



This is a repository copy of *Everyday stories of impact: interpreting knowledge exchange in the contemporary university*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/118459/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Matthews, P., Rutherford, R., Connelly, S. orcid.org/0000-0003-1758-0366 et al. (3 more authors) (2018) *Everyday stories of impact: interpreting knowledge exchange in the contemporary university*. *Evidence and Policy: a journal of research, debate and practice*, 14 (4). pp. 665-682. ISSN 1744-2648

<https://doi.org/10.1332/174426417X14982110094140>

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Introduction

Within the UK, the advent of the measurement of research “impact” in the 2013 UK Research Excellence Framework (REF) for measuring the research performance of universities, has led to a renewed preoccupation with the use of academic evidence in policy-making. Whereas traditionally this has been a focus of policy studies, the debates and research on how, and indeed whether, academic evidence should influence policy has been broadened across academic disciplines (Pain, Kesby *et al.* 2011; Slater 2012; Flinders 2013; Smith and Stewart 2016). In particular, academic disciplines such as the arts and humanities now find themselves expected to deliver “impact” in the specific policy sense of ‘an effect on, change or benefit to the economy, society, culture, public policy or services, health, the environment or quality of life, beyond academia’ (REF 2012). The evidence around evidence use by policy-makers questions a lot of the assumptions behind the “impact” model used in the REF exercise: the idea that one study could be directly instrumental in a rational policy-making model has been shown to be demonstrably unrealistic and also likely to be inappropriate (Weiss 1979; Nutley, Walter *et al.* 2007); even broader models of knowledge transfer or translation have been found wanting due to the one-way nature of communication suggested (Davies, Nutley *et al.* 2008). Indeed, much of the research on evidence-informed policy – including the broader project that this paper comes from (Connelly *et al.* 2015) – suggest that developing close, collaborative working between policy-makers is the best way to allow exchange of knowledge between academics and policy-makers and for academics to become part of the complex networks of policy-making (Best and Holmes 2010).

Summarising the literature on evidence translation and the literature that has emerged in the UK alongside the REF impact agenda, this paper highlights that these mainly focus respectively on: the demand for evidence from policy-makers; the boundary between academia and policy-making; and academic critiques of, or concerns about, the impact agenda. Building from this literature, this paper makes an empirical contribution by focusing on academic practices themselves – a noted gap in the literature to date (Oliver, Innvar *et al.* 2014). Using evidence from a group of academic teams who were producing outputs that were specifically designed to impact on policy-making, the paper begins to answer the question: what are academics doing, or attempting to do, when they seek to deliver impact in the policy-making process? Taking an interpretive stance (Yanow 2000; Yanow 2003) we focus on what meanings these academics bring to the process, and further what meanings they take from trying to deliver “impact”. We understand our research participants and objects as ‘situated “knowers” and situated “knowns”’ (Yanow 2003: 231). The research was co-produced with a civil servant with the UK Government, Rutherford a social researcher, who conducted the interviews and some analysis with Matthews. This co-produced research process provided unusual empirical insights that are not prominent in existing research.

The data and analysis highlights three specific barriers to delivering impact that we argue are worthy of further attention: individual biography; disciplinary identity; and institutional pressures, including the REF itself. In presenting this data we highlight the challenges of negotiating relationships within policy-making environments and the importance of these for understanding the needs of policy-makers, communicating successfully with them, and ultimately, delivering “impact” through academic research.

The Research Excellent Framework, “impact”, and evidence translation

There has been a long-standing concern with the use of academic research in policy-making. In recent years this concern has grown, particularly within the UK, due to the pressures resulting from the 2013 REF which for the first time judged university research on its socio-economic “impact”. While this is of particular concern within the UK, we spend some time discussing it here for two reasons: firstly it has led to disciplines outwith applied social science or natural science attempting to get their knowledge used as evidence in the policy-making process; and secondly because it is important in framing our findings below. The measurement of socio-economic “impact” within the REF has led to debate, and criticism, across academic disciplines emerging from the UK (Pain, Kesby *et al.* 2011; Bannister and Hardill 2013; Smith and Stewart 2016). These range from the view that “impact” is an imposition of a neo-liberal accountability regime narrowly focused on instrumentality which limits academic freedom that must be resisted (Slater 2012: in reply to Pain, Kesby *et al.* 2011); ‘debates concerning the ‘crisis’ or ‘tragedy’ of political science’ (Flinders 2013: 150); and within policy-focused research areas, such as health policy research, there is also concern that “impact” will lead to a focus on research that is instrumentally useful for central government, stymying academic freedom and more innovative research (Smith and Stewart 2016). Finally, in terms of individual academic careers, and wider structural inequalities within academia, there is a concern that it will benefit certain researchers more than others. As Newman (2011: 480) argues, ‘[n]otions of EBP [evidence-based policy], knowledge transfer and other contemporary discourses...serve to summon particular kinds of academic subject and privilege particular forms of knowledge’.

