

Title of proposal: Closing the Circle: Research and Policymaking in Education

Authors(s) of proposal, affiliations and corresponding author email address.

Authors: Iftimescu, Simona;¹ Ion, Georgeta;² Proteasa, Carmen¹; Iucu, Romiță¹, Marin, Elena¹; Stîngu, Mihaela¹

¹University of Bucharest, Romania

² Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain

E-mail corresponding author: simona.iftimescu@fpse.unibuc.ro

Keywords: research mobilisation, educational research, policymaking.

Words: 5805 (not including the abstract, the tables and the bibliography)

Sub-theme: 3. Innovation in learning and teaching, strengthening EHEA-ERA cooperation

Acknowledgement:

The paper derives from a research project funded by the Romanian National Authority for Scientific Research and Innovation, CNCS – UEFISCDI, project number PN-II-RU-TE-2014-4-1605.

Authors' bio:

Simona Iftimescu (corresponding author)

PhD, Lecturer

Simona Iftimescu is a lecturer at the Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, University of Bucharest, and Secretary General of the Romanian Educational Research Association. Simona's research interests comprise policy analysis and development, higher education and particularly the Bologna Process implementation, graduate employability, as well as teacher training.

E-mail: simona.iftimescu@fpse.unibuc.ro

Carmen Proteasa

PhD candidate

Carmen Proteasa is currently completing her doctoral studies in Educational Sciences at the Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, the University of Bucharest. Carmen is involved in several projects, ranging from teaching, to teacher and school management training and development and her research interests focus on knowledge transfer and policymaking in education.

E-mail: carmen.proteasa@gmail.com

Georgeta Ion

PhD, Associate professor

Georgeta Ion is an associate professor at the Department of Applied Pedagogy, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB), Spain. Georgeta does research in Educational Management, Higher Education and Evidence based practices. She is currently working on a project related to the use of research in school practices and assessment strategies for self-regulated learning.

E-mail: georgeta.ion@uab.cat

Romiță Iucu

PhD, Professor

Romiță Iucu is a professor at the Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences and Vice-rector of the University of Bucharest. He is a member of The International Hall of Fame of Adult and Continuing Education, of ENTEP – European Network for Teacher Education Policies, an expert of the European Commission and one of Romania's representatives in the BFUG – Bologna Follow-up Group until 2017. He specializes in educational policies, teacher training and development, and management in the field of higher education.

E-mail: romita.iucu@unibuc.ro

Elena Marin

PhD, Lecturer

Elena Marin is currently lecturer at the Department of Educational Sciences, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, the University of Bucharest, Romania, also collaborating with other universities in Europe and with educational institutions at a national level. Elena's research interests range from the social dimensions of higher education to teacher training, with a particular focus on inclusion.

E-mail: elena.marin@fpse.unibuc.ro

Mihaela Stîngu

PhD, Lecturer

Mihaela Stîngu is currently lecturer at the Department of Educational Sciences, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences and coordinator of the Centre for Development and Training in Higher Education, the University of Bucharest, Romania. Mihaela's research interests focus around impact of research in the development of educational policies, professional development of teachers and training and development in higher education.

E-mail: mihaela.stingu@fpse.unibuc.ro

Closing the Circle: Research and Policymaking in Education

Iftimescu, Simona¹; Ion, Georgeta²; Proteasa, Carmen¹;

Iucu, Romiță¹; Marin, Elena¹; Stîngu, Mihaela¹

Abstract

Starting from the underlying scope of shaping a more coherent image of the educational system as a whole and arguing for shared responsibility for improving the system between higher education institutions and policymakers, this paper aims to analyse the configuration of factors contributing to research uptake in education. One subsequent objective is to identify mechanisms for developing better synergies not only between educational practice and research, but also between these and educational policy.

The paper relies on results drawn from a survey administered to a selected sample of public servants in the Romanian central administration involved in the planning, evaluation and implementation of public policies in the field of education. The survey covered topics related to the institutional mechanisms of research uptake and utilization (communication and dissemination strategies, clarity, access and availability of research data, policymakers' preferences for certain research topics) and aspects aligned with the perceived relationship between researchers and policymakers (the strength and nature of the relationship, policymakers' general involvement in research studies, etc.).

The findings of our study pave the way for an in-depth analysis of organizational factors likely to affect research utilization: research culture and engagement with researchers; the political and managerial context likely to promote research transfer; and the financial context needed to foster quality results.

Results indicate there is a growing need to enhance the partnerships between policymakers and researchers, focusing on high-quality research, transparency and social responsibility mechanisms.

1 Introduction

The field of evidence-based policy and practice is well known in education. While the factors affecting the uptake of research findings in educational practice have been intensively analysed in the literature (Cain, 2016 among others), few studies have focused on the field of policymaking, especially in countries with less of a tradition for using evidence in policymaking and those that have a weak research culture in public institutions. This study aims to address the factors contributing to research uptake in policymaking from the perspective of public authorities in education.

Some arguments support the role of research in policymaking (e.g., Temple, 2003, Brown, 2017). Levin et al (2011) argue that the research findings represent a critical factor in any innovative change process in education. In addition, Oakley (2000: 3) argues that approaches involving the utilisation of research ensure that 'those who intervene in other people's lives do so with the utmost benefit and least harm'.

Evidence-based practice is a field that has already been explored in depth in health sciences and now is starting to be explored in other fields. For instance, Oxman et al. (2009) point to health systems summarizing the benefits of policy-makers adopting an evidence-informed approach as one that increases the probability of a policy being more effective, equitable and efficient. In contrast, the authors consider that 'poorly informed decision making is one of the reasons why services sometimes fail to reach those most in need (...) and may also contribute to problems related to the effectiveness, efficiency (i.e., value for money), and equity of health systems' (p.1). Along the same lines, but applied to the field of education, the findings of Cordingley (2013) and Mincu (2014) suggest that using research in decision-making is associated with better teaching and learning, schools and systems. Similar relationships have also been found by Sebba et al., (2012) and Godfrey (2014, 2016). Despite the interest around the benefits of research-based approaches in policymaking and practice, 'little effort has gone into understanding how, when, or why research affects education policy', and 'most discussion has focused on how to identify <best practices> or <scientifically based> methods and how to encourage' the use of research findings (Hess, 2008, p.534).

