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Abstract
This paper looks at the gap between growing knowledge of school improvement and public policy for education. I examine the likelihood that governments will actually adopt improvement-friendly policies, and the factors both supporting and militating against their doing so. A main section of the paper discusses the nature of government decision-making processes and the possibilities and limits these create for reform. A final section provides some recommendations to researchers interested in school improvement as to how they could have more impact on public policy.

Introduction
In this paper I want to ask what we can reasonably expect from governments in regard to education reform, and what role researchers might play in improving education policy. How might we bring our increasing knowledge about school improvement together with the realities of government and politics to support policies and practices that are of real benefit to students, families and communities? In addressing this question, I focus more on government and politics than on school improvement, for reasons that will be explained later.

This paper grows very much out of my own experience. Over the past twenty-five years I have moved back and forth from the world of education research to the world of education policy and management. I have been a school trustee, a school board research director, a university professor, a university administrator, and — twice — a senior civil servant. In all that time, I have been concerned with the relationship between research, policy and practice, and the extent to which research knowledge affects what really happens in schools and school systems.

In 1996, I began a research project looking at recent large-scale education reforms in several English-speaking jurisdictions (the full study is in Levin, 2001). Nobody will be surprised by my observation that much of the recent effort in education reform has had disappointing results. In
large part, our increasing knowledge about teaching and learning, and about ways in which we could actually improve students’ learning was not adequately reflected in these reforms (Hopkins & Levin, 2000).

Two other aspects of my present situation are especially relevant to this paper. I am currently the chief civil servant responsible for education in the Province of Manitoba. This gives me a very direct role in shaping education policy, since in Canada education is the responsibility of provincial governments. I am also, in my capacity as a professor at The University of Manitoba, a participant in a study, centred at OISE/University of Toronto, looking at the implementation of the National Literacy Strategy and National Numeracy Strategy in England (see http://www.standards.dfee.gov.uk/literacy/publications/). This gives me an opportunity to look from outside at one of the largest, best-developed efforts anywhere to change teaching and learning practices in ways that will truly affect student outcomes.

The Knowledge-Policy Gap

Growing knowledge

Education research remains a very small endeavour in relation to the scale of education practice. Financial support and infrastructure for improving our knowledge about education takes up a tiny proportion of the resources provided to deliver education. Health, in comparison, spends a much larger proportion of budget on research and development. The research and evaluation effort in relation to work-related training is also much more substantial in relation to the size of the sector than is the case for elementary, secondary or tertiary education.

I am not suggesting that if we had enough money we would be able to achieve knowledge about education that would be determinative of action and results. Without entering into the debate about the nature of knowledge in the social sciences, it seems safe to say that the changing context around education will mean that our knowledge is always provisional and will need constant review. As people’s ideas and situations change, so will their response to education, so that strategies that were successful in one place and time will not necessarily be so in other situations. Context matters enormously in teaching and learning; one size does not and will never fit everyone.

Moreover, people disagree about what education should be for, which inevitably has consequences for the way schools operate. The growing emphasis in the past two decades on the economic purposes of schooling has led to more managerialist and directive education policy as opposed to an earlier view that placed more emphasis on a profession-centred approach to developing human capacity broadly.

Yet even with a small investment and an ever-changing environment we have learned a great deal over the past twenty years or so about school improvement both in regard to substance and process. In terms of substance, we know much more about many things, such as teaching initial reading, working with some kinds of disabilities, the importance of motivation in shaping achievement, ways of involving parents in their children’s education, and so on. There is
growing recognition of the importance of focusing on changes that will directly affect what and how students learn.

We also know much more about the process of change and improvement. The problems and issues around implementation of change are well developed conceptually. We have come to understand how uncertain are the links between changes in systems and changes in teaching and learning. Current ideas about capacity-building and learning organizations provide exciting ways of working towards improvements that seem much more consistent with the ideals of education than did earlier approaches. The International Handbook on Educational Change (Hargreaves et al., 1998) provides a good overview of this field.

**Problems of policy**

Many researchers believe that our growing knowledge about effective schooling is not well reflected in government policy (or, for that matter, in daily practice in schools). The educational outcomes of many of the reforms of the last two decades have been disappointing because the reforms have not taken into account what we are learning about how to conduct education more effectively and about how to design and implement changes that support more effective practices.