When we look at how socio-economic “impact” is understood within processes such as the REF, the rational model of policy-making still clearly dominates thinking of how academic evidence might be used within policy-making (Bannister and Hardill 2013; May and Perry 2013). The REF guidance, states:

‘impact is defined as an effect on, change or benefit to the economy, society, culture, public policy or services, health, the environment or quality of life, beyond academia... Impact includes, but is not limited to, an effect on, change or benefit to: ...the activity, attitude, awareness, behaviour, capacity, opportunity, performance, policy, practice, process or understanding... of an audience, beneficiary, community, constituency, organisation or individuals”

(Research Excellence Framework 2012: 26)

This is a very linear, direct model, where a piece of evidence is seen to have clear and direct effects on societal outcomes, one of which may be policy. This adopts, or assumes, a quasi-rational policy cycle into which evidence from academics can just slot (Smith and Stewart 2016). “Pathways to impact” then become akin to communication strategies, marketing findings to a presumed audience that is interested. This is still the case even though policy analysis has, for decades, demonstrated that policy-making does not happen in this rational way (Cairney 2016); analogies of translation or transfer are ill-thought out and unrealistic (Davies, Nutley *et al.* 2008); and the role of evidence in the policy-process is complex and multifaceted (Weiss 1979; Parsons 2002; Nutley, Walter *et al.* 2007).

Research on evidence use by policy-makers has predominantly elaborated the needs and practices of policy-makers. At its simplest this focuses on differences and crossing boundaries: exhorting

academics to “do better”, understand policy-making better (often ignoring substantial differences within this category), or “talk human” (Flinders 2013: 150). More complex accounts highlight the competing demands on policy-makers – particularly the political context – and the way they judge and choose what evidence to use when making decisions. This is exemplified by realist accounts, such as the classic text on evaluation by Weiss (1997), or the accounts by Pawson et al. of why policy-makers need knowledge of what works, why and in what circumstances, rather than the types of evidence ordinarily produced by positivist, empiricist social science (Pawson and Tilley 1997; Pawson, Greenhalgh *et al.* 2005).

The barriers and facilitators to getting research into policy-making have been summarised in a recent systematic review of the evidence (Oliver, Innvar *et al.* 2014). In the section on research and researcher characteristics, this review found studies that showed:

‘Researchers themselves were described as factors affecting uptake of their research. Having a good understanding of the policy process and the context surrounding policy priorities was supportive of research uptake ... A barrier to uptake was identified where researchers were described as having different priorities from policymakers, with pressure to publish in peer-reviewed journals. Researchers were valued more when it was clear they were non-partisan and producing unbiased results and provision of expert advice was also reported as helpful.’

(Oliver, Innvar *et al.* 2014: 6)

As Nutley et.al. (2007: 298) argue, postmodernist and interpretivist accounts take these insights further and move us ‘away from understanding research use as primarily an individualised process, to seeing it as something that is socially and organisationally situated’. Such research blurs the boundaries between academia and policy-making, offering more fruitful analysis as to why, and how, evidence is used by policy-makers. This includes understanding the complex, dialogic nature of how academic evidence is used in policy-making systems (Best and Holmes 2010). This focus on the “how” highlights how socio-cultural, organisational and individual biases and meanings affect how evidence is brought into policy-making. However, much of this work focuses on policy-makers, and how they use evidence. For example, it suggests that they: carry class-bias that prevents them defining a policy-problem adequately (Matthews 2012); struggle in chaotic situations to marshal the vast extent of evidence (Wilkinson 2010); and are operating in policy networks with a range of actors translating evidence for them (Smith and Joyce 2012).

Following this line of research, we follow Smith’s more realistic line of argument:

‘from the perspective of much of the policy sciences literature concerning policy change, the question becomes not, ‘why is public health policy not evidence-based?’ but ‘why would we ever assume it could (or should) be?’

(Smith 2014: 562)

In this paper we seek to take this further and ask, why would academics want their evidence used by policy-makers? The insights of science and technology studies have provided nuance to broader debates about the types of knowledge created by academic research (Freeman 2009; Smith and Joyce 2012), and the variable take-up of these in different policy areas. However, a focus on academics as individuals with biographies and normative political commitments, and on academic

practices has been noted to be rare (Oliver *et al.* 2014). Exceptions are the reflections of particular academics who have taken on roles of “policy entrepreneurs” or “boundary spanners” (for example: Newman 2011) or those debates within individual disciplines representing disciplinary reflexivity (for example Flinders 2013). One area of specific focus comes out of the reflection of knowledge-exchange professionals increasingly employed by universities (for example: Phipps and Morton 2013).

While these accounts add richness and complexity to accounts of evidence use, we suggest that returning to the “two communities” model (Caplan 1979) might actually help us conceptualise the policy-making process more usefully by focusing us on one “community” – academics themselves. This is particularly the case as there is little research on what academics *actually do* and *their motivations* when they try to get their evidence into policy-making: most asks about perceptions, not practices, and most is interview based. Less than ten per cent of the research Oliver *et al.* (2014: 3) reviewed used observational methods, and while more practice-based work exists there is a consensus amongst its authors that not enough is known (Nutley, Walter *et al.* 2007; Oliver, Innvar *et al.* 2014: 9.) In the rest of this paper we present evidence from academics who were attempting to deliver “impact” to help fill this gap in the evidence.

