

Policy Networks and Research Utilisation in Policy

2.1 INTRODUCTION

As Chap. 1 underlined, the empirical analysis of this book lies at the intersection of two theoretical disciplines: (i) the literature on the policy-making process and research utilisation in policy and (ii) the literature on state building and SSR in fragile, conflict-affected contexts. The first part of the book thus explores the main theoretical themes underpinning this empirical study—the theoretical literature on the policy-making process, and the one on post-conflict state building and SSR—in order to identify concepts and ideas that will be used to analyse the extent to and the ways in which research has influenced and interacted with British-led SSR policy in conflict-affected Sierra Leone. Such a theoretical framework would emphasise the value of the Sierra Leone case study for the literature on the research-policy nexus. It would help deriving important theoretical insights on the use of research in state building and SSR policy in post-conflict, fragile countries, and it would help exploring new measures that could favour and improve the influence of research upon externally-led state building and SSR policy decisions and programmes.

This chapter focuses on the role that research and researchers can play in policy. It introduces notions, understandings, and theoretical frameworks pertaining to the academic literature on the policy-making process to explain how policy-makers, street-level bureaucrats, and researchers interact with each other as part of policy networks. It further canvasses

the literature on research utilisation to understand the different ways and processes through which research can influence the work and decisions of policy-makers and street-level bureaucrats on the ground.

The chapter is composed of three different sections and is structured as follows.

Section 2.2 looks at the evolution of the literature on policy networks to explain how researchers are one of several external groups that interact formally and informally with governmental actors as part of the policy-making process. The continuous and dynamic sets of interactions between a government and such external groups create policy networks, which have the capacity to shape the policy process. Policy networks can differ for different dimensions, such as their number of participants, the type of interest, their frequency of interaction with governmental actors, their resources and power (Marsh and Rhodes 1992, p. 251). These dimensions eventually determine the tightness of a network, and its role and importance in the policy-making process. Section 2.2.1 then introduces the dialectic approach to policy networks, a particular view of policy networks that focuses on the variability within and across networks.

Section 2.3 moves from the discussion on policy networks to focus on particular approaches that stress the cognitive dimension of policy networks and the role of knowledge and expertise in policy-making. In particular, the analysis shows how the role of research and researchers in policy could be explained by the notion of epistemic communities, transnational networks of professionals with expertise, competence, authoritative claim, and policy-relevant knowledge in a determined area. Researchers thus form a transnational epistemic community that can influence the policy process and the activities of policy-makers and street-level bureaucrats on the ground.

The final section of the chapter, Sect. 2.4, canvasses theories and paradigms pertaining to the literature on research utilisation to explore in depth the research-policy nexus and the ways in which research influences and interacts with the policy-making process. It firstly introduces the different models of research utilisation to examine the different ways policy-makers account for research in their policy decisions. It then investigates the complex and dynamic interactions between policy and research by presenting some main factors that hinder or facilitate the uptake of research into policy and limit the extent, frequency, and quality of interactions between policy and research actors within policy networks. Finally, it introduces a readapted version of the payback model, a

conceptual framework of research utilisation in policy that explores the different ways in which research and policy interplay as part of the policy-making process.

2.2 POLICY NETWORKS

The literature on the policy process provides models, notions, and theories that emphasise the role of external actors in policy. The study of public policy and of ‘how the machinery of the state and political actors interacts to produce public actions’ (John 1998, p. 1) evolved throughout the years as the role, responsibilities, and policy domains of the state expanded. The extensive literature investigating the policy process followed this expansion of the state, bridging and incorporating new approaches to explain the increasing ‘variety and complexity of the decision-making process’ (John 1998, p. 1) vis-à-vis the expansion of the state and its policy domains. Traditional ‘stagist’ models of the policy process (Easton 1965), which assume ‘a clear sequence of stages through which public policies proceed’ (Dorey 2005, p. 4), have been discarded and replaced by different approaches that provide a more realistic explanatory account of the increasing complexity of the process. More articulated models of the policy process have thus been developed in the last 50 years. Some of these models focus on the role of the institutions in shaping policy decisions and outcomes, or on the importance of groups and networks in the policy process. Others emphasise the influence of socio-economic factors, rational choice, as well as institutional and socio-economic constraints on policy outcomes. Still more highlight the role of ideas in the agenda setting, giving rise to different policy-making models such as the rational, the incrementalist, or the ‘garbage-can’ model, to mention a few (Hanney et al. 2003; John 1998; Sabatier 1999).

Among these different models, the policy network approach contends that ‘different types of relationships between group representatives, bureaucrats, politicians, and other participants in decision-making account for the various ways in which political systems process policy’ (John 1998, p. 78). According to this view of the policy-making process, policy decisions derive from the exchanges, interdependence, and links between a government and other external actors—the policy networks. Rhodes (2006) defined such policy networks as ‘sets of formal institutional and informal linkages between governmental and other actors structured around shared if endlessly negotiated beliefs and interests in

public policy making and implementation' (p. 426).¹ In the context of this book, researchers and their research can be considered part of these external actors that potentially influenced and interacted with British-led SSR policy in conflict-affected Sierra Leone. The policy network approach, with its emphasis on the relationship between government and other external societal actors, thus emerges as the most pertinent way of understanding and explaining the policy process in the context of this research. Consequently, this chapter begins with a short presentation of the literature on policy networks, as introducing this literature would help understand the role that external groups—and researchers among them—can have in the policy-making process

The idea that a government has to consider the interests of different groups in its policy-making process is not new and some authors have traced it back to Greek philosophy (Jung 2010, p. 351; Kimber and Richardson 1974, p. 4; Parry 1969). One of the first modern references to the influence of groups on government can be found in the work of Charles Alexis de Tocqueville in the early nineteenth century, when he describes how a tariff question generated association and lobbying activities at the national level (Tocqueville 2003, pp. 222–224). However, it is only at the beginning of the twentieth century—particularly with the end of World War II—that the activities of groups started to be considered as an integral part of the policy-making process.

The analysis of government/group relations developed and expanded in the twentieth century in the United States (US) literature and is embedded in the pluralist tradition (John 1998, pp. 67–68; Richards and Smith 2002; Smith 1993, pp. 15–28). For pluralists, 'power is dispersed throughout society rather than concentrated within the state' (Smith 1993, p. 3), and different groups reflecting the various, competing, and sometimes divergent interests of the society are formed to put pressure on government. Groups are therefore central to the political process and neither the state nor single groups have the ability to control the policy process. The role of the state is therefore to reflect the public desires and adjudicate between the competing interests of the society. In line with this pluralist view, the pioneering work of Arthur F. Bentley in 1908 describes for the first time government as the 'process of the adjustment of a set of interest groups' (p. 260) and as a 'network of activity' (p. 261). Bentley concludes that 'all phenomena of government are phenomena of groups pressing one another, forming one another and pushing out new groups and representatives (the organs or agencies of governments) to mediate the adjustments' (p. 269).

