A framework for understanding cross-national differences in the relationship between research and policy

Nothing much seems to have changed since Caplan described the "worlds" of research and policy as being incompatible. Across Europe, representatives from both communities in the field of migration and integration issues, discuss their linkage as having failure wired into it, and label successful interaction as the exception to the rule. Nevertheless, research-policy linkages differ substantially between countries, in their intensity and in their dominant modalities. The way stakeholders talk about these differences does not sit well with current understanding of the issue. A major reason for the general feeling that social science analysis of the research-policy interface has not delivered much relief is caused by its fixation on the utilisation of knowledge. Bench-marking research-policy linkage shows that the discussion about similar issues (such as interdisciplinarity) is primarily in terms of the quality of the relationship between the actors involved, and the effects of the relationship (i.e. i.c. non-use or under-use of academic knowledge) are considered in derivative terms. It is argued that thinking about the interaction of research and policy in terms of relationship rather than utilisation, in combination with a focus on the wider context within which the relationship unfolds, makes for a useful analytical framework for understanding cross-national differences in the use of research by policy.

Introduction

In 1998 my collegues and I conducted a comparative survey of experiences with and perceptions of the use of scientific information in policy development in the area of migrants and cities in ten European countries[1]. Its main objectives were to further the discussion about the various ways social science research and policy interact by providing a common vocabulary across contexts, and to identify effective means or arrangements to facilitate linkage between research and social policy. Obviously, an exercise like that cannot do without a literature review. We quickly learned that the issue of research use by policy is the focus of a small but established field of studies, usually labelled Knowledge Utilisation (KU). Carol Weiss, the most important figure in the field[2], identifies its defining problem as "...the frequent disregard of the findings of sound research and evaluation in the making of social policy"[3]. It proved easy to review: just a couple of classics, a couple of journals, and not much heated debate, at least not during the last decade.

Weiss recently drafted a research design for the UNESCO/MOST programme[4] that succinctly describes the state of affairs with regard to the KU perspective on social research-social policy linkage issues. Initially, we took her design as our framework for understanding the cross-national differences in what our interview partners told us about the factors that advance or thwart the use of research results in the policy arena. Figure 1 depicts that framework[5].

INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

The understanding contained within this framework seemed pretty solid in terms of these factors being the ones most relevant to understanding the (dis)regard of research by policy, but less so with respect to our understanding of the conditions that have to be met for a particular factor to become a facilitator or inhibitor of research utilisation. (see Box 1).

Box 1: *Carol Weiss on twenty-five years of research on "knowledge utilisation"*

"We know a great deal from twenty-five years of research on "knowledge utilisation" (KU)...Many studies have investigated the characteristics that are associated with greater use of research findings: characteristics of the studies, of the dissemination mechanisms, of the researchers, or of the users. Scores of studies of knowledge utilisation (KU) have been published, providing a cafeteria of answers to the question of what kinds of research are most apt to be used. Unfortunately, the answers have not converged. For example, some studies find that research quality is important for use; other find that the quality of the research is unrelated to how much influence it has. Some studies find that policy actors turn to research findings when they face a crisis situation; other studies find that crisis is not an environment favorable to research use.…the findings on [knowledge utilisation] do not cohere into a tidy package of accepted truths"[6].

Initially, we hoped and expected our survey results to add their modest share of coherence to the current understanding. However, we got something quite different. Not that our interview partners weren't addressing the factors mentioned above, far from it. Most of them figured prominently in many of our conversations. But we quickly discovered that they talked about other things too. Things that did not fit the categories of figure 1: the social status of disciplines, the institutional structure of the migration and/or minorities policy sector in their country, historical path dependancies like the influence of WWII on the French attitude towards including ethnic questions in surveys, and so on, and so forth. To interpret cross-national differences in the way research and policy commune with each other the existing list of relevant factors needed extensions. On top of that, many interviewees did not seem to evaluate linkage (solely or mainly) in terms of the use of research results. A focus on utilisation did not seem to cover all there is to effective interaction between research and policy. This implied a necessity to rethink the core of the existing perspective on the linkage problem. Together these challenges meant that to make sense of what we were told we had to come up with an *new* and *enlarged* framework for understanding.

This article describes (how we arrived at) this new perspective on the linkage issue: the interface between research and policy through the looking glass of relationship. And how we enlarged the set of factors framing that interface.

It starts with the major of the two challenges, the search for an alternative perspective, by describing the basics of the existing framework of understanding: the worlds of research and policy divided by a wide and deep chasm (the gap metaphor), and the widespread stakeholder recognition this perspective receives. Then it addresses the kinds of solutions developed for getting more of the commodities produced in one world used in the other, and their lack of success. Although wanting to understand what our interviewees told us triggered the search for a new perspective I show why this motive was soon enough accompagnied by the potential an alternative might hold for new solutions. Next our strategy of benchmarking the interaction between research and policy, i.c. against the interaction between disciplines, as the way to hit upon a new perspective, is explained. I then show that the alternative metaphor resulting from this benchmarking strategy, two worlds communicating with each other, trying to figure out how to improve their relationship (the relationship metaphor), supports new evaluations of what is termed successful research-policy interaction and brings new problem-solving interventions to our attention, whithout loosing sight of the explanatory factors given centre-stage by the gap metaphor.

The second challenge is faced next: how to enlarge the set of factors relevant to the research-policy interface. Our interview material enabled us to face this challenge directly by providing

us with a long list of context factors beyond the issue arena (see Figure 1). The argument proceeds by illustrating the relevance for the understanding of cross-national differences at all levels: the macro-level (differences in the overall level or intensity of interaction), the meso-level (differences in the prefered or possible interaction modalities), and the micro-level (differences in the shaping of particular instances of interaction).

After presenting a more productive and encompassing framework for understanding cross-national differences in the relationship between research and policy that combines the above described insights, the article concludes with an epilogue. This epilogue addresses three issues in need of further thought: the importance of conceiving the issue-arena in terms of *all* of its stakeholders, the fact that the presuppositions of the framework may imply that it does not or less effectively apply to non-democratic settings, e.g. many third world countries, and the lessons to be learned from the way we our survey predisposed us towards hitting upon a new perspective.

The non-use of research: its core understanding

Having talked our way across Europe, surveying experiences with research-policy interaction in the field of migration and integration issues, it struck us as remarkable how well the early two "worlds" or "communities" description of Caplan[7] fits the contemporary opinions of stakeholders, be it from the research or the policy side. This "two worlds" model, described more than 20 years ago, states that the question of utilisation can be viewed from two angles, that of the customer (the policy-maker), and that of the supplier (the researcher). Accordingly, problems of under- or non-utilisation are attributed to non-compatible characteristics of the "worlds", "communities", or "systems" of customer and supplier[8]. The most important areas of friction are:

- *Problem definition*: policy has to deal with complex real world social problems, while research develops questions from theoretical frameworks, characterised by a reduction of complexity;
- *Culture*: policy thinks in terms of targets, ways and means, is interested in "what" results, and its discourse uses procedural and legal jargon. Research thinks in terms of generalisation and explanation, is interested in "how" and "why" results, and its discourse uses common sense concepts in restricted, sometimes arcanely technical senses;
- *Role and accountability*: policy tends towards risk-avoidance, repeating previously successful actions, or, in epistemological terms, aims at "verification", while research has a stake in the new and unexpected, and aims at "falsification";
- *Time-frame*: policy needs quick solutions, research needs time to comply with its internal quality criteria;

Since then, KU studies have elaborated this basic "two worlds separated by a difficult to bridge gap" framework and enriched it with typologies of kinds of use and descriptions of particular characteristics of research that positively influence its use by policy makers[9]. Our interview partners obviously felt comfortable with the resulting enriched but basically unchanged KU studies perspective on the linkage problem. Also, serving as a rapporteur at a recent UNESCO/MOST conference on research-policy linkage, the survey experience of widespread acceptance of the "gap" perspective was more than confirmed. At this conference, Carol Weiss set the stage for workshop discussions on experiences with mutually beneficial

interaction by presenting the linkage problem in terms of the "four I's", another way of characterising the differences between the research and the policy "communities" (see box 1). Her presentation was widely recognised by the researchers, administrators, politicians and practitioners present, as matching their personal experiences.