Method

The interviews for this research were carried out in 2014-15, as part of a wider project exploring practices of evidence use and communication on both sides, and across, the academic/policy-making border. The project was undertaken collaboratively with the UK Government’s Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), and an important aspect of this was to research academics from the perspective of policy-makers. This is very unusual, and allowed novel insights into both the policy-making worlds and academics’ worlds. The focus of the project was three policy reviews that had aimed to translate academic evidence from a major research programme funded by the UK Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) into policy-making on decentralisation and community governance. Two of the projects were led by scholars who would consider themselves social scientists. The way they chose to present their evidence reviews was largely in response to what civil servants in DCLG requested. The other project was led by a scholar from an arts and humanities background. The outputs of this project explicitly tried to represent the evidence in a different way and creatively disrupt norms of communication and policy-making (for a more detailed discussion, see Connelly *et al.* 2012). The research team – the authors of this paper – comprised four members of the policy briefing teams, as well as an academic, Matthews, who was not involved in the policy briefing projects, and a civil servant analyst from DCLG, Rutherford, who was in the team which was the principal audience for the briefings.

The 11 interviews that comprise the bulk of the data presented here were carried out by Rutherford and Matthews. The sample was all the academics involved in the policy reviews; one team member was an artist brought into one of the projects as a co-investigator. Apart from this artist, all our participants were in “Russell Group” research-intensive universities in the UK. All but one of the original review team members were interviewed. One interview was carried out by one interviewer over Skype for convenience, the rest were carried out by both interviewers, in person.

The methodology of the research was interpretive – seeking to understand how participants understood the process of developing the policy reviews. This interpretive stance also framed the

nature of the questions asked of participants. The interviews were semi-structured, covering the process of carrying out the reviews, participants' motivations for doing research that had an impact, and wider working environment, and were open-ended allowing participants to reflect on their activities, emotions and motivations. This produced a rich discussion between the three parties in the interview; indeed one interviewee commented at the end of the interview that they were not expecting such a deep and reflexive experience. The questions included one about the REF as this had come out as of particular interest in the preparation for the interviews by participants and the interviewers. Given the interdisciplinary nature of the policy reviews, the interview also inquired about the interface between social science and arts and humanities disciplines in carrying out the reviews. Interviews were transcribed and shared among all six researchers, including those who had worked on the initial policy reviews. The transcripts were inductively coded in NVivo by Matthews, with analysis and input from Rutherford and the wider project team. Given the co-produced nature of the research project, this created a deliberative, reflexive team. The ethics of sharing data between the team were negotiated on an ongoing basis as part of the process of co-production (see: Beebeejaun, Durose *et al.* 2015: for a discussion of ethics within contemporary co-produced research). Due to the ease with which quotes may be attributed to participants, they are reproduced sparingly in the empirical section to preserve anonymity.

The interview data was supplemented by further material. Firstly, observational data collected by the research team during the course of the fieldwork, for example at meetings with policy-makers and seminars, and meetings between the academic team and civil servants within DCLG. Secondly, the team members were asked to produce reflexive blog posts during the project: at the start asking them to reflect on producing the original briefs and then to reflect on where they felt they were going with this co-produced project (this helped develop the interview schedules); and then at the end of the project reflecting on how they think academic practices needed to change. Thirdly through the co-produced methodology, the collective process of reflection in person and by email, and the production of "tools" (discussed further in the conclusion), added a further richness and thickness to the data and analysis.

In analysing the data we used an interpretive approach to understand the practices and meanings of the interviewed academics as 'local knowledge' of policy actors (Yanow 2000; Yanow 2003). The interviewing approach providing rich material for this analysis. Rather than abstracting data out of the interview transcripts thematically through thick coding, the analysis was sensitive to the story being told by individuals, the contexts individuals found themselves in, and in-turn created, through their actions. Narrative structure of stories reveals causal interpretations used by participants – that an event came after, and was linked to, a previous event (Hollway and Jefferson 2000). In reproducing the data below, this desire to be sensitive to the data was in tension with the confidentiality of the participants, so a level of richness has had to be sacrificed.

In interpretive analysis, the aim is to move between micro levels of analysis, such as metaphor, myth and stories, and build these up to rich descriptions of meaning-making systems – variously described as cultural domains (Coffey and Atkinson 1996) or traditions (Bevir and Rhodes 2006). Both cultural domains and traditions should be internally cohesive and relatively stable, yet because they are systems that actors use to make meaning of the world, they are also amenable to change. In this case, the quantity of data did not allow us to reach such theoretical saturation, so it would be

inappropriate to consider whether we had identified stable domains or traditions, a point we return to in the conclusion.

As well as these abstractive approaches to data analysis, the co-produced methodology involved interpretation and analysis of the data. The three-way discussion in interview allowed for interrogation of specific points and a reinforcing discussion on diagnosis of problems and possible solutions. The reflexive end-of-interview discussion, when the recorder was switched off, furthered this, along with discussion between Matthews and Rutherford. In the rest of the paper we thus present three stories that come out of the thickness of this co-produced analysis that tie together the accounts of our participants and bring to the fore key aspects of academic experience and behaviour that were important in terms of knowledge translation or exchange type activities: individual biographies and motivations; academic disciplines; and institutional pressures, including the REF. We conclude by highlighting a solution identified by most participants, the need for dialogue between researchers and policy-makers, and the relation of this to space, both physically and metaphorically.

Career biographies as meaning-making

Career biographies were a common feature in the interviews. The biographies were diverse, and participants used them to explain their current practices in a variety of different ways, most often without explicit prompting. These narratives were meaning-making for our participants in the way that they helped explain why they wanted to do research that had an impact, relating this to a normative desire to change the world, and among five participants related to previous work outwith academia, in policy-making or related areas. They helped explain why our participants behaved in certain ways, and as will be explored in the subsequent section, placed them within an academic discipline and norms.

