Janice Tripney is a lecturer in social policy at the Institute of Education, University of London. Her current work includes reviewing evidence for the World Bank and developing postgraduate study in research use. Address for correspondence: jtripney@ioe.ac.uk.

Caroline Kenny (PhD) is a researcher at University College London. She is seconded full time to the UK Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology (POST) as a social science adviser. Address for correspondence: kennyc@parliament.uk.

David Gough is a professor of evidence-informed policy and practice at the EPPI-Centre and the Social Science Research Unit (SSRU), Institute of Education, University of London. His most recent publication is "Learning from Research: Systematic Reviews for Informing Policy Decisions: A Quick Guide" for the Alliance for Useful Evidence: www.alliance4usefulevidence.org/assets/Learning-from-Research-A4UE.pdf. Address for correspondence: d.gough@ioe.ac.uk.

Janice Tripney, Caroline Kenny, & David Gough

Enabling the Use of Research Evidence within Educational Policymaking in Europe

Lessons from the EIPEE Project

Abstract

Despite a political climate demanding evidence-informed decision making in education both within individual countries and at the international level, empirically grounded European research in this field is scarce. This paper reports on a European Commission–funded study that sought to identify and analyze different initiatives across Europe aimed at furthering research-informed policymaking in education, one of a number of comparative analyses in this emerging field. The nature and extent of activity in this area is outlined and an analytical framework is developed to assist understanding. Potential reasons for the observed variation among countries are discussed, along with some of the methodological and conceptual challenges involved in undertaking empirical work in this area. Practically, it is hoped that the results of the mapping exercise and the framework provide a platform for further empirical and conceptual research on research use, an area of study that until recently has been largely ignored by education researchers.

Background

There exists a growing demand that public-sector policymaking and professional practice be based on the best evidence possible. Using evidence in the interests of public policy is not a new phenomenon (Bogenschneider & Corbett, 2010; Bulmer, 2010; Solesbury, 2001; Thomas & Pring, 2004; Weiss, 1979). What is new and interesting, however, is the increasing emphasis that has been placed on the relation between research, policy, and practice across Europe over the past decade, both within individual countries and at the international level (Burns & Schuller, 2007; Deutsches Institut für Internationale Pädagogische Forschung [DIPF], 2007; Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD], 1995, 1996; Rickinson, 2007; Rokicka, 1999). This interest has had consequences in the form of all kinds of activities. The number of articles and books has increased dramatically; new journals, associations, and networks have been created; new degree programs are being offered; and many conferences and symposia giving increased attention to this theme have been held.

Not everyone, however, agrees that the movement toward greater use of research evidence is desirable. Critics raise a variety of issues. Central to these is the argument that evidence-informed policy and practice (EIPP) relies on a technocratic, linear understanding of the policymaking process that downplays the realities of politics and seeks to promote a cookbook approach to both research and policymaking that undermines professional expertise and autonomy (Du Toit, 2012; Greenhalgh & Russell, 2009; Hammersley, 2001a; Webb, 2001; Winch, Creedy, & Chaboyer, 2002). A main issue concerns the definition of what counts and should count as evidence, with some arguing that EIPP advances positivistic notions about objectivity, or value-free characteristics of research—a criticism reminiscent of the decades-old debate in the social and behavioral sciences about positivistic versus subjectivist approaches to knowledge (Biesta, 2007; Hammersley, 2001b; Lassnigg, 2012; Stronach & Hustler, 2001). In this context, the political drive for an evidence-informed approach to decision-making relates to what has been described as a move toward greater "scientization" of education governance (Grek & Ozga, 2010), with the accompanying preference for "getting the facts" representing a neo-empire of knowledge in education. Others lament that evidence and the language of research are often political strategies that act as a post hoc legitimization of policy rather than genuinely informing it (Lather, 2004; Weiss, 1979).