Policy falls short of knowledge in a number of respects, some of which David Hopkins and I have outlined elsewhere (Hopkins & Levin, 2000). We believe that the school improvement research would suggest a focus on classroom practice, support for validated curriculum and teaching models, support for extensive staff development, acceptance of the importance of local context, and a general emphasis on building school capacity in ways supported by research evidence. However, much of the reform emphasis has been on changes in governance, more prescribed curricula, increased assessment of students and greater use of market-like mechanisms. In terms of policy levers, reform programs have tended to emphasize mandatory approaches and threats, rather than building institutional understanding and capacity to act more effectively. Issues of implementation and support for local options have not been prominent.

Governments and politics receive much of the blame for this state of affairs. Some critics of recent policies contend that governments have deliberately adopted regressive policies because of ideological commitments that support increased inequality. Others may take the view that the weaknesses in current policy are the result of government ignorance or the dominance of political considerations over educational ones. Certainly, many educators see politics as antithetical to education and may harbour the wish, however forlorn, that political pressures might diminish or disappear so that they can get on with the work of educating young people (Levin & Riffel, 1997). Ironically, this distrust of politics is also one of the motivators for those who favour more use of markets as vehicles to solve educational problems (Plank & Boyd, 1994).

It seems superfluous to point out that there is no chance whatsoever of politics disappearing from education in the foreseeable future. In fact, the trend has been very much in the other direction, with the growing political salience of education leading to greater political interest and intervention. Education is high on the list of issues of public concern in various opinion polls.
The various parties — not only governments, but also educators and various third parties — have successfully argued that education is vital, with the inevitable result that it features in the programs of political parties. Education has been a central feature of the most recent national political campaigns in the U.S. and U.K. In Canada, where the national government is excluded from constitutional authority over education, issues of learning were nonetheless often discussed in the recent federal election. It will be especially important, then, for educators and researchers to understand political processes more fully in order to participate in them more effectively and influence them more substantially.

The Dynamics of Government

Educators sometimes describe politics as a largely irrational activity. That is not my experience at all. In fact, politics is intensely rational. However, the premises behind political rationality are not necessarily the same as those governing education or research.

To understand political processes more fully, it is important to keep in mind six fundamental factors that affect all elected governments. Although these descriptions arise largely from my own experience, they are also supported by a substantial literature on the dynamics of government, which is discussed at greater length in Levin (2001).

1. Governments do not control their own agendas.

Although every government comes to office with a set of policy ideals or commitments, the reality is that much of what governments attend to is not of their own design or preference. One vital difference between government and private-sector companies is that the latter can largely determine what business they want to be in, whereas governments have to be in whatever businesses people see as important. Nor are people necessarily consistent or reasonable in their views as to what governments ought to do — or refrain from doing.

Government agendas are certainly shaped in part by political commitments, party platforms, and the views of key political leaders. Governments do try to keep a focus on meeting the commitments they made when elected. However, they are also influenced — and often to a much greater extent — by external political pressures, changing circumstances, unexpected events and crises.

As soon as a government is elected, various groups try to influence its agenda in accord with their own. This is in many ways the essence of the political process. It means, though, that politicians are constantly bombarded with requests or demands to do things, stop doing things, increase funding, decrease funding, pass legislation, repeal other legislation, and so on. As people are better educated and better organized, the number and intensity of the pressures on politicians has risen.

The nature of political life is such that there is no respite from these demands. A politician may leave her or his office, but almost every social encounter will also lead to new pressures or requests. Being a politician is a 24/7 job, as the new e-language would put it.
Unanticipated developments can also affect political agendas. If the economy turns sour and revenues drop, if natural disasters occur, if new domestic developments take place, governments must respond in some way, even if that means taking attention and resources away from other activities that were high on the priority list. As Dror puts it (1986, p. 168), there is "at any given moment a high probability of low probability events occurring. In other words, surprise dominates" (1986, p. 186).

While some of these pressures relate to very important, long-term issues, others may concern small short-term details. However, one cannot assume that the former will always be more important than the latter. Sometimes very small items can turn into huge political events (Bovens & t’Hart, 1994). For example, a system may be working quite well for 99% of those using it, but one or two complaints can sometimes trigger so much attention that the entire system has to be reviewed and changed.

