

## **Knowledge mobilization: the new research imperative**

Tara Fenwick, University of Stirling, and Lesley Farrell, University of Technology, Sydney

How can educational research have more impact? How do we know the depth and scope of the impact it has? What processes of knowledge exchange are most effective for increasing the uses of research results? How can research-produced knowledge be better ‘mobilized’ among users such as practicing educators, policy makers, and the public communities?

These sorts of questions, despite their many embedded definitional, philosophical and pragmatic problems, are commanding urgent attention in educational discourses and research policies now circulating in the UK and Europe, Canada and the US, Australia and other parts of the world. This attention has been translated into powerful material exercises that shape what is considered to be worthwhile research and how research is funded, recognized, and assessed. Granting agencies request knowledge mobilization or knowledge exchange plans and offer special funds for its purposes. Researchers and universities are explicitly directed, in research design and accountability, to emphasize knowledge exchange or mobilization - announced by one funding council as a core priority (SSHRC 2008, 2010).

Yet precisely what activities constitute effective knowledge mobilization, or even what is meant by ‘moving knowledge’, remains unclear. Equally puzzling is why a predominant focus on applied research - with linear associations of knowledge being piped from one site to another - has become a desirable aim for educational research. What *politics* are at play in determining knowledge ‘impact’ across radically different contexts, each comprising unique needs and diffuse educational processes where multiple influences are entangled? What activities, exactly, enact effective knowledge mobilization according to different audiences? Who determines what counts as impact, and for what purposes? How are ‘results’ of educational research separated from its participants and processes? What are the consequences of distinguishing users from producers in educational knowledge and research, and who benefits from such distinctions?

Knowledge mobilization in educational research also invokes debates about the *languages* through which knowledge is constructed, policy processes are enacted, and research unfolds. A panoply of terms that signify very different processes and interests are often used synonymously: knowledge mobilization, exchange, transfer, and use; research results, processes, and impact; research, inquiry, knowledge, and evidence. Knowledge mobilization in some formulations is portrayed as a linear and rational matter of designing more targeted and appealing dissemination, but it is entangled in social processes and contradictory influences. The worlds of research and of policy (Ungerleider, this volume), for example, function with very different rhythms, orientations, risks and accountabilities, and knowledge-sharing among their languages is a fraught endeavour at best. Certainly as research and its texts move around the globe, problematics emerge about what is valued as scholarship as it is mediated and made visible or invisible through particular dominant languages and relations of research, as argued in this volume’s final chapter (Lingard, Hardy and Heimans).

Indeed, in any relationships among researchers and the communities they serve, there exist conflicts over the value, purpose and ultimately the *responsibilities* of knowledge mobilization: different systems often attempt to shape educational research to meet their own needs (Edwards, Sebba and Rickinson 2007: 653). Increasing concern, for instance, has been voiced about researchers' responsibilities in approaching unique epistemologies such as Indigenous knowledges, which have historically been colonized by dominant forms of educational research (L.T. Smith 1999). Negotiating these diverse expectations may require special knowledge about communicating and building relationships (Nutley et al. 2007) about knowledge politics, and about the material-discursive processes through which knowledge is enacted. As today's knowledge scapes are being reconfigured through Web 2.0 worlds of interconnectivity and blurrings of user/producer, public/private, it is increasingly difficult to trace knowledge production and movement. Issues of ownership and rights of access to knowledge have prompted debates about scholarly responsibility to circulate knowledge freely (Willinsky, 2005). Some iterations suggest that researchers bear responsibility for creative knowledge design, pedagogic and civic enactments in diverse communities, as well as relational bridge-building. And yet as Edwards et al. (2007) point out, while educational researchers are even now making huge efforts to engage with professionals in schools as well as policy-makers, the perception continues that they are not engaged much at all.

This book explores these three issues of knowledge mobilization – politics, language, and responsibilities – through the voices of 21 authors based in the UK, Canada, Hong Kong and Australia, speaking from disciplinary perspectives based in law, digital media studies, museum studies, journalism and policy-making as well as in fields of education.