While taking all of these concerns seriously, advocates of using research to improve public services nonetheless reject them, maintaining that their arguments are misunderstood. EIPP, they argue, does not mean only applying the results of randomized controlled trials; instead, evidence is sought which is "fit for purpose" (in other words, which is best suited to the policy question at hand) (Boaz & Ashby, 2003; Nutley, Powell & Davies, 2013). In addition, rather than disregarding practitioner and service user expertise, the EIPP approach explicitly builds it into the equation by encouraging the involvement of a range of stakeholders in the research process (Mulgan, 2005; Rees & Oliver, 2012). Building on growing intolerance for ineffective policies and wasteful use of resources, supporters of using research evidence to improve public services highlight a small but growing body of evidence demonstrating research use has resulted in improved outcomes for citizens, while arguing that research often has influence in less instrumental ways, affecting decision–makers' understanding and awareness without immediate effect on decisions (e.g., Chalmers, 2003; Petrosino, Turpin-Petrosino, & Buehler, 2002; Sutcliffe & Court, 2005; Van Zwanenberg & Millstone, 2005; Weiss, 1979). Wider ethical and political arguments are also made regarding rights and responsibilities, accountability, and governance (Bannister, Leadbeater, & Marshall, 2011; Gough, 2007). Last, there is growing recognition within the field that the use of research rarely occurs in a linear way where researchers simply convey their findings to users, but rather the process of transferring research into policy/practice occurs in a multidimensional, complex way, with research-based evidence one of many factors influencing decisions, including expert knowledge, public opinion, and competing policy

narratives and ideological frameworks (Liverani, Hawkins & Parkhurst, 2013; Tseng, 2012).

Yet despite the historical nature of these debates, and a political climate demanding evidence-based decision making, there remains a lack of clarity about how evidence is acquired, diffused, and ultimately used. Although the literature on research utilization has grown rapidly over the past thirty years, much of it remains more conceptual or rhetorical than empirical. There are many works analyzing situations, decrying methodological weaknesses, and proposing actions, but much less evidence on the actual effects of efforts to increase research use (Levin, 2013). Particularly in education, which has been slower to adopt an evidence-informed approach to decision making in comparison with other public services such as health and criminal justice, empirically grounded research detailing effective strategies for increasing the uptake and use of research is scarce (Gough, Tripney, Kenny, & Buk-Berge, 2011; Kenny, Gough & Tripney, in press; Nelson & O'Beirne, 2014). Our most recent knowledge of this area has come primarily from qualitative inquiries seeking to understand the perspectives and attitudes of policymakers and practitioners in relation to issues such as how they perceive and value educational research; what factors influence their decisions to use or not use research; and, what other sources of information are relied upon (see, e.g., Bell, Cordingley, Isham & Davis, 2010; European Commission, 2008; Everton, Galton, & Pell, 2000; Gore & Gitlin, 2004; Hemsley-Brown & Sharp, 2003; Vanderlinde & van Braak, 2010). Studies are only just beginning to explore the different kinds of intermediary agencies (and related activities) being used to mediate the research/policy interface in education, what they do, how they do it, and to what effect. Most of these studies, however, are conducted outside Europe (Cooper, 2010; Dedering, 2009).

In the context of an urgent need to increase our research use evidence base in education, the European Commission Directorate-General for Education and Culture (under the Lifelong Learning Programme) commissioned the study discussed in this paper. Designed to develop better understanding of, and build capacities for, evidence-based policymaking, the study was conducted as part of the *Evidence Informed Policy in Education in Europe (EIPEE)* project, a thirteen-month initiative (March 2010–April 2011) led by the Evidence for Policy and Practice Co-ordinating Centre (EPPI-Centre), and supported by another seventeen European project partners.

Politicians at the European level recognize that high-quality education and training are fundamental to Europe's success and Union-level initiatives have gained impetus since the adoption of the Lisbon Strategy in 2000. A fundamental component of European Union (EU) strategy is the emphasis on countries working together and learning from each other, contributing to the recent expansion of interest in comparative educational research (Kazamias, 2001; Watson, 2001). In the newly emerging global economic order, when profound changes are occurring in the whole structure of economic, social, and cultural relations and the role of education in these changes is coming to be recognized as fundamental, wide support exists for the idea of governments and policymakers using comparative data and ideas to inform policy decisions (UNESCO, 1993). At the same time, the "comparative global enterprise" acting to transfer responsibility and control over education policy from the national level to the international, and specifically EU, level, thereby calling into question educational systems that for decades have been imagined on a national basis, has been the subject of considerable comment and critique (Broadfoot, 2000; Crossley, 2002; Grek, Lawn, Lingard, Ozga, Rinne, Segerholm, & Simola, 2009; Lawn & Lingard, 2002; Nóvoa & Yariv-Mashal, 2003). Over the past decade, increasing the use of evidence in educational policy decisions has become a further EU priority (European Commission, 2004, 2007, 2009, 2010a, 2010b; European Union, 2009). Attempts at better integration of education, research, and innovation—the "knowledge triangle"—to help achieve sustainable growth have been integral to the work of the EU/EC, both before and since the adoption of ET2020, the current strategic framework for EU-wide cooperation in education and training. The substantial increase in funds available to the 7th Framework Programme and the establishment of a European Research Council are key examples of investment in this area. Individual projects have also been commissioned (e.g., Brankoviæ & Bogunoviæ, 2012;

Eurydice, 2007) in recognition of their importance in helping further debate and action within both the research and policy communities. The study drawn upon in this paper is a further element of EC investment in this area.