In the following years, other scholars and political scientists began to give particular attention to the role of groups in the policy process. For example, Griffith argues in 1939 (p. 182):

One cannot live in Washington for long without being conscious that it has whirlpools or centers of activity focusing on particular problems. ... It is my opinion that ordinarily the relationship among these men – legislators, administrators, lobbyists, scholars – who are interested in a common problem is a much more real relationship than the relationship between congressmen generally or between administrators generally. In other words, he who would understand the prevailing pattern of our present governmental behavior, instead of studying the formal institutions or even generalizations of organs, important though all these things are, may possibly obtain a better picture of the way things really happen if he would study these ‘whirlpools’ of special social interests and problems.

Following World War II, an ‘increasing complexity in the organisation of government and the government of society’ (Jung 2010, p. 351) moves scholars and political scientists towards a more attentive study of government/group relations. In 1951, Truman states that ‘the behaviours that constitute the process of government cannot be understood apart from the groups, especially the organized and potential interest groups, which are operative at any point in time’ (p. 502). Likewise, in 1952 Latham recognised the importance of groups in the political process in his book, *The Group Basis of Politics*.

The idea of policy networks developed from these early studies and replaced the group perspective. Different from the pluralist tradition, the policy network approach sees the state as having its own interests, goals, and resources that it seeks to manage through networks. The concept of policy networks therefore explains the relationships between government and groups. These relationships can be different, informal, and vary by policy sector. The relationships between group representatives and decision-makers matter and influence the policy process, rather than the mere presence of a group.

The term ‘*policy network*’ appears for the first time after World War II in the US literature. Starting from the 1950s, the scholarship investigating the policy process became increasingly aware of the role of groups, networks, associations, and informal relationships both inside and outside political institutions in shaping the policy process. As part of this increasing consideration of the role of networks in policy-making,

political scientists began to concentrate their attention on a ‘few privileged groups with close relations with governments’ (Rhodes 2006, p. 427) and on the ‘links between actors involved in both policy formulation and implementation’ (Jung 2010, p. 351). This focus entailed a distinction between outsiders and insiders (Dorey 2005, pp. 125–132; Grant 1978, 1995), with the latter defined as legitimate groups ‘acceptable to government, responsible in their expectations, and willing to work with and through government’ (Rhodes 2006, p. 427).

In this way, the process of policy formation and implementation began to be understood through the analysis of sub-governmental levels and by the linkages within a policy sector between public and private organisations, government, and external groups. These sub-government levels constitute ‘clusters of individuals that effectively make most of the routine decisions in a given substantive area and policy’ (Ripley and Franklin 1981, pp. 8–9). Scholars described their understanding of the government/group relations by developing new metaphors such as ‘sub-systems’ (Freeman 1965; Freeman and Stevens 1987), ‘subgovernments’ (Cater 1964), ‘sloppy large hexagons’ (Jones 1979), and ‘iron triangles’ (Ethridge and Handelman 2010; Ripley and Franklin 1981). These new concepts represent the first attempts to better understand the evolution of policy-making in the US and to further investigate aspects of the government/group relationship rarely addressed by the precedent literature.

Originating from these studies, the work of Hecla and Wildavsky (1974), and particularly Hecla (1978), further refined the analysis of government/group relations within the policy process. Hecla argued that for many policy initiatives it ‘is all but impossible to identify clearly who the dominant actors are’ (Hecla 1978, p. 102) or who is controlling these actions. By looking as a consequence at the wider ‘open networks of people that increasingly impinge upon government’ (Hecla 1978, p. 88) and at the webs of influence that provoke and guide the exercise of power, the author introduces the concept of issue networks. Issue networks are defined as webs of influence that ‘comprise a large number of participants with quite variable degrees of mutual commitment or of dependence on others’ (Hecla 1978, p. 102). In an issue network, no one is ‘in control of the policies and issues’ (Hecla 1978, p. 102), as ‘participants move in and out of the networks constantly’ (Hecla 1978, p. 102). Within an issue network, intellectual and emotional commitment are more important than direct material interest: individuals with ‘a reputation for being knowledgeable’ (Hecla 1978, p.

103), issue-skilled people, ‘policy activists who know each other through the issues’ (Heclo 1978, p. 103), and ‘people with recognised reputations in particular areas of public policy’ (Heclo 1978, p. 107) can all be part of an issue network. The introduction of the concept of issue networks was an important step forward in the literature about government/group relations. It underlines for the first time the dynamic nature of the interaction between government and external groups. Furthermore, it does not confine the nature of the relationship between government and groups to material interests only.

British, Western European, and Canadian scholars and political scientists rapidly broadened and expanded the early US studies on policy networks (Berger 1981; Pross 1986; Richardson 1982). In particular, the literature on policy networks flourished in Britain, where groups acquired increasing importance in the domestic policy-making to become over the decades ‘a central aspect of the British political process’ (Kimber and Richardson 1974, p. iii). Over the years, British scholars devoted increasing attention to the importance and influence of policy networks in the domestic policy process: if in 1958 *Finer* underlined the existence of ‘faceless, voiceless, and unidentifiable; in brief, anonymous’ (p. 145) groups, *Alderman* argued in 1984 that ‘the influence of pressure groups is to be found at all levels in the organs and decision-making machinery of British government. This is inevitable’ (p. 126). Likewise, a survey of more than 250 groups in 1986 found that ‘almost 75%—maintained ‘regular or frequent’ contact with one or more MPs’ (Rush 1990, pp. 280–296 cited in Norton 1995, p. 94) and *Kavanagh* affirmed in 1996 that ‘the role of pressure groups and the development of the “group politics” style of decision-making are crucial to an understanding of the development of British politics’ (p. 202). Government/group relationships therefore increased their importance in British policy-making through this period to become ‘part of the democratic process’ (Alderman 1984, p. 132), with the British literature drawing from the post-World War II American insights to develop its own independent perspectives over the years.

Richardson and *Jordan* were among the first scholars to study the role of pressure groups in the British policy-making process. The two authors consider groups as ‘essential to the process of government’ (John 1998, p. 71) and they argued that ‘policy-making is characterised as a process by which an equilibrium is reached between the competing groups in society’ (Richardson and Jordan 1979, pp. 3–4). They thus introduced for

the first time the concept of policy communities, groups ‘distinguished by commonality of interests’ (Dowding 1995, p. 138) and a ‘common culture and understandings about the nature of the problems and decision-making processes within a given policy domain’ (Dowding 1995, p. 138). Policy communities are therefore ‘a special type of *stable* network’ (Jordan 1990, p. 327, emphasis in original) with shared views on a problem. The two authors focused their attention on the role of policy communities in the British policy-making process. By seeing the policy process as based on cooperation and consensus, they asserted that ‘co-ordination takes place at a number of levels within the relevant policy community until a common policy emerges’ (Jordan and Richardson 1982, p. 83). In their analysis of the British policy process, they stated that ‘the incorporation of some types of groups into the process by which policies are formulated and implemented has become routinized in a complex web of informal and formal arrangements’ (Jordan and Richardson 1987, p. 277) and considered the influence of groups in the political system as ‘both inevitable and generally positive’ (Jordan and Richardson 1987, p. 290).

