helen Chambers Head of Strategy and Delivery at Inspiring Scotland.

(34)	House of Lords Select Committee on Science and Technology *Strengthening the Role of Chief Scientific Advisers.* February 2012. Available online at http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/lords-select/science-and-technology-committee/news/csa-report-press-notice/

(35)	Johnson, Steve and Gareth Williams *Evaluating the Impact of Social Scientists*. Final Report to the Economic and Social Research Council November 2011. Available online at: http://www.esrc.ac.uk/_images/Evaluating%20the%20Impact%20of%20Social%20Scientists_tcm8-18812.pdf

(36)	Scotland and the question of independence ESRC programme announced summer 2012. Available online at http://www.esrc.ac.uk/about-esrc/what-we-do/our-research/scotland/index.aspx

(37)	Black, Robert. Facing up to Fiscal Challenge. The Scotsman Newspaper 5th October 2012. Available online at: http://www.scotsman.com/news/robert-black-facing-up-to-fiscal-challenge-1-2563871

(38)	Robert Black spoke at a David Hume Institute Seminar at the Royal Society of Edinburgh on 4th October 2012 Available online shortly at: http://www.davidhumeinstitute.com/seminars/presentations.htm

John Ramsey
Head of Volunteering, Age UK

User engagement, perspectives from the Voluntary Sector

Evidence-based decision making is the back bone of how we work. Ensuring that evidence is sufficiently robust in its methodology and analysis is key to ensuring we work effectively.

Our starting point for any piece of research is how does it help us better meet the aims of the organisation and the beneficiaries we represent.

I have collaborated with a number of research institutions on a variety of works. From my perspective the process can be divided into three phases: Development; Research; and Implementation. These are not necessarily linear phases but should be seen as interactive processes both for an individual piece of research and for collective research.

My initial thoughts on how we can 'dance with new partners' are posed as a number of questions. At this point, these are not comprehensive and further ideas are welcomed.

Development Phase

The idea

- Working for a large organisation gives me intrinsic advantages around access to partners and funders, historical relationships etc. But smaller organisations don't necessarily have these advantages. How do organisations know who to talk to when they have an idea for research? And similarly do researchers know the best organisation to partner with when they have a proposal?

- Is it possible to develop a dating website for research that can bring together organisations, researchers and funders, to enable the best fit? Or even speed dating events based around specific subjects that can ring suitable partners together.

- A particular obstacle is knowledge of, and access to existing research. If an organisation doesn't have a history of engaging in research it is difficult for them to know how to find out what research has been carried out and how to find it. How do we develop a database that can lead an organisation to the research it wants without it being too encompassing and too difficult to maintain? Is this possible?

Establishing the relationship

A successful research partnership is based on trust, in particular that the methodology will be robust enough to bear scrutiny. But trust takes time to develop. How can we ensure the best environment so that that trust can flourish? Would it be helpful to have conferences or online videos that explain how, for example, the research process works, or how organisations use research?

Research Phase

- **Research evolution**
  The environment in which the research operates can fundamentally alter the need for that research - a national policy 'u-turn' or the election of a new government, local or national. Can research be flexible enough to meet these changing needs and should it be? What role do funders play in this and does it mean that funders need to have a closer relationship with the respective partners?

Implementation Phase

The key part for the non-academic partner is how it will be used for maximum impact.

- **Involving influencers**
  Too often policy recommendations are made that sit in isolation from the people who have the power to change policy or can influence possible change. Is there a role to have multi-partner research projects where partners come in at specific points of the project with distinct objectives?

- **Using the data**
  It is a cliché to say that you can statistics to prove anything. But equally the challenge is representing the information in a fair and accurate manner, that does not ignore that which either challenges our presumptions or contradicts our viewpoint. This can be difficult when an influential stakeholder has a particular agenda to pursue. How can we ensure that accuracy is achieved, and where it is not, it is powerfully challenged by collective action rather than by individuals?

The question we always use for everything we do is what impact has that made on our beneficiaries. And similarly when we partner in a piece of research we need to query whether the cost in time, resources etc justifies the benefit it provides. The question though is what do we measure and how do we measure it?

John Ramsey, 2012

Agenda setting workshops

The think pieces were followed by agenda setting workshops. The purpose of the workshops was to draw on the think pieces and subsequent debate to scope the three workshops.

1. **Conceptualising impact and demonstrating impact**
   Rehema White (St Andrew's University), Daniela Sime (Strathclyde) Sue Baines (MMU)

This group prepared for the first workshop (convenor Dr Daniela Sime, Strathclyde University, January 2012). We asked participants to scope a workshop on the development of advanced knowledge and skills in delivering and demonstrating (quantitative and qualitative) impact in times of economic austerity; critical scholarship when user approach is relevant. The workshops participants began by examining the different ways in which impact can be conceptualised and measured, and then posed some big questions that needed to addressed regarding impact. They also identified potential speakers, and a series of issues they would like addressing, including conceptualisations of impact; linkages between user engagement and impact, and exploring knowledge mobilisation.