Aims and approach

The aims of the study were twofold: first, to expand our knowledge of the range of different approaches being used across Europe to mediate the research/policy interface; and, second, to develop an analytical framework suitable for capturing the variation, and allowing better understanding of the underpinning mechanisms. Comprehensively identifying and describing every qualifying activity across Europe was outside the scope of this work; rather, the emphasis was on capturing as many different types of activity as possible and identifying examples from each of the thirty-two target countries in Europe.[1] It is also important to stress that our interest was on both formal/routine activities and those of an informal/embedded nature (Nutley, Walter, & Davies, 2007); and, both the direct use of research evidence in changing policymakers behavior (and ultimately policy itself) and the indirect (more conceptual or enlightened) uses of research evidence in shaping policymakers knowledge, understanding, and attitudes to issues (Gough & Elbourne, 2002). The study was limited to policymaking at national, federal, regional, and local authority level; decision making at the organizational level (e.g., by school teachers) was not within scope.

Methods

Given the broad perspective of the study, identification of relevant activities comprised an iterative process involving snowballing search techniques and purposive sampling. We first conducted a nonrepresentative, nonexhaustive survey (email and telephone) of project partners, representatives of national and regional ministries of education across Europe, and other expert informants. This was supplemented with a search of relevant literature and websites recommended by respondents to the survey, including those references in the literature. Midway through the process, we concentrated specifically on seeking activities from countries that were under- (or not) represented. Concurrently with the identification of activities, qualitative and quantitative data was collected using a structured coding tool.

   With numerous literatures and traditions subsumed within its broad domain, many variations in terminology exist within this field, among them knowledge mobilization, knowledge brokerage, knowledge transfer, knowledge translation, knowledge exchange, research utilization and knowledge-to-action (Estabrooks, Derksen, Winther, Lavis, Scott, Wallin, & Profetto-McGrath, 2008; Graham, Logan, Harrison, Straus, Tetroe, Caswell, & Robinson, 2006; McKibbon, Lokker, Wilczynski, Ciliska, Dobbins, Davis, Haynes, & Straus, 2010; for evolution of the field, see Backer, 1991; Cottrill, Rogers & Mills, 1989). Terms and definitions vary across sectors and disciplines, are often used interchangeably, and are commonly misunderstood, with the potential for confusion and misunderstanding. Consequently, our survey instrument was designed to avoid the use of dominant terms, and instead referred to "activities used to link research and policy," with participants given detailed definitions of each of the key concepts. The survey materials were available in English only, as there were insufficient project resources to undertake the necessary translation (plus project partners' raised concerns about the known difficulties of translating concepts such as "evidence-informed policy and practice" into other European languages).

   A comparative approach was used to highlight similarities and differences across countries. This paper presents quantitative results. Interested readers can find qualitative information about the identified activities in the publicly available EIPEE database.[2] Full details about the study scope and methods are presented in the main report (Gough et al., 2011). The study also involved the development of an analytical framework to assist understanding of the survey data. The framework consisted of two interrelated elements: (1) a simple model of the evidence production-

to-use system; and (2) a typology comprised of mechanisms for linking research evidence to policy, and types of activities using such mechanisms to achieve change.

Many different conceptual models and frameworks have already been developed to explain the evidence production-to-use process. Once viewed as fairly simple, the process is now recognized as being considerably more complex, involving many direct and indirect processes. Linear models where evidence is understood to inform decision making in a one-way process have largely given way to dynamic, interactive models that emphasize the relationships between producers and users of evidence, and the structures and systems that shape such interactions (see, for example, Best & Holmes, 2010; Nutley et al., 2007; Walter, Nutley & Davies, 2005).[3] The continuing lack of a shared and comprehensive model, as noted in a recent systematic review (Banzi, Moja, Pistotti, Facchini & Liberati, 2011), presented a challenge. Whilst recognizing the disadvantages in producing yet another model, existing models were considered too complex for the needs of this investigation. A conceptual diagram of the system, as understood for the purposes of this study, is depicted in Figure 1. This is not offered as a replacement for existing models, but merely a simpler version.[4]

[Insert Figure 1 here]

The process has three main interconnected dimensions: *Evidence production:* the generation of evidence through, for example, research-based processes. *Evidence use:* the utilization of evidence by educational policymakers, practitioners, and other end users; encompassing the direct use of evidence in changing policymakers' behavior (and ultimately, policy itself) and the indirect, conceptual/enlightened uses of evidence in shaping policymakers' knowledge and understanding of, and attitudes toward, issues (Nutley et al., 2007; Weiss, 1979). *Evidence mediation:* the bridging of the gap between evidence production and its use.