Working in the same decades as Richardson and Jordan, Rhodes developed new models and understandings of the policy networks. In particular, Rhodes’ numerous analyses of the policy networks (Marsh and Rhodes 1992; Rhodes 1981, 1986, 1997) became influential and predominant in the literature because the author aligned policy networks along a continuum according to their diverse degrees of integration, stability, and exclusiveness, thus differentiating for the first time policy networks according to their characteristics.

In Marsh and Rhodes’ (1992, p. 251) model, policy networks differ in their levels of membership, integration, resources, and power. Furthermore, ‘the character of the network explains policy outcomes and policy change’ (John 1998, p. 84). In other words, the different characteristics of a policy network determine its position along a hypothetical continuum, as well as its influence on policy, power, and access to policy-makers. Located at the two ends of the continuum, policy communities and issue networks are two ideal types with different and antithetic characteristics. Any other network ‘can be located at some point along it’ (Rhodes 1997, p. 45), as ‘no policy area will conform exactly to either list of characteristics’ (Marsh and Rhodes 1992, p. 250).

The levels of membership, integration, resources, and power are thus important to locate a policy network along Marsh and Rhodes’

continuum and understand a network's influence on policy. Policy communities are tight and stable networks with a limited number of participants and 'frequent and high quality interaction between all members of the community on all matters related to the policy issues' (Rhodes 1997, p. 43). On the other hand, issue networks are unstable and loose networks, characterised by a large number of participants and fluctuating interaction and access for the various members (Marsh and Rhodes 1992, p. 14; Rhodes 1997, p. 45). The stability and balance of a policy community allow frequent and continuous interactions with policy-makers and the construction of a reciprocal relationship which could eventually influence the policy process. Conversely, the large, loose, and fluctuating nature of an issue network hinders its regular access to policy-makers, resulting in a less powerful government/group relationship and a limited influence on policy.

During the same period, Wilks and Wright developed a new typology to study the different policy actors within the industrial policy sector (Wilks and Wright 1987; Wright 1988). They also assigned policy actors to differently aggregated sub-systems of policy universes, policy communities, and policy networks. However, Wilks and Wright's re-utilisation and redefinition of terms that already had an accepted currency in the policy networks literature—such as policy communities and policy networks—undermined the success of this new typology (Jordan 1990, p. 335).

The policy network continuum, with its division between policy communities and issue networks and the different dimensions of the Marsh and Rhodes typology, influenced the successive literature on policy networks to become in the course of the decades 'the most widely referenced schema' (Skogstad 2005, p. 4). Most of the scholars who studied policy networks in the last two decades started their analysis from the Marsh and Rhodes typology, aligning policy networks along a policy community and issue network continuum according to their different characteristics. Some authors, such as Van Waarden (1992), tried to develop new classificatory schemas to catalogue policy networks; others, like Dorey (2005, pp. 124–161), readapted Marsh and Rhodes' model to specify the different characteristics and dimensions of policy networks and their role in the policy process. The result of this second group of classifications is thus not dissimilar to the Marsh and Rhodes' model, with policy communities intended as close and organised networks with significant impact and influence on public policy, and issue networks

understood as loose and wide networks, which ‘usually enjoy only limited or sporadic consultation with policy makers’ (Dorey 2005, p. 156), having a minimal role in the implementation of public policies.

2.2.1 *The Dialectic Approach to Policy Networks*

The characteristics and nature of policy networks are important factors explaining the influence of a network on policy and, in the case of this study, the differential impact and uptake of research. For instance, Evans and Davies (1999) introduced the notion of policy transfer network, ‘ad hoc phenomenon set up with the specific intention of engineering policy change’ (Evans and Barakat 2012, p. 545) and characterised by defined levels of membership, integration, resources, and power. Likewise, Marsh and Smith introduced in 2000 the dialectical approach to policy networks, a new approach attempted to ‘provide an explanation of policy continuity and change within policy networks’ (Evans 2001, p. 543) and examine policy networks effects on policy outcomes.

The starting point of Marsh and Smith’s reflection is ‘the claim that policy networks cannot be distinguished from the actors who are participating in them’ (Evans 2001, p. 543). As a consequence, the two authors produced a multi-level, interactive theory of policy networks that integrates micro-anthropological levels of analysis with macro-level of analysis and looks at the ways in which both micro-level and macro-level factors shape and affect policy. According to Marsh and Smith, ‘there are three interactive or dialectical relationships involved between: the structure of the network and the agents operating within them; the network and the context within which it operates; and the network and the policy outcome’ (Marsh and Smith 2000, p. 20). Interactive relationships between networks and actors define, shape, interpret, and reinterpret policy outcomes. Likewise, ‘the network is interpreted, reinterpreted, and constrained by its participating actors’ (Evans 2001, p. 543), in a complex interaction between structure—the network—and agency—its participating actors. According to Marsh and Smith, a dialectic, interactive, and more complex relationship exists between actors and networks. Macro-level variables are part of this relationship, as they are interpreted by both actors and network relationships and, consequently, ‘should not be seen as distinct from networks’ (Evans 2001, p. 543).

The dialectic approach to policy networks advocated an alternative pathway within the academic debate on the topic. It tried to surpass

precedent accounts and approaches to the study of policy networks and integrate them into a coherent analytical whole. It underlined the limits of the explanatory claims of meso-level approaches and argued that these can be enriched and integrated with macro and micro-level perspectives. It enriched the debates on policy networks, engaging and focusing on the interactive relationship between structure and agency. Lastly, the dialectic approach assumed a conceptual, environmental, contextual, political, ideological, institutional, cultural, and ethical variability within, and across, networks; an important aspect of policy networks which will explain the differential influence and uptake of research in British-led SSR policy in conflict-affected Sierra Leone.

This brief account of the literature on the policy process presented the modern evolution of the concept of policy network, and its particular uptake and redefinition in the British literature. Not only did British scholars further explore the concept of policy networks, aligning them in a continuum according to their degrees of integration, but they also investigated their different characteristics and the implications on policy influence, power, and access to policy-makers. This evolution of the British literature proceeded together with a change in the British policy process, ‘a shift from government by a unitary state to governance by and through networks’ (Bevir and Rhodes 2003, p. 6), an increasing hollowing out of the state (Dorey 2005; Rhodes 1997, 2007; Richards and Smith 2002), and a progressive loss of control of the British core executive over the policy-making arena (Dunleavy and Rhodes 1990; Kavanagh et al. 2006, pp. 42–63; Rhodes and Dunleavy 1995, pp. 1–60; Smith 1999).