#### PERSPECTIVES OF 'MOBILITY' IN CONTEXTS OF KNOWLEDGE

Generally knowledge mobilization seems to be about active engagement of diverse public users of research results - engagement that extends beyond 'traditional' forums of academic dissemination such as journal articles directed towards academic readers. Outcomes of this engagement should then mobilize the public to become research users, and mobilize impact or visible change among these research users. In health care research, 'knowledge-to-action' is the term suggested by Graham et al. (2006) in their survey of 33 research funding agencies in nine countries: the intent underpinning most terms for knowledge mobilization or exchange is, they show, often focused on involving users from the beginning of the knowledge creation process and throughout activities of moving and sustaining applications of the knowledge.

But - what is knowledge when it moves? Increasingly, knowledge is reified and mobilized as language. Texts make knowledge portable. In many respects knowledge seems, or used to seem, unambiguously situated – situated in the practices of disciplines, professions, industries, times, places, histories, cultures and so on. The textual dimension of knowledge was secondary. The contemporary domination of communications technologies, and especially Web 2.0 technologies, has challenged and transformed the practices associated with specific forms of knowledge, re-emphasizing the textual character of knowledge.

D. Smith (1999) argues that it is the textual character of knowledge that allows it to move from one domain to another and it is the textual character of knowledge, its apparent immutability and objective 'truth', that gives it its coercive force in locations that are remote from its origins. The words and images that instantiate knowledge as they move across temporal, spatial and disciplinary boundaries appear to be stripped of their place and their time when they are constituted as texts to be circulated. But, words cannot avoid 'dragging their pasts behind them' (Bahktin 1981) and they are inevitably, as Appadurai (2000) argues, reconstituted with differently inflected meanings as they circulate through new locations. So knowledge is, paradoxically, both fixed and mutated as it mobilized across boundaries.

What is implied by references to knowledge mobilization is that the boundaries of different knowledges are distinct and that they can move about across different domains to (re)organize thought, space, and practices. However, knowledge that moves is itself embedded in material practice. Knowledge is inscribed within objects such as texts, tools, technologies and bodies. It emerges in new ways as these objects circulate among different activities, making/dissolving connections with one another, making/dissolving their own boundaries, and mutating as they themselves are mediated in local practices. Among the important questions to ask may be about which objects become most visible and through what material processes, which material practices become most durable, and what linkages and labour holds them in place. Some education analysts have argued that these are not questions of mobilizing new perspectives or interpretation, as when an object such as a curriculum guide is interpreted differently in different classrooms, but that in effect, different worlds can be mobilized through the same object (e.g. Fenwick 2010; Mulcahy 2007; Verran 2000). We see some of these flows in the meeting of art, research, Indigenous and scientific knowledge (Somerville, this volume).

Education itself is both a technology and a catalyst of knowledge mobilization, at the same time as education's dynamics (its premises, purposes and processes) are an outcome of knowledge mobilization. In considering the mobilities and connections of objects, we need also to consider carefully just what might be the role of educational researchers in the textual, social and material practices that enact knowledge mobilization.

## ISSUES IN 'KNOWLEDGE MOBILIZATION' IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

While this book is organized around three broad themes of politics, languages and responsibilities in knowledge mobilization, more issues trickle across these themes. Four are outlined below to provide some background for the chapter discussions.

### Heterogeneity of Understandings

Levin (2008) has pointed to three main problems of heterogeneity in writings about knowledge mobilization: (1) a lack of agreement on terminology, (2) multiple conceptual frames and lack of agreement on main issues; and (3) working across disciplines. Heterogeneity emerges in diverse views and traditions of different disciplines regarding the relationship between researchers and society. It also becomes evident across national research strategies. For example, in comparing such strategies in the UK, Canada and Australia, one can discern different priorities and responsibilities envisioned for the state

and state-funded granting agencies with respect to enabling links of researchers and the communities that might benefit from their studies.

The term 'knowledge mobilization' itself is particularly prominent in Canadian research policy discourses, where it is generally understood to refer to 'the flow of knowledge among multiple agents leading to intellectual, social and/or economic impact' (SSHRC 2010:4). The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada characterizes knowledge mobilization as a 'co-constructed' process distinct from linear, one-way knowledge dissemination or knowledge transfer. The Council's 2009-2011 strategic plan for knowledge mobilization (SSHRC 2010: 2) places strong value on accessibility and impact of research for 'knowledge users'. The responsibility for SSHRC is largely limited to fostering 'connections' and the sharing of information. This leaves ambiguous questions of exactly where responsibility lies for engaging non-researchers in knowledge production and use, configuring research findings in formats and forums that are truly accessible and attractive to users, and conducting research processes in ways that users might value as impact.