These are supplemented with a further three components: *System level:* this dimension recognizes that, in addition to being considered separately, the working of the above three components together (i.e., as a whole system) should also be considered (Best & Holmes, 2010). *Stakeholder engagement*: this dimension recognizes the engagement of other stakeholders (the media, other professionals, social partners, civil society organizations, employers' organizations, trade and industry organizations, and so on) who may be involved in any part of the process. *Research on evidence production and use*: this takes into consideration that the nature of the evidence production-to-use system, how its components can vary, and to what effect, is itself a growing area of research.

The focus of this study was on efforts at increasing the uptake and use of research evidence through activity in any of the four main processes depicted in the model (research production; research use; research mediation; systems level). While the model applies to all forms of evidence, our interest was limited to one particular type: research-based evidence, particularly that arising from social research. Evidence is acknowledged as only one factor influencing decision-making; other factors, such as values, contexts, and resources, are also important.

The second part of the typology drew on the findings of our survey. A classification system of activity types was developed iteratively based on the information collected using the structured data collection tool. For the second element of the typology (mechanisms) we turned to an existing classification system developed by Walter, Nutley & Davies (2003), building upon and adapting it where necessary.

Results

The study found a broad range of approaches being used across Europe to enable the use of research evidence within education. In total, 269 examples were identified from 30 of the 32 target countries in Europe (see Figure 2). Further descriptive information about the activities, including case study examples, can be found in the main report (Gough et al., 2011) and in the

publicly available EIPEE database.[5]

[Insert Figure 2 here]

The majority of activities were based and/or hosted in the UK. Only five activities were based and/or hosted in more than one European country (several series of workshops/meetings and one cross-national program of work). Around a fifth of all activities operated at a transnational level, having ongoing active work with international partners, and/or being formally focused internationally (of which about half had both cross-European and broader international connections). Most of the examples we identified were set up in the past twenty years (primarily within the past decade). More than three-quarters are currently active, nearly one-fifth are no longer in existence, and around 2 percent are in development. Of those activities that are currently ongoing, most have been in operation for more than four years. National governments and/or government-related agencies set up and managed the majority of the identified activities (66 percent).

Drawing on the findings of the survey and other resources, a typology of twenty-seven activity types and nine underpinning mechanisms was developed. The relationship between the different types of activity and their underlying mechanisms is illustrated in Table 1.

[Insert Table 1 here]

The survey highlighted that efforts across Europe to improve the use of research are taking place in different parts of the production-to-use system, and, as such, are concerned to different extents with "pushing," "pulling" or "mediating" research evidence into the decision-making process (see Figure 3). Our investigation reveals that the majority of activities seek to improve the use of research-based evidence through making the research production process more efficient ("push" activities). Driving this result is the considerable number of activities underpinned by the mechanisms *accessibility* and *relevance* (see Table 1 for definitions). Almost one-fifth of the identified initiatives sought to improve the use of research through improvements to the research use process ("pull" activities): the most common mechanisms were *education* and *seek and/or interpret*. A tenth of all activities were specifically designed to broker better links between researchers and users of research ("mediation" activities). Only a handful of activities identified by the survey coordinated efforts at the level of the entire system. Twenty-six of the thirty-two target countries had at least one activity in the research production category ("push" activities). For eight countries, the survey did not identify any activities specifically focused on the needs and contexts of research users ("pull" activities). Sixteen of the target countries had at least one activity aimed at bridging the gap between the two communities ("mediation" activities). Five of the thirty-two countries have activities operating at systems level: Belgium, France, Germany, Norway, and the UK.

[Insert Figure 3 here]

Discussion

European policy documents place an increasing importance on evidence as a driver of new policy and practice developments. Forming one element of the Commission's investment of resources in this area, the study described in this paper goes further than previous work in highlighting the nature and extent of activities across Europe, which attempt to mediate the research/policy interface in education. As a mapping exercise, it provides a static picture of what is happening at a given moment, while highlighting certain aspects of the dynamic nature of ongoing processes. Some of the commonalities and differences among European countries on this issue are

illustrated, with additional information about their cross-cutting and multifaceted nature available in the technical report and publicly available database. A decade ago, Solesbury (2001) considered this field a particularly British affair. Evidence is presented here that this is no longer the case, if indeed it ever were. Nonetheless, the UK remains the most active country in this area, with a few European countries appearing to place little or no emphasis on linking research to policy. Potential reasons for the observed variation are discussed below.