Governments are particularly susceptible to issues that take on public salience through the media. As most people get their information about public events from the mass media, an issue that is played up in the media often becomes something that a government must respond to, even if the issue was no part of the government’s policy or plan. Media coverage is itself motivated by a number of considerations, but long-term importance to public welfare is not necessarily one of them. Indeed, novelty is an important requisite for the media in order to sustain reader or viewer interest, so that governments are likely to be faced with an ever-changing array of issues supposedly requiring immediate attention.

**Figure 1 shows the range of influences that come to bear on political decisions.**
2. There is never enough time.

Governments are in some sense responsible for everything. Government leaders have to make decisions about a vast array of issues — from highways to the environment, from financial policy to education, from health to justice systems. And, as just noted, they are likely to face an unending set of pressures on their energy and attention. A cabinet member not only has responsibility for her or his own area of jurisdiction — which can itself be enormously complicated and fraught with difficulties — but is also supposed to participate in collective decision-making on a wide variety of other matters facing the government.

Consider a small jurisdiction such as Manitoba. The Minister of Education was newly elected in the fall of 1999 and had previously been a town councilor and part-time teacher. When named minister, he acquired responsibility for everything to do with elementary, secondary and post-secondary education, as well as adult education and training. He has to give political and substantive direction to staff on every aspect of these systems, many of which involve great subtleties and complexities. At the same time, every week, he goes to a cabinet meeting at which a whole range of issues from all his colleagues are also on the table for discussion. In a given week, these might include a new mineral exploration license, a change in policy on highway maintenance, a loan for a new commercial enterprise, changes in legislation regulating a profession, funding for a new health program, setting new entry prices for provincial parks, deciding on a communications strategy for a change in a social program, and so on for twenty or thirty items. In addition, he has many political functions to attend, and a constituency to look after. Some politicians even try to have time for family, friends and a personal life!

There is, consequently, never enough time to think about issues in sufficient depth. Senior government leaders, both politicians and civil servants, work under tremendous time pressures, in which they are expected to make knowledgeable decisions about all the issues facing them within very short timelines and without major errors. This is, of course, impossible. It is nonetheless what we expect from our leaders.

The result is that important decisions are often made very quickly, with quite limited information and discussion. This is not because politicians like making hurried or uninformed decisions, but because there is no alternative.

The pressure of multiple issues is also one of the reasons that policy implementation tends to get short shrift. As soon as one decision has been made, there is enormous pressure to get on to the next issue. Even with the best intentions, it is hard to get back to something from months ago to see how it is progressing, since so many other issues have meanwhile arrived on the doorstep.

3. Politics and policies are both important.

Everything in government occurs in the shadow of elections. Every government is thinking all the time about how to improve its prospects for being re-elected. Some find this cynical, but it is hard to see what else politicians could do. After all, this concern for re-election is really a
concern to do what most people want, and presumably we elect governments for precisely that purpose. A government that does not satisfy people will be tossed out most of the time. The British cabinet minister in the TV series *Yes Minister* understandably reacted with dismay when his chief advisor, Sir Humphrey, called for taking a courageous stand, since this meant doing something unpopular. If we vilify our politicians for ignoring our wishes, we can hardly be surprised if they go to great lengths to try not to do so.

At the same time, governments are often genuinely concerned about the results of their actions and policies. They do usually want to fulfill their commitments to voters, and programs and policies are the means of doing so. Policy does matter because it is a vital part of political success. Some politicians are intensely pragmatic and willing to reshape policy in light of changing pressures or public preferences, while others are deeply committed to particular values and work hard to promote and implement a course of action over years.

There is, to be sure, a cynical side to this effort, in that governments do attempt to manipulate public opinion, to give the perception of action even when they are not doing much, and sometimes focus on image rather than substance. Rhetoric is a vital part of politics (Levin & Young, 2000), and government statements of intention cannot necessarily be taken at face value. Murray Edelman (1964, 1984) and Deborah Stone (1988), among others, provide excellent analyses of the symbolic dimensions of policy. As the increasing level of cynicism about politics shows, however, these strategies are, in the longer-term, self-defeating, especially with electorates that are increasingly better educated.