Box 1: *Why doesn't research have more direct influence*[10]

The policy world does not run on principles of scientific rationality but on the rationality of our system to reconcile different societal interests, what we call politics. Research may present consequences of different directions, in itself it does not determine direction. Direction is determined by the contest in the policy-arena. Within this arena research is faced with obstacles that hinder its use, the so called four I's:

a. Interests, of bureaucrats, private business, or other parties involved;
b. Ideologies, the reigning beliefs and values;
c. Information, research being only one source among many; usually research information enters into a pre-existing policy frame;
d. Institutional forum: government organizations have a history, a culture or tradition, rules, a budget, etc. Some issues are simply off-limits, no matter what research evidence shows, others are dealt with in stereotypical or path-dependant way because of the policy history;

All of these four obstacles interact…..

The same four I's that act as obstacles to the use of research evidence within the policy arena hinder the production of policy oriented research results within the science arena:

a. Interests: a career within the scientific world often asks for compliance to a particular research agenda, a certain format for one's output etc;
b. Ideologies are called paradigma's and are ususally mono-disciplinary and obsessed with primary data;
c. Prior information is called theory and often limits practical applicability of results;
d. The institutional forum encourages submission to the academic forum and does not reward time spent on policy usefulness.

Such widespread stakeholder recognition signals that the way research-policy interaction is conceptualised within KU studies strikes a right cord. It is also important to note that this recognition only applied to research-policy interaction in open democratic contexts in which authorities are constraint by their public accountablity and governance is based upon consensual agreement. This means that the existing framework should in principle be useful for understanding cross-European differences, but may not or less effectively apply to e.g. many third world contexts (an issue addressed in the epilogue).

Solutions for the non-use of research: a stalemate

Two kinds of solutions have been promoted to the problem as currently defined, i.e. research being disregarded by policy. One emerged from KU studies and could be called the "tone down your expectations" approach: do not expect much instrumental use of research results, but aim at creating the conditions for research to have some (usually long-term) conceptual trickle down effects. The list of characteristics of research that positively influence its (conceptual) use by policy makers in Box 2 summarises the practical wisdom that this perspective has resulted in.

Box 2: *Characteristics of research that positively influence its use by policy makers*[11]

1. Addresses issues that policy-makers care about (which is not to say that all social science research should be directed by the policy agenda!);

2. Has high methodological quality: policy does not want its critics to be able to shoot the study down;
3. Synthesizes existing knowledge (for example meta-analyses): as inconsistent results are always available on the market of research, policy favours "one-handed" research that summarizes the weight of the evidence;
4. Includes policy-makers in the research process (difficult to make it actually happen!), and is flexible enough to be adapted during the study to the changing nature of the policy debate;
5. Has clear low cost action implications that do not run into strong political or bureaucratic opposition and can be handled by existing staff and/or institution(s); research that points towards something policy can change, providing directions for the next step to take;
6. Is well and widely disseminated, using language that communicates and (also) personal channels: a necessity as avarage daily reading time of politicians is minimal (a study of US Congress members came up with 11 minutes per day…);
7. Its researchers have long-term intermediairy linkages with the policy world, be it direct or indirect; contacts with research departments within policy settings or with think tanks, or being part of issue networks are examples of such linkages. E.g. in the US, the issue-arena of migration is populated by players from Congress, the government bureaucracy, the media, interest groups and academia. For social science to exert any influence it has to participate in this network; on top of that, dialogue with the policy world may very well improve the interpretation of the results!

Although research being in agreement with the current policy perspective and reasoning facilitates its use, presenting a challenge to the status quo, puncturing some myths, and/or suggesting alternative policy perspectives, may also exert influence although one has to be prepared for a trickle down time of ten to fifteen years.

The other kind of solution is more radical in its efforts to get at the heart of the gap between research and policy. It directly addresses the areas of friction. This solution comes in two varieties. One is largely customer instigated: the introduction of a contract-relationship between the knowledge-producing researcher and his policy-consumer. The development of the other is more researcher-driven: it advocates close involvement of some or all of its stakeholders from the problem-formulation stage onwards, in a way that effectively makes them co-researchers. This variety covers a broad spectrum of action research type strategies. In the more specific context of evaluation research, the field that has generated more debate on research utilisation than any other (utilisation being fundamental to its very definition), such strategies carry labels like "utilisation-focussed", "stakeholder-focussed" or "client-centered"[12].

The solutions elaborated constitute an effective toolbox for dealing with some of of the issues, some of the time. The application of the practical wisdom contained in Box 2 surely has made lots of research more policy-oriented. The policy-customer dominated contract-relationship can indeed be a most appropriate linkage form between research and policy, especially for certain kinds of ad hoc and short term policy knowledge needs. However, for challenges to the status quo, the debunking of (policy) myths, and suggestions for alternative policy perspectives, the kind of input that (long-term) strategic policy development needs, the restrictions of a contract are often counterproductive. In other words, the contract will do for certain problems, under certain circumstances, but is not a general panacea. The same argument - certain problems, under certain circumstances, but not a general panacea - is valid for action research type strategies.

Should this state of affairs be reason for concern? The European survey mentioned above indicates it should: the "two worlds" description of the relationship between research and

policy strikes such a note *because* stakeholders generally experience the gap as unbridgeable. Some of the time, for certain problems we have learned how to establish true linkage, but most of the time, for most problems research and policy are still worlds apart. And that's the view of KU experts too: the International Evaluation Research Group (IERG)[13] is working on a book project titled *The Evaluation Utilization Debate Revisited: Is There a Way Forward and out of the Cul-de-sac?* They believe that the current understanding is insufficient to come to grips with the issues of research use, but "no new compelling understandings of utilization have been presented in the past decade"[14]. The current stalemate seems inextricably linked to the KU perspective. We indeed need a new understanding.

A strategy to escape from the stalemate: benchmarking

The gap metaphor of research-policy interation that so easily fits the experiences of stakeholders means that linkage has failure wired into it, and succesful interaction is the exception to the rule. From the perspective of wanting to improve the linkage situation this is not very satisfactory to say the least. There has to be an alternative that defines the problem in different terms, a different metaphor for "reading" the situation, an alternative perspective that opens our eyes to alternative solutions. An alternative that does not so much *replace* the existing perspective – which would be a denial of the widespread recognition it receives – but that *adds* new insights. To paraphrase the basic premisse of Morgan's famous treatise on images of organisation (see Box 3): 'by analyzing problems through different metaphors, by realising that all these "readings" are partial, by realising that the different aspects are intertwined (as opposed to the expectation that one metaphor "fits" the situation best), a new depth of understanding is possible'.