A first consideration should be a number of challenges related to the scope and conduct of the study. The survey instrument avoided the use of dominant terms, such as knowledge brokerage, but was available only in English. Either of these features may have accounted for partial responses to some of the questions. We also experienced difficulty in identifying suitable survey participants. In some European countries, responsibility for education lies at the regional level, thereby multiplying the number of representatives to be identified. No European Ministry of Education website provides details of any personnel fulfilling a knowledge brokerage role. Snowballing techniques were used, but when participants could no longer be identified, or when surveys were returned incomplete, the data collection process became dependent on information provided in websites (often a limited source of relevant data). The seventeen project partners helped fill in evidentiary gaps wherever possible (e.g., identifying individuals to contact; translating survey responses, web pages, and study reports that were not in English). Such efforts notwithstanding, there is no way of knowing the extent of information not collected due to language barriers and other data collection challenges.

The observed variation between European countries may also stem from cultural differences. With some of those who study research utilization beginning to shift their focus to the policymaking process itself, there is now greater understanding of how the development of evidence-informed policy is not only a technical problem of knowledge translation or exchange, but also a political challenge. In the area of health policy, a number of studies demonstrate links between the use of evidence and key features of political systems, such as the structure of decision-making authority, or level of public participation and democracy (Klein, 1990; Liverani et al., 2013). Like health, educational policymaking is complex, reflecting institutional structures, historic patterns, operational legacies, cultural influences, and international constraints (Ruane, 2012). The existence of dramatically different education systems and ministerial models across Europe is likely to have an impact on initiatives taken by individual member states; for example, nations that do not have strong central planning may see evidence-based policy issues as unaffordable, both financially and conceptually, resulting in a lack of investment in channels to facilitate communication between educational researchers and policymakers (Burns & Schuller, 2007). There are also significant cultural differences among countries as regards readiness to accept external sources of advice and to seek ideas and innovative practices from other countries.

Last, different disciplinary traditions within education and the social sciences have a likely role to play in varying levels of awareness and commitment to this issue. Across Europe, the historical development of the social sciences has resulted in alternative centers of intellectual power and different ways of doing research, their consolidation in academic institutions intimately linked to, and contextualized within, broader historical phenomena. In the UK, for example, social reform efforts were integral to the founding of the social sciences in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, a tradition that continues to exercise a major influence upon UK utilization of social research in the present day (Bulmer, 1986). Other countries, particularly those with research traditions that are less used to quantitative methodologies, may be less inclined to actively engage with this topic, resulting in fewer investments aimed at bridging the research/policy divide.

Extending to thirty-two European countries, a key strength of this study is its breadth of scope. Successful working with international partners was central to capturing the experiences and perspectives of different countries. In developing the classification system of research-to-policy linking activities, our approach of adapting an existing typology rather than applying it wholesale allowed the creation of new mechanism categories that are more fine-tuned to the specific context

of educational policymaking.[6] Always intended as a work in progress, the analytical framework can be used in future research, with examination of the theoretical underpinnings of the additional categories a key element of further development of the typology. Given the conceptual, methodological, and evidentiary challenges encountered during this work, several limitations of the study should also be stressed. Although the large number of identified activities attests to the efforts of the search process, the survey was not exhaustive and it is unlikely that all qualifying activities were identified. The frequencies of different activities are only indicative, and the data presented should not be used as an exact measure of activity within individual countries. In addition, although intended as mutually exclusive categories, maintaining a strict distinction among the twenty-seven different activity types was challenging (due to the partial and fragmented nature of the survey data); as a result, our categorization could be open to (re)interpretation and correction. Last, although consideration of contextual data was outside the scope of this project, this paper readily accepts concerns about comparative practices in the wider literature that study findings can be decontextualized, due to their macro outlook (Watson, 2001). Before any attempt to transfer particular strategies used to link research and policy to other contexts, there is a need to understand not only whether they are effective, but why, when, and for whom they are effective. What works in one situation may not work in another (Moss, 2013). In this regard, calls for a more "bottom-up" approach to defining and/or encouraging evidence-informed practices (Nutley et al., 2013) may warrant further investigation.