2. **Methods in user engagement**
   Irene Hardill (Northumbria University), Ann Clark (UHI), and Heather Wilkinson (Edinburgh University)

The focus of the second workshop participants were asked to scope was on user engagement methods with front line professionals and the 'hard to reach'; developing user engagement capacity and capability within the academy and research users. This structure and precise focus of the workshop (Northumbria University, March 2012) was co-produced by participants. The key points to emerge from the discussion was that this event needed to acknowledge that 'users' are very diverse; that there is a fluidity to the process of user engagement and there is a need for an awareness of a range of methods for different users and needs. It was also felt to be important to address research ethics at the Northumbria workshop, which should reflect on the barriers to engagement with various 'hard to reach' users. This provided the scoping brief for the March seminar.

3. **Research education – approaches/methods to embodying impact**
   Richard Thorpe AcSS (Leeds University), Paul Ellwood (Leeds University) and Oliver Moss (Northumbria University)

This group worked on an agenda for action for the third workshop, which aimed an exploration of the development of practical training for user engagement and impact. An important element of this workshop should be about helping those stakeholders/actors – giving them the tools to be more interactive (research users). It was also felt to be important to involve doctoral students early career stage, staff such as Directors of Research/Graduate Schools.

The day ended with a final plenary chaired by Professor Leela Damodaran of Loughborough University. The Event concluded with an overall agreement that the launch event had been

well-received but that the issues raised were wide-ranging and diverse. The challenge was to narrow these topics down into specific focuses for the events on what is clearly a relevant, important and timely issue.

WORKSHOP 2
CONCEPTUALISING & DEMONSTRATING IMPACT

October 25th 2011, British Academy London
January 30th 2012, Scottish Universities Insight Institute, University of Strathclyde

This workshop was convened by Dr Rehema White (St Andrew's) Dr Daniela Sime (Strathclyde) and Dr Sue Baines (MMU). The speakers were:

Chris Fremantle, Public Art Resource & Research Scotland (PAR+RS)
Professor Irene Hardill, Programme Co-ordinator, Northumbria University
Helen Harper, Research & Development Manager, Volunteer Development Scotland
Liz Locke, Principal Psychologist, Glasgow City Council
Sarah Morton, Co-director (KE), Centre for Research on Families and Relationships
Professor Ian Sanderson, Leeds Metropolitan University
Joanna McPake, Vice Dean (KE) Faculty of Humanities & Social Sciences, Uni. of Strathclyde
Dr Rehema White, University of St Andrews

Context

- The aims of this workshop were to: look at approaches to contextualising, demonstrating and measuring impact in all its diversity.

Questions discussed:

- How can impact assessment recognise ways in which the research evidence combines with other knowledge to influence decision making?
- How can impact be recorded without making excessive demands on participants?
- How can assessment, monitoring and measurement acknowledge different forms of impact and different perceptions from stakeholders?
- Can we co-construct measures of impact with stakeholder groups?
- What are the challenges and benefits of innovative ways of demonstrating impact (e.g. videos, cooperative research centres)?

Key points

- The workshop was well attended by a range of participants including academics, policy makers and practitioners, early career researchers, and representatives from the voluntary and community sector and local and national government organisations.

- The complexities of targeting and measuring research impact were acknowledged and discussed; impact is a process as much as an outcome, it can be negative as well as positive, it is accumulative and partially serendipitous, facilitated by trust and relationships.

- Whilst several presentations acknowledged the instrumental-conceptual impact spectrum model offered by Nutley *et al.* (2007), this seminar offered new insights particularly on capacity building/change in mindset when it comes to impact.

- Whilst other studies have often focused largely on impact on policy, this session also explored impact on practice, on research participants, on organisations and on the researchers themselves.

- There was debate about the roles to play in the design, implementation and assessment of research impact. Should we specialise in roles? How do academics engage with practitioner researchers? How can organisations ensure that the research they specifically commission has impact?

- Practical tools for designing and evaluating research impact were shared.

- The workshop had a Scottish focus, with recognition of how the engaged approach of the Scottish Government and other actors has facilitated connectivity and research impact in Scotland, but acknowledgement of how, in practice, the new devolved administrations may pursue political as well as evidence based agendas.