There are many agents involved in the process of research utilisation (in the production process, but also in the use of research findings), and their alignment and its implications have been investigated. This analysis brings into focus some explanatory models, which encapsulate the variety of elements involved in these processes (Landry et al, 2002, Levin, 2013, Brown, 2012 among others) and the role of human resources in supporting them. However, the complexity and the nature of the relationship between research producers and users prevent us from offering a full understanding of the process. While a significant body of literature explores the role of the research production context (Cherney, et al, 2012 among others) and the use of research in practice (Mincu, 2016, Ostelini, 2017 among others), studies exploring the complex context of policymakers are still underdeveloped in the educational field (Gough, 2004, Lavis, 2006, Cain, 2016 among others). For this reason, our research aims to contribute to the understanding of the factors involved in the uptake of research by educational policymakers, namely those involved in central public administration. The study focuses on Romanian educational researchers in higher education institutions (as relevant producers of educational research influencing theoretical development, policy and practice, including teaching and learning) and their relation to policymakers. Also, this is an exploratory study, which investigates perceptions on research in general, without differentiating amongst various methodologies and approaches to research (i.e. action research, fundamental research etc.). In this context, we first analyse the most common models explaining the factors influencing research utilisation. Second, we explore how these factors are shaped by public servants in education in order to explore the emergence of other factors and propose suggestions for how research adoption processes might be

more effectively supported by both researchers, in particular those in higher education, and policymakers.

2 Configuration of factors influencing the research uptake in policymaking

Definitions about evidence-informed policymaking (EIPM) have arisen in the literature in recent years and range from an approach which 'helps people make well informed decisions about policies, programmes and projects by putting the best available evidence at the heart of policy development and implementation' (Davies 1999:124) to understandings more associated with the concept of 'knowledge mobilization' (Cooper, Levin, and Campbell, 2009). The term describes the growing interest in studying the role that evidence plays in the policymaking process, which has been drawing interest for decades beyond the field of education.

However, there is little agreement about what the term EIPM really indicates (Gough, Tripney, Kenny, Buk-Berge, 2011). The extent of what is considered 'evidence' is wide and can include expert knowledge, published research, statistics, stakeholder consultations, previous policy evaluations, other information sources and/or output from economic and statistical modelling. Thus, research is just one source amongst many (Nutley et al. 2009). To these views, Weiser (2016) and Cain (2016) added both personal and professional experience in the construction of knowledge. Independently of what shapes the evidence used by policymakers, one thing is clear: the way it is configured depends on the articulation of different factors linked to individuals, groups and organisations (Ion & Iucu, 2014). Many of these components are directly involved in the process of decision-making: from political priorities, the availability of resources, contextual factors and information such as research, and other forms of evidence (see, for example, Campbell et al. 2007; Davies 2004; Gough 2007; Nutley et al. 2007). Additionally, the relationship between evidence and decision-making is complex and involves not only different factors but also agents. In the model of evidence-informed policy and practice, Levin (2013) proposes three contexts interfering in the utilisation of research: the context of the research production, mediators and research users. Levin (2013) and Tripney, Kenny and Gough (2014) conceptualise educational policymakers as 'end users' of research, although there is a strong case for seeing policymakers as a special case of mediators who can potentially have a strong influence on ensuring that research findings are used in practice. Users function as constructors of knowledge and act in their own setting; they are not just passive recipients of the work of researchers (Levin 2009).

The literature has analysed different explanatory models for evidence-based policy and practice, integrating the different contexts mentioned before. Landry et al (2001) analysed different models in the literature, highlighting their potentials and limitations. The explanatory models of research utilisation cover a wide range of scenarios, and the authors discussed four major alternatives: *the science push model*, *the demand pull model*, *dissemination model* and *the interaction model*. Each one explains only in part the factors contributing to research use. Since we included some of the factors derived from these models in the research design of the present study, we will present a brief review of each one. The science push model puts the emphasis on the role of the researchers and research in focusing on aspects such as the quality and type of research (basic/ applied, general/abstract, qualitative or quantitative, particular or concrete, etc.) and contends that the utilisation process follows a linear sequence from the supply of research findings to utilisation by policymakers and practitioners. The model has been criticised mainly due to two aspects: the transfer of knowledge is not automatic, and raw research information is not usable in policymaking. These aspects encouraged the emergence of the demand pull model, which focuses on the role of the final users (policymakers and practitioners) in research utilisation. In this model, the users become the major source of ideas for policy initiatives (Weiss, 1979, Rich, 1991, among others). Its lack of consideration about the organisational interests of the users led Landry et al (2001) to add this new variable to the model. The model assumes that organisational structures, rules and norms are essential determinants of knowledge utilisation (Rich and Oh, 1993) and that the critical factor causing

the under-utilisation of research findings links to the political interest of users, which may be in conflict with the research data (Landry, et al, 2001). Criticized for its excessive instrumental use of research and for the omission of the role of the interaction between users and knowledge producers, the model led to the emergence of the dissemination model, which described the role of the transfer process as both formal and non-formal. The dissemination model promoted the need to develop dissemination mechanisms to identify useful knowledge and transfer it to users. The model stresses the importance of two determinants: the type of research results and the dissemination effort (Landry et al, 2001). The model's lack of preoccupation with the process of dialogue between producers and users and the gap between the two contexts prompted the appearance of the interaction model (Huberman and Thurler, 1991, Oh, 1997 among others). The variables considered in this model are related to: informal personal contacts, participation in committees and transmission of reports to non-academic organisations (Huberman and Thurler, 1991).