While we need to be careful in interpreting the results due to limitations of data collection methods, this study nonetheless offers an important contribution to knowledge and understanding about the range of activities and mechanisms being used to increase the use of research evidence within educational policymaking across Europe. At the same time, this issue remains ripe for continuing scholarly investigation, with ample potential for further cross-European collaboration. Continuing capacity-building projects (Gough et al., in press) have an important role to play, but are insufficient in themselves. Additional systematic empirical study of research use is urgently needed, in order to guide the future development and implementation of activities capable of enabling and strengthening the use of research by those with responsibility for the improvement of educational standards, processes and outcomes across Europe.

Notes

1. Europe in this study refers to the thirty-two countries eligible to submit proposals to the European Commission call for projects (EAC/26/2009): that is, the twenty-seven EU member states (as of 2010), and Norway, Switzerland, Iceland, Liechtenstein, and Turkey.

2. Available at www.eipee.eu.

3. A useful database of KT conceptual models, frameworks and theories can be found at www.iceberg-grebeci.ohri.ca/research/kt_theories_db.html.

4. Any in-depth case study examination of the identified research/policy mediation activities would require a more complex model, which included contextual factors, etc.

5. Available at www.eipee.eu.

6. The classification system of Walters and colleagues reflected their concern with cross-sector initiatives covering a wide range of policy, practice and organizational targets for research impact.

References

Backer, T. E. (1991). Knowledge utilization: The third wave. *Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization*, *12*(3), 225–240.

Bannister, E., Leadbeater, B., & Marshall, E. (2011). *Knowledge translation in context: Indigenous policy and community settings*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Banzi, R., Moja, L., Pistotti, V., Facchini, A., & Liberati, A. (2011). Conceptual frameworks and empirical approaches used to assess the impact of health research: An overview of reviews.

Health Research Policy and Systems, *9*(26), 1–10.

Bell, M., Cordingley, P., Isham, C., & Davis, R. (2010). *Report of professional practitioner use of research review: Engagement in and/or with research*. London: General Teaching Council for England.

Best, A., & Holmes, B. (2010). Systems thinking, knowledge and action: towards better models and methods. *Evidence and Policy*, *6*(2), 145–159.

Biesta, G. (2007). Why "what works" won't work: Evidence-based practice and the democratic deficit in educational research. *Education Theory*, *57*(1), 1–22.

Boaz, A., & Ashby, D. (2003). Fit for purpose? Assessing research quality for evidence based policy and practice. ESRC UK Centre for Evidence Based Policy and Practice: Working Paper 11. www.kcl.ac.uk/sspp/departments/politicaleconomy/research/cep/pubs/papers/assets/wp11.pdf .

Bogenschneider, K., & Corbett, T. J. (2010). *Evidence-based policymaking: Insights from policy-minded researchers and research-minded policymakers*. London: Routledge.

Brankoviæ, J., & Bogunoviæ, Z. (2012). *Mapping regional capacities for evidence based policy making in education in South Eastern Europe: An exploratory analysis of evidence-based policy making in the field of education in Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro and Serbia*. Belgrade: UNESCO Centre for Education Policy.

Broadfoot, P. (2000). Comparative education for the 21st century. *Comparative Education*, *36*(3)*,* 357–371.

Bulmer, M. (1986). *Social science and policy*. Allen and Unwin: London.

Burns, T., & Schuller, T. (Eds.) (2007). *Evidence in education: Linking research and policy*. Paris: CERI/OECD.

Chalmers, I. (2003). Trying to do more good than harm in policy and practice: The role of rigorous, transparent, up-to-date evaluations. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 589*(1), 22–40.

Cooper, A. (2010). *Knowledge mobilization in education: A cross-case analysis of 44 research brokering organizations across Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto.

Cottrill, C. A., Rogers, A. M., & Mills, T. (1989). Co-citation analysis of the scientific literature of innovation research traditions. *Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization*, *11,* 181–208.

Crossley, M. (2002). Comparative and international education: Contemporary challenges, reconceptualization and new directions for the field. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, *4*(2), 81–86.

Dedering, K. (2009). Evidence based education policy: Lip service or common practice? Empirical findings from Germany. *European Educational Research Journal*, *8*(4), 484–496.

Deutsches Institut für Internationale Pädagogische Forschung [DIPF] (2007). Knowledge for action—research strategies for an evidence-based education policy. Symposium during Germany's EU Presidency 28–30 March 2007 in Frankfurt. http://ice.dipf.de/de/pdf/tagungsdokumentation.

Du Toit, A. (2012). *Making sense of evidence: Notes on the discursive politics of research and pro-poor policy making*. PLAAS Working Paper 21. Cape Town: PLAAS.