4. *People and systems both matter.*

Much of what a government does is shaped by the individuals who happen to occupy critical positions, regardless of their political stripe. Any political party is likely to contain a wide range of views and positions. In fact, to put it in statistical terms, the within-group variance in ideas in a party is likely to be quite a bit larger than the variance between one party and another. So the individuals who come to hold certain positions are important. Whether a particular cabinet member or government leader is a hawk or a dove on certain issues makes a big difference to the ideas that get considered and promoted. Can anyone doubt that the educational history of England would have been different had the Conservative government in the 1980s had someone other than Margaret Thatcher as prime minister?

At the same time, the nature of government systems also matters. The roles of departments and agencies, the relative power of ministers vis-à-vis central government, and the nature of checks and balances are all important in shaping the way policies are constructed and delivered. The Labour government in New Zealand in the 1980s was able to make huge changes in a short time because the country had a unicameral system with no written constitution and few balances against a strong and determined majority government. It would be much, much more difficult to do something similar in the United States or Canada because there are more built-in limitations on what a government can do.
5. **A full-time opposition changes everything.**

Imagine how your work might change if there were people whose full-time job it was to make you look bad. Imagine also that they could use means of doing so that were less than scrupulous, and that there was a tendency for people to believe their criticisms ahead of your explanations. Might that not change the way each of us went about our work?

Yet that is precisely the situation facing every elected government. Oppositions are there to oppose. They will work hard to show how government actions are wrong, venal, or destructive. In doing so, they will not always be particularly concerned with balance or fairness in their accounts.

While many people decry negativity in politics, politicians use this strategy not necessarily because they like it, but because they think it works. If conflict is what attracts public attention, then conflict is what politicians will create, since public attention is what they must have. A politician friend once told me that he got far more publicity and recognition from a certain public relations gesture that he knew was rather narrow than from any number of thoughtfully articulated policy papers, so the public relations gesture would continue.

There is a potential 'tragedy of the commons' in this dynamic, however. To the extent that political processes focus on the negative and the critical, even when the issues are not really substantive, they serve to increase voter cynicism about politics, which in turn leads to even more focus on the negative since this is what resonates for people. Low levels of voter turnout in a number of countries indicate that there is substantial disenchantment with politics generally, which must surely be a worrisome trend. Yet as long as the incentives push political action in this direction, we are unlikely to see a change in pattern.

6. **Beliefs are more important than facts.**

Academics are usually convinced that policy ought to be driven by research findings and other empirical evidence. From a political perspective, however, evidence is only one factor that shapes decisions, and it may be one of the less important factors at that. I have had a number of politicians tell me on various occasions that, while the evidence I was presenting for a particular policy might be correct, the policy was not what people wanted.

For politicians, what people believe to be true is much more important than what may actually be true. Beliefs drive political action and voting intentions much more than do facts. Witness the strength and depth of public support for various measures that clearly fly in the face of strong evidence. Many people continue to believe in capital punishment or other severe sentences as deterrents for crime, or that welfare cheating is a bigger problem than income tax evasion. Others are convinced that amalgamating units of government saves money, or that free tuition would substantially increase accessibility for the poor, or that retaining students in grade will improve achievement even though in all these cases a strong body of evidence indicates otherwise. Where beliefs are very strongly held political leaders challenge them at their peril.
Even more problematic is that there is no requirement for people to be consistent in their attitudes, either across issues or over time. The same people who demand more services from governments may also demand lower taxes. The same people who in one year argued vehemently in favour of reduced government spending might the following year be just as impassioned when pointing out the negative consequences of the reductions. People can and do hold inconsistent beliefs, but political leaders must do their best to accommodate these inconsistencies in some way.

Not everything in government is subject to all these constraints. At any given time, much of what a government is doing happens outside the political sphere. Programs are organized, services are delivered, activities are undertaken, payments are made, without political scrutiny. Many activities of government are not of much public interest unless something dramatic happens. And the many pressures at the political level ensure that there is not enough time to look at everything no matter what one might wish to do. However, as soon as an issue gets onto the public agenda, it will be of interest to politicians and all the problems noted will apply.