These models have been criticised in recent years due to progress in the field of knowledge utilisation. For instance, Estabrooks et al (2006) and Cooper et al (2009) argue that the variables proposed in the models are not sufficient to explain the complexity and variety of the real situations, scenarios and agents involved in the research utilisation process.

To overcome the limitations of the previous models, Brown (2012) added variables derived from a sociological approach posited by Dowling (2008) known as the *Social Activity Model*. The contribution of this model is the understanding of the knowledge adoption as 'most likely to occur when both researchers and policymakers are actively seeking to engage with one other, employing corresponding strategies to enable this process' (Brown, 2012: 460). This model and its criticisms led to a new configuration of the variables. The alternative is called the 'policy preference model' (Brown, 2012) and is centred on two reasons: on one hand, factors directly related to the evidence to be adopted and to efforts to communicate this evidence; on the other hand, factors that impact how the findings from any given study are likely to be received by its audience. From here, two categories of factors are derived by Brown (2012: 460): internal (the nature of what is being communicated, clarity with regards to its presentation, the efficacy of the communication type and the level of proactivity, contextualisation and tailoring) and external factors (factors inherent to policymakers and which constitute their knowledge 'mould', the perceived credibility of the source of evidence by policymakers, the perceived quality of the evidence by policymakers, general involvement by policymakers in research studies and access to policymakers). To these factors, Brown (2012) added factors linked to the preferences policymakers have for other research topics and the strength and nature of the relationship between the researcher and policymaker (Brown, 2011).

To all these considerations, other several factors that shape the nature of the relationship between researchers and policymakers can be named, such as political, legislative, economic and cultural factors (Nicu, 2013), though the intention is not to focus on the latter aspects.

3 The context of the study

For a better understanding of the national context as a study case, as our study is conducted in Romania, a brief presentation of the policy cycle and the associated factors that shape the policy dimension or the institutions as actors in the process is offered for clarification on the subject. In the Romanian central administration, policy formulation and implementation is organized within the Policy and Programme Coordination Unit, a unit that is part of the General Governmental Secretary organization chart since 2003. In the field of education, the actors involved in defining and implementing national public policies are the Ministry of Education and other categories of actors actively involved at a national level in providing evidence meant to inform the decisions made by the Ministry of Education, such as the Institute of Educational Sciences, the National Council for Curriculum and Evaluation, the National Centre for Evaluation and Examination, the National Centre for Vocational Education Development and the National Agency for Quality Assurance in Education (one agency for higher education and one agency for pre-university education).

Regarding the higher education system, the mechanisms for policy development are sustained by the activity of the Ministry of Education, nine intermediary institutions, three national agencies and 108 public and state universities. It is worth mentioning some of the nine intermediary institutions as actors actively present in the public educational sphere: The National Council for Higher Education Financing, the National Council of Scientific Research and the National Council for Diploma and University Certificates Attestation. Additionally, the Executive Agency for Higher Education, Research, Development and Innovation Funding is an institution that administers the public funds for research projects at the national level. The interconnection among the actors for public policy development in education is made through the Ministry of Education that works together with the above-mentioned national institutions and agencies in order to support, coordinate and evaluate the activity of the public and private institutions involved in the educational system.

The public policy alternatives need to be sustained by arguments that are articulated in studies and analyses offering clear information about the opportunity for solving the social problem, the estimated budget, the estimated impact and evaluation criteria for each alternative, criteria for choosing the recommended alternative to be implemented and the related action plan. However, the Romanian context is especially relevant for situations in which public policy is not coherently structured and regulated by local legislation, leaving its implementation in the hands of both research producers and users.

In this study, we aim to detect and describe the configuration of the main factors that could influence the uptake of research for policymakers. Thus, our research explores the policymakers' perspective, placing it against the different explanatory models for evidence-based policy and practice.

4 Methods

The data comprised in this article are part of a project funded by the Ministry of Education through the Executive Unit for the Financing of Higher Education, Research, Development and Innovation, whose main objective is to analyse the utilisation of educational research in policymaking. The overall study (developed between 2015-2017) used a mixed methodology, comprising two surveys (one of policymakers and another of Romanian higher education academics and researchers), two sets of interviews with academic managers and with a selection of policymakers/experts, as well as of a focus groups with a select group of academics, university managers and policymakers. The current article draws on data gathered solely from one iteration – namely the survey administered to policymakers working in public administration in the field of education.

4.1 Survey structure

Research use was measured through 59 multiple-answer questions on a seven- to five-point scale, built on the policy preference model and its dimensions. These dimensions were considered as variables, related to internal factors linked to the quality and access to research data:

- the nature of what is being communicated
- the clarity with regards to the presentation of research data
- access and availability of data
- factors linked to the preferences of policymakers have for one or other research topic
- different sources of information

and external factors linked to the perceived relationship between policymakers and researchers:

- the perceived quality of the evidence by policymakers
- communication and dissemination
- the strength and nature of the relationship between researchers and policymakers
- policymakers' general involvement in research studies

In addition, two open-ended questions were added, related to:

- factors discouraging and encouraging policymakers to make educational policy decisions based on scientific evidence.

The independent variables used for this particular stage in the project are socio-demographic variables such as the respondents' role in the institution, overall professional experience, professional experience in their current position and the respondents' level of education, aiming to provide a better understanding of the context and particularities of research use at the decision-making level. The data analysis was carried out by clustering the survey items around internal and external factors identified by the model. Then, data were analysed using the weighted average for each item correlated with the independent variables. For the limited purpose of this article, we will focus on the respondents' institutional role in correlation with the above-mentioned internal and external factors.