Estabrooks, C. A., Derksen, L., Winther, C., Lavis, J. N., Scott, S. D., Wallin, L., & Profetto-McGrath, J. (2008). The intellectual structure and substance of the knowledge utilization field: A longitudinal author co-citation analysis, 1945 to 2004. *Implementation Science, 3*(49), 1–22.

European Commission (2004). *European research: A guide to successful communication*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

European Commission (2007). *Towards more knowledge-based policy and practice in education and training*. (Commission Staff Working Document SEC 2007.1098). Brussels: European Commission.

European Commission (2008). *Scientific evidence for policy-making*. Brussels: European

Commission.

European Commission (2009). *Conclusions of the Council and of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States, meeting within the Council, of 26 November 2009 on developing the role of education in a fully-functioning knowledge triangle* (2009/C 302/03).

European Commission (2010a). *Communicating research for evidence-based policymaking: A practical guide for researchers in socio-economic sciences and humanities*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

European Commission (2010b). *Europe 2020: A European strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth*. Brussels: European Commission.

European Union (2009). *Council conclusions of 12 May 2009 on a strategic framework for European cooperation in education and training ('ET 2020')* (2009/C 119/02).

Eurydice (2007). *Survey: The relationship between research, policy and practice in education and training*. Brussels: Eurydice.

Everton, T., Galton, M., & Pell, T. (2000). Teachers' perspectives on educational research: Knowledge and context. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, *26*(2), 167–182.

Gore, J., & Gitlin, A. (2004). [RE]Visioning the academic-teacher divide: power and knowledge in the educational community. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, *10*(1), 35–58.

Gough, D. (2007). Giving voice: Evidence informed policy and practice as a democratizing process. In M. Reiss, R. DePalma & E. Atkinson (Eds.), *Marginality and difference in education and beyond* (pp. 31–43). London, Trentham Books.

Gough, D., & Elbourne, D. (2002). Systematic research synthesis to inform policy, practice and democratic debate. *Social Policy and Society, 1*(3), 225–236.

Gough, D., Tripney, J., Kenny, C., & Buk-Berge, E. (2011). *Evidence informed policymaking in education in Europe: EIPEE final project report*. London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London.

Gough, D., Tripney, J., Kenny, C., & Morris A. (in press). *Evidence informed policy and practice in education in Europe (EIPPEE) final report*. London: Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London.

Graham, I., Logan, J., Harrison, M., Straus, S., Tetroe, J., Caswell, W., & Robinson, N. (2006). Lost in knowledge translation: Time for a map? *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions*, *26*(1), 13–24.

Greenhalgh, T., & Russell, J. (2009). Evidence-based policymaking: A critique. *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine, 52*(2), 304–318

Grek, S., Lawn, M., Lingard, B., Ozga, J., Rinne, R., Segerholm, C., & Simola, H. (2009). National policy brokering and the construction of the European Education Space in England, Sweden, Finland and Scotland. *Comparative Education*, *45*(1), 5–21.

Grek, S., & Ozga, J. (2010). Re-inventing public education: The new role of knowledge in education policy making. *Public Policy and Administration, 25*(3), 271–288.

Hammersley, M. (2001a). Some questions about evidence-based practice in education. In R. Pring & G. Thomas (Eds.), *Evidence-based practice in education* (pp. 133–149). Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.

Hammersley, M. (2001b). On "systematic" reviews of research literatures: A "narrative" response to Evans & Benefield, *British Educational Research Journal*, *27,* 543–554.

Hemsley-Brown, J., & Sharp, C. (2003). The use of research to improve professional practice: A systematic review of the literature. *Oxford Review of Education*, *29*(4), 449–470.

Kazamias, A. (2001). Re-inventing the historical in comparative education: Reflections on a protean episteme by a contemporary player. *Comparative Education*, *37*(4), 439–449.

Kenny, C., Gough, D., & Tripney, J. (in press). Approaches to assist policy-makers' use of evidence in education in Europe. In L. Vega (Ed.), *Empires, post-coloniality and interculturality. New challenges for comparative education*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Klein, R. (1990). Research, policy, and the National Health Service. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law*, *15*(3), 501–523.

Lassnigg, L. (2012). Use of current best evidence: Promises and illusions, limitations and contradictions in the triangle of research, policy and practice. *International Journal of Training Research*, *10*(3)*,* 179–203.

Lather, P. (2004). This is your father's paradigm: Government intrusion and the case of qualitative research in education. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *10,* 15–34.

Lawn, M., & Lingard, B. (2002). Constructing a European policy space in educational governance: The role of transnational policy actors. *European Educational Research Journal, 1*(2), 290–307.