Given all of these dimensions, it should not be surprising that some policies are poorly thought out. The real surprise might be to find policies that are coherent, thoughtful and well-developed. In some ways, governing a modern country is an almost impossible task.

**Possibilities for Improvement**

The constraints and limits of politics and government are significant. However, the current situation offers more grounds for optimism about public policy, in my view, than would have been the case twenty or thirty years ago. There have been some positive trends in policy-making in recent years — not so much in the substance of what has been done, but in the changing nature of the political process.

Three particularly important developments concern the growing importance of public debate, the growing importance of research and evidence, and the growing understanding of the importance of implementation and adaptation.

Because people are more insistent on having a voice on political issues than used to be the case, and because there are more and better organized interest groups, governments generally have to pay more attention to public opinion than they used to and cannot so easily dismiss firmly held views (Levin, 2001). For example, Canadian provincial governments are increasingly engaging in public consultation exercises before making significant policy changes. Commissions, hearings, white papers, web sites and other devices are used to provide an opportunity for input to a much greater extent than used to be the case. Lobby groups have also gained importance. Business groups have had significant impact on education policy in recent years (Manzer, 1994), and foundations or ‘think tanks’ have also played a growing role. Parent coalitions have been important influences in several jurisdictions.

These processes are not always genuine; sometimes governments have already decided what will be done and consultation is pro forma. Sometimes, the goal is decided and consultation is only about means. There is also no guarantee that the views expressed during consultations will
themselves be well founded or helpful. However, increased public debate does offer the opportunity for everyone to learn more about the issues even if that learning is not immediately turned into policy. This potential is far from being fully used, but may become more so as societies learn more about how to conduct political argument in a constructive way. We are only at the beginning of this process.

The growing importance of public discussion of issues coincides with increased interest in research and evidence as contributors to policy. In some policy fields, such as health or training, few debates now take place without at least some attention to empirical evidence. Education lags these fields by quite a bit, with in some cases very little attention to evidence, but here, too, the pattern is changing. Even some of the most vitriolic education debates, such as those over reading methods or school choice or testing, have made extensive use of evidence of various kinds. Leaders in education are also gradually learning to pay attention to research. Some might argue that the evidence is only brought forward to support previously held opinions, but over time evidence can begin to assert an independent effect on what people take to be true and therefore on the way political agendas are constructed (Kingdon, 1994). A good example would be recent attention to early childhood development, an interest driven at least in part by the accumulation of evidence about the importance of these early years to children’s life prospects. Insofar as more evidence is gathered and made public, people will also get increasingly used to evidence as a part of debate, which would itself be a positive development.

Finally, increased attention to issues of implementation and adaptation makes it more possible for those directly involved with education reform — especially teachers, parents and students — to have a real and acknowledged share in shaping the way reforms actually work. As thinking moves from reform as mandates to reform as capacity-building, leaders will have to pay more attention to what those ‘in the field’ think, because in the end it is their commitment that will shape the success of most initiatives. The literature on managing generally is giving increasing attention to idea of organizational learning and more participative decision-making. The reality of life in most organizations may not reflect the rhetoric, but the ideas do have an impact on what is possible politically.

These developments are creating changes in the way public policy is developed. All of them lead towards a better balance between knowledge and partisanship in policy-making, as suggested by Majone (1989) or Lindblom (1990). These changes also open some real opportunities to educational researchers and policy analysts if we use them carefully and knowledgeably. It may be tempting to sit back and complain about the disastrous nature of political practice — just as politicians might complain about the very real problems and limits they see in the work of researchers — but it is going to be much more rewarding to look at ways in which the impact of research could be strengthened.

**Linking Evidence to Policy**

I want to suggest three ways in which researchers can strengthen the value and impact of their work. All of these assume that the work itself is already of high quality — carefully conceptualized and put together so that data and findings are robust.
1. Try to stay focused on what matters.

Researchers are not immune to the tendency to faddism. A search through the abstracts of any major conference over time will show that the presentations and papers do follow fashion, with topics rising and falling in interest. But research only has impact over time, from a considerable body of evidence well put together, and with a focus on something that can really make a meaningful difference. So one challenge for researchers is to develop, individually and collectively, bodies of work that are focused on central issues and that are sustained over time.