A ‘whole range of pressures’ (Richards and Smith 2002, p. 3) therefore shapes the current policy-making process in Britain, and the role of interest groups and policy networks has become crucial in contemporary discussions of governance. Considering the influence of external groups on policy-makers has assumed paramount importance in the understanding of the modern British policy process. Researchers can be considered as one of these many competing groups—a particular external group of actors that derives its authority from knowledge and expertise in a determined field with the potential of interacting with and exerting influence on the activities of decision-makers and on the policy-making process. Nevertheless, the literature on policy networks presented in this subsection has adopted a descriptive and principally rational approach to outline a decision-making process mainly based on power relations.

The next section of this chapter looks at the work of those scholars who explored the cognitive dimension of policy networks and the role of knowledge and expertise in policy-making. Among the different and alternative approaches to the study of the policy process presented in Sect. 2.3, the analysis particularly focuses on the theoretical concept that better understands and explains the role of researchers in influencing the policy-making process: the notion of epistemic communities.

2.3 THE ROLE OF EPISTEMIC COMMUNITIES IN THE POLICY PROCESS

The bulk of the literature on policy networks employs a descriptive approach to policy networks and sees the policy process as ‘a bargaining game between different types of actors’ (Dowding 1995, p. 147) with loose or tight interactions between themselves. It mainly focuses on ‘normative questions around policy formation’ (Dowding 1995, p. 147), principally rational decision-making, power structures, and technical issues over policy formulation and implementation. It rarely devotes a similar level of attention to the processes through which interests are generated. Starting from the 1990s, new studies investigating the generation of interests and ‘the socially constructed nature of knowledge’ (Dowding 1995, p. 147) have questioned this rational, power-dependent approach and the possibility of rational policy formation. This shift of attention compelled international policy and decision-makers to face and consider an ever-widening range of issues of ‘increasingly complex and technical nature’ (Haas 1992, p. 12). The descriptive literature on policy networks was therefore no longer seen as a sufficient tool to encapsulate and explain the role of groups in the policy process. Some scholars developed new and alternative approaches that looked at the role of beliefs, meanings, and traditions in policy-making; others started to investigate ‘the generation of policy ideas from technical experts and professionals’ (Dowding 1995, p. 147).

Starting from the early 1990s, scholars and political scientists studying the policy process moved away from the rational and power-dependent models that had characterised the literature up to that point, instead exploring the role of beliefs in the policy-making process and developing alternative approaches to the study of policy networks. For example, the pioneering work of Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith introduced the advocacy coalition framework, a new view of the policy process that conceptualised public policies ‘in the same manner as belief systems,

that is, as sets of value priorities and casual assumptions about how to realise them' (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith 1993, p. 16). According to Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith's view of the policy process, advocacy coalitions 'seek to translate their beliefs into public policies or programs' (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, p. 28). Belief systems therefore 'determine the *direction* in which an advocacy coalition [...] will seek to move governmental programs' (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, p. 29, emphasis in original). Stable advocacy coalitions have a consensus upon a set of core, shared beliefs that is resistant to change. They also have some secondary beliefs that can change over time and bring a 're-evaluation of the belief system about public policy' (Dowding 1995, p. 147) and a reformulation of the interests of a coalition over a policy solution. Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith's advocacy coalition framework surpassed the understanding of public policy as a mere battle between groups, reintroducing 'the concept of ideas and their origins in the study of policy change' (Dowding 1995, p. 150), and considering knowledge as a source of power. However, in arguing that knowledge is used in open rationale debate, the authors did not aim to demonstrate that 'public policy is a result of open rational debate, and would not want to try' (Dowding 1995, p. 150).

Following the work of Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, more recent scholars such as Rhodes (2007) and Bevir and Richards (2009a, b) promote a new and decentred approach to policy networks that 'highlights the importance of beliefs, meanings, traditions and discourses' (Bever and Richards 2009a, p. 7) in the policy process. This decentred approach argues that beliefs and actions, 'informed by traditions and expressed in stories' (Rhodes 2007, p. 1259), can influence the everyday practices of policy-makers. Government advisers therefore 'define and redefine problems in new ways by telling policy-makers distinctive stories about their world and how it is governed' (Bever and Richards 2009a, p. 13). This approach thus calls for a richer understanding of networks which involves 'methodologies, such as textual analysis and ethnography, as a way of recovering meanings embedded in traditions' (Bever and Richards 2009a, p. 13) and attention to the way other people construct the world. It moves away from earlier rational, power-dependent approaches to the study of policy networks to adopt a more nuanced and articulated view of policy networks and the policy-making process.

A second group of scholars investigated the cognitive dimension of policy networks and the role of knowledge and research in the policy-making

process. The early literature on policy networks had already identified researchers and experts as two of the groups of actors potentially interacting with the policy process. For example, Laffin (1986) saw the ‘possession of expert knowledge; occupancy of a senior position in a relevant organisation’ (p. 7) as two qualities required to be part of a policy community. Similarly, Creighton Campbell et al. (1989) considered “experts”, inside government, in universities or other institutions, who research and think about policy’ (p. 86) among the main possible members of a policy community. However, it is only with the introduction of the concept of epistemic communities in the early 1990s that a new approach to account for the role of knowledge and information in policy is developed.

The literature on epistemic communities focused its attention on ‘the various ways in which new ideas and information are diffused and taken into account by decision makers’ (Haas 1992, p. 4). Haas defines epistemic communities as networks of ‘professionals with recognized expertise and competence in a particular domain and an authoritative claim to policy-relevant knowledge within that domain or issue-area’ (1992, p. 3). These networks, usually transnational in their nature, ‘can consist of social scientists or individuals from any discipline or profession who have a sufficiently strong claim to a body of knowledge that is valued by society’ (Haas 1992, p. 16). They share knowledge, beliefs, values, professional judgement, skills, methods, and techniques, and ‘can influence state interests either by directly identifying them for decision makers or by illuminating the salient dimensions of an issue from which the decision makers may then deduce their interests’ (Haas 1992, p. 4). Decision-makers can consult epistemic communities under conditions of uncertainty. Furthermore, epistemic communities can also influence the international debate and contribute to the creation of institutions that guide international behaviour, increasing ‘the likelihood of convergent state behavior and international policy coordination’ (Haas 1992, p. 4).

The notion of epistemic community is the closest to the idea of research influencing policy, as researchers could be seen as an epistemic community with expertise, competence, authoritative claim, and policy-relevant knowledge in a particular subject. Policy-makers tend to rely on the expertise and knowledge of epistemic communities to justify a particular policy pursued by a state and legitimate ‘the power that the state exercises in moving toward that policy’ (Adler and Haas 1992, p. 389). As Haas underlines, epistemic communities can influence the decisions of policy-makers in different ways: they can ‘provide advice about the likely results

of various courses of action' (Haas 1992, p. 15); they can 'help decision makers gain a sense of who the winners and losers would be as the result of a particular action or event' (Haas 1992, p. 15); they can also 'shed light on the nature of the complex interlinkages between issues and on the chain of events that might proceed either from failure to take action or from instituting a particular policy' (Haas 1992, p. 15). Additionally, epistemic communities can influence and 'help formulate policies' (Haas 1992, p. 15), providing, for example, information about a proposed policy and its alternatives, selecting an appropriate policy and working out its details, anticipating possible conflicts of interest, or building national and international coalitions supporting it. Lastly, epistemic communities 'influence policymakers through communicative action' (Adler and Haas 1992, p. 389) and can exert influence on policy innovation by 'framing the range of political controversy surrounding an issue, defining state interests, and setting standards' (Adler and Haas 1992, p. 375).