Box 3: *Metaphor: a way of thinking*[15]

"The basic premise .... is that our theories and explanations of organisational life are based on metaphors that lead us to see and understand organisations in distinctive yet partial ways. Metaphor is often just regarded as a device for embellishing discourse, but its significance is much greater than this. For the use of metaphor implies a *way of thinking* and *a way of seeing* that pervade how we understand our world generally.....

We use metaphor whenever we attempt to understand one element of experience in terms of another. Thus, metaphor proceeds through implicit or explicit assertions that A *is* (or is like) B. When we say "the man is a lion", we use the image of a lion to draw attention to the lion-like aspects of the man. The metaphor frames our understanding of the man in a distinctive yet partial way.....[I]n drawing attention to the lionlike bravery, strenght, or ferocity of the man, the metaphor glosses over the fact that the same person may well also be a chauvinist pig, a devil, a saint, a bore, or a recluse. Our ability to achieve a comprehensive "reading" of the man depends on an ability to see how these different aspects of the person may coexist in a complementary or even paradoxical way.

It is easy to see how this kind of thinking has relevance for understanding organisation and management. For organisations are complex and paradoxical phenomena that can be understood in many different ways. Many of our taken-for-granted ideas about organisations are metaphorical, even though we may not recognise them as such. For example, we frequently talk about organisations *as if* they were machines designed to achieve predetermined goals and objectives, and which should operate smoothly and efficiently. And as a result of this kind of thinking we often attempt to organise and manage them in a mechanistic way, forcing their human qualities into a background role." (p.12-13)

It is well-known that perspectives are difficult to change. They are like Kuhnian paradigms: even when the "facts" are staring you in the face it is difficult to make the shift. We followed a trusted strategy to identify a new perspective: look for it outside your own field. In the same way that scientific advance is often to be found at the borders of disciplines[16], new perspectives are often to be found by browsing through other fields of research. It is like benchmarking[17] your field's approach against that of other but "similar" fields[18]. To give but one well-known example of fruitful cross-border benchmarking: the thinking on effective government organisation has profited greatly from using the private sector as a benchmark. All kinds of organisational principles, non-existent in the bureaucracy discourse, could suddenly be entertained as possibilities for increasing efficiency[19].

Several "similar" fields can be thought of, but in the context of this article I will mention only one: studies of interdisciplinarity[20]. Although multi- and/or interdisciplinarity frequently surfaces in KU studies - it did in our survey - as an important ingredient of, or even prerequisite for, policy relevant knowledge, the body of literature on the problems associated with conducting inter- and multidisciplinary research is strangely absent from KU. Strangely, because a "gap between two worlds" metaphor has long been around in interdisciplinarity studies: in 1959 Charles P. Snow coined the label "two cultures" to signal the separation between the arts and the sciences[21].

The bulk of the literature on interdisciplinarity has a very evident focus: the issue of communication between disciplines. How to make academics understand the concepts, problem definitions and vocabulary of other disciplines? How to make them really communicate with each other, within a shared frame of understanding? This interest is usually not fired by a short term problem-solving motivation but is aimed at establishing long-term relationships between researchers with the aim to move the development of science forward[22]. Although it is true that a relationship of trust between producer and user of scientific knowledge is a very prominent KU studies' factor for promoting the use of research in policy-making, there is a clear *difference in perspective on what is the key-issue* at hand. KU studies focus on what influences the make-up of *knowledge exchange* between the interaction partners, while interdisciplinarity studies focus on what determines the *relationship* of the interaction partners. KU studies are about the *effects* of a faulty relationship, Interdisciplinarity studies are about their *cause*.

A new perspective: from utilisation to relationship

Benchmarking the interaction between research and policy against the interaction between disciplines thus delivers a new metaphor for the interface of research and policy. We were stuck with a prism on two worlds divided by a wide and deep chasm trying to figure out how to get more of the commodities produced in one world used in the other. We now have a prism on two worlds communicating with each other, trying to figure out how to improve their relationship. The new metaphor makes a difference because it brings new problem-solving interventions into the picture. For examples, multidisciplinary settings within the business world are the best benchmarks. Box 4 describes the tool of process facilitation. When I came across it, it struck me as significant that I had never encountered any readiness to admit to a possible need for process facilitation at the research-policy interface, while the market of multidisciplinary interfaces within the corporate world sustains a whole sector of consultancy businesses specialised in facilitation techniques. It may not be the, or even a good solution to many of the relational problems that pester the research-policy linkage situation, but it

definitely seems worth a try.

Box 4: *Facilitating a product developing team*[23]
'In the summer of 1997 Vrumona, the soft drinks producer of the Heineken corporation, organised a two-day brainstorm session to generate ideas for new products. One of the resulting ideas is a drink for the modern and awareness-oriented adult, with ingredients that go along with the human biorhythm and improve balance and vitality.... In November, the management gives the 'biorhythm' project team the go-ahead to develop the new soft drink. It takes project leader Haarsma and his team a year and around 450.000 Euro to create 'Xi'.
Haarsma considers his multidisciplinary project team essential for the product's success. It consists of a brand manager, a technological product innovator, a logistic expert, a purchasing agent and account managers for the household market and the catering industry.
"Before, the marketeer studied the consumer market and told the technologist what kind of drink he needed. But the product innovator should be directly involved in the market research because he is much more knowledgeable about tastes.With all different disciplines combined it is easier to make the right decisions, but it asks a lot of the members of one's team".
That is why the biorhythm team gets an external mediator to facilitate the group interaction. She confronts team members with communicative habits, like continuously interrupting others, that block smooth interaction and intervenes when discussions are non-productive or collaboration runs into rough waters'.[translation RH]

Thinking in terms of relationship about the linkage situation focusses one's attention on the issue of collaboration. Box 5 gives an inspired description of what real collaboration entails. It is this kind of cooperation that facilitators try to bring about in teams responsible for product development (see box 4), and it is this kind of cooperation that might ensure optimal linkage between research and policy interests.

Box 5: *Cooperation*[24]
'Cooperation is a skill. Before a team can function successfully, several important conditions have to be fulfilled.... an unambiguous, shared aim, the willingness to share responsibility, equal participation, sincerity and trust , and sufficient autonomy for each individual.

Cooperation is also an art, a communicative art... It is the art to deal with the various perspectives existing within a team, and to understand, value and "manage" their interrelationships.

But cooperation is foremost a choice.... Cooperation implies more than knowing what one has to offer and what one takes responsibility for, it also implies knowing what one refrains from, what one leaves to others.... Cooperation means that people are consciously willing to be mutually dependent.