In the UK's Economic & Social Research Council (ESRC 2010: para.1) the more prevalent term is 'knowledge exchange', defined as 'exchanging good ideas, research results, experiences and skills between universities, other research organisations, business, Government, the third sector and the wider community to enable innovative new products, services and policies to be developed'. Knowledge transfer, incidentally, is defined exactly the same way. Here the emphasis is on 'conversation' (ESRC 2010: para.2), with responsibilities listed for both 'those carrying out research' and 'for those using research'. The ESRC presents its own role as mostly promoting this knowledge exchange, and more influentially, by placing increasing weight on exchange activities and projected impact in the assessment of new research bids.

In Australia, the Research Quality Framework (RQF) of the conservative Howard government controversially proposed to measure research 'impact' in ways that would substantially influence research rankings and research funding. As it has been in the UK, this was controversial partly because the measures of impact were themselves not clearly defined and partly because considerations of 'impact', especially outside the academy, were understood to redefine the role of universities in making and mobilising knowledge. After the defeat of the Howard government the Rudd Labor government developed the Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA) accountability exercise and deleted 'impact' from the assessment framework, relying heavily on more traditional metrics. This too is controversial, supported by the sandstone universities which promote research for its own sake but opposed by the newer technological universities which stake their reputations on the demonstrable utility of their research.

### Inter/Multi-Disciplinary in Knowledge Generation and Mobilization

An increased emphasis on the utility of university research has led to an increased focus on the need for university researchers to address complex and intractable real-world problems. Such problems clearly demand interdisciplinary approaches and multidisciplinary teams, and rhetoric around university research strategies and research funding programs endorses and advocates such approaches. They are however, difficult

to achieve. In the first place, the organisation of research accountability regimes may militate against interdisciplinary work. The ERA exercise in Australia, for instance, reports and evaluates research productivity according to Field of Research (FOR) codes at the four digit (sub-disciplinary) level. Researchers who engage in interdisciplinary projects, and publish outside their disciplinary field, may jeopardize the ranking (and ultimately the funding) of their discipline within their university. In the second place, the conduct of interdisciplinary work is itself demanding. Different disciplines have different ways of conceptualizing problems and of investigating them, and what counts as a legitimate methodological approach, with robust knowledge claims, in one discipline may be unknown, or dismissed, in another. Researchers in the field of Journalism, for instance, notoriously find themselves in conflict with social science researchers on the matter of research ethics, which have different and in many respects more stringent, constraints on interviewing behaviour than journalistic ethics impose (Richards 2009).

### Access to Knowledge in a Capitalist Economy

In a capitalist economy knowledge is also understood as a commodity to be traded on a global market. As a commodity it has value and that value has been protected through control of access and intellectual copyright laws (Fraser, this volume). An important development in the shift to knowledge mobilization has been the open access movement, whereby published work is made free to readers. The growth of open access to scholarly research has obviously been enabled by new technological tools and publishers' experimentation with online publishing. However, it was also spurred by groups of scholars renewing commitment to the ideals of open science and the ethics of making publicly funded research available to the public, in the wake of dramatically escalating costs of accessing such research through scholarly journals whose subscription fees skyrocketed in the final decades of the twentieth century (Willinsky 2005). Debates in open access publishing focus precisely on the quality of knowledge, the forms of knowledge that can and should be made available, the avenues of availability such as archives and search engines, the costs of producing knowledge, and of course questions about ownership and property rights. Slowly, a transformation appears to be occurring in scholarly views about such issues as universities such as Harvard adopt an Open Access mandate to make their scholarly products available to the public, free, in open access repositories.