The concept of epistemic communities is thus the best way to understand the policy process and the influence of knowledge and research on policy in the framework of this book. In particular, the fact that epistemic communities can influence international debates accrues the value of this concept for this study. In line with the notion of epistemic communities, state building and SSR researchers consulted by international and national policy-makers can eventually shape bilateral SSR policies and contribute to the convergence of SSR policy at international level. In this way, epistemic communities of researchers can influence and interact with the SSR policy process. Yet, the influence, use, and uptake of ideas and research into policy are rarely part of a straightforward, immediate, linear process, but are instead impeded, hindered, inhibited, mediated, or postponed by several theoretical and practical problems. In order to address these problems, the next section of this chapter moves away from the policy network literature to present the principal theoretical models that explore the research-policy nexus and the utilisation of research in policy. It introduces the literature on research utilisation and underlines some of the main practical aspects that characterise and sometimes hinder the utilisation of research in policy.

2.4 THEORIES AND PARADIGMS OF RESEARCH UTILISATION

So far, this chapter has shown how researchers can be seen as one of the many groups that are able to interact with the policy process and influence the activities of international and national policy-makers.

In particular, the notion of epistemic communities—groups of professionals with competence, expertise, and policy-relevant knowledge in a determined area—has been introduced as the best way to understand the role and influence researchers might exert on policy. The chapter has also illustrated how the loose or tight nature of the network of policy-makers and different groups eventually determine the extent, frequency, and quality of interactions between governmental actors and external groups. The extent to which research influences and interacts with policy is thus linked to the nature and extension of the network of policy-makers, street-level bureaucrats, and researchers working on state building and SSR. Yet, the extent, quality, and frequency of interactions between researchers and policy actors within a policy network are dependent on several circumstances and numerous barriers can hinder or postpone the use of research in policy. The literature on research utilisation has extensively examined these factors and barriers that ultimately facilitate or oppose the use of research in policy. The following section of this chapter provides a review of this literature, as most of these general factors and barriers also characterise the research-policy nexus in the case of British-led SSR in Sierra Leone.

Some of the analyses that explored the role of research (and researchers) in policy assume, as a general belief, a cultural divide and lack of dialogue between researchers and policy-makers, who seem to live in parallel universes and belong to two distinct communities with different values, language, timeframes, interests, reward systems, and professional affiliations (Buse et al. 2005, p. 163; Caplan 1979; Green and Bennett 2007, p. 26). Researchers cannot understand why there is resistance to policy change despite clear scientific evidence; conversely policy-makers bemoan the inability of researchers to produce accessible and digestible findings. On the other hand, the presumption that social science ought to be useful in the formulation of policies has been accepted by policy-makers over the years, as the UK government's commitment to 'better use of evidence and research in policy making' (Cabinet Office 1999, p. 16) and the increasing amount of money DFID allocated to research in the last decade demonstrate.

The relationship between researchers and policy-makers therefore appears founded upon a difficult dilemma: on the one hand, decision-makers accept the importance of research in policy-making—at least for a mere 'value for money' approach that can justify the high amount of governmental investments on research—while, on the other hand, the differences in agendas and *forma mentis* between researchers and decision-makers seem hardly reconcilable. Facing this dilemma, also known

as the ‘two-communities’ theory (Caplan 1979), several authors tried to explain the difficult relationship between research and policy and the way research can feed into policy. Different models of research utilisation, theoretical paradigms, and understandings of the research-policy nexus have been developed over the years, and some scholars have derived from practical case studies some lessons for a better uptake of research into policy. Likewise, some authors took into account all the factors and issues facilitating or inhibiting the research-policy nexus to create conceptual frameworks that explain the interplay between research and policy in the policy-making process.

The diffuse and contingent nature of policy-making and the exercise of power in policy networks portray a fragmented and densely populated policy terrain, where policy-makers take their decisions amidst a variety of different, divergent, and sometimes competing interests. Researchers are among the competing groups and actors which can influence the policy-making process, and research is only one of the many variables and factors that can influence policy-making. As Clarke and Ramalingam underlined, ‘the model of policy-making as a rational process that gathers evidence and provides guidance for appropriate actions is highly questionable’ (2008, p. 32) and multiple, frequently competing, and intertwined sets of influences and factors also concur to the policy process (Jones and Walsh 2008, p. 2). Furthermore, the availability of quality research products does not necessarily imply their uptake into policy, as decision-makers can always decide whether to use evidence in their work or not, and how such evidence should be incorporated. Thus, the interaction between research and policy in the policy-making process can hardly be encapsulated by linear or top-down explanations of the research-policy nexus. Over the decades, new and more articulated paradigms have developed alongside the traditional linear approach to explain the role, influence, and uptake of research into policy.

The literature on the policy networks shows how various dynamic interactions between governmental and external actors often characterise the policy-making process. Likewise, the use and uptake of research into policy is rarely a linear and straightforward process, as decision-makers can become acquainted with research in a variety of ways. Over the last three decades, several scholars have investigated and theoretically explained the diverse, dynamic modes in which research influences and interacts with the policy process. As a consequence, the literature on research utilisation has grown widely to encompass numerous models,

paradigms, and theories on the research-policy nexus. First presented by Weiss in 1979, these models of research utilisation capture common approaches of policy-makers to research and constitute general understandings of the ways in which decision-makers use and take into account research as part of the policy process. These models also characterise the use of SSR and state building-oriented research by British policy-makers and street-level bureaucrats working on SSR in Sierra Leone, which is the focus of this book. Described in detail by Waldman et al. (2014, pp. 14–16), the main models of research utilisation in policy are: the classic/purist/knowledge-driven model; the problem-solving/engineering/policy-driven model; the interactive/social interaction model; the political model; the tactical model; the enlightenment/percolation/limestone model; and the intellectual enterprise view of research utilisation.

In the knowledge-driven model, a linear sequence of four stages describes the ways through which knowledge generated by research is eventually applied in policy (Rothschild 1971). The problem-solving model also sees research feeding into policy through a linear sequence; however, this process begins with a policy-maker identifying a problem and requesting a researcher to provide the missing knowledge. The interactive model sees the research-policy process as a set of interactions: social science research is one of the many competing sources from which policy-makers seek information. The political model assumes that policy-makers use congenial and supportive research findings as ‘ammunition in an adversarial system of policy making’ (Hanney et al. 2003, p. 8) to support (pre)determined positions over a policy issue. The tactical model occurs when policy-makers invoke research ‘irrespective of its conclusions’ (Weiss 1979, p. 429) for purposes such as gaining time or delaying a decision on a pressing issue. The enlightenment model is a less direct form of research uptake and assumes that insights, views, concepts, theories, and perspectives generated by social science research gradually permeate the policy-making process (Janowitz 1972). Policy-makers might not be able to quote specific studies that influenced their decisions, nonetheless ideas and values emerged in social research shape their policies. Finally, the intellectual enterprise view of research utilisation sees research as one of the many intellectual pursuits of a society that interacts with, influences, is influenced, and responds to the larger currents of social thought.