That is why cooperation always has its price: it makes one vulnerable because it draws heavily on trust, on solidarity, and on one's willingness to honour agreements. Cooperation costs time and energy, because one's own input and interest must constantly be tuned to those of others. And cooperation can be boring, because taking radical and extreme positions is curtailed, and strong conflicting needs must be patiently reconciled, for example, the need to individually excell and the need to be part of the team. Cooperation is a quite a task.' (p.206)[translation RH]

I'm pretty sure that the description in box 5 does not match your personal experience with "the other community". I'm also sure that it does not feel very realistic, and many or even most might doubt if it is desirable. But I strongly feel that we should confront the fact that in all kinds of other "interface"settings, teamwork along these idealtypical lines is believed to

produce the best possible outcome. As "best possible outcome" is always going to be dependent upon the total context, and the longer-term nurtering of the collaborative relationships involved, it should not be equated with "maximum use of research results by policy in this particular case". The utilisation and relationship perspectives may lead to very different evaluations of particular cases of research-policy interaction: what is termed a success from one perspective may be labelled a failure from the other, and vice versa.

I believe this new perspective is a real step forward because it enables new evaluations of what is termed successful research-policy interaction and it brings new problem-solving interventions to our attention, whithout loosing sight of the explanatory factors given centre-stage by the gap metaphor.

Cross-national differences

Our survey results made it amply clear that improving the understanding of cross-national differences in the research-policy interface involves more than taking a new viewpoint. What is being looked at must include much more of the context of the interaction setting. To throw in another metaphor: we have to change camera position *and zoom out*. "Context" is a difficult concept. It denotes all that is *not* the phenomenon under scrutinity but nevertheless *relevant* to its understanding. Obviously "what is relevant to its understanding" has to be delimited to be manageable.

Carol Weiss again leads the way as her framework includes "context" and defines it as the issue arena: its amenability to research and evaluation; its degree of political polarisation; the intensity of lobbying from interested parties; and the extent to which research runs counter to the politics of the arena (see Figure 1). Relating these to the process and results of research-policy interaction certainly deepens our understanding. However, our survey results suggest that we need to zoom out much further. It even suggests that the "issue arena" is better conceptualized as an integral part of the linkage situation itself. Comparing linkage experiences across ten European countries a long list[25] of context factors beyond the issue arena appeared to be relevant for understanding particular instances of research-policy interaction: see Box 5.

Box 5: *Context facors for understanding cross-national differences in research-policy interaction*

- Differences in the R&D input between countries
- Type of welfare state
- Political Culture
- Academic Culture
- Policy philosophy for the sector concerned
- The place accorded to science as a knowledge producer by the political and administrative Establishment
- The political belief in rational planning
- The different status assigned to different disciplines
- The research system in a particular sector
- The institutional structure of the policy sector
- Mobility of professionals between sectors and institutional settings
- Historical contingencies

To illustrate the necessity of looking beyond the particular issue arena I will use some examples of differences between European countries that are valid across various issue-

arenas. These examples show how the wider context can be relevant for the understanding of cross-national differences at all levels: the macro-level, the meso-level, and the micro-level.

Understanding macro-level differences: the example of academic culture

Relevance for the understanding of macro-level differences (differences in the overall level or intensity of interaction) can e.g. be illustrated by the context factor "academic culture". Academic culture varies considerably across countries. Johan Galtung's classic essay on itellectual styles, published twenty years ago[26], can still be considered a useful starting point and is described in Box 6.

Box 6: *Diversity in intellectual style*

Johan Galtung characterises four ideal-type intellectual styles according to their profile of differences along four dimensions:

- The extent to which they engage in paradigm analysis;
- The extent to which their descriptions produce propositions;
- The importance attached to theory formation;
- The extent to which commentary on other intellectuals is an important activity;

The resulting matrix of differences between what he calls the Saxonic, Teutonic, Gallic and Nipponic styles is not very informative as such, but his pastiche description of each style is recognisable to those travelling the world academic circuit as valid, albeit close to charicature. Galtung summarises these descriptions by ridicule "...putting down in the shortest possible form the typical question put in the four intellectual styles when somebody is faced with a proposition:"(p.838)

- Saxonic style: how do you operationalise it? (US version), how do you document it? (UK version)
- Teutonic style: wie können Sie das zurückführen/ableiten? (how can you trace this back/deduce it from basic principles?)
- Gallic style: peut-on dire cela en bon français? (is it possible to say this in French?)
- Nipponic style: donatano monka desuka? (who is your master?)

Obviously, particular countries, especially the smaller ones of the periphery, are under the influence of two or even three styles. Also:

"The Saxonic intellectual style will tend to crop up where the computers penetrate [remember that this is a 1981 article! RH] ...Even in the heartland of Teutonia and Gallia computers will find their place and generate myriads of data in search of more interpretation than the theory classes of these countries would ever be able to produce. As a consequence dataoriented sub-cultures will emerge,.., giving the entire intellectual system a somewhat schizophrenic character. What comes out of this in the long term remains to be seen; but it may be a Saxonic Trojan horse.... But all that is on the surface of the world. Underneath the styles will live on: the teutons will continue to be irritated when the gauls become too lyrical,.., and the gauls will continue to be bored by teutonic pedantry... Some of them will learn from the others what they do not master themselves, but by and large, what is the virtue of the one will continue to be the vice of the other"(p.849).

Galtung himself hinted at the importance of intellectual styles for understanding the relationship between research and policy when arguing that the saxonic style - rich in documentation and very meagre in theory, rich in formal language and poor in elegancy - fits the exigencies of political bureaucracies:

"...There is a need if not for consensus at least for a basis on which gentlemen can argue. The saxonic intellectual style produces such a basis. At the same time it reinforces the distinction between professionals of the [bureaucracy] and the outside consultants on the one hand delivering the raw material for the debate, and the governing bodies...picking what they want, putting it in their various thought systems with build-in polarisations..."(p.849).

This means that countries characterised by a style less congruent with policy needs would also be characterised by less interaction between the research and policy worlds. Box 7 illustrates this with a comparison between Teutonic Germany and more Saxon-oriented Netherlands.

Box 7: *Germany and the Teutonic style*[27]
"The link between the social sciences... and policy is much stronger in the Netherlands than in Germany. German social scientists are more theoretically oriented and do not have much interest in policy-oriented and therefore often theoretically less interesting research. Similarly, the portfolio of contract research of German ministries [compared to that of Dutch ministries] is much smaller and when they fund research it is hardly ever at universities. Both orientations strengthen each other. Ministries do not offer contracts because they think professors are not interested, or are unable to deliver. And researchers do not go out of their way to bag contracts. Also because the volume of fundamental research funds - Forschungsgemeinschaft, Volkswagenstiftung, Thyssenstiftung, etc. - is much larger and less difficult to tap. As a result, contact opportunities that could lead to an advisory relationship are scarce" [p. 15, translation RH].

Germany is classified by van Waarden as the country that has the most formidable barriers on the road to tenured professorships. The status accorded to the position (and its host organisation the university) befit those difficulties; it is very high. The barriers create a work habitus that is difficult to reconcile with the practical needs of outsiders:

"A typical German dissertation contains a summary of more than 100 pages of relevant theoretical literature... The fear of forgetting an important author or approach is great...this fear is grounded because the dissertation is going to be judged by promotors and other professors on its exhaustiveness. In this way a habitus of perfectionism is confirmed and reproduced in the process of academic socialisation" (van Waarden, p.12).

And professors are very much in charge; only *they* are taken seriously, within their own circles at least. Academia is a relatively self-referentially closed national domestic discourse.
The difficulty to create linkages with "outsiders" do not limit themselves to policy but also to international colleagues. That charateristic is shared, by the way, with other "larger-medium-sized" nations like France and Japan.