Summary of the workshop

At this workshop the complexities of targeting and measuring research impact were acknowledged and discussed; impact is a process as much as an outcome, may be negative, is accumulative, is partially serendipitous and is facilitated by trust and relationships. Whilst several presentations acknowledged the instrumental-conceptual impact spectrum model offered by Nutley et al (2007), this seminar offered new insights particularly on capacity building/change in mindset aspects of impact. Whereas other studies have often focused largely on impact on policy, we also explored impact on practice, on research participants, on organisations and on researchers themselves.

OPENING WORKSHOP

WORKSHOP 3

ENGAGING "HARD TO REACH" USERS

March 23RD 2012, Gallery North, Squires Building, Northumbria University

This workshop was convened by Ann Clark, (UHI), Dr Heather Wilkinson (Edinburgh) and Professor Irene Hardill (Northumbria). The speakers were:

Kye Askins, Northumbria University
Stephen Anderson, Executive Director of the Academy of Social Sciences
Rosemary Barber, University of Sheffield
James Bright, Bright Club
Ann Clark, University of the Highlands and Islands
Professor Angie Hart, University of Brighton
Professor Leela Damodaran, University of Loughborough
Laura McIntyre, Cyrenians
Professor Rachel Pain, Durham University
Lyn Russell, Independent Service User Adviser
Mark Smith, University of Edinburgh
Tom Wakeford, University of Edinburgh

Context

- The aims of this workshop were to focus on the *users of research* and *user* engagement methods with front line professionals and the 'hard to reach', especially marginalised groups (communities in poverty, ethnic minority communities and/or people with communication difficulties).

- We also wanted to surface the context and purpose of user engagement, which are key to the choice of methods to be employed, and to acknowledge that research users may value engagement differently from research funders or the Research Excellence Framework (REF). Engaging with research users may occur throughout the research process, and different methods are called upon at different stages of the research process.

Key points

- The workshop was well attended by a range of participants including academics, policy makers and practitioners, early career researchers, and representatives from the voluntary and community sector and local and national government organisations.

- The institutional influences on user engagement were recognised;

- The ethical and practical challenges to user engagement were discussed, alongside key issues such as the payment of participants, researcher security, and the ownership of data;

- Through participatory methods a more open engagement with participants can be practiced; but participation is multiply positioned and contested. Moreover impact is about a two way relationship; the scale of engagement does not equate with the quality of impact, and impact can occur throughout the research process, not just from research outputs;

- Language can be a barrier, as can be our terminology, such as the use of the term 'hard to reach', some alternative terms could be 'easily ignored' 'chronically excluded'. Some participants suggested that it is academics who are, in fact, the 'hard to reach'.

Summary of the Workshop

The participants at this seminar examined user engagement methods with front line professionals and the 'hard to reach' ("people whose voices are seldom heard" or "easily ignored" groups). We concluded that participatory approaches can be empowering, offering process benefits to researchers, participants and places as well as specific outcomes including change in practice. However, participatory processes can also reinforce existing power hierarchies.

 Participatory, engaged processes require a shift to a (new) dialogic mode of research, yet this research approach can be impeded by the particular form of Research Excellence Framework (REF). Language, timescales, expectations, differ amongst researchers, communities, government, agencies, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and other organisations; good relationships are critical.

OPENING WORKSHOP

WORKSHOP 4
RESEARCHER EDUCATION

10th May 2012, University of Leeds

This workshop was convened by Professor Richard Thorpe and Paul Ellwood (Leeds University). The speakers were:

John Burgoyne, University of Lancaster
Charlotte Coleman, University of Leeds
Jenny Dibden, Joint Head of the Government Social Research Service
Susan Molyneux-Hodgson, Director, white Rose Social Science Doctoral Training Centre
Professor Richard Thorpe, University of Leeds

Context

- The aims of this workshop were to:

    o surface the education and training issues associated user engagement for producers and users of research in the social sciences

    o learn in what areas enthusiasm exists within the "Dancing with New Partners" networks to pursue new approaches to researcher education for better user engagement

Key points

- Different professions and disciplines experience different pressures when considering user engagement

- Leadership from institutions or departments is critical to ensure that an environment that facilitates user engagement is created

- Whilst the Research Excellence Framework (REF) legitimises engagement and impact as research approaches, the contrasting emphasis on the publication of research outputs creates tensions within academia

- Postgraduate training on user engagement and impact tends to viewed as 'transferable skills'. There is an opportunity to engage with the new Doctoral Training Centres and propose that these elements are included at the time of proposal writing rather than at 'knowledge dissemination', but any such training should be meaningful.

- Engagement with users such as in the form of visits or placements can be made more meaningful through pre-visit discussions and post-visit group reflection and analysis.

- The form and extent of user engagement may be a function of the discipline, the culture of the particular institution and the willingness, ability, awareness, and speciality of the individual.