The extensive literature on research utilisation not only focuses on theoretical models of the research-policy nexus, but also includes several studies which investigated, often through practical case studies, the

several factors that can impede, hinder, inhibit, or postpone the uptake of research into policy (Cairney 2016; Carden 2004; Coleman 1991; Davies et al. 2000; Edwards 2005; Garret and Islam 1998; Nutley et al. 2002; Perri 6 2002; Sen 2010; Shaxson 2005; Walt 1994). These factors also characterise the research-policy nexus and the use of research in British-led SSR in Sierra Leone, as they can be considered general features, practical problems, and issues limiting the ideal model of a governmental decision-making based on evidence and objective knowledge. They derive from inner characteristics of the research utilisation process, as well as from the nature of both social knowledge and policy. For example, one of the main problems emerging from the research utilisation literature is attribution, understood as the difficulty of identifying the extent to which a specific piece of research has influenced a particular policy (Carden 2004; Sen 2010). Research indeed can be contributory in nature and built on others' work; it can be indirect and not targeted to a particular policy, or it can be hard to identify, quantify, and measure its potential impact on policy. Likewise, timeliness and communication are two other and equally fundamental aspects influencing the uptake of research into policy, as decision-makers usually need readily available, clear, and accessible research findings upon which to make immediate policy choices (Walt 1994). Policy-makers have limited time and they rarely rely only on research when taking their policy decisions; they often overuse, misuse, or interpret research partially, and are seldom able to predict their future information, knowledge, and research needs.

Stone (2002) is one of the several scholars who studied the factors in the research supply and demand side, as well as in the contingent political models (or 'policy currents'), that can influence the use or uptake of evidence by policy-making institutions and other research users. These factors are also likely to characterise dynamics and international policy processes such as externally-led state building and SSR interventions in conflict-affected environments. On the supply-side, an inadequate supply of policy-relevant research, lack of access to research for policy-makers, poor policy comprehension of researchers about the policy process, and ineffective communication might limit the number of studies available to policy-makers. Similarly, on the demand side politicians may ignore the existence of policy-relevant research, have a tendency for anti-intellectualism, be incapable of absorbing and using research, or tend to use it in a politicised way. Other factors, such as a societal disconnection of both researchers and decision-makers from each other, broader patterns

of socio-political, economic and cultural influence, the contested validity of knowledge, and different epistemological questions about what is knowable and the different ways of knowing further characterise and distinguish Stone's account of the research-policy nexus.

Mulgan underlined some practical limits inherent to the nature of government and social knowledge that hinder the influence and interaction of research with policy and are present in a high degree in fast-paced policy processes such as SSR in conflict-affected countries. According to Mulgan, democracy, ambiguity, and time are the limits deriving from the nature of government. In a democracy, the people and the politicians 'have every right to ignore evidence' (Mulgan 2005, p. 224); ambiguity is essential to hold together a society, as 'the assertion of rationality and evidence may have little impact' (Mulgan 2005, p. 224) when different groups have diametrically opposing views and interests. Additionally, research time is different from high-pressured decision-making time, as politicians and officials do not have time for tests and evaluations, but take quick decisions upon their internalised understanding of how the world works. Similarly, the nature of social knowledge is limited by contingency, reflexivity, and disciplinary organisation. Social knowledge is historically contingent: knowledge bases need to be constantly replenished, research users are normally sceptical about the validity of research evidence, and theories and practices change as people and systems change. Reflexivity implies that 'actors act in the light of available knowledge which transforms the accuracy of the available knowledge' (Mulgan 2005, p. 225) and has implications for a government's capacity to influence the behaviours of others. Furthermore, the disciplinary organisation of the social sciences has left major gaps and weaknesses in knowledge and areas that may be of most interest to policy-makers.

Effective and adequate communication of research findings to policy-makers is another fundamental aspect influencing the extent to which research is used in policy. Several scholars focused on the role of communication in the policy process, presenting models and practical suggestions to improve the impact of research on policy. Majone (1989), for example, starts from the assumption that 'public policy is made of language' (p. 1) to analyse the role of evidence, argument, and persuasion in the policy process. He underlines the importance of rhetorical skills for policy scientists and analysts to improve the methods and conditions of public discourse at all levels and stages of policy-making. Likewise, Porter and Prysor-Jones understand the research-policy nexus

as a three-pronged ‘process of communication linking researchers, decision makers, and those most affected by whatever issues are under consideration’ (Porter and Pryor-Jones 1997, p. vii). Starting from this model, they list the four basic stages in the research process (defining the research question; developing the proposal; conducting the study; communicating research results), and present a series of recommendations researchers should follow in each of the four stages to improve the influence and uptake of their work into policy.

The different theoretical paradigms presented, as well as lessons learned from practical studies, demonstrate how the uptake of research into policy is rarely linear and straightforward, but it follows conversely a more articulated process impeded, inhibited, postponed, or facilitated by several converging issues, factors, and external circumstances. Starting from these findings, some authors developed a series of conceptual frameworks that take into account the literature on research utilisation while trying to explain and illustrate the interplay between research and policy in the policy-making process. Among the different conceptual understandings that captured the inter-relationships between research and policy, the revised payback model originally developed by the Health Economics Research Group at Brunel University in 2003 and readapted by Waldman et al. (2014, p. 18) has been employed as a conceptual framework to support the research of this book.

Based upon the various theories of research utilisation, the model consists of a series of stages and interfaces (the latter being the commissioning, dissemination, and communication of research), which together underline the process through which research is accounted into policy. It incorporates the different interactions of this process with the stock of existing knowledge and with the wider political, professional, industrial/economic, and social environment. The need for research is identified in stage 0, which occurs before a project or a research is commissioned. Stage 1 encompasses the first inputs to research: ‘the financial inputs but also the experience of the researchers, the knowledge-base on which they build and the opportunity costs of their involvement’ (Hanney et al. 2000, p. 144). Inputs from already existing knowledge, evidence, and analysis therefore come also into play at this stage of the model. Research is then conducted in stage 2 and produces outputs and findings in stage 3. Such outputs not only improve the stock of existing knowledge, evidence, and analysis, but they are also disseminated and communicated, eventually reaching the policy arena. Research outputs such as

publications and articles produced at stage 3 can thus influence policy at a rhetoric and conceptual level, or influence policy outcomes at a primary and secondary level. Primary policy outcomes in stage 4 are formal, governmental policy documents, white papers, and cross-governmental policies. Secondary policy outcomes in stage 5 are key research themes or findings in specialised and programme-oriented policy documents, such as DFID country plans or sectoral strategies. Both primary and secondary policy outcomes can thus be influenced by ideas, concepts, and notions elaborated in research and academia.