An indicator of both the social status and the inward-looking character of the German university sector is that "...something like a consequent evaluation system is still not extant and is still not applied for Germany's university research"[28]. In other countries, such as the UK, a tight feedback linkage between evaluation and funding have been established.

Understanding meso-level differences: the example of social experiments
Relevance for the understanding of meso-level differences (differences in the prefered or possible interaction modalities) can be illustrated by the context factor "type of welfare state". The Canadian social experiment on strategies to make work pay, described in Box 8, was presented at the earlier mentioned UNESCO/MOST conference. All present immediately accepted it as a very important linkage modality. However, those from North-Western

continental Europe unanimously judged such social experiments as being unimaginable within their own national context, at least not in the short term. The project described in box 7 may not be from the migration and integration issue-arena, but I'm sure that anyone familiar with the Dutch, German, or French academic and policy "scene" will agree with me that this judgement is issue-arena independant[29]. However, it is difficult to pin that intuition down to a particular cross-national difference, at least to anything more specific than Canada representing a very different type of Welfare state (in the Esping-Anderson meaning of term[30]) than those of North-Western Europe[31]. Context in the broadest sense of the word may thus be a major explanatory variable for the presence or absence of a particular linkage modality.

Box 8: *A Canadian social experiment on strategies to make work pay*
dr. John Greenwood, executive director Social Research & demonstration Corporation, Ottawa (taken from case study paper *Policy research and social policy development: an illustration from Canada*).

[Welfare policy] involves making a trade-off between putting money into hands of poor families versus encouraging self-sufficiency through work….[there is an] increasingly prevalent view that welfare has become part of the problem, not part of the solution.…As in many other countries, the principle preoccupation in seeking to reform welfare policy in Canada has been how to design a new social safety net around work - i.e.,…"work-based" welfare reform initiatives….

In 1991, the Canadian federal employment department…encouraged the creation of a non-profit social policy research organization specifically to conduct a large-scale, long-term social experiment. At that time, a few senior government officials had a policy interest in examining a work-conditioned income guarantee as a way of both fighting poverty and of encouraging more employment among welfare recipients….Linking the income trasfer to employment could both increase work efforts and raise incomes…
Because any financial incentive programme was potentially very expensive, the prevailing view was that it should be carefully tested first. In adition, since the policy was bound to be controversial, its backers wanted a "state-of-the-art". The goal was to produce results that would be irrefutable; discussions could then focus on the policy implications of the project's findings, rather than on questions concerning evaluation methodology. Consequently, the decision was taken to use a random assignment evaluation design - widely regarded as the most reliable way to measure program impacts…
Finally, as the project got underway, it was decided that in order to more fully exploit the opportunity afforded by the experiment, it should not only address the basic policy questions concerning the use of a financial incentive. It should also try to assess the incremental impact of offering the incentive in combination with employment services and try to learn something about the potential for such programs to produce an entry effect.

Eventually this resulted in a very ambitious project, which became known as the Self-Sufficiency Project (SSP) - a project with a budget of $70 million, that would enroll almost 9,000 single parents in receipt of welfare payments in two provinces and randomly assign them to three separate research samples, and that ultimately will last ten years before the scheduled research is complete. The organization that was set up to design, operate and evaluate this experiment is the Social Research and Demonstration Corporation. SRDC was established as a not-for-profit corporation at arms-length from government, but receiving government funds to conduct the experiment….

After four years of implementation activity, SSP began to produce results. And while the research is still continuing, the employment results achieved so far are among the largest of any welfare-to-work program that has been rigourously evaluated….In Canada, one province has already implemented an earnings supplement program, even though final results from SSP are not in yet….Not unreasonably, there were concerns over the applicability of SSP's results to a different type of client operating within the context of a different type of transfer program. Consequently, a second social experiment was

initiated - Earnings Supplement Program. ESP tested a different type of financial incentive with two groups of applicants for unemployment insurance benefits. It enrolled more than 11,000 participants at nine locations across the country. The results of this second experiment showed that that program had either no impact…or a small and short-lived impact on labour market behaviour…In the face of these "negative" findings, no [alternative] earnings supplementation programs have so far been developed….

Hope, intuition and political expediency all continue to play a larger role in the development of new policies and programs than do research findings….However, our experience does demonstrate that research can play an influential role in the development of policy. Why did it occur in this instance? There are, I think, a number of factors that were important.

First, there were influential "champions" - a few key individuals in senior positions who had an interest in a particular issue and were willing to support a major research initiative to explore it. Second, the issue was somewhat controversial….Many client advocacy organizations were firmly of the view that this type of intervention could not be helpful….Third, a new source of funds for research had been established, funds that were earmarked specifically for rigourously conducted policy-relevant research. Research projects did not face competition from other uses in accessing funds from this source, nor was it necessary to divert funds from program budgets to finance research….Fourth, an institution was set up, arms-length from government with a mandate to conduct long-term policy research on issues that would be identified from time to time by government.

Understanding micro-level differences: the example of sectoral policy philosophy

Context factors can also be relevant to understanding differences at the micro-level, f.e. to explain why particular projects, take different shapes in different national contexts. The discussion in box 9 illustrates such micro-level influence for the context factor "policy philosophy for the sector concerned". It also shows that that context factors enrich an explanation but are often difficult to conceptualise as simple causal determinants.

Box 9: *Labelling and political correctness in surveys*[32]

"It is almost a truism to observe....that the French disinclination to recognise 'minorities' contrasts sharply with the Dutch acceptance of cultural difference, Scandinavian and British pragmatism and German exclusionary concepts of societal membership.... Perhaps the most extreme divergence of view on how issues of migration and integration should be approached is that between the 'Anglo-Saxon' model and that derived from the principles of *citoyenneté* enshrined in the French Republican model. This is not the place to explore the underlying philosophies that inform these perspectives; suffice it to say that whereas the former has found it possible to use social constructions such as 'race' in census returns, the latter has always eschewed such labels on the grounds that they are potentially divisive.

In fact, close inspection shows that as far as Europe is concerned, actual practices are more temporal than fundamental. For example, in the UK census of 1981 a question was included on birthplace and parental birthplace. Ethnic descent was then inferred from this proxy variable. Later, after heated and often acrimonious debate, a so-called 'ethnic question' was included in the census of 1991 and will be repeated in 2001 (with some minor amendments). In France, it is now not uncommon for surveys to include similar questions to those included in British censuses and surveys during the early years of migrant settlement (Silberman and Fournier, 1998).[33] For example, the *Formation Qualification Professionelle* survey of 1985 (and repeated on a smaller scale in 1993) contains data on naturalisations, thereby enabling foreign-born populations to be identified. Later surveys (such as the EVA survey in 1993 carried out by the *Centre de Recherche et d'Etudes sur les Qualifications*) contain data on immigrants according to their date of arrival and on children of immigrant parents. Studies in the UK showed that data derived from questions on parental birthplace were well within acceptable error levels when compared with self-assessed ethnic origin data. In other words, the differences between nations may well turn out to be less fundamental than earlier feared. I am certain, for example,

that French survey practice will generate data that are comparable with those in other European counties."