4.2 Sample

The survey¹ was administered in March 2017 to a self-selected sample of 54 public servants from the main institutions involved in the management of education in Romania. Most of the respondents work at the Ministry of National Education (67%), with 4% employed at the Strategy and Public Policy Unit within the Ministry, 7% at the National Agency for Community Programs for Education and Professional Development, 4% at the Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Pre-University Education and the Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education, respectively, 2% at the Executive Unit for the Financing of Higher Education, Research, Development and Innovation and 12% in other public institutions.

Out of those who responded to the survey, the majority (40%) are experts in their field, while the rest are either in an administrative position (10%), work at an executive level (26%), have a research role (8%), or are in charge of planning (20%) and evaluation (12%) of policies. As 14% have other roles, overall percentages show that some respondents have, or identify with, more than one role within their institution. All the respondents are considered to have a policymaker role, as they are involved, in different capacities, in formulating educational public policies within their particular institutional structure. The majority of the respondents have more than 10 years of experience in their current position (52%), while 8% have worked in their current position for a period of time between 6 and 10 years and 40% reported having worked for 1 to 5 years in their current capacity. Out of the total 54 respondents, all have higher education degrees, with 8.16% having completed a bachelor's degree, 51.02% a master's degree, 38.78% also have a PhD, while 2.04% preferred not to answer this specific question.

5 Results

The results of this study are presented in relation to the respondents' institutional role and follow the identified clusters: internal and external factors influencing the uptake of research by policymakers and factors encouraging or discouraging the policymakers to make educational policy decisions based on scientific evidence. Some data are reflected in corresponding tables, whereas others are presented solely in a narrative form.

5.1 Internal factors influencing the uptake of research by policymakers

When it comes to the internal factors which influence the uptake of research, we will focus on the policymakers' perceptions on the nature and clarity of communication, access and availability of data, on factors linked to their preferences for research topics and on the different sources of information they use.

¹ The survey can be accessed at <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/3SXC225> (in Romanian)

In regard to **the nature of what is being communicated**, respondents appear to focus on, or value more, the practical and applied side of research (M: 4.78) to the detriment of fundamental research, which contributes to the existing theoretical knowledge (M: 4.28), thus the role and contribution of research to the development and progress of knowledge itself appears to be less of a priority. Respondents also place high value on **clarity with regards to the presentation** of what is being communicated, as research results written in a clear language for decision-makers represents one of the factors receiving higher consideration (M: 4.56). The availability of results when a decision has to be made also appears to be an important factor influencing research use (M: 4.62), an aspect that encourages more communication and synchronicity between research and decision-making agendas in order to ensure research is relevant to current issues and readily available for decision-makers.

Statement Role within the institution	Results with direct implications on policies and practices are a priority	The results being readily available when a decision has to be made is a priority	Research results written in a clear language for decision-makers are a priority	Research which contributes to the existing theoretical knowledge are a priority	Impartial results of the research are a priority
Administrative	5	4.8	4.8	4	4.2
Expert in a certain field	4.65	4.5	4.58	4.2	4.7
Executive	4.85	4.69	4.54	4.54	4.46
Documentation/Research	5	4.75	4.75	4.5	3.5
Planning	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.3	4
Evaluation	4.83	4.5	4.33	4.17	3.67
Rating average	4.78	4.62	4.56	4.28	4.08

Table 1. When you want to use results of academic educational research, which aspects do you consider a priority? (On a scale from 1 to 6, where 1 represents 'low priority' and 6 represents 'high priority')

With regards to **access and availability of data**, there are several outliers that could be further discussed. First, it appears the administrative staff tend to agree that the current methods of knowledge dissemination derived from educational research seem adequate (M: 5.00), even though they are least exposed to research results and usage, while by comparison those more directly involved with research are more reserved on this particular topic (an overall average of M: 4.09). This is also reflected in the fact that administrative staff agree that the institution they work with has specific structures that allow access and usage of scientific data, an opinion shared by their colleagues to a lesser extent, as shown in table 2. However, the majority of respondents disagree with the fact that the available resources are sufficient for them to use research data (M: 3.04), which might be a reason why research evidence is not always used when formulating, initiating or evaluating an educational policy initiative (M: 4.35).



Statement Role within the institution	Technology has greatly improved access to scientific evidence	Academic research is independent from the political agenda	I often use research evidence when I formulate/ initiate/ evaluate an educational policy initiative	The current models of knowledge dissemination derived from educational research seem adequate to me	The available resources are sufficient so that we can use research data
Administrative	5.20	4.6	4.20	5	4
Expert in a certain field	5.37	4.5	4.70	3.8	2.75
Executive	5.67	5	4.15	3.75	2.77
Documentation /Research	5.50	5	4.00	3.5	3.25
Planning	5.50	4.4	4.40	4.2	3
Evaluation	5.67	4	4.67	4.33	2.5
Rating average	5.48	4.58	4.35	4.09	3.04

Table 2. Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements (On a scale from 1 to 6, where 1 represents 'complete disagreement' and 6 represents 'complete agreement').

With regards to **the different sources of information** used by policymakers, the majority of respondents agree that technology has significantly improved access to scientific evidence (M: 5.48), and the most relevant sources appear to be national and international statistical databases (M: 5.14) and national agencies' reports (M: 4.92) as shown in table 3. This indicates that policymakers are more familiar with institutional reports and raw data issued by national or international organizations and not by researchers in higher education. It merits noting that respondents rely heavily on their previous professional experience (M: 5.03), thus underlining the contribution of experiential learning to the development of professional knowledge and the need for them to be more involved in the research process in order to expand and use their knowledge in the field, which also draws upon external factors.