- In researcher education, time, risk, the need to develop and maintain relationships with users and supervisor experience impede the possibilities for user engagement in the form of co-production.

- Engagement brings ethical questions; it should not be encouraged merely for the purpose of 'education' but should still be beneficial to participants.

- The work of Government analysts would be enhanced by academics who are capable and willing to engage with policy makers in appropriate ways; they have significant impact on government but work in different ways from academics because have to make decisions based on available information.

- Several practical opportunities to influence researcher education were identified.

- Throughout the day, discussion of IT was ongoing. Engagement requires both face to face relationship building and the use of social media, with appropriate use of both means.

Summary of the Workshop

The fourth workshop aimed to identify the education and training issues associated with user engagement and impact. Disciplinary differences, the tension between publication outputs and investment in user engagement were acknowledged. The form and extent of user engagement may be a function of the discipline, the culture and leadership of the particular institution and the willingness, ability, awareness, and speciality of the individual. Despite a recent focus by the REF and other academic areas on impact, researcher education at present seems to include very little on user engagement and impact. There is an opportunity to engage with the new Doctoral Training Centres and propose that these elements are included at the time of proposal writing rather than at 'knowledge dissemination'. Such training, however, needs to recognise the major shift in research approach through meaningful analysis and reflection rather than diminishing it to a tick box exercise. In researcher education, time, risk, the need to develop and maintain relationships with users and supervisor experience impede the possibilities for user engagement in the form of co-production. In addition, engagement brings ethical questions; it should not be encouraged merely for the purpose of 'education' but should still be beneficial to participants.

CONVENED BY THE ACADEMY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND BIRKBECK,

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

September 21st 2012, University of London

Context

- Audience: Social science researchers, and users of the outputs from social science research

- The aim of this final event was to: facilitate knowledge sharing of the work of the Network; and to engage with other Networks

Summary

The convenors of each workshop presented resumes of their work, along with the think piece authors; and the dissemination of the work of the Network was also discussed, including the scope of the special issue of *Contemporary Social Science*.

One important output from the Network has been the production of two special issues of the Academy of Social Science journal *Contemporary Social Science*. During 2011-12 Network participants developed a series of academic papers, a number have been co-authored with user partners. The papers address themes raised in the workshops, and they will be published in 2013-4. The abstracts of these papers are provided below.

Why Social Scientists Should Engage with Natural Scientists

Philip Lowe, Jeremy Phillipson (both Centre for Rural Economy, School of Agriculture, Food and Rural Development, Newcastle University) and
Katy Wilkinson (Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Warwick)

It has become part of the mantra of contemporary science policy that the resolution of besetting problems calls for the active engagement of a wide range of sciences. The paper reviews some of the key challenges for those striving for a more impactful social science by engaging strategically with natural scientists. It argues that effective engagement depends upon overcoming basic assumptions that have structured past interactions: particularly, the casting of social science in an 'end-of-pipe' role in relation to scientific and technological developments. These structurings arise from epistemological assumptions about the underlying permanence of the natural world and the role of science in uncovering its fundamental order and properties. While the impermanence of the social world has always put the social sciences on shakier foundations, 21st-century concerns about the instability of the natural world pose different epistemological assumptions that summon a more equal, immediate and intense interaction between field and intervention oriented social and natural scientists. The paper examines a major research programme that has exemplified these alternative epistemological assumptions. Drawing on a survey of researchers and other sources it seeks to draw out the lessons for social/natural science cross-disciplinary engagement.

Knowledge mobilisation and the social sciences: dancing with new partners in an age of austerity

Jon Bannister (Manchester Metropolitan University) and Irene Hardill (Northumbria University)

The social sciences hold the potential to help interpret and address the complex challenges confronting society. The impact agenda actively encourages the social sciences to make and demonstrate a difference; to justify and protect social science funding. Knowledge mobilisation (KM) can be thought of systematically as a process, encompassing the coproduction and channelling of knowledge that can enable the social sciences to gain purchase and voice in the policy-making and delivery process, and supports the endeavour to make a difference. This article serves as an editorial introduction to two special issues 'KM Issue 1: Research Impact' and 'KM Issue 2: Engagement'. It sets out to outline the forces leading to the rise of the impact agenda and the questions it poses for the social sciences. Particular attention is given to the changing policy context that has reshaped the academy. The article then progresses to outline debates on research and impacts and the forms of engagement that are needed to demonstrate and deliver impact beyond the academy. The article examines the ways in which impact is defined, measured and 'delivered' with the social sciences. This is followed by a section on the ways in which social science knowledge is mobilised. The penultimate section address the co-production of social scientific knowledge and this is followed by a brief conclusion.