A framework for understanding cross-national differences in the relationship between research and policy[34]

Combining the above described insights about perspective and context results in a more productive and encompassing framework for understanding cross-national differences in the interaction of research and policy. Figure 2 summarises this framework. To make sense of it, it helps to keep in mind that the framework differs in several respects from the Weiss framework of figure 1:

- It rearranges to some extent what is depicted as a *factor* and what is depicted as a *characteristic* of a factor. For example, the Weiss framework has a research factor, that contains both the research itself and the researchers as characteristics (each defined by various second-order characteristics), while the alternative framework for research-policy interaction has research itself as a separate factor and subsumes researchers under the factor called actors;
- It is more elaborate, including (on top of the characteristics already mentioned in the Weiss framework) additional factor characteristics that showed up in our survey as facilitators for a good relationship[35];

However, the above differences do not change the fact that the new model may equally be used to frame the utilisation of research results (if the factor use is taken out of the model one is left with a differently ordered, more elaborate variant of the Weiss framework). To put it in somewhat grandiose terms, the alternative framework does what new "paradigms" are supposed to do: explain whatever the old way of looking at things did, *and* more[36].

INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE

For any framework of understanding, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. This means that our proposal will have to prove itself in future applications to cases of research policy interaction. To give an indication of how various factors (might) interact with each and co-determine the relationship between the research, policy and other stakeholders, I add a rump description of how we envision its network of interdependencies to look like.

The actors

There are three main actors involved in the interaction:

- the researcher(s)
- the politician(s)
- the civil servant(s)
-

These actors can play various *roles*. To name only a few that researchers can play:

- the role of the hired producer of policy-relevant knowledge (new research);
- the role of hired summariser of policy-relevant knowledge (state of the art);
- the role of independent critic of policy assumptions;
- the role of expert advisor in policy development;

These roles are bound by general *rules*, for example the civil service is subordinate to politics. These roles are also characterised by general *interests*, for example. civil servants need

problem definitions and solutions that are politically acceptable. These rules and interests do not prevent (and sometimes actively induce) *tensions* between the actors. Often the interaction is not limited to these main actors. Other potentially relevant actors are:

- interest groups
- other intermediaries like think tanks
- the media

Also these roles have rules and interests attached to them.

The issue-arena

The characteristics of the issue-arena can be broken down into three categories:

- Characteristics that influence the extent to which research is a regular source of knowledge-input for policy: the amenability of the issue to research and evalution (one might consider this something close to a context factor).
- Characteristics that are interdependent with only one other factor of the framework: degree of political polarisation, intensity of lobbying from interested parties and the extent to which research runs counter to the politics of the arena. These are all characteristics that may hinder or promote the use of research and are therefore central to the conceptualisation that focuses on utilisation; they are more marginal from the perspective of understanding the relationship.
- Characteristics that are interdependent with many other factors of the framework and are therefore part of the heart of the network of interdependencies that frames the relationship between research and policy, called the *policy cycle*

The Policy cycle can be divided into four *phases*[37]:

- the phase of problem definition
- the phase of policy formulation
- the phase of policy implementation
- the phase of established policy

Generally speaking, it is the case that the rules followed, the (competing) interests of, and the negotiating positions of the three main actors mentioned above vary across policy phases. Moreover, the purposes and uses served by research in the policy process differ across these phases. Usually, all of the mentioned phase differences co-exist; for example, when policy makers look for help in coming to grips with an intangible problem, field researchers are often given carte blanche, the purpose their input serves is often conceptual, and their work may be very influential in setting the (policy)agenda. On the other hand, when established policy is to be evaluated, researchers are usually recruited on the basis of very detailled terms of reference, the assumptions underlying the policy are not expected to be questioned, and the results of the evaluation do not normally influence policy.

Research

The characteristics of the research parameter can be divided into two categories:

- Characteristics that are interdependent with only one other factor of the framework: good versus bad methodological quality, quantitative versus qualitative, and meta-analyses/reviews versus single studies. These are all characteristics that may hinder or promote the use of research and are therefore central to the conceptualisation that focuses on utilisation; from the perspective of understanding the relationship they are more marginal. To a certain extent, quantitative versus qualitative has context factor

characteristics too. The meta-analyses/reviews versus single studies has an internal interdependency link with the characteristic 'purpose of research' that is dealt with below.
- Characteristics that have interdependency links with two other factors: research versus advice is connected with actor characteristics and with the instruments factor.
- Characteristics that are interdependent with many other factors of the framework and therefore are part of the heart of the network of interdependencies that frames the relationship between research and policy: the *purpose of research*.

Research can serve various purposes in relation to policy:
- it can provide (input for) the basic assumptions and concepts for policy in a particular field to be regulated or with regard to a particular problem to be solved;
- it can provide (input for) the actual development of policy;
- it can provide (input for) the development and/or choice of instruments for policy implementation;
- it can provide (input for) the monitoring and evaluation of policy.

Phases of the policy cycle and different purposes of research are linked; basic assumptions and concepts are most important in the problem definition phase and least asked for when a particular field is regulated by an established policy, etc.

The use
A last, yet crucial factor in the framework is the use that is made of scientific knowledge and/or concepts.
The traditional dichotomy, common in utilisation research, is:
- instrumental use ("engineering"; direct use, practical solution to practical problems)
- conceptual use ("enlightment"; indirect use, knowledge "creep")

Both types of "use" presuppose that science plays an active role with policy as the passive recipient. However, the recipient, often academically trained, normally does something with or to the knowledge; it is translated or transformed into knowledge that can be applied in practice:
- transformation use

Four common transformations are:
- selective use of scientific results or concepts;
- fitting scientific results or concepts into existing organisational practice (re-labelling of those practices);
- specification of scientific results or concepts to fit ideosyncratic circumstances;
- rewriting of scientific results or concepts.

The essence of this perspective is that (policy) users do not *apply* scientific knowledge but actively *co-produce* it.

With respect to the two factors, not yet addressed, the relevant characteristics of *instruments to link research and policy* were distilled from our survey material and are not elaborated upon in this article. And *context* has been dealt with earlier.

Epilogue

So far, I pride myself on having presented a straightforward argument: a problem description, followed by a problem analysis, a presentation of the methodology used to discover a solution, and the the solution discovered. However, for the sake of streamlining the argument, I have left things out that should not be left unmentioned. Someone with rhetorical skills superior to mine would have undoubtably managed to include the following three caveats in the main storyline. Therefore, their place in an epilogue should not be misinterpreted as signalling minor importance.

First, there is a caveat about the generalisability of the new framework. The context factor of the democratic content of the society involved cannot be framed in the same manner as the other context factors because it underlies the framework as a whole. The framework represents research-policy interaction in open democratic contexts in which authorities are constraint by their public accountablity and governance is based upon consensual agreement. The least one can expect is that the roles actors can play are bound by rules and interests different from those prevalent in democratic contexts. This does not imply that the framework is of little value for discussing research-policy linkages in societies without a democratic culture of public accountability. However, it *does* imply that one should be aware of this underlying assumption when applying it to other settings. And third world contexts would certainly ask for separate attention.