In terms of explaining a particular normative mission of our participants these short biographies created a causal story. For those participants who were not explicitly wanting to change policy, there was a common normative desire in their research to not just explain the world, but to apply that knowledge in some way to alleviate problems, or give marginal groups a voice in contexts where they would otherwise be ignored. For example, one of our participants described their ongoing work with a local deprived neighbourhood as: “trying to do something that for me is a long-term project” of representing the communities in different settings to help them. Another participant understood their current activities and research practices by relating them to working with gypsy-traveller groups in community development work over 20 years ago – the injustice they had witnessed then, and their experiences of trying to tackle them through research-based activism. Another older Professor explained how they were: “still driven by I want to make a change to society. I actually want a better society, I want some of those problems actually solved”.

Individual biographies were also meaning-making for participants who had worked outwith academia – it was used to justify why they knew how things are done in other (predominantly policy-making) contexts outside of the academy. For example, one respondent explained that:

“So I mean [name] City Council was an interesting place to pick, it was doing things differently. Before that I used to work in [local authority] in an R&I [research and innovation] unit which was one of the biggest R&I units outside London and it was just doing a job that local

government should have been doing, it was fantastic. But it was innovative, it was your leading edge. So if you've been always in those circumstances you are very critical in a positive way you know, not critical 'oh it's bad' but you know, 'how could things be better?'"

This was part of quite a long career for this participant, but it remained important to them in terms of helping them better understand policy-making contexts.

These biographies were also important in relating how comfortable people felt "outside" academia, or working in a policy environment:

"Before I was an academic I worked for a political party and I've done some think-tank work"

The interviewee went on to explain:

"so I suppose I've always been interested in kind of what goes on outside the academy and wanted to do research that was policy-relevant. And I suppose the sort of research I've done which has been about public services obviously lends itself very well to that."

Another participant used their career biography in terms of places of employment to describe their 'socialisation' into a particular position that was comfortable working with policy-makers:

"the places that I've worked, so I was at [applied university research centre] and then at [local government-funded research centre] and [applied university department] and then at [applied university research centre], they're all places that really position themselves at a kind of nexus between policy, practice and academia. And that appealed to me and I think that ... so that's just how I've been socialised".

For our participants these biographies thus explained their approach to their research, and importantly whether doing applied policy-relevant research, working with policy-makers, and communicating in a policy environment were things they had experience in, or were socialised to expect to do as part of their role as an academic.

Academic disciplines and meaning-making and boundary-producing

Throughout our data, the importance of academic disciplines was a key theme. We see this in three ways: their centrality to biography; how comfortable, or not, participants felt in policy-contexts; and the use of meaning and practices from specific disciplines in boundary-marking.

Firstly, and leading on from the previous section, academic discipline was often a key part of our participants' biographies, for example:

"I was actually lucky enough to be taught by [academic] and a lot of really amazing people at university which actually really affected how I saw the world. I mean he's really powerfully present in my work still. So my book ... is on actually revisiting and thinking about [academic's] legacy. So that's me."

The closing "So that's me" is particularly telling – from this participants' experiences of being taught by a leading academic, we are meant to then fully understand everything about this person, the type of academic they are and what they do. Such important figures appeared in other participants'

biographies and could be understood as academic “parents”, imbuing our participants with a way of being an academic, and importantly being an academic within their specific discipline.

Secondly, and important for our analysis here, this sense of disciplinary-self led to how our participants understood themselves within policy-making environments and how comfortable they felt. For example, one meaning-making practice for our participants who had engaged with policy-focused research in the past was to understand the research process in a client-researcher relationship, often with the research client understood as a “policy customer”. The ambiguities and tensions this produces for researchers, especially where the client is a government body, have been explored in other research (Lse Gv Group 2014). It should be noted that in our research some of our participants were in university research units that relied on consultancy income, but this notion of a client-researcher relationship was not confined to these people.

This affected how these participants went about doing their commissioned reviews. Some participants worked from the basis that there was a research client and they had to produce the research this client wanted. In this case, these researchers felt there was an ambiguity around who this “client” was, as the policy reviews were funded by the AHRC to deliver impact through being used by DCLG. For these scholars, this presented them with dual lines of accountability. The teams led by social scientists sought confirmation of what was needed from the client and were quite amazed that the AHRC were not in a position to offer this steer and changed their approaches accordingly:

‘So I think we made a decision on both that I didn’t know what the AHRC really wanted but I thought I knew what you [DCLG] wanted. And I thought that I was better able to do that.’

This same participant also described in a blog post how the AHRC seem to lose interest:

“this was different to my experience of working on commissioned research where the ‘client’ is usually critically engaged ... [they] ... Seemed to lose interest once commissioned, particularly in the sense of building an ongoing policy relationship.”

Because of this, these teams were comfortable reporting to, and engaged much more closely with, the DCLG. This was clear in the outputs produced – the teams produced reports in formats suggested by DCLG: a slide pack (a substantial PowerPoint presentation intended to be read as a document) and a report informed by a 1-4-20 format and genre (a single page summary, a four page executive summary and a 20 page report).