Impact and Knowledge Mobilisation:
What I have learnt as Chair of Economic & Social Research Council Evaluation Committee

Ann Buchanan (University of Oxford)

This paper, written by the current Chair of the Evaluation Committee of Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC), highlights the findings from the impact studies commissioned by the Committee over the last six years. The first part of the paper outlines the context to the new focus on 'Impact'. In particular it notes how developments in knowledge mobilisation, especially in Canada, came together with the rise of evidence-based policy and practice. With New Labour (and currently the Coalition Government) making greater use of research evidence there was a strong message to the Research Councils that they needed to demonstrate a better return from their investments in research by demonstrating economic, societal and scientific 'impact'. But a major challenge was how could 'impact' be demonstrated?

The central sections of the paper summarize the findings from three groups of ESRC 'impact' studies. These studies have done much to inform how ESRC researchers could better achieve knowledge mobilisation and 'impact', and what they should do to create 'Pathways to Impact'. The final section asks 'where have we come from on knowledge mobilisation and impact', and 'where might we be going'? In undertaking these evaluation studies on impact, much has been learnt which the author believes deserve wider publication but there are further challenges ahead.

Mobilising knowledge in community-university partnerships: What does a community of practice approach contribute?

Angie Hart (University of Brighton), Ceri Davies (University of Brighton), Kim Aumann (Boingboing Social Enterprise), Etienne Wenger (Independent Researcher, Grass Valley, California), Kay Aranda (University of Brighton), Becky Heaver (University of Brighton), Dave Wolff (University of Brighton)

Over the past decade different approaches to mobilising knowledge in Community-University Partnership (CUP) contexts have emerged in the UK. Despite this, detailed accounts of the intricate texture of these approaches, enabling others to replicate or learn from them, are lacking. This paper adds to the literature which begins to address this gap. The case considered here concentrates on one particular approach to Knowledge Mobilisation (KM) developed in the UK context. It provides an account of the authors' involvement in applying the concept, and practical lessons from a Community of Practice (CoP) approach, to developing Knowledge Exchange (KE) between academics, parents and practitioners.   The authors' approach to KM explicitly attempts to combat power differentials between academics and community partners, and problematises knowledge power hierarchies. The paper explores the CoP concept and critically investigates key elements of relevance to developing KE in the CUP context. Specific themes addressed are those of power, participation and working across boundaries by CoP members with very different subject positions and knowledge capitals. The paper concludes that CoPs can be a useful mechanism for KM, but have many limitations depending on the specific context in which KM is being undertaken.

Enlivening evidence-based policy through embodiment and emotions

Irene Hardill (Northumbria University) and Sarah Mills (Loughborough University)

Evidence-based policy and practice tends to operate on a belief that knowledge is obtained through objective observation and reasoning, leading to 'rational decision-making'. But the work of producing such knowledge is typically more 'messy', more iterative and more non-linear; features of the knowledge production process only made more pronounced by imperatives such as co-production. Just over a decade ago Smith and Anderson traced out a position countervailing to that of the predominant - yet, at that stage, only tentative - 'policy (re)turn' in human geography and set about charting a new course of research, variously promoting and encouraging a more enthusiastic laying bare of the researcher's positionalities and emotional sensitivities. In this paper we wish to briefly reassess the 'emotional turn', via a case study centring on the New Dynamics of Ageing (NDA) research programme to highlight the challenges of translating emotions into a policy making environment. In our project we examined the ways in which the materialities of ICT (and new technology more broadly) are embedded in everyday life. How people feel, their emotional sensitivities, towards the use of information and communication technologies (ICTs) we argue is crucial for understanding the potential impact of the current public policy thrust to move to the online delivery of public services (or egovernment). Adding emotional sensitivities in the body of knowledge when in dialogue with policy makers we suggest enriches evidence based policy that centres on behaviour change.

Mobilising the experiential knowledge of clinicians, patients and carers for applied health care research

Pam Carter[1,2], Roger Beech[2,3], Domenica Coxon[1], Martin J Thomas[1], Clare Jinks[1,2.]
[1]Arthritis Research UK Primary Care Centre, Keele University, [2]West Midlands Research Design Service. [3] Health Services Research Unit, Keele University

This article demonstrates the challenges and benefits that can accrue when combining various types of knowledge derived from partners involved in applied health research. Funding is available for health research despite these being "austere times" for public services and international policy shifts recognise the role that patients, carers and the public can play in research. However, accessing funding in a competitive environment remains challenging. In England the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Research Design Service (RDS) was created to mobilise the experiential knowledge of clinicians working in the NHS and ensure that this practice based knowledge is informed by academic knowledge of social science methodology to achieve relevant research outcomes. The RDS also facilitates patient and public involvement in research, framed as "PPI".