Sources used in the past 12 months Role within the institution	Publication in scientific journals	Public opinion	Employees of my own institution	News papers, magazines, web pages	TV and radio	Previous professional experience	Students	Organizations and professional associations	Formal meetings with researchers at scientific events	Informal meetings with researchers	National and international statistical databases	University databases	National agencies' reports
Administrative	4.40	2.40	3.80	3.80	2.60	5.00	3.00	4.40	4.60	4.60	4.60	3.80	4.00

Expert in a certain field	4.15	3.37	3.65	3.40	2.95	4.89	3.65	4.10	4.50	4.50	5.15	4.25	4.95
Executive	4.31	3.46	4.31	3.38	2.62	5.00	3.00	4.08	4.46	4.23	4.77	4.15	4.77
Documentation/ Research	4.25	3.00	4.00	2.75	2.75	5.00	4.00	4.50	4.75	5.50	5.50	4.50	5.25
Planning	4.56	3.44	4.22	3.89	3.22	5.00	3.22	4.22	4.33	4.67	5.33	4.33	5.22
Evaluation	5.00	3.00	4.17	3.33	2.83	5.33	4.00	4.33	4.50	4.33	5.50	4.83	5.33
Rating average	4.44	3.11	4.02	3.42	2.82	5.03	3.47	4.27	4.52	4.63	5.14	4.31	4.92

Table 3. *How relevant are the following sources of information for the educational policy decisions you have made in the last 12 months? (On a scale from 1 to 6, where 1 represents 'low relevance' and 6 represents 'high relevance').*

The researchers' proactivity is reflected in policymakers receiving results of research carried out by higher education institutions or research centres and it indicates a more direct connection between researchers and policymakers primarily at the executive level (M: 4.55) and to a lesser extent among experts (M: 4.16). Those policymakers who tend to read and analyse research reports are mostly executives (M: 5.45) and those working in evaluation (M: 5.50). Whereas the latter are less likely to directly receive results from researchers (M: 3.67), they appear to use research more in their work; therefore, they should be among those targeted in the dissemination process. When referring to policymakers' proactivity towards research use, the lowest overall rating average is recorded for respondents feeling encouraged by their colleagues/peers to use research data in their activity (M: 3.82), which reflects a rather low value attributed to organisational factors in relation to research use.

In reference to contextualization and tailoring of research for policymakers, the results show that respondents most frequently see educational research being used in order to plan or project and implement educational policies and programmes (M: 4.09). A lower average (M: 3.68) is reported for educational research used to influence the way decision-makers reflect upon different educational aspects. The trend is consistent in regard to educational research being used to introduce new aspects on the political agenda (M: 3.47) and to justify or legitimize options or decisions already made by decision-makers (M: 3.69), an aspect which is more aligned with the *demand pull model*, as previously described.

Situations in which research data were used Role within the institution	Educational research has been used to project and implement educational policies and programs	Educational research has been used to influence the way in which decision-makers reflect upon different educational aspects	Educational research has been used to introduce new aspects on the political agenda	Educational research has been used to justify or legitimize options already chosen by the decision-makers
Administrative	4.40	3.80	3.60	3.75
Expert in a certain field	4.00	3.47	3.26	3.67
Executive	4.15	4.08	3.38	3.36
Documentation/ Research	4.00	3.75	3.75	4.50

Planning	4.00	3.70	3.50	3.89
Evaluation	4.00	3.33	3.33	3.00
Rating average	4.09	3.68	3.47	3.69

Table 4. *When you access and use educational research in decision-making, how frequently do you encounter the following situations? (On a scale from 1 to 6, where 1 represents 'never' and 6 represents 'always').*

Values reflected in table 4 indicate a rather limited role of research in relation to the political agenda, as perceived by the majority of respondents, with the lowest weighted averages reported by respondents involved in evaluation at the institutional level. It could also be inferred from comparing data that, while all respondents recognize the importance of research and research use in decision-making, in reality the connection between the two components appears to be rather weak.

5.2 External factors associated with the uptake of research in policymaking

In this section, we will focus on two external factors identified in relation to the perceived relationship between policymakers and researchers: policymakers' general involvement in research studies and the strength and nature of the relationship between researchers, particularly in higher education, and policymakers.

Policymakers' general involvement in research studies refers mostly to reading and analysing research reports (M: 5.31 out of 6) and to adopting results of educational research (M: 5.56), two aspects relevant mostly for those in executive and policy evaluation roles at the institutional level. However, there is a high level of agreement regarding the lack of training in the field of research utilization within public institutions where decisions are made (M: 4.06), indicating the necessity and utility of such an activity in supporting and encouraging the use of research in policymaking. An important aspect would also be to increase **access to policymakers**, considered to be relatively low given the lack of sufficient forums and networks that could bring together researchers in HEIs and policymakers (3.96), also reflected in a rather low average of policymakers receiving results of research carried out by universities or research centres (M: 3.87). A stronger collaboration between policymakers and researchers in higher education is further deterred by the amount of time that must be invested in coordinating the activity between the two parties (M: 4.42) and the existing bureaucratic practices, which can cause delays (M: 4.26).

Following up on these aspects, it would appear that **the strength and nature of the relationship between researchers in higher education and policymakers** are influenced by the rather limited access to policymakers, as well as by the different agendas and timeframes for research and for decision-making. However, the results presented in table 5 indicate partnerships with universities are highly regarded by policymakers, indicating they have a motivational and commitment role, as research partnerships appear to help some of the respondents be more motivated in relation to the work they are doing (M: 3.83) and to extend the number of contacts with universities (M: 3.78). Moreover, there appears to be a general openness towards working in projects developed in collaboration with HEIs and strengthening the relationship between policymakers and researchers in higher education.