The contrasts with the participants from the other team who had very little engagement with the civil servants who were to be the “customer” for their knowledge. One member of this team reflected on this in terms of a lack of confidence to work with DCLG:

“I think it’s been really interesting working with people like [other team members] who are much more confident ... I’m not as confident with [civil servants] though ... I’m not confident with the DCLG”

This team member was from a humanities background, so had no relevant experience from their research to date, or from wider disciplinary experience.

More broadly, our participants reflected on their own experience of different disciplinary practices and how some disciplines, for example urban studies and urban planning, social policy and public health, were more comfortable operating in a policy environment. In these disciplines doctoral supervisors or peers would interact with policy-making and the practice was valued. Some participants noted how where they worked was different and not as comfortable positioning themselves as policy oriented. For example, one of our participants reflected that:

“there are institutes sort of similar to us...which will produce these nice sort of two-page, easily email-able, etc. summaries of their research and when I suggested doing it here I think most people were broadly sympathetic as long as they themselves didn’t have to write it. But you know, some of them who were more sort of professoriate, had a view that well journal articles only want original work, so we can’t be publishing things in two-page summaries.”

Another participant told us that “people didn’t want to have to the word ‘applied’ in our vision of the School because they felt that that would demean the quality of their intellectual work.” Doing “impact” in these departments risked undermining perceived scholarly quality and reputation and represented a disciplinary difference for these participants who had greater policy experience.

The importance of discipline as a meaning-making tradition was particularly apparent when our participants were discussing the boundaries between disciplines, or how disciplines were seen by “outsiders”. The evidence reviews being produced were, by their very nature, interdisciplinary: they were taking knowledge from the arts and humanities, loosely defined, and applying this in a policy context traditionally dominated by the social sciences. Because of this, the differences between disciplines emerged in the everyday work of carrying out the project, which is common in interdisciplinary working (Barry, Born *et al.* 2008).

The following two quotes from participants exemplify this, particularly in the way that the participants felt their background was being stereotyped or misunderstood:

“I think the difficulty I had with working with [social scientists] was that it was very much “art was fun”.”

“There’d be a whole lot of stuff about kind of stereotype of social scientists, which I found very irritating because I don’t think of myself in those categories.”

The broader literature on interdisciplinary working suggests that it is most successful when it is focused on particular issues and leads to epistemological change in the disciplines coming together (Barry, Born *et al.* 2008). The two quotes from different team members presented here suggest this epistemological transformation did not fully occur. One interpretation could be that the epistemological difference between the disciplines was too great to ultimately bridge; indeed, in interview one team member used their hands to gesture such a bridge failing to be built, their fingers not quite touching as they brought their hands together.

Further, when interpersonal differences and the stresses of working to a tight timescale got too much, the practices of academic disciplines as traditions that were meaning-making were a comforting place to withdraw to, stopping the progress of interdisciplinary transformation in its tracks:

'The discussions kind of oscillated between really fabulous conversations and then [arts and humanities scholar] withdrawing into ... Arts and Humanities bunker, from my perspective. So some of the time it felt very 'Yeah, we can really get to grips with this stuff' and then suddenly it would stop being like that.'

One participant regularly used a "deliberate boxing metaphor" in their blog post to describe how this tension manifested itself in project working. Another participant described it as a "clash": "I think it was a disciplinary clash that looked like a personality clash. I think underneath it it's a philosophical clash that is quite deep"

In terms of the policy review produced, the tension and stress of nearing the final deadline meant the social scientists resorted to their traditional disciplinary practices: producing a report in the format that might be expected by a policy-maker in a UK Government department. The arts and humanities wanted to disrupt communication with artistic outputs, particularly a short film. What is more important for us here, in understanding the efficacy of academics getting evidence into policy-making, is that it demonstrates how important academic disciplines were for our participants. When individual identity was threatened through tensions between individuals, project management, disagreements on communication styles and the relative weight given to different types of knowledge in outputs, individuals appeared to hunker down and use their academic discipline as a cloak.

A final example of a participant demonstrating this disciplinary "otherness" is useful here. In a reflexive moment, this participant describes how they were described by another academic from a different discipline and the impact of this:

"Participant: And [another academic] asked me, he asked me at this workshop 'Where are you from in disciplinary terms?' and I said 'I'm from Politics' and he went 'Oh, sorry'.

Interviewer: (laughs)

Participant: And then said 'Politics is not very political' and it really hit home to me. And it made me realise that a lot of political science work is very dominated by like...empiricism...and is not political in the same way that social policy is."

In data such as this, we therefore see important of academic disciplines as a set of norms and behaviours for our participants as meaning-making. While the literature on evidence translation does recognise disciplinary differences in getting evidence into policy-making, this tends to focus on the nature of the evidence itself: for example the debates as to whether policy-makers prefer the "objective" knowledge of quantitative social science (Nutley, Walter *et al.* 2007). Alternatively it focuses on how different disciplines are effective, or not, in communicating their findings (Flinders 2013). Interpreting academic disciplines instead reveals a different issue: that these disciplines are part of academics' deep meaning-making repertoire, and how they make sense of the world and operate in it. This means, in-turn, that there are complex intersections of these meaning with working in a policy-making environment.