We present three case studies, each of which involved a combination of academics, clinicians, patients, carers and the public in applied health research. These case studies demonstrate that involving patients and the public is neither a "quick fix" nor a cheap solution but requires time, money, facilitative skills and a respect for difference. Two successfully funded projects developed a study design and appropriate research question by mobilising long standing relationships with patient groups. We also give an example of an unsuccessful research proposal. In our discussion we make a contribution to theoretical development through refining the conceptualization of PPI by unpicking the different roles that members of the public play as lay people and distinguish this from the specific expertise that comes from direct experience of being a service-user, carer or patient. We conclude that different types of knowledge are required for applied health research: social scientific methodological expertise, practice-based expertise, and the experiential expertise of patients or carers. While there are no guarantees, lay involvement in research funding panels can challenge the balance of power.

Research, policy and knowledge flows in education: What counts in knowledge mobilisation?

Gemma Moss (University of London)

This Special Issue places discussion of Knowledge Mobilisation in the context of diminishing government funding for research, and the difficulties the research community has experienced in reaching out to those who might make best use of its knowledge base and research findings. The emphasis policymakers and funders give to demonstrating research impact turns these pressures into a potentially toxic brew with the capacity to distort how the academic community interacts with other interested parties. To re-direct attention to some of the more difficult issues in knowledge mobilisation, this paper presents three empirical case studies from education, exploring what happens as knowledge travels from one context of use to another. The cases highlight some substantial inequalities in the rights to define what counts as relevant knowledge that trouble easy acceptance of the concepts of impact or influence as key drivers in knowledge exchange.

Rethinking policy-related research:
Charting a path using Qualitative Comparative Analysis and complexity theory

Tim Blackman (The Open University)

This article argues that conventional quantitative and qualitative research methods have largely failed to provide policy practitioners with the knowledge they need for decision making. These methods often have difficulty handling real world complexity, especially complex causality. This is when the mechanism of change is a combination of conditions that occur in a system such as an organisation or locality. A better approach is to use Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA), a hybrid qualitative/quantitative method that enables logical reasoning about actual cases, their conditions, and how outcomes emerge from combinations of these conditions. Taken together these comprise a system, and the method works well with a whole system view, avoiding reductionism to individual behaviours by accounting for determinants that operate at levels beyond individuals. Using logical reduction, QCA identifies causal mechanisms in sub-types of cases differentiated by what matters to whether the outcome happens or not. In contrast to common variable-based methods such as multiple regression, which are divorced from actual case realities, QCA is case-based and rooted in these realities. The use of qualitative descriptors of conditions such as ways of working engages practitioners, while their standardisation enables systematic comparison and a degree of generalisation about 'why' questions that qualitative techniques typically do not achieve. The type of QCA described in the article requires conditions and outcomes to be dichotomised as present or absent, which is helpful to practitioners facing binary decisions about whether to do (a) or (b), or whether or not an outcome has been achieved.

Knowledge mobilisation and the civic academy:
The nature of evidence, the roles of narrative and the potential of contribution analysis

Jon Bannister (Manchester Metropolitan University) and
Anthony O'Sullivan (University of Glasgow)

The purpose of knowledge mobilisation (KM) can be defined as the creation and communication of evidence motivated by a desire to improve the design, delivery and consequent impact of public services. This definition also embraces the notion of the civic academy. In this article, we explore the requirements of effective KM in the light of recent contributions to the theory of knowledge (specifically regarding the nature of evidence) and of the potential roles for narrative. We consider in these contexts whether a number of recent conceptual and methodological developments offer the prospect of progress in the pursuit of effective KM.

"It's what gets through people's radars isn't it":
Relationships in social work practice and knowledge exchange

Mark Smith (University of Edinburgh), Heather Wilkinson (University of Edinburgh) and
Mark Gallagher (University of Glasgow)

This article draws on findings from a knowledge exchange (KE) project, which involved academics working with local authority social workers around a theme of engaging with involuntary clients. The user engagement agenda is actively promoted in social work but is not straightforward, reflecting a mish-mash of client rights, managerial and consumerist agendas. Engaging with involuntary clients, in particular, those whose involvement with social work is mandated by law, rarely fits into policy agendas and requires a range of conditions and practitioner skills for it to happen effectively. A parallel aim of our project was to explore what was seen to be effective in the KE and knowledge mobilisation (KM) processes when local authorities and university academics work together. Like client engagement, KE is also seen as 'a good thing' but in reality it is similarly problematic. In this article we trace the growth of both client engagement and KE agendas, particularly in relation to social work. We describe our project and discuss its findings. A number of parallel processes might be identified in 'what works' with hard to reach social work clients and 'what works' in KE/KM. Neither are linear or necessarily rational processes. What does seem to hold both together, however, is the nature of relationships built up between, in the first instance, social workers and those they work with and, in the second, between academics and local authority practitioners. These findings suggest that personal qualities that might be associated with the concept of emotional intelligence play an important part in enabling both social work practice and KE/KM to happen effectively.