Next there is a caveat about the importance the research-policy axis, in the light of the total constellation of stakeholders in the issue-arena. True, all stakeholders are part of the framework (see figure 2) but the dominance of the major axis often impedes the definition of the model of linkage as really including the others, especially the target group(s) or the victim(s) of the policy concerned. On top of that, the issue-arena of interest to the readership of this Journal, migration and integration issues, is particular in a sense that aggravates the consequences of neglecting the voice of the other stakeholders. With respect to this arena, the majority rule bottom line of liberal democracies, the major premisse that guides the role of politicians (and civil servants), is seriously conditioned. The targetgroups of migration and integration policies are mostly absent from that majority. These groups are therefore all the more dependent upon the implicit understanding that publicly accountable decision-makers should "…actively collect, scrutinize and weigh all relevant arguments before taking decisions, and … reconsider earlier decisions if new relevant arguments or data come forward" (Penninx, 2000). Rinus Penninx statement in box 9 sums why focussing on ways to improve the relationship between research, policy *and* stakeholders is so important in this policy-arena.

Box 9: *Research, Policy and Stakeholders: rules of the game*[38]

[T]he quality of democracy can best be measured by the extent to which the public debate is systematically used as an instrument to reach "consensus" or "compromise" among different interest groups. In our case this "quality rule of the game democracy" is all the more important, since in our domain of research and policies we focus heavily on the position of newcomers in large cities: groups that are often relatively small in numbers, groups that often have limited ways and means to express their interests effectively in the political system, and groups whose interest are not necessarily reflected in the political and institutional infrastructure of their new place of arrival, because that structure has been the outcome of the earlier political struggle of established groups in that particular society. Too early and too much application of the last ressort of democracy - majority rule - may thus have perverse effects on minority

groups; a danger which is all the more prominent, since we know that in the present situation of big cities significant immigration is the rule and will be the rule in the future…

It is from this conception of quality of democracy and governance and the role of public debate therein that the specific role of researchers and stakeholders - in this case representatives of the target groups of that policies: immigrants - can in principle be derived: scientists and immigrant organizations can contribute significantly to the quality of the public debate by delivering sound and adequate problem definitions, by collecting and publishing high quality information, by making clear what immigrants themselves are able and willing to contribute, but also by indicating possible unintended consequences of policies etc. Briefly: by bringing in ideas, analysis and facts. One could even say - and some political theorists do so - that researchers and stake holders as "responsible citizens" have an obligation to contribute to the quality of the public debate, just as politicians have the obligation to collect and weigh arguments before taking decisions.

The last topic to be addressed in this epilogue is the role of our survey instrument in the development of a new metaphor for, or perspective on the research-policy interface. In the introduction I mentioned that many interviewees did not seem to evaluate linkage (solely or mainly) in terms of the use of research results. To properly understand the implications of this finding it is important to ponder the fact that the focus of our interviews was on linkage experiences that worked. Sure, we talked about *use* too but the phrasing of our questions invited our respondents to talk about satisfaction with *linkage experiences*. The methodological background of this approach is that we could not claim our unit of analysis to consist of in-depth case-studies of linkage practices. That is to say, we gathered information about many different cases with the aim to discover lines of variation and aspects of similarity. But we lacked (in most instances) the detailed, objectively validated information that would be necessary to determine if, to what extent, and in what way, direct use was made of research in problem definition, policy development, implementation or evaluation. The effect of our probing for satisfaction, *whatever its cause*, and not limiting the conversation to the "efficiency" aspect of linkage (use or utility of research results), was that its "relational" aspect became much more prominent.

I doubt if familiarising myself with the discourse in related fields like interdisciplinarity studies *alone* would have made me "see" the relationship metaphor. The fact that our interviewees had been talking so much "relationship", and the new perspective was thus literally staring me in the face, certainly was an important factor. I conjecture that the decade-long stalemate in KU studies is related to the "one tends to find what one is looking for", illustrated by the above. KU studies being about *use*, means that its instruments are designed for collecting information about *use*. Although these instruments show the importance of a relationship of mutual trust and actual collaboration in the research process (see Box 2), they produce results that underestimate its full impact. In the introduction I stated that we got something quite *different* than we had expected originally. It is equally true to say that we got a lot *more* than we had expected. The fact that our instrument took an approach, differentfrom the KU standard, was clearly due to its cross-national ambitions. For me this is a beautiful illustration of the potential and often unpredictable added value of internationally comparative research.

References

Campbell, D.F.J. & B. Felderer (1997) *Evaluating Academic Research in Germany; Patterns and policies*, Wien: Institut für Höhere Studien (IHS).

Caplan, N. (1979) The two communities theory and knowledge utilization. *American Behavioural Scientist*, 459-470.

Caplan, N., Morrsion, A. & Stambough, R. (1975) *The use of social science knowledge in policy decisions at the national level*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Cross, M. (1998) *Research within Metropolis: an Agenda for Action* paper prepared for the 3rd international Metropolis conference, Zichron Yaacov, Israel.

Cross, M., Henke, R., Oberknezev, P. & Pouliasi, K. (2000) *Building bridges. Towards effective means of linking scientific research and public policy: Migrants in European cities*. Utrecht: AWSB research papers 99/07, p.177. www.international.metropolis.net/research-policy/ercomer/metropolis_rp99_07.pdf

Cunningham, R. (1999) *Interdisciplinarity and the Organisation of Knowledge in Europe.* Luxembourg: EC.

Danko, Q. (2000) Kom met een nieuw product. [come with a new product] *Intermediair*, 4, p.21.

Esping-Andersen, G. (1990) *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*. Cambridge: CUP.

Galtung, J. (1981) Structure, culture, and intellectual style: An essay comparing saxonic, teutonic, gallic and nipponic approaches. *Social Science Information* (Sage), 20 (6), p. 817-856.

Groen, R. (1998) Teamrolmanagement in Nederland. In: Belbin, R., M. *Mangement teams: over succes en faalfactoren voor teams*. [Management teams: factors for success and failure] Academic Service.

Henke, R. (2000) *Final report International UNESCO/MOST conference on Social Science and Governance*, 20-21 March. http://www.unesco.org/most/scspconf.htm

Henke R. (2001) *Funding possibilities for ex ante designed internationally comparative empirical research* Report prepared for the Research Board of Metropolis International (in Press)

Kemper, F. (1998) *Research and Policy Research in the Netherlands*, paper presented at the 14th ISA conference, session on Policy Making and Applied Sociology.

Morgan, G. (1986) *Images of organisation*. Beverly Hills etc.: Sage.

Mudimbe, V.Y. & B. Jewsiewicki (eds.) (1996) *Open the Social Sciences, report of the Gulbenkian Commision on the restructuring of the Social Sciences,* Stanford, California: S.U.P.

Penninx, R. (1988) Wie betaalt, bepaalt? De ontwikkeling en programmering van onderzoek naar migranten, etnische minderheden en woonwagenbewoners, 1955-1985, met speciale aandacht voor de rol, van de overheid. [Does the one who pays decide? Programming and development of research on migrants, ethnic minorities and caravan dwellers, 1955-1985, with a focus on the role of government] *Amsterdamse sociaal-geografische studies*, 13.

Penninx, R. (1992) *Wie betaalt en wie bepaalt? Onderzoeksbeleid van de overheid m.b.t. minderheden en de invloed van onderzoek op beleid.* [Who pays and who decides? Government policy on research about minorities and the influence of research on policy] The Hague: Home Ministry.