Institutional pressures

As discussed in the literature review, the debate about bringing evidence into policy-making is framed, particularly in the UK, in terms of the pressures on the contemporary university and issues of performance management (Shore 2010; Slater 2012). Here, we want to use the specific insights generated when a civil servant asked academics about their practices to understand institutional pressures in a novel way. We focus specifically on how our participants discussed the REF as this was a clear theme within the data; for the civil servant analysing this data, it was the least understood aspect of academic working conditions for an outsider. In total, across the interviews “REF” was mentioned 78 times (although this does include mentions by the interviewers). It should also be noted that the interviews were carried out either side of when the final REF results were published, so the topic was pertinent.

As with most commentary and research from within academia in the UK (see, for example: Smith and Stewart 2016), our participants were ambivalent about the REF as it impacted on their professional development, some more than others:

“Because I think a lot of it’s bollocks. And I know it’s important but I feel quite strongly they shouldn’t drive our academic lives. I try and make sure that stuff I do is helpful but I’m not going to let the REF drive my academic life.”

For our participants there was pressure on them to produce the four, ‘four-star’ papers from research projects. One of our participants contrasted this to the ‘fun stuff’: ‘I also don’t need bits of research that won’t lead to REF-able publications ... You can’t just keep having fun, do you know what I mean?’, by which they meant policy and practice-relevant work that was not fully recognised by their institution.

While we want to focus on the REF here as an institutional pressure that led to specific practices, it must also be acknowledged for many of our participants, the REF was part of a wider set of performance pressures. For example, for one participant, being awarded the policy review grant was linked to their desire to make a good impression and develop networks within a new university context:

“it’s maybe a bit of a nervousness on my own part that I was going to you know, a Russell Group kind of university and it was quite a big step up ... So yeah, it wasn’t that there is a target to meet those awards, it was more a sense of I want to give an impression of what kind of colleague I am and what kind of contribution I’m able to kind of make.”

However, the main institutional pressure on our participants derived from the REF was the tension between writing papers and taking the time to develop strong, trusting relationships with policy-makers that would allow effective translation of evidence into policy-making to occur. The overwhelming power that the REF had over the choices and incentive structures of our participants was apparent. While performance management regimes, with organisational and individual targets and annual reviews, are now commonplace, particularly in government (Matthews 2015), this was something quite different. The way the participants framed so much of their working lives in terms of the REF was striking – it would be discussed without prompting as something that affected academic practices, and narratives would often include the REF in the storyline.

It was also clearly apparent in the broader fieldwork for the project that the REF model of impact was inconsistent with the real world of multiple pressures on academics' time and policy-makers' resources. Given the inherent time lag in journal publication, and without access to academic journals, or the time to read and translate them, it was highly unlikely a policy-maker would be able to access academic knowledge and evidence in the format privileged by the REF. Our data would suggest that it is not sufficient for academics to repackage, or translate, their evidence in ways that might be more suited to policy-makers. Rather there is a need for policy-makers to understand the broader practices and meaning-making traditions of academics.

Dialogue in complex environments

The stories of impact presented above suggest a marked difference in the approach of the three teams: two were comfortable in policy environments, and sought dialogue with the policy "customer" to tailor outputs so they could be readily used by policy-makers. The other team, on their own admission, were working in the dark, as a member of the team commented on how they treated the end of the project presentation:

"we actually then behaved in a very traditional academic way and said here are the outputs from this project, go figure. And we didn't. There was no dialogue, there was no opening up the space"

The learning from this for this team was the need to open up dialogue to ensure greater understanding of the policy environment. In their blog post commenting on the end-of-project presentation, the same team member noted that the research in this paper: "grew out of a conversation that day with [civil servant] to the effect that we needed to carry on the dialogue". The opportunity of one of this team being embedded within the DCLG (see: Connelly *et al.* 2015) enabled this to be tested further, as they reflected in interview at a comment directed at Rutherford:

"[civil servant] very graciously sat down and spent a bit of time with me looking at my version of my...film, which I'd already realised within ten minutes of being in your office, I realised that film was no use whatsoever to you but I couldn't articulate why. So I had that conversation with [civil servant] and [they] offered to sit down and kind of go 'That bit's useful, that's not' kind of thing, which was incredibly useful. But without that opportunity of sitting in your office I would have no clue on what to leave in and what to leave out as much as I did have just from sitting in there"

As discussed in the literature review, this suggests that Kaplan's idea of the "two communities" is still a useful heuristic for understanding the divide between academia and academics, and policy-makers.

However, rather than crossing the boundary, or learning a new language, as metaphors of communities and translation suggest, our research suggests an ongoing engagement with the complex system of policy-making is required. Put simply, from experience some of the academics we interviewed had greater experience, and thus learning, about this than others. As one team member commented in a blog post, for academics this requires:

"holding a position of learner, improving and using reflective practices, constructing/ contributing to a space for honest dialogue"

The tensions in academics' careers and the pressures put on them, as discussed in the previous section, seem to mitigate against this. As one team member commented in a blog post: "in principle my department likes me to do this stuff, it doesn't make any time for it."

The co-produced aspect of this research demonstrated that this is not a one-way process and that policy-makers can learn from this level of engagement, experience and learning. As another participant commented in interview:

"one would hope that that leads to a much deeper, closer engagement between policymakers, obviously we're talking primarily civil servants and in terms of setting the research agenda, monitoring and reviewing that agenda, having a dialogue, making sure that the results in the research gets sort of fed into government."