Researching with Impact in the Global South? Impact Evaluation Practices
and the Reproduction of 'Development Knowledge'

Glyn Williams (University of Sheffield)

Long-standing questions about the production and control of knowledge about 'the developing world' have been given new urgency through the deployment of impact evaluation practices within UK universities, highlighting the need for careful ethical reflection on the role of Northern researchers in both academia and practice. In this context, this paper takes up the three underlying themes of this special issue – the conceptualisation, evaluation and methods of knowledge mobilisation – to ask what 'researching with impact' might mean for academics whose work focuses on the Global South. With regard to the conceptualization of knowledge, it argues that the RCUK's definition of 'high impact' research sits uncomfortably with both critical scholarship on the power of 'development knowledge' and with 'alternative development' practices that call for knowledge co-production. With regard to the evaluation of knowledge mobilisation, it uses Northern researchers' reflections on their practice to argue that impact evaluation practices are 'nudging' academia in directions that require our attention. Finally, with regard to methods of knowledge mobilisation, it investigates what an ethically-engaged response to these pressures might look like, arguing for scholars working on the Global South to defend the production of 'development knowledge' that is both practically engaged and critically distant from policy makers.

A Model for Knowledge Mobilisation and Implications for the Education of Social Researchers

Paul Ellwood (University of Leeds) and Richard Thorpe (University of Leeds)

The growing imperative for social sciences to apply more directly to the communities they study raises issues about how researchers develop their capabilities to interact with people in such communities throughout their career. A traditional model sees researcher education focus on challenges that matter primarily within their university: the mastery of methods and production of research papers. If social *research* is to be more relevant outside the academy, then how are social *researchers* to be prepared for this challenge? The underlying proposition of this paper is that publishing academic research is merely work in progress towards the realisation of some challenge held to be of wider interest within society. However, pursuing such an outcome will require a reorientation of programmes of researcher education to consider the practices of user engagement. In this paper we reflect upon the development of our own practice of user engagement within the context of management studies. We develop our argument by conceptualising the process of knowledge mobilisation as a series of stages in which knowledge translates into practice. We suggest that academic researchers contribute only one of the inputs to this translation process, with other inputs being provided by users who are in some manner involved in the research. We discuss the implications of this model for researcher education throughout academic careers, as well as for explaining the research to users who are part of the process of translating knowledge into practice. We illustrate our arguments by drawing on data generated whilst undertaking a review of the UK's Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) research training recognition; our experience of designing and delivering university researcher workshops in user engagement; and the reflections of one PhD researcher conducted at various stages in her research project, including interaction with various stakeholders with whom she had to engage.

Everyday ethics in community-based participatory research

Sarah Banks (Durham University) and Andrea Armstrong with Kathleen Carter, Helen Graham, Peter Hayward, Alex Henry, Tessa Holland, Claire Holmes, Amelia Lee, Ann McNulty, Niamh Moore, Nigel Nayling, Ann Stokoe, Aileen Strachan.

This article explores a range of ethical issues that arise in community-based participatory research (CBPR), drawing on literature and examples from practice. The experience of CBPR practitioners adds further weight to the growing critique by many other social researchers of regulatory approaches to research ethics (which focus on rule-following in accordance with research governance frameworks, codes of conduct and ethics review procedures). Yet whilst many of the ethical challenges in CBPR are common to social research generally (informed consent, anonymity, issues of ownership of data and findings), the dynamic, complex and value-based nature of CBPR gives them particular prominence. There are also specific issues relating to the ethics of partnership working, collaboration, blurring of boundaries between researchers and researched, community rights, community conflict and democratic participation that are more frequently encountered in CBPR. Four practice examples are used demonstrate this argument. These are taken from a young women's community allotment, a community organisation researching poverty, a youth peer

research project and a museum-based digital storytelling project. The article concludes that current institutional ethical codes, guidelines and ethical review procedures are not particularly well-suited to CBPR, in that they adopt principle-based and regulatory approaches to ethics; whereas character- and relationship-based approaches to ethics are also very important in CBPR, which is adopted by many researchers with a strong value commitment to social justice.