Despite its linearity, the model leaves room for feedback loops and forward leaps and recognises the ‘multidirectional and convoluted’ (Hanney et al. 2003, p. 3) steps through which research is used and final outcomes are achieved. As a consequence, the influence of research on policy-making is best understood as part of a wider analysis of the utilisation of research in the policy process. Research can directly influence policy-makers as part of the linear flow, it can enter the stock of existing knowledge and be grabbed by policy-makers at a different time, or it can be received by other actors such as industry, professionals, and the broader public who can, in turn, influence the policy-making process.

2.5 CONCLUSION

This chapter has explored the academic literature on the policy process and research utilisation to identify concepts and ideas that shed light on the empirical case study presented in this book. The analysis has shown how researchers, policy-makers, and street-level bureaucrats can be seen as part of a policy network that interacts with and eventually influences policy decisions. In particular, Haas’ notion of epistemic communities has been used to explain the role of researchers in the policy-making process. The chapter then canvassed the literature on research utilisation to show how research rarely has a direct uptake into policy, but often interacts with the policy process in a dynamic and sometimes indirect way. By introducing some of the factors that can hinder, inhibit, or conversely facilitate the utilisation of research in policy, the chapter has concluded by presenting a readapted version of the payback model developed by the Health Economics Research Group at Brunel University (Hanney et al. 2003, Waldman et al. 2014), a conceptual framework to understand the interplay between research and policy in the policy-making process.

The theories, analyses, approaches, and frameworks introduced in this chapter have mainly considered the role of research in domestic policy; however, these same frameworks are also applicable to the use and uptake of research into international policy. They are directly relevant to the main case study presented in this book and to the task of understanding the applicability of the literature on the research-policy nexus to particular international policy of SSR in conflict-affected countries. In determining the extent to which policy-makers at headquarters level and street-level bureaucrats in Sierra Leone have used research and knowledge as part of their activities, the book therefore also aims to explore the particular challenges, difficulties, and dynamics of research utilisation in foreign policy implemented in fragile, conflict-affected environments. The next two chapters re-elaborate the literature presented in this chapter with reference to the context of state building and SSR in post-war societies. In presenting the recent evolution of externally-led state building and SSR in international policy and research, they show how the network of policy-makers, street-level bureaucrats, and researchers working on these topics has grown progressively in recent years, stretching from donor states, such as the UK, to fragile, conflict-affected countries like Sierra Leone.

NOTE

1. *Policy network* is a generic term used to identify these actors. The literature on policy networks also identifies similar general concepts such as pressure or identity groups. Besides these general terms, more specific notions such as policy communities, issue networks, iron triangles, sub-governments, or sub-systems have developed over the years to better identify, describe, and understand the linkages between a government and other groups. These notions will be considered as varieties and more specific subsets of the general notion of policy networks and will be explored in the course of the chapter.

REFERENCES

- Alderman, G. (1984). *Pressure groups and government in Great Britain*. Burnt Mill: Longman.
- Adler, E., & Haas, P. M. (1992). Conclusion: Epistemic communities, world order, and the creation of a reflective research program. *International Organisation*, 46(1), 367–390.

- Berger, S. D. (Ed.). (1981). *Organising interests in Western Europe: Pluralism, corporatism, and the transformation of politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bevir, M., & Rhodes, R. A. W. (2003). *Interpreting British governance*. London: Routledge.
- Bevir, M., & Richards, D. (2009a). Decentring policy networks: A theoretical agenda. *Public Administration*, 87(1), 3–14.
- Bevir, M., & Richards, D. (2009b). Decentring policy networks: Lessons and prospects. *Public Administration*, 87(1), 132–141.
- Buse, K., Mays, N., & Walt, G. (2005). *Making health policy*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Cabinet Office. (1999). *Modernising government*. London: The Stationery Office.
- Cairney, P. (2016). *The politics of evidence-based policy making*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Clarke, P., & Ramalingam, B. (2008). Organisational change in the humanitarian Sector. In M. Herson, J. Mitchell, & B. Ramalingam (Eds.), *ALNAP 7th review of humanitarian action* (pp. 21–82). London: ODI.
- Caplan, N. (1979). The two-communities theory and knowledge utilization. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 22(3), 459–470.
- Carden, F. (2004). Issues in assessing the policy influence of research. *International Social Science Journal*, 56(179), 135–151.
- Cater, D. (1964). *Power in Washington*. New York: Random House.
- Coleman, D. A. (1991). Policy research—Who needs it? *Governance: An International Journal of Policy and Administration*, 4(4), 420–455.
- Creighton Campbell, J., et al. (1989). Afterword on policy communities: A framework for comparative research. *Governance: An International Journal of Policy and Administration*, 2(1), 86–94.
- Davies, H. T. O., Nutley, S. M., & Smith, P. C. (Eds.). (2000). *What works? Evidence-based policy and practice in public services*. Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Dorey, P. (2005). *Policy-making in Britain: An introduction*. London: Sage.
- Dowding, K. (1995). Model or metaphor? A critical review of the policy network approach. *Political Studies*, 43(1), 136–158.
- Dunleavy, P., & Rhodes, R. A. W. (1990). Core executive studies in Britain. *Public Administration*, 68(1), 3–28.
- Easton, D. (1965). *A framework for political analysis*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Edwards, M. (2005). Social science research and public policy: Narrowing the divide. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 64, 68–74.
- Ethridge, M. E., & Handelman, H. (2010). *Politics in a changing world: A comparative introduction to political science*. Wadsworth: Cengage Learning.
- Evans, M. (2001). Understanding dialectics in policy network analysis. *Political Studies*, 49(3), 542–550.