We now conclude the paper by exploring the possibility for co-production to further the embedding of academic evidence in policy-making.

Conclusion

This paper has sought to begin to answer the criticism from many scholars of evidence translation that we do not know what academics are doing when they carry out work to translate evidence into a policy environment, although there is ample evidence of academics' views and perceptions of what they have done. The "two communities" approach has been a useful heuristic for focusing on academics' practices and knowledge. Taking an interpretive stance, we have understood academics as bringing specific experiences and meanings to knowledge translation activities and encounters. Further, through these activities, our participants took new meanings as they understood specific contexts better and further developed a cross-cultural competence necessary for good quality translation (Connelly *et al.* 2015).

We have highlighted three particular themes from our data that seemed particularly important when working with policy-makers. Firstly was personal biography, and in particular previous experiences of working in policy-focused environments. This gave this group of our participants an understanding of the motives and working practices of policy-makers, increasing their comfort in these environments. Second, and related, was the importance of academic discipline. This was particularly an issue given the interdisciplinary nature of the policy reviews our participants had produced. It had deeper significance though – through their own admission some of the disciplines our participants would locate themselves in had much greater collective experience of working with policy-makers which they could draw upon. Further, there was a clear role for disciplines in creating boundaries for the identities of our participants – they were *this* discipline, because they were different to *another* discipline that did things differently. Finally, specific pressures on our participants had a lot of meaning for them, in particular the pressures of the REF and the contradictory pressures to produce high-quality research outputs (primarily peer-reviewed journal articles) and the recognition that activities that might, ultimately, lead to evidence being fed into policy-making processes might not be highly valued.

The sample of participants in this study were self-selecting and cannot be assumed to be representative of their disciplines as a whole. The interviews were focused around the particular policy reviews produced in a particular context and time (in the run-up to the REF). There is likely to

be much variability across academics, disciplines and policy areas. However, we believe the interpretive approach to understanding and analysing their practices and “local knowledge” of trying to do impact, and influence policy-making, is a fruitful avenue for the study of evidence translation to follow. Supplementing this, the co-produced nature of this research also provided particular insights, which might not be readily forthcoming from a project conducted solely by academics.

Returning to the discussion of the REF that opened this paper: instrumentally, if we want to improve the efficacy of evidence translation, this research has specific implications. Most obviously, as mentioned, is the fact that it highlights the tension inherent within the REF between producing high quality outputs and impact with those outputs.ⁱ Normatively, as our findings suggest, many academics do want to have a positive impact on policy-making, making outcomes more just, or improving the efficiency and efficacy of policy. Our research points to specific barriers in this regard as well – this normative drive behind providing evidence for making policy decisions and delivering policy is very different to the need for objectivity, particularly in the UK Civil Service, as enshrined in the Civil Service Code with its explicit commitment to impartiality (UK Civil Service 2015). This does suggest that, in some ways, two very different communities do exist, and there is a need for cultural competence and understanding across the boundary. We have suggested practical ways to overcome these barriers elsewhere (Connelly et al, 2016).

In their systematic review of what works in evidence translation, Oliver et.al (2014: 4) found that the ‘the role of relationships, trust, and mutual respect’ was extremely important for getting research findings into the policy-making arena. That this research – and this paper – were co-produced with a policy analyst in the UK Civil Service is further evidence to this effect. However, to develop such relationships means that academics must enter what Newman (2013: 525) referred to as ‘contact zones’. It was clear from our data that some academics had more skill, experience, and knowledge to do this effectively. Our data also suggests that greater cross-cultural competence is needed. This needs to move beyond the obvious awareness that policy-makers might need evidence repackaged in particular formats, such as “triple-writing” (Flinders 2013). Policy-makers need to have greater awareness of the motivations, pressures and diversity of academics and be more confident in exploring these with the academics they have, or want to have, contact with. Academics also need to have greater reflexivity. Part of this may be awareness and caution in entering a complex, political environment: Newman (2013: 525) highlights ‘the ambiguities and dilemmas associated with creative labour in these perilous times: how the very words one speaks can rebound as they become taken up in government discourse’. The further reflection we suggest that might be required is a consideration of more basic issues: what are your motivations for trying to get your research findings into policy-making? Do they align with the policy-makers you are wanting to work with? Have you discussed this with them? While this may not produce a panacea to make the process of translating evidence into policy-making a more fruitful process, the cross-cultural competence this may engender might make these interactions slightly less haphazard.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all the academics and civil servants who took time to engage with this research. The research was made possible by a grant from the Arts and Humanities Research Council, reference: AH/L013223/1.

References

Bannister, J. and Hardill, I., 2013, Knowledge mobilisation and the social sciences: dancing with new partners in an age of austerity, *Contemporary Social Science*, 8, 3, 167-175

Barry, A., Born, G. and Weszkalnys, G., 2008, Logics of interdisciplinarity, *Economy and Society*, 37, 1, 20-49

Beebeejaun, Y., Durose, C., Rees, J., Richardson, J. and Richardson, L., 2015, Public harm or public value? Towards coproduction in research with communities, *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 33, 3, 552-565

Best, A. and Holmes, B., 2010, Systems thinking, knowledge and action: towards better models and methods, *Evidence & Policy: A Journal of Research, Debate and Practice*, 6, 2, 145-159

Bevir, M. and Rhodes, R. A. W., 2006, Defending Interpretation, *European Political Science*, 5, 1, 69-83