Penninx, R. (1998). Over machtsverhoudingen tussen politiek, beleid en onderzoek; de casus van minderhedenstudies en -beleid. [Power relations between politics, administration and research; the case of research and policy on minorities] *Sociale Interventie*, 7(4), p.175-181.

Penninx, R. (2000) *Research, policy and stakeholders: rules and tools of the game*. Paper for the UNESCO/MOST conference on Social science and governance, 20/21 March

Snel, E. (1996) *De vertaling van wetenschap; Nederlandse sociologie in praktijk*, [The translation of science: Dutch sociology in practice] Utrecht: SWP

Snel, E. (1996a) Voorbij 'engineering' en 'enlightment'. Nieuwe visies op het theorie-praktijk probleem in de sociologie. [Beyond 'engineering'and 'enlightment'. New visions on the problem of theory and practice in sociology] *Beleid&Maatschappij*, 3, p. 109-120.

Van Waarden, F. (1996b) Instituties en internationale mobiliteit; een vergelijking van wetenschappelijke banenmarkten en carrierepatronen in Duitsland, Oostenrijk, Engeland, de USA, Belgie en Nederland. [Institutions and international mobility; labourmarkets and careerpatterns of scientists in Germany, Austria, England, the USA, Belgium and the Netherlands] *AWSB working papers* 96/03.

Weiss, C. (1999) *Factors that improve the use of research in social policy, case studies: research design on behalf of the UNESCO/MOST programme* (unpublished)

[1] The results are reported in Cross, Henke, Oberknezev & Pouliasi, 2000.

[2] If anyone can reflect with authority on issues of research/policy linkage it is professor Carol Weiss (Harvard Graduate School for Education). She has authored various classics such as *Using social research in public policy making*, Mass: Lexington Heath, 1977, and (with Bucuvalas) *Social science research and decision making*, NY (etc.): Columbia UP, 1980.

[3] See note 4.

[4] For more information on this programme in general, see: www.unesco.org/most/ ; for more information on the research design, see: Cross, Henke, Oberknezev & Pouliasi, 2000.

[5] This framework includes several what I call *factors*, the components of the linkage issue that need to be addressed in any sensible description of a particular case, and factors are either divided into several *types* or are described in terms of several relevant *characteristics.* Both the types and the characteristics are the distillation of 25 years of KU studies.

[6] See note 4.

[7] This description can be regarded as the one defining the field of KU studies. See: Caplan, N., Morrsion, A. & Stambough, R. 1975, and Caplan, N., 1979.

[8] This summary is based on Kemper , 1998.

[9] For an overview, see the summary of Carol Weiss'presentation in Henke, 2000.

[10] See Henke, 2000.

[11] Adapted from Henke (2000) Final report International Conference on Social Science and Governance: http://www.unesco.org/most/scspconfreport.pdf

[12] E.g. see the presentation of the Evaluation Utilization Project of the International Evaluation Research Group: www.c3e.fr/inteval/progress.htm

[13] The overarching aim of this group – chaired by dr. Ray Rist of the World Bank - is to enhance the utilization of evaluation in the public sector by means of internationally comparative research on the theory and practice of policy evaluation, in relation to other instruments of internal and external public management. Over fifteen years, the research group has accumulated an impressive and acknowledgeable material on evaluation theory and practice across the world. Research results usually take the form of co-edited books, most of them being part of the Comparative Policy Analysis Series (Transaction Publishers). See: http://www.c3e.fr/inteval

[14] See note 12.

[15] This material is taken from Morgan, 1986.

[16] Applying a theory developed in one discipline to the phenomena studied by another.

[17] This term is normally applied to comparisons of the performance a particular organisation to that of others in the same line of business, often the one(s) most successful. Another, more recent application popular at EU level, are comparisons between the performances of countries on particular indicators.

[18] Fields most congenial are those that seem to be addressing phenomena similar to those that dominate the discourse within one's own field.

[19] This is not to claim that government and private sector are identical to each other in all respects. The private sector is ruled by the "market", public administration is ruled by the "budget". Party politics are particular to

government, as are the guiding concepts of legitimacy and public accountability (analysis borrowed from an interview with Marjan Smit *De BV Nederland? Onzin!*, Intermediair,2 , 2000.
[20] Cross, Henke, Oberknezev & Pouliasi, chapter 2.4. gives several other examples: (interorganisational) networks, development projects, and management.
[21] This separation has a long intellectual history.
[22] Two relevant publications are Mudimbe & Jewsiewicki, 1996, and Cunningham, 1999.
[23] Danko, 2000.
[24] Groen, 1998.
[25] I do not consider this list, extensive as it may be, to be exhaustive. It is based on one survey only.
[26] Galtung, 1981.
[27] Based on van Waarden, 1996.
[28] Campbell, D. & Felderer, B. 1997.
[29] Two remarks are warranted. In the first place the US and not Canada is known as the idealtype haven for social experiment type ex ante designed policy intervention evaluations. The adoption of this evaluation modality by the Canadian policy world is of recent times, while the US have a 20-year history of using it. Secondly, the intuition apparent among the audience of the conference is in line with European reality. A review by the Evaluation of Labour Market Policies and Project programme of the German Institute for the Study of Labour (ZEF, directed by prof. dr. Klaus Zimmerman, well-known within the migration and integration research field) concluded f.e. "most strikingly, social experiments are practically non-existent in Europe, even though experiments contributed a large share of the most reliable empirical evidence on the effectiveness of North American labor market programs" (IZA Compact, 2000, p.2)

[30] Esping-Andersen, 1990.
[31] The review mentioned in note 29 explains the difference between the US and contentinental Europe in the following terms: "A distrust deeply rooted in the North American society toward all government action, combined with a strong emphasis on the principle of individual responsibility, renders it virtually impossible to implement labor market programs without an evaluation by independent experts…in many European countries…this field of research is still in its infancy " (p.2).
[32] The text of this paragraph is taken from Cross, 1998; for references, see the original.

[33] Silberman and Fournier note, for example, that the relative absence of studies on education and labour market performance amongst migrant descended populations is '...more a lack of questions than a shortage of data...' (Silberman, R., Fournier, I.,1998, *Educational attainment and unemployment for immigrants' children in France: an investigation of the discrimination hypothesis.* Unpublished paper presented tot the 3rd MigCities conference, Milan, november, p.3).
[34] Apart from Carol Weiss, our thinking on this conceptual framework has greatly profited from discussions with prof.dr. Rinus Penninx, director of the Institute of Migration Studies of the University of Amsterdam (formerly employed by the Dutch department that was - at that time - responsible for migration and integration policy), and dr. Erik Snel, Erasmus University, Rotterdam. Both have also written on the relationship between research and policy (see also Penninx, 1988, 1992, 1998, and Snel, 1996a and 1996b).
[35] See: Cross, Henke, Oberknezev & Pouliasi, 2000.
[36] Another, but equally partial equivalent to the relationship between the Weiss framework and ours is the understanding of the *structure of the relationships* between attitudes that might result from an internationally comparative survey based on purposive samples and the understanding of the *cross-national differences in absolute levels* of these relationships that might result from representative samples. See: Henke 2001, *Box 12: The ICSEY and ISATIS projects*.
[37] Various authors label the phases slightly differently and/or distinguish three or five phases; however, the gist of all these phase-models is the same.
[38] From Penninx, 2000.