By ‘central issues’ I mean those things that can make a difference to what happens in schools and to students. A good example would be the body of work on early reading. It is probably risky to venture into an area in which I am manifestly not an expert, but there does seem to be a growing consensus that early reading is best supported by a balance of methods in the classroom and strong connections to home and family. The reading wars may be continuing for the moment unabated, but the most recent syntheses of knowledge in this area (Burns, Griffin & Snow, 1999) hold the promise of allowing us to move the discussion of reading to a less polemical plane and to work with families and schools to change practices in ways that really will improve outcomes. Other areas of potential impact where a significant body of evidence could help shape policy and practice would include strengthening links with families (e.g., Coleman, 1998) or improving pathways between schools, post-secondary education and work (Krahn, 1996).

2. Disseminate.

Research has impact gradually over time, but the degree of impact and length of time depends on how strongly and effectively it is disseminated. The pressures of politics are such that political leaders tend to be bombarded with policy ideas rather than having to seek them out. In a world crowded with competing ideas, quality will not necessarily win out by itself. Good ideas and good evidence have to be sold (Kingdon, 1994).

Most researchers have only a very limited idea of what real dissemination means. We tend to think that giving conference papers and writing articles constitutes effective dissemination. However, in recent years, the growth of lobbying organizations has brought more attention to getting ideas noticed. A wide variety of tools and strategies are now used to make ideas known to more people in ways that make them more likely to be noticed. As well, special purpose institutions have been developed to propagate public policy ideas, including a whole range of ‘think tanks’ as well as new media vehicles. Many of these organizations are very good at getting ideas into the public eye.

I regard it as unlikely that individual researchers will ever give a great deal of attention to dissemination in this broader sense. This work requires special skills and dedicated resources. Instead of expecting researchers to do it as an add-on, we need to look at developing structures that have dissemination as a central goal or focus and are specialized to do this work. Universities have begun to explore ways in which they could, as institutions, do more to disseminate and promote the results of their research. Governments have taken some encouraging steps in this direction as well, such as the program in the U.K. to conduct, make public and disseminate independent research on important issues. Various third-party
organizations such as foundations, professional groups and research associations also could play an important role in this domain. The key is to ensure that we give as much attention to getting ideas and evidence into the public arena as we do producing the ideas and evidence in the first place.

3. **Build interaction and links with users.**

Research use is not built only through formal efforts at dissemination. Connections between researchers and potential users have to be built from the outset so that there is discussion about what research should be done and how it should be done as well as about outcomes and conclusions. Researchers need and would benefit from more interaction at more points with politicians, civil servants, and all the various community organizations that may have an interest in their work.

Connections with users should not be limited to those in formal decision-making roles. As influences on public policy broaden, researchers need to keep in mind the entire range of audiences that might have an interest in their work, including labour organizations, community groups, professional associations, foundations, lobbyists of various kinds, and the media. It may well be easier to shape government agendas through third-parties than directly. In any case, research is most likely to be policy-relevant when researchers are connected to and have an understanding of the issues of concern to a range of people and organizations.

There are many dilemmas to be faced in acting on this simple suggestion (Levin, 1993). Issues of independence and objectivity arise, since to the extent that research is seen to be done in support of a particular point of view, it may lose some of its credibility. I am not arguing that all research needs to have an immediate practical purpose, either. However, we are still reasonably far from a situation in which research in education is excessively oriented to the problems of policy and practice. There is still considerable room for researchers to work more closely with users of various kinds in all phases of research.

**Conclusion**

I have attempted in this paper to combine a realistic view of what government is like with optimism about the potential impact of research and empirical evidence on public policy. I have argued that there is scope to increase the impact of research on policy, and that some important long-term trends in policy-making appear to be working in this direction. However, some hard-headed realism on the part of researchers and analysts is required, including a willingness to understand and accept the realities of government. If we are willing to take seriously the constraints and requirements of political action, we improve our chance to bring the increasing knowledge about better schooling to bear on policy.
Endnotes

This paper is the opinion of the author only and does not necessarily represent the views of the Government of Manitoba.

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the International Congress on School Effectiveness and Improvement, Toronto, January 2001.

I gratefully acknowledge the contribution of David Hopkins to the ideas developed in this paper.
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