Cairney, P., 2016, *The Politics of Evidence-Based Policy Making*, London: Palgrave Macmillan

Caplan, N., 1979, The Two-Communities Theory and Knowledge Utilization, *American Behavioral Scientist*, 22, 3, 459-470

Coffey, A. and Atkinson, P., 1996, *Making Sense of Qualitative Data: Complementary Research Strategies*, London: Sage

Connelly, S., Vanderhoven, D. and Rutherford, R., 2016, *Translation for Policy*, Swindon and Sheffield: AHRC and University of Sheffield

Davies, H., Nutley, S. and Walter, I., 2008, Why 'knowledge transfer' is misconceived for applied social research, *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy*, 13, 3, 188-190

Flinders, M., 2013, The politics of engaged scholarship: impact, relevance and imagination, *Policy & Politics*, 41, 4, 621-642

Freeman, R., 2009, What is 'translation'?, *Evidence & Policy: A Journal of Research, Debate and Practice*, 5, 4, 429-447

Hollway, W. and Jefferson, T., 2000, *Doing Qualitative Research Differently: Free Association, Narrative and the Interview Method*, London: Sage

Lse Gv Group, 2014, Evaluation under contract: Government pressure and the production of policy research, *Public Administration*, 92, 1, 224-239

Matthews, F. M., 2015, Letting go and holding on: The politics of performance management in the United Kingdom, *Public Policy and Administration*,

Matthews, P., 2012, Problem definition and re-evaluating a policy: the real successes of a regeneration scheme, *Critical Policy Studies*, 6, 3, 243-260

May, T. and Perry, B., 2013, Universities, Reflexivity and Critique: Uneasy Parallels in Practice, *Policy Futures in Education*, 11, 5, 505-514

Newman, J., 2011, Boundary troubles: working the academic-policy interface, *Policy & Politics*, 39, 4, 473-484

Newman, J., 2013, Performing new worlds? Policy, politics and creative labour in hard times, *Policy & Politics*, 41, 4, 515-532

Nutley, S. M., Walter, I. and Davies, H. T. O., 2007, *Using Evidence: How research can inform public services*, Bristol: Policy Press

Oliver, K., Innvar, S., Lorenc, T., Woodman, J. and Thomas, J., 2014, A systematic review of barriers to and facilitators of the use of evidence by policymakers, *BMC Health Services Research*, 14, 2, <http://www.biomedcentral.com/1472-6963/14/2>

Pain, R., Kesby, M. and Askins, K., 2011, Geographies of impact: power, participation and potential, *Area*, 43, 2, 183-188

Parsons, W., 2002, From Muddling Through to Muddling Up - Evidence Based Policy Making and the Modernisation of British Government, *Public Policy and Administration*, 17, 3, 43-60

Pawson, R., Greenhalgh, T., Harvey, G. and Walshe, K., 2005, Realist review - a new method of systematic review designed for complex policy interventions, *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy*, 10, suppl 1, 21-34

Pawson, R. and Tilley, N., 1997, *Realistic Evaluation*, London: Sage

Phipps, D. and Morton, S., 2013, Qualities of knowledge brokers: reflections from practice, *Evidence & Policy: A Journal of Research, Debate and Practice*, 9, 2, 255-265

Research Excellence Framework, 2012, *Assessment Framework and Guidance on Submissions*, Bristol: REF

Shore, C., 2010, Beyond the multiversity: neoliberalism and the rise of the schizophrenic university, *Social Anthropology*, 18, 1, 15-29

Slater, T., 2012, Impacted geographers: a response to Pain, Kesby and Askins, *Area*, 44, 1, 117-119

Smith, K. E., 2014, The politics of ideas: The complex interplay of health inequalities research and policy, *Science and Public Policy*, 41, 5, 561-574

Smith, K. E. and Joyce, K. E., 2012, Capturing complex realities: understanding efforts to achieve evidence-based policy and practice in public health, *Evidence & Policy: A Journal of Research, Debate and Practice*, 8, 1, 57-78

Smith, K. E. and Stewart, E., 2016, We Need to Talk about Impact: Why Social Policy Academics need to Engage with the UK's Research Impact Agenda, *Journal of Social Policy*, FirstView, 1-19

UK Civil Service, 2015, *The Civil Service Code*, <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/civil-service-code/the-civil-service-code>: Accessed 22 June 2016

Weiss, C., 1979, The many meanings of research utilization, *Public Administration*, 39, 5, 426-431

Weiss, C., 1997, *Evaluation: Methods for Studying Programs and Policies 2nd Edition*, Upper Saddle River, N.J. : Prentice-Hall

Wilkinson, K., 2010, Organised Chaos: An Interpretive Approach to Evidence-Based Policy Making in Defra, *Political Studies*, 59, 4, 959-977

Yanow, D., 2000, *Conducting Interpretive Policy Analysis*, London: Sage

Yanow, D. 2003, Accessing local knowledge, in M. A. Hajer and H. Wagenaar (Eds) *Deliberative Policy Analysis: Understanding Governance in the Network Society*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 228-246

ⁱ Ironically, this was a tension for this project itself – the team had discussions as to whether to prioritise the production of research outputs such as these, or a “toolkit” to improve translation across the academia-policy interface, with the latter a priority for our partners within the Civil Service.