Statement Role within the institution	I had the opportunity to use data which otherwise would	I have extended the number of contacts	Research partnerships have contributed to attracting supplementary	Such partnerships have offered me the opportunity to	Partnerships in research have helped me advance	Such projects helped me be pragmatic and realistic	Research partnerships have helped me better understand the	Research partnerships helped me be more motivated in
--	---	--	--	--	---	--	--	--



	have been difficult to access	within the academia	ntary financing sources for the institution I work with	improve my expertise in the field	in my career	with regard to research results	work of researchers	relation to the work I am doing
Administrative	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.60	3.40	3.60	3.60
Expert in a certain field	3.80	3.70	3.26	3.55	3.58	3.80	3.85	3.84
Executive	3.77	4.23	3.62	4.00	3.83	3.92	3.67	4.00
Documentation/Research	3.50	3.75	3.25	3.25	3.50	4.00	3.75	4.00
Planning	3.22	3.50	3.25	3.25	3.50	3.67	3.56	3.75
Evaluation	3.50	4.00	3.17	3.17	3.33	3.83	3.67	3.83
Rating average	3.54	3.78	3.34	3.45	3.55	3.77	3.68	3.83

Table 5. How do you appreciate the collaboration with higher education institutions in your professional activity? Please express your agreement in relation to the following statements (from 1 representing 'strong disagreement' to 5 representing 'strong agreement').

The qualitative data collected at the end of the survey summarises the main facilitators and inhibitors of the uptake of research by policymakers. In aspects related to *communication and dissemination* of research results, policymakers value using a clear and friendly language for 'translating results in common language' and expect researchers to make their work more visible and be more proactive in connecting and communicating with public institutions. They also suggest developing partnerships with influential factors within civil society and organisations working in European educational programmes, also hinting at implications of these initiatives for the public funding of research: 'national financing priorities can be set based on the existing realities transposed in research'. With regards to *the research content*, policymakers recommend clear, easy-to-understand proposals with short-term impact adapted to the context and to the specific requirements of the environment where they will be implemented; they also *expect researchers* to develop applied research and be more proactive and participate as experts in implementing projects developed by institutions that initiate educational policies.

The factors that encourage policymakers to make educational policy decisions based on scientific evidence vary from *personal factors* (intrinsic motivation), such as their personal desire to improve their expertise or their professional responsibility, to *results-driven* factors (extrinsic motivation), either in relation to the decision-makers, such the possibility to influence decisions or substantiate pertinent argumentation that could help adopt policy, or in relation to the system, such as obtaining long-term positive results and ensuring objectivity in making decisions. Furthermore, there are factors pertaining to *existing general evidence*, particularly the decreasing quality of the educational process or the increase in the drop-out rate, as well as *factors related to research*, namely the need to access highly accurate data, based on rigorous and realistic research, objectivity and sample representativeness.

On the other hand, *the factors discouraging policymakers* from making educational policy decisions based on scientific evidence are identified at either systemic or institutional levels or are determined by *factors related to research* itself. Regarding the latter, barriers appear mainly in relation to the lack of correlation between theory and practice and the risk of over-theorized research, as well

as access to evidence. *At the systemic level*, respondents are preoccupied with public sphere inertia, lack of coherence in designing strategies and the numerous changes in the system and the lack of thematic research in the national context, which is needed when promoting educational policies measures. *At the institutional level*, the main concerns refer to the lack of institutional or practical culture in the field for using results of research and innovation in the field, as well as at the level of decision-making. One observation that could be made with regard to this aspect refers to the actual and perceived identity of the policymaker. Given the current data and the wider context of the research, it appears that employees in public administration, even though in charge of drafting, implementing and evaluating policies, do not necessarily perceive themselves as decision-makers, a role which they mostly attribute to elected or appointed officials in their field. This could also fall under the external factors influencing the research uptake, namely, under factors linked to the preferences of policymakers for one or another research topic, which indicate their preference is mostly driven by the decision-making agenda and less by particular topics of interest. Thus, their preferences appear to be highly volatile and influenced by the political factor, making it difficult for researchers to respond promptly to their requests, especially given the different timeframes required for the research cycle and the political decision cycle.

6 Discussion

This study analysed the factors linked to the perception of policymakers on the use of research in their work. The findings demonstrated that, despite the weak presence of national regulations regarding the support of evidence-based decisions in education, public servants highly value the research contributions and agree that research makes them more confident in their decisions and has implications on the quality of their work (Levin, 2011). The data also reveal the trust policymakers have in educational research as a critical factor in understanding the dynamic of research uptake in policymaking and of the relationship between researchers and policymakers on which the success of the utilisation of research depends. In this regard, our results confirm the findings of previous studies (Brown, Daly, & Liou, 2016). However, in a context where research appears mostly as part of political discourse, policymakers still consider their professional experience as one of the main source of knowledge when decisions are made. The least relevant aspect in terms of key factors for considering research of priority appears to be the using research which contributes to the existing theoretical knowledge. This situation generates a discussion about knowledge management in public administration and the balance between formal and informal mechanisms to access evidence. It also sparks a debate on the partnerships and alliances between those in charge of knowledge production and those who use it (Treadway, 2015).

The findings reveal the role of personal and organisational factors in influencing the research utilisation as an organisational dynamic and its internal structures, but also highlight the role of the existing research culture in the institution. The research culture is a critical aspect and is linked to the group dynamic in the organisation (Ion & Iucu, 2014) and the support of colleagues and leaders. Similarly, data highlight the importance of training policymakers in order to increase their level of awareness in the use of data derived from research. The findings also bring into discussion not only the various internal and external factors contributing to the research uptake but also the role public servants perform in their institutions. Depending on their responsibilities, they could be more or less connected to the research. As it can be inferred from the findings, educational research in Romania is currently at a crossroad between the *science push model*, as higher education institutions are attempting to influence the research agenda and disseminate their results, and the *demand pull model*, as policymakers are attempting to draft evidence-base policies, without always being able to find the necessary evidence, as their policy interests are not yet harmonized with the research interests of higher education institutions – the main research producers. Even more so, the demand pull model sometimes implies that the policymakers are looking at evidence to justify their decisions rather than inform them, which creates an even larger rift between the two parties.

