

---

# Better understanding impact of scientific knowledge on policy. Conceptualising policy making conditions

Jakob Edler, Maria Karaulova, Kate Barker

Atlanta STI Policy Conference October 2017

---

- 
- Increasing demand for science and evidence for society and policy
  - Scientists and scientific organisations are asked to do more impactful science
  - Considerable dis-satisfaction with the way science relates to policy
  - Assumptions: “Failure” mainly related to the science system and scientists (many studies, e.g. (ESRC 2009, Young 2008)
  - Remedies: Adapt incentive structures in and for scientific organisations
  - Existing academic studies mainly focus on:
    - Supply of knowledge: science production and incentives
    - Linkage mechanisms
-

- Focus on **knowledge users** in public policy
  - **personal characteristics, institutional conditions**
- ...and their **interactions**
  - not a formalistic “dissemination” or heroic “co-generation”
- ...while taking note of conditions, behaviour, interaction of scientists
- Fill a gap:
  - analysis of science system, scientists and linkage mechanisms
  - the (more recent) focus on process perspective (SIAMPI, ASIRPA)
  - political science approach with scientific input or experts as one variable
- Developing a longitudinal research programme

- **Scientific evidence:** knowledge (co)produced by professionals in universities, public research organisation, think tanks
- **Impact: on whom** - Actors in policy making arena (all levels)
  1. “policy makers”: agents in public organisations deciding or supporting decision making on policy choices (what, why, how, budgets)
  2. Politicians: elected, Parliaments/ Department heads
  3. (Intermediators)
- **Impact: nature** (Weiss 1999, Almeida / Bascolo 2006)
  - **Conceptual:** change in awareness, problem definition, normative/cognitive
  - **Instrumental:**
    - problem solving (I),
    - strategic (II)
  - *Either might happen without the other*

- Concept of institutional conditions (Scott 2013)
  - Socio-cognitive: (socially mediated) frames of interpretation, meaning
  - Normative: guiding values, norms, collective processes shaping expectations
  - Regulative: formal rules, incentive structures
  - Institutional carriers: express / embody / transport elements
  
- Explaining policy change: Reflexive institutionalism
  - Meaning of ideas, evidence and discourse for policy change

- Political science approach to understand policy change
- Institutions are not only “constraints” for change
- Change comes about not (only) through
  - calculation of interests in given incentive structures,
  - windows of opportunities to change established historical pathways
  - evolutionary change of socially accepted norms
- Rather...
  - problem definition, solution space, perception of interest open to change
  - through reflection and of exchange on **cognitive** and **normative ideas**

(based on V. Schmidt 2007, 2012, 2015 (discursive institutionalism) and Edler 2000, 2002 (reflexive institutionalism))

- Ideas transported / modified in discourses  
(who “says” what to whom, how)
  - Coordinative:
    - to develop policy solutions in the policy space establish “consensus”
  - Communicative:
    - to interact with broader public, to gain political legitimacy
    - Interplay of policy knowledge with broader societal narrative
- Complex interplay

- Policy change as result of scientific input
- Nature of normative and cognitive ideas (evidence) and its (co-) production
- Nature of discourse and discursive interaction (“producer and user”)
- **Regulative, normative and cognitive** conditions and processes
  - **...within organisations** (search, use)
  - **...of interaction** (e.g. science-policy; or policy-intermediaries)
    - Exchanges and deliberations between science and policy organisations
    - Co-creation of meaning and expectations
  - impact values and cognition in policy making organisations (vice versa)

(3) *Broader, contextual institutional conditions, role of science in society*



---

<b>Institutional Carriers / Institutional Processes</b>
<b>Relational Systems</b>
<b>Symbolic Systems</b>
<b>Routines</b>
<b>Material Culture</b>

---

<b>Institutional Carriers / Institutional Processes</b>	<b>Endogenous institutional Conditions</b>	<b>Institutionalised interactions</b>
<b>Relational Systems</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• R: Organisational hierarchies; funding streams</li> <li>• N: Informal authority systems</li> <li>• C: Identities; variety/isomorphism</li> </ul>	
<b>Symbolic Systems</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• R: Formal rules and lawful obligations; targets; material rewards</li> <li>• N: Social roles that structure expected behaviour; valued impact expectations; informal rewards</li> <li>• C: Frames, schemas and typifications; mimetic behaviour; taken-for-granted elements</li> </ul>	
<b>Routines</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• R: formal instruction; monitoring; evaluation</li> <li>• N: Collective action; [informal] activities; institutional work</li> <li>• C: Scripts; habits</li> </ul>	
<b>Material Culture</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• R: Objects complying with standards and specifications</li> <li>• N: Perceptions of material culture of a certain standard as appropriate for the task</li> <li>• C: Objects with symbolic value</li> </ul>	