Levin, B. (2013). To know is not enough: research knowledge and its use. *Review of Education, 1*(1), 2–31.

Liverani, M., Hawkins, B., & Parkhurst, J. O. (2013). Political and institutional influences on the use of evidence in public health policy. *PLoS ONE,* 8(10), doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0077404.

McKibbon, K. A., Lokker, C., Wilczynski, N. L., Ciliska, D., Dobbins, M., Davis, D. A., Haynes, B., & Straus, S. E. (2010). A cross-sectional study of the number and frequency of terms used to refer to knowledge translation in a body of health literature in 2006: A Tower of Babel? *Implementation Science*, *5:16*: doi:10.1186/1748-5908-5-16.

Moss, G. (2013). Research, policy and knowledge flows in education: What counts in knowledge mobilisation? *Contemporary Social Science: Journal of the Academy of Social Sciences*, DOI: 10.1080/21582041.2013.767466

Mulgan, G. (2005). Government, knowledge and the business of policy making. *Evidence and Policy, 1*(2), 215–226.

Nelson, J., & O'Beirne, C. (2014). *Using evidence in the classroom: What works and why?* Slough: National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER).

Nóvoa, A., & Yariv-Mashal, T. (2003). Comparative research in education: A mode of governance or a historical journey? *Comparative Education, 39*(4)*,* 423–439.

Nutley, S., Powell, A., & Davies, H. (2013). What counts as good evidence? Provocation Paper for the Alliance for Useful Evidence. London, NESTA. www.alliance4usefulevidence.org/assets/What-Counts-as-Good-Evidence-WEB.pdf.

Nutley, S., Walter, I., & Davies, H. (2007). *Using evidence: How research can inform public services*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (1995). *Educational research and development—trends, issues and challenges.* Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (1996). *Knowledge bases for educational policies.* Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).

Petrosino, A., Turpin-Petrosino, C., & Buehler, J. (2002). 'Scared Straight' and other juvenile awareness programs for preventing juvenile delinquency. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews,* Issue 2.

Rees, R., & Oliver, S. (2012). Stakeholder perspectives and participation in reviews. In D. Gough, S. Oliver, & J. Thomas. *An introduction to systematic reviews* (pp. 17–34). London: Sage.

Rickinson, M. (2007). Summary report from the peer learning activity on 'evidence-based policy and practice' in The Hague, Netherlands, 30 May–1 June. www.kslll.net/Documents/PLA%20Evidence-based%20policy%20and%20practice_summary%20report_May%202007.pdf.

Rokicka, W. (1999). (Ed.) *Educational documentation, research and decision-making. National case studies*. Paris: UNESCO.

Ruane, F. (2012). Research evidence and policymaking in Ireland. *Administration*, *60*(2), 119–138.

Solesbury, W. (2001). *Evidence based policy: Whence it came and where it's going.* ESRC UK

Centre for Evidence Based Policy and Practice, Working Paper 1.

Stronach, I., & Hustler, D. (2001). Old whine in new battles. *British Educational Research Journal, 27,* 523–525.

Sutcliffe, S., & Court, J. (2005). Evidence-based policymaking: What is it? How does it work? What relevance for developing countries? London: Overseas Development Institute.

Thomas, G., & Pring, R. (Eds.) (2004). *Evidence-based practice in education.* Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.

Tseng, V. (2012). The uses of research in policy and practice. *Social Policy Report, 26*(2), 3–16.

UNESCO (1993). *World Education Report*. Paris: UNESCO.

Vanderlinde, R., & van Braak, J. (2010). The gap between educational research and practice: views of teachers, school leaders, intermediaries and researchers. *British Educational Research Journal*, *36*(2), 299–316.

Van Zwanenberg, P., & Millstone, E. (2005). *BSE: Risk, science and governance.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Walter, I., Nutley, S., & Davies, H. (2003). *Developing a taxonomy of interventions used to increase the impact of research*. (Discussion Paper 3). St. Andrews: Research Unit for Research Utilisation, University of St. Andrews.

Walter, I., Nutley. S., & Davies, H. (2005). What works to promote evidence-based practice? A cross-sector review. *Evidence and Policy*, *1*(3), 335–363.

Watson, K. (2001). (Ed.) *Doing comparative education research: Issues and problems*. Oxford: Symposium.

Webb, S.A. (2001). Some considerations on the validity of evidence-based practice in social work, *British Journal of Social Work, 31,* 57–79.

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

Winch, S., Creedy, D., & Chaboyer, W. (2002). Governing nursing conduct: The rise of evidence based practice, *Nursing Inquiry, 9,* 156–161.