The study suggests a number of implications for policymakers in public administration. Our research paves the way for an in-depth analysis of organizational factors likely to affect research utilisation: engagement, interpreted as the attitude of organizations and their members towards research; the political and managerial context likely to promote and favour research transfer and use; and the financial context needed to foster quality results. Thus, there is a growing need to enhance the partnerships between policymakers and researchers (Malin & Brown, 2019), focusing on high-quality research, well-developed transparency and social responsibility mechanisms, as well the 'third mission' as an academic priority.

Whereas the study tackles the idea of bridging the gap between the policymakers' and researchers' contexts, it cannot provide at this stage a full understanding of how an efficient partnership could be defined. However, it provides us with a sense of the policymakers' positive perception regarding the collaboration with researchers in higher education institutions and it shapes potential guidelines for the latter to strengthen this relation. Thus, researchers could potentially be more proactive in disseminating research results, specifically targeting executive and policy evaluation staff in public institutions, creating formal and informal contexts for meeting their counterparts, developing training programmes (initial and continuous) aimed at interpreting and understanding research results, applying research results in drafting educational policy or facilitating research utilization in public institutions, engaging not only instruments related to research utilization, but also to teaching and learning. As research is an essential part of the declared and assumed mission of higher education, strengthening the research component of initial training in HE could contribute to its increased visibility and relevance. It could also contribute to better prepared graduates – more informed research producers, users and mediators, and to shaping a clearer role for research as an overall strategy to develop the higher education system.

The implications of the study are also found at **the macro-systemic level of educational policies**. The focus on the role of research is shifting from the symbolic use of research results to evidence-based policy. Likewise, the transparency policies promoted by the Romanian higher education system are still vague and incoherent. The political implications may address the quality assurance mechanisms likely to assess and approve research results. This should stimulate the transfer of research locally, regionally and internationally. Moreover, 'mapping' mechanisms must be implemented, as well as fair opportunities to access research funds and infrastructures.

The links between production and use contexts on both formal and informal levels may add value to the relationship between research production and its transfer and use. Thus, it may improve the sense of responsibility of both parties as long as the relationship is based on equality, mutual respect and shared responsibilities.

Bibliography

- Brown, Chris. 2012. "The 'policy-Preferences Model': A New Perspective on How Researchers Can Facilitate the Take-up of Evidence by Educational Policy Makers." *The Policy Press* 8 (4): 455–72.
- Brown, Chris, Alan Daly, and Yi-Hwa Liou. 2016. "Improving Trust, Improving Schools." *Journal of Professional Capital and Community* 1 (1). Emerald Group Publishing Limited : 69–91. doi:10.1108/JPC-09-2015-0004.
- Cain, Tim. 2015. "Teachers' Engagement with Research Texts: Beyond Instrumental, Conceptual or Strategic Use." *Journal of Education for Teaching* 41 (5): 478–92. doi:10.1080/02607476.2015.1105536.
- Cherney, Adrian, Jenny Povey, Brian Head, Paul Boreham, and Michele Ferguson. 2012. "What Influences the Utilisation of Educational Research by Policy-Makers and Practitioners?: The Perspectives of Academic Educational Researchers." *International Journal of Educational Research*. Elsevier Ltd. doi:10.1016/j.ijer.2012.08.001.
- Cooper, Amanda, Ben Levin, and Carol Campbell. 2009. "The Growing (but Still Limited) Importance of Evidence in Education Policy and Practice." *Journal of Educational Change* 10 (2–3): 159–71. doi:10.1007/s10833-009-9107-0.
- Cordingley, Philippa. 2013. "The Contribution of Research to Teachers' Professional Learning and Development." *Research and Teacher Education: The BERA-RSA Inquiry*, 1–13.
- Davies, Philip. 1999. "What Is Evidence-Based Education?" *British Journal of Educational Studies* 47 (2). Taylor & Francis Group: 108–21. doi:10.1111/1467-8527.00106.
- Dowling, Paul. 2008. "Unit 4: Generating a Research Question." London.
- Estabrooks, Carole A., David S. Thompson, Jacque J.E. Lovely, and Anne Hofmeyer. 2006. "A Guide to Knowledge Translation Theory." *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions* 26 (1): 25–36. doi:10.1002/chp.48.
- Godfrey, David. 2014. "Creating a Research Culture – Lessons from Other Schools." <http://www.sec-ed.co.uk/best-practice/creating-a-research-culture-lessons-from-other-schools>.
- . 2016. "Leadership of Schools as Research-Led Organisations in the English Educational Environment." *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* 44 (2): 301–21. doi:10.1177/1741143213508294.
- Gough, David. 2004. "Systematic Research Synthesis." In *Evidence-Based Practice in Education*, edited by Gary Thomas and Richard Pring. Open University Press.
- Gough, David, Janice Tripney, Caroline Kenny, and Elisabeth Buk-Berge. 2011. *Evidence Informed Policymaking in Education in Europe. EIPEE Final Project Report Summary*. <http://www.eipee.eu/>.
- Hess, Frederick M., and Lorraine McDonnell. 2008. *When Research Matters: How Scholarship Influences Education Policy*. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard Education Press. http://www.worldcat.org/title/when-research-matters-how-scholarship-influences-educational-policy/oclc/495194314&referer=brief_results.
- Huberman, Michael, and Gather Thurler. 1992. "De La Recherche À La Pratique. Eléments de Base." *Revue Française de Pédagogie* 98 (1). Persée - Portail des revues scientifiques en SHS: 69–82. doi:10.3406/rfp.1992.1335.
- Ion, Georgeta, and Romita Iucu. 2014. "Does Research Influence Educational Policy? The Perspective of Researchers and Policy-Makers in Romania." In *The European Higher Education Area: Between Critical Reflections and Future Policies*, edited by Adrian Curaj, Liviu Matei, Remus Pricopie, Jamil Salmi, and Peter Scott, 873–89. London: Springer.
- Landry, Réjean, Nabil Amara, and Moktar Lamari. 2001a. "Climbing the Ladder of Research Utilization: Evidence from Social Science Research." *Science Communication*. doi:10.1177/1075547001022004003.
- . 2001b. "Utilization of Social Science Research Knowledge in Canada." *Research Policy* 30 (2): 333–49. doi:10.1016/S0048-7333(00)00081-0.
- Lavis, John N. 2006. "Research, Public Policymaking, and Knowledge-Translation Processes: Canadian