# Towards an operationalisation: (Policy making) organisation

<b>Institutional Carriers / Institutional Processes</b>	<b>Within Organisations</b>
<b>Relational Systems</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where are the sources of authority located in the policy organisation with respect to ideation based on research?</li> <li>• Are there dedicated units or groups dealing with scientific research?</li> </ul>
<b>Symbolic Systems</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are values, beliefs and attitudes in the policy organisation with respect to scientific research and handling research results?</li> </ul>
<b>Routines</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are professional routines in the organisation?</li> <li>• What are windows of opportunity for the use of scientific research in routinised policy processes?</li> </ul>
<b>Artefacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the material culture of policymaking organisation?</li> <li>• Are there objects signifying the role of scientific research? (libraries, repositories)</li> </ul>

# Towards an operationalisation: Interaction / relationship

Institutional Carriers / Institutional Processes	Between Organisations
<b>Relational Systems</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are authority relationships between policy and research organisations, including intermediaries and other stakeholders?</li> </ul>
<b>Symbolic Systems</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there significant separation between values and ultimate societal goals between policy organisations and research organisations?</li> <li>• Is there contestation?</li> </ul>
<b>Routines</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the expectations of regular interfaces (direct or mediated) between research and policymaking actors?</li> <li>• What usually happens procedurally at these interfaces?</li> </ul>
<b>Artefacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where do institutional interactions take place?</li> <li>• Are they mediated by objects (phones, newspapers)?</li> <li>• What is the role of material culture?</li> </ul>

# Something to build on... systematically

<b>Institutional Carriers / Institutional Processes</b>	<b>Within Organisations</b>	<b>Between Organisations</b>
<b>Relational Systems</b>	Sources of decisions about credibility of knowledge (Bannister/Hardil 2017)	Existence of mission-oriented research; research contracted by the user side
<b>Symbolic Systems</b>	Importance to have organisational environment that values research (van der Arend 2014; Bowen / Zwi 2005)	-Discourse continuity and complementarity (Upham and Dendler 2015) -Value-charged discourse (Douglas, 2009)
<b>Routines</b>	Attention to routines at different stages of knowledge absorption (Moktar et al 2013)	Embeddedness in networks and regular exchanges (SIAMPI)
<b>Artefacts</b>	Objects signifying the importance of research in policy organisations (Uzochukwu et al 2016)	The roles of direct and indirect productive interactions

Beyond  
Science-Policy  
Organisations:

Overall value  
of science in  
society



# What does it add...

---

- **We reverse the science biased focus**
  - **Allow proper “demand side assessment”** (Sarewitz/Pielke 2007)
  - We propose **reflexive institutionalism** taking
    - **content** and
    - **institutional conditions** seriously, at various levels
  - We distinguish types of impact, **focus on neglected *conceptual* impact**
  - ...and in doing so might better understand (lack of) **instrumental impact**
-

# Thank you!

---

# [Annex] Exogenous institutional processes beyond organisational fields



<b>Institutional Carriers / Institutional Processes</b>	<b>Beyond Organisational Fields</b>
<b>Relational Systems</b>	What is the authority of science in society nationally? Regionally?
<b>Symbolic Systems</b>	What are the dominant world views and normative orientations in society? What are national strategy and goals?
<b>Routines</b>	What is the general ethics and professional codes of conduct for professionals in the society?
<b>Artefacts</b>	What are research and policy infrastructures and material conditions nationally? Regionally?



- Users need to show impact of policy, legitimise policy: demand for credible, salient, legitimate knowledge (Cash et al 2003, Pielke 2000)
- Value charged knowledge **meets normative / socio-cognitive user context** (Douglas 2009)
- **Ability to deal with uncertainty** major user factor (Bradshaw/Borchers 2000)
- **Role of values and beliefs of policy makers as filters** for evidence (Bowen / Zwi 2005)
- Knowledge in line with **professional and/or operational experience of user** organisation more likely to be used (Bannister/Hardil 2017)
- **Different roles in organisations: Who decides** which knowledge is relevant and credible? Why? (Bannister/Hardil 2017)
- Importance of **individual attributes** (education etc.), **professional routines** and **scientific context** changes for **different stages** of knowledge absorption (Moktar et al 2013, user survey)
- Perception of **conditions of science production** (autonomy, funding dependency etc.) influence nature of knowledge (Douglas 2009, James/Duncan 2017)
- However: no conceptual framework and theoretical underpinning