- Evans, M., & Barakat, S. (2012). Post-war reconstruction, policy transfer and the world bank: The case of Afghanistan's national solidarity programme. *Policy Studies*, 33(6), 541–565.
- Evans, M., & Davies, J. (1999). Understanding policy transfer: A multi-level multi-disciplinary perspective. *Public Administration*, 77(2), 361–362.
- Freeman, J. L. (1965). *The political process*. New York: Doubleday.
- Freeman, J. L., & Stevens, J. P. (1987). A theoretical and conceptual reexamination of subsystem politics. *Public Policy and Administration*, 2(1), 9–24.
- Grant, W. (1978). *Insider groups, outsider groups and interest group strategies in Britain*. Working Paper No. 19. Warwick: University of Warwick, Department of Politics.
- Grant, W. (1995). *Pressure group politics and democracy in Britain*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Garrett, J. L., & Islam, Y. (1998). *Policy research and the policy process: Do the twain ever meet?* Gatekeeper Series No. 74. Washington, DC: International Institute for Environment and Development.
- Green, A., & Bennett, S. (Eds.). (2007). *Sound choices: Enhancing capacity for evidence-informed health Policy*. Geneva: World Health Organisation.
- Haas, P. M. (1992). Introduction: Epistemic communities and international policy coordination. *International Organisation*, 46(1), 1–35.
- Hanney, S., Packwood, T., & Buxton, M. (2000). Evaluating the benefits from health research and development centres: A categorization, a model and examples of application. *Evaluation: The International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice*, 6(2), 137–160.
- Hanney, S., et al. (2003). The utilisation of health research in policy-making: Concepts, examples and methods of assessment. *Health Research Policy and Systems*, 1(2), 1–28.
- Heclo, H. (1978). Issue networks and the executive establishment. In S. H. Beer & A. S. King (Eds.), *The new American political system* (pp. 87–124). Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Heclo, H., & Wildavsky, A. (1974). *The private government of public money*. London: Macmillan.
- Janowitz, M. (1972). Professionalization of sociology. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78(1), 105–135.
- John, P. (1998). *Analysing public policy*. London: Continuum.
- Jones, C. O. (1979). American politics and the organization of energy decision-making. *Annual Review of Energy*, 4, 99–121.
- Jones, N., & Walsh, C. (2008). *Policy briefs as a communication tool for development research*. ODI background note. London: ODI.
- Jordan, A. G. (1990). Sub-Governments, policy communities and networks: Refilling the old bottles. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 2(3), 319–338.

- Jordan, A. G., & Richardson, J. J. (1982). The British policy style or the logic of negotiation? In J. J. Richardson (Ed.), *Policy styles in Western Europe* (pp. 80–110). London and Boston: Allen & Unwin.
- Jordan, A. G., & Richardson, J. J. (1987). *Government and pressure groups in Britain*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Jung, T. (2010). Policy networks: Theory and practice. In S. P. Osborne (Ed.), *The new public governance?: Emerging perspectives on the theory and practice of public governance* (pp. 351–364). London: Routledge.
- Kavanagh, D., et al. (2006). *British politics* (5th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kimber, R., & Richardson, J. J. (Eds.). (1974). *Pressure groups in Britain: A reader*. London: J. M. Dent & Sons.
- Laffin, M. (1986). *Professionalism and policy: The role of the professions in the central-local government relationship*. Aldershot: Gower.
- Lord Rothschild. (1971). The organisation and management of government R&D. *A Framework for government research and development* (pp. 747–776). London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Majone, G. (1989). *Evidence, argument and persuasion in the policy process*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Marsh, D., & Rhodes, R. A. W. (1992). *Policy networks in British government*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Marsh, D., & Smith, M. (2000). Understanding policy networks: Towards a dialectical approach. *Political Studies*, 48(1), 4–21.
- Mulgan, G. (2005). Government, knowledge and the business of policy making: The potential and limits of evidence-based policy. *Evidence & Policy: A Journal of Research, Debate and Practice*, 1(2), 215–226.
- Norton, P. (1995). Parliament's changing role. In R. Pyper & L. Robins (Eds.), *Governing the UK in the 1990s* (pp. 85–107). Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Nutley, S., Davies, H., & Walter, I. (2002). *Evidence based policy and practice: Cross sector lessons from the UK*. ESRC UK Centre for Evidence Based Policy and Practice Working Paper 9. St. Andrews: Research Unit for Research Utilisation, University of St. Andrews.
- Parry, G. (1969). *Political elites*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Perri 6. (2002). Can policy making be evidence-based? *MCC: Building Knowledge for Integrated Care*, 10(1), 3–8.
- Porter, R. W., & Prysor-Jones, S. (1997). *Making a difference to policies and programmes: A guide for researchers*. Washington, DC: Support for Analysis and Research in Africa Project.
- Pross, P. A. (1986). *Group politics and public policy*. Don Mills: Oxford University Press Canada.
- Rhodes, R. A. W. (1981). *Control and power in central-local government relationships*. Farnborough: Gower.

- Rhodes, R. A. W. (1986). *The national world of local government*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Rhodes, R. A. W. (1997). *Understanding governance: Policy networks, governance, reflexivity and accountability*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Rhodes, R. A. W. (2006). Policy network analysis. In M. Moran, M. Rein, & R. E. Goodin (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of public policy* (pp. 425–447). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rhodes, R. A. W. (2007). Understanding governance: Ten years on. *Organization Studies*, 28(8), 1243–1264.
- Rhodes, R. A. W., & Dunleavy, P. (Eds.). (1995). *Prime minister, cabinet, and core executive*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Richards, D., & Smith, M. J. (2002). *Governance and public policy in the UK*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Richardson, J. J. (1982). *Policy styles in Western Europe*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Richardson, J. J., & Jordan, A. G. (1979). *Governing under pressure: The policy process in a post-parliamentary democracy*. Oxford: Martin Robertson.
- Ripley, R., & Franklin, J. (1981). *Congress, the bureaucracy, and public policy*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- Rush, M. (Ed.). (1990). *Parliament and pressure politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sabatier, P. A. (Ed.). (1999). *Theories of the policy process*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Sabatier, P. A., & Jenkins-Smith, H. C. (Eds.). (1993). *Policy change and learning*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Sen, K. (2010). *Literature review on rates of return to research*. Research for Development Record. Retrieved September 25, 2013, from <http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk/Output/183629/Default.aspx>.
- Shaxson, L. (2005). Is your evidence robust enough? Questions for policy makers and practitioners. *Evidence & Policy*, 1(1), 101–112.
- Skogstad, G. (2005). *Policy networks and policy communities: Conceptual evolution and governing realities*. Paper Prepared for the Workshop on “Canada’s Contribution to Comparative Theorizing”, Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association. London: University of Western Ontario.
- Smith, M. J. (1993). *Pressure, power and policy: State autonomy and policy networks in Britain and the United States*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Smith, M. J. (1999). *The core executive in Britain*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Stone, D. (2002). Using knowledge: The dilemmas of bridging research and policy. *Compare*, 32(3), 285–296.
- Tocqueville, C. A. (2003). *Democracy in America: And two essays on America*. London: Penguin.

- Van Waarden, F. (1992). Dimension and types of policy networks. *European Journal of Political Research*, 21(1), 29–52.
- Waldman, T., Barakat, S., & Varisco, A. (2014). *Understanding influence: The use of statebuilding research in British policy*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Walt, G. (1994). How far does research influence policy? *European Journal of Public Health*, 4(4), 233–235.
- Weiss, C. H. (1979). The many meanings of research utilization. *Public Administration Review*, 39(5), 426–431.
- Wilks, S., & Wright, M. (1987). Conclusion: Comparing government-industry relations: States, sectors, and networks. In S. Wilks & M. Wright (Eds.), *Comparative government-industry relations: Western Europe, the United States, and Japan* (pp. 274–313). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Wright, M. (1988). Policy community, policy network and comparative industrial policies. *Political Studies*, 36(2), 593–612.

Research in Security Sector Reform Policy

The Case of Sierra Leone

Varisco, A.E.

2018, XXIII, 279 p. 11 illus., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-1-137-58674-2

A product of Palgrave Macmillan UK