- Efforts to Build Bridges." *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions* 26 (1). Wiley Subscription Services, Inc., A Wiley Company: 37–45. doi:10.1002/chp.49.
- Levin, Ben. 2009. "How Governments Decide: The Role of Research." In *Research of vs Research for Education Policy : In an Era of Transnational Policy-Making*, edited by Richard Desjardins and Kjell Rubenson, 210. Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller. http://www.worldcat.org/title/research-of-vs-research-for-education-policy-in-an-era-of-transnational-policy-making/oclc/527526759&referer=brief_results.
- . 2013. "To Know Is Not Enough: Research Knowledge and Its Use." *Review of Education* 1 (1): 2–31. doi:10.1002/rev3.3001.
- Levin, Benjamin, Amanda Cooper, Shalini Arjomand, and Kathy Thompson. 2011. "Can Simple Interventions Increase Research Use in Secondary Schools?" *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy* December (126): 1–29. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ955449.pdf>.
- Malin, Joel and Brown, Chris. 2019. *The Role of Knowledge Brokers in Education: Connecting the Dots Between Research and Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Mincu, Monica. 2014. "Building Collective Capacity for Improvement at a School and System Level." In *British Educational Research Association*, 5:1–36. <http://www.voced.edu.au/content/ngv60343>.
- . 2015. "Teacher Quality and School Improvement: What Is the Role of Research?" *Oxford Review of Education* 41 (2): 253–69. doi:10.1080/03054985.2015.1023013.
- Nicu, Adriana. 2013. *Politici Educaționale*. Cluj-Napoca: Asociația de Științe Cognitive din România.
- Nutley, Sandra, Isabel Walter, and Huw Davies. 2007. "Using Evidence: How Research Can Inform Public Services." Policy Press, 363. <http://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/distributed/U/bo13441009.html>.
- Oakley, Ann. 2000. *Experiments in Knowing : Gender and Method in the Social Sciences*. New York: New Press.
- Oh, Cheol H. 1997. "Issues for the New Thinking of Knowledge Utilization: Introductory Remarks." *Knowledge and Policy* 10 (3). Springer Netherlands: 3–10. doi:10.1007/BF02912503.
- Oh, Cheol, and Robert Rich. 1996. "Explaining Use of Information in Public Policymaking." *Knowledge and Policy* 9 (1). Springer Netherlands: 3–35. doi:10.1007/BF02832231.
- Ostinelli, Giorgio. 2017. "Between University and School: The School Improvement Advisor/researcher (SIA)." *International Journal of Leadership in Education* 3124 (August). Routledge: 1–17. doi:10.1080/13603124.2017.1321784.
- Oxman, Andrew D, John N Lavis, Simon Lewin, and Atle Fretheim. 2009. "SUPPORT Tools for Evidence-Informed Health Policymaking (STP)1 : What Is Evidence-Informed Policymaking?" *Health Research Policy and Systems* 7: 1–7. doi:10.1186/1478-This.
- Rich, Robert. 1991. "Knowledge Creation, Diffusion, and Utilization." *Knowledge* 12 (3). Sage Publications/Sage CA: Thousand Oaks, CA: 319–37. doi:10.1177/107554709101200308.
- Romanian Government. 2008. "H.G. Nr 775 Din 14 Iulie 2005 Pentru Aprobarea Regulamentului Privind Procedurile de Elaborare, Monitorizare Și Evaluare a Politicilor Publice La Nivel Central [Governmental Decision Number 775 from 14th of July 2005 Regarding the Approval of Procedures c."
- Temple, P. 2003. "Educational Research and Policymaking: Findings from Some Transitional Countries." *London Review of Education* 1 (3): p.217-228. doi:10.1080/1474846032000146776.
- Treadway, C. 2015. "Policymakers' Perceptions on the Application of Research Evidence in the Policymaking Process within West Virginia's Higher Education System." Theses, Dissertations and Capstones. Paper 945. <http://mds.marshall.edu/etd/945/>.
- Tregenza, Jo, Judy Sebba, and Phillip Kent. 2012. "Powerful Professional Learning : A School Leader ' S Guide to Joint Practice Development." Nottingham.
- Tripney, Janice, Caroline Kenny, and David Gough. 2015. "Enabling the Use of Research Evidence Within Educational Policymaking in Europe Enabling the Use of Research Evidence Within Educational Policymaking in Europe Lessons from the EIPEE Project" 4934 (October).

doi:10.2753/EUE1056-4934460103.

Weiss, Carol H. 1979. "The Many Meanings of Research Utilisation." *Public Administration Review* 39 (5). Wiley American Society for Public Administration: 426. doi:10.2307/3109916.

Wieser, Clemens. 2016. "Teaching and Personal Educational Knowledge – Conceptual Considerations for Research on Knowledge Transformation." *European Journal of Teacher Education* 39 (5): 588–601. doi:10.1080/02619768.2016.1253673.