Intangible Assets, Absorbing Knowledge and its Impact on Firm Performance: Theory, Measurement and Policy Implications

Richard Harris (Durham University) and John Moffat (Swansea University)

The use of intangible assets is widely recognized as a key driver of enterprise performance. A concept that is closely linked to intangible assets is absorptive capacity which is defined as the ability to exploit knowledge that is embodied in intangible assets. The main objective of this paper is to explore what is meant by absorptive capacity, before examining the empirical relationship between absorptive capacity and various dimensions of firm performance. The latter is not straightforward because there is no agreed approach to measuring absorptive capacity. The approach taken here is to use data on whether firms sourced knowledge or collaborated externally from the UK Community Innovation Survey. This allows us to show that there is a clear and important link between absorptive capacity and various dimensions of firm performance. In this paper we aim to contribute to the special issue by focusing on the role mobilising knowledge can play in improving the performance of firms in the private sector, which has a particular resonance in these difficult economic times.

Our central message is that for firms to perform better in hard times they need to mobilise their absorptive capacity. Government must therefore consider whether they should focus their efforts on helping firms directly to increase their own absorptive capacity or on improving the flow of (local) knowledge through supporting networks. Our view is that, while maintaining existing policies that aim to increase connections and encourage collaborations between firms, there should be a greater emphasis on the firm because evidence shows that unless firms have sufficient absorptive capacity, they will not be able to fully internalise the benefits of any knowledge spillovers, no matter how large such spillovers may potentially be.

Endnotes

[i] http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/

[ii] See SSHRC's knowledge mobilization strategy at http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/society-societe/community-communite/index-eng.aspx

[iii] See http://canada.metropolis.net/index_e.html

[iv] Mme Bourgon gave a presentation in Australia in February 2009 that seems to anticipate the content of her new book. Called "New Governance and Public Administration: Towards a Dynamic Synthesis," the presentation places value on an enhanced role for citizens; the need to address complex and unpredictable problems; the difficulty of seeing *emerging patterns* in an ever-changing landscape and therefore the inability *to intervene* ahead of time; the need for governments to "improve their capacity to tap the *collective intelligence* of society, to extract knowledge and meaning about emerging patterns and trends in the social system" – to take advantage of their access to an "almost limitless pool of talent and ingenuity among their citizens" (p. 14); and the need to sustain resilient communities possessed of a "critical mass of *active citizens …* and durable, diverse *networks of community groups* that can mobilize people and resources to respond to challenges" (p. 16); and the need to involve scholars and professionals in government preparedness. See http://jocelynebourgon.ca/documents/Governance%20Paper-Canberra%20_Feb_16_v21%20_PMilley%20Edits_.pdf

[v] See message by the Centre's director, Mathew Mendelsohn: http://www.mowatcentre.ca/directors-message.php

[vi] See http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/results-resultats/2010/cura-aruc_eng.pdf; the last cohort of CURA projects has just been launched, with the CURA program now having been absorbed into SSHRC's new Partnership Development Grants and Partnership Grants offerings. Information on the original CURA program: http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programs-programmes/cura-aruc-eng.aspx

[vii] http://communityresearchcanada.ca/index.php?action=alliance

[viii] http://www.easternontarioknowledge.ca/ . This work at Queen's was supported, in part, by a Knowledge Impact in Society (KIS) grant from SSHRC

[ix] See http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/tal/kcl/eff-eng.asp#deputy_minister

[x] The nine: Transport, Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Human Resources and Skills Development, Statistics Canada, the Canada School of Public Service, Fisheries, Environment and the Privy Council Office

[xi] See the summative evaluation for SSHRC's Standard Research Grants and Research Development Initiatives programs at http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/about-au_sujet/publications/SRG_RDI_Evaluation_e.pdf (p. 11). Copies of the eight case studies can be obtained by contacting Wayne MacDonald, director of SSHRC's Corporate Performance and Evaluation Division: wayne.macdonald@sshrc-crsh.gc.ca

xii http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/maf-crg/overview-apercu/elements-eng.asp

xiii See Canada's 2010-11 Public Service Renewal Action Plan at
http://www.clerk.gc.ca/eng/feature.asp?pageId=165

xiv http://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/ic1.nsf/eng/h_00231.html

xv See http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programs-programmes/priority_areas-domaines_prioritaires/digital_research-recherche_numerique-eng.aspx

xvi *Building Safer Communities* (**RES-809-19-0017**) was funded as part of the Economic and Social Research Council, Scottish Funding Council and Local Authority Research Council Initiative, 'Engaging Local Authorities Scheme'. The project formalised a partnership between a Universities (Glasgow, Edinburgh and Dundee) team and the Scottish Community Safety Network. The project commenced in November 2009 and was initially funded to November 2010. A further contract, secured directly from the Scottish Community Safety Network, has extended this initiative until November 2011.