Willinsky (2010), an expert on open access knowledge and director of the Public Knowledge Project <<http://pkp.sfu.ca>>, is a strong advocate of open access publishing to mobilize educational knowledge. He urges educational researchers to take more responsibility for increasing knowledge availability, such as by publishing in open access journals, sharing their data sets, and archiving their published work in publicly-accessible digital repositories. Provocatively, he laments what he calls the unnecessary isolation of educational research, within its own little corner of the academy, effectively cut off from this newly revitalized sphere by the toll-gate barriers of article and subscription costs ... it does not make a lot of sense to watch others selectively cull aspects of this work and represent it as the whole of the relevant educational research that bears on the schools today. We need to look to the consequences of the knowledge that we seek to contribute to education... (Willinsky 2010/in press: 9)

## Recognizing and Evaluating Impact of Knowledge Mobilization

Significant emphasis on the impact of research knowledge in many quarters of research policy has prompted a number of debates reflected in this volume's chapters. Researchers wonder just what is meant by impact, and what it means to consider and even measure knowledge mobilization as impact. Even when 'impact' is translated to mean something like productive outcomes, the multiplicity of variables affecting any outcome in education – or any aspect of social or natural life – prohibit a meaningful causal linkage to one particular study or to the mobilization of particular knowledge. Researchers intending to demonstrate impact, as they are required to do in ESRC-funded research in the UK, may simply report outputs of a project (articles published for academics, reports given to government staff, dialogues hosted, websites or art works created) as its outcomes. Outcomes, however, are more visible changes or effects influenced through knowledge: in scholarship, but also in policy, professional practice, products, student outcomes, or public understandings and activities. The ESRC's impact strategy for 2008-2011 defines research impact to include both economic and societal outcomes, the latter referring to effects of research on the environment, public health or quality of life, and impacts on government policy, the third sector and professional practice. In other words, researchers in education as in other fields are increasingly enjoined to show the direct influence of their work on the contemporary worlds around them, not the 'PR fluff' of all the information they disseminate.

The issues of identifying impact of knowledge mobilization are by now well known, following several studies of research impact since 2000. Different types of knowledge exercise influence differently. At least three different forms of impact have been proposed:

- instrumental (for example, influencing the development of policy, practice or service provision, shaping legislation, altering behaviour)
- conceptual (for example, contributing to the understanding of these and related issues, reframing debates); and
- capacity building (for example, through technical/personal skill development)

(Nutley *et al.* 2007)

The type of *environment* will affect the way knowledge moves and exercises influence, depending on the processes available to engage users, the willingness and availability of users to engage in this knowledge, and the perceived relevance of the knowledge. The problem of *time lag* between the completion of research and any changes it might influence in policy and practice make impact difficult to recognize, let alone assess. There is also the problem of time lag between the production of knowledge and a particular community's need for that knowledge. It is also difficult to identify the *points of influence* throughout the complex processes whereby particular knowledge may begin to affect decisions or practices, or even the *kinds of influence* that are of most interest to users. For example, community groups often indicate that they are less interested in the actual 'findings' of particular studies, as they prefer to rely upon their own data, than in the sorts of questions that researchers help them to ask.

Taking such issues into consideration, case studies of impact in social science research were conducted by the ESRC (2009) to identify different forms of impact, how these might be recognized, and what environments and activities are most helpful to promote them. 'Key impact factors' were identified through these case studies:

- Established relationships and networks with user communities
- Involving users at all stages of the research
- Well-planned user-engagement and knowledge exchange strategies
- Portfolios of research activity that build reputations with research users
- Good infrastructure and management support
- Where appropriate, the involvement of intermediaries and knowledge brokers as translators, amplifiers, network providers

(ESRC 2009: 14).

In many of these iterations, however much the knowledge mobilization process is characterized to be organic and multi-directional, there persists a clear division between those who produce (e.g. university-based researchers) and those who use knowledge (e.g. policy makers, community members, industry representatives, education providers, professional practitioners, institutional managers, etc). There is also a tendency to treat knowledge as a package exchanged across domains. Here is where there is fundamental heterogeneity. Mobilizable knowledge is sometimes equated to findings, ‘evidence’ or ‘best practice’, such as when a particular protocol is developed through research and universalized for many settings of practice. Knowledge also might refer to innovation, itself a slippery term that can mean new products and services, new questions that challenge existing orthodoxies, or simply everyday improvisations. Knowledge in some inquiries may be philosophical, engaging both researchers and non-researchers in thinking differently or more broadly about their worlds. Or, what is meant by knowledge may be moved through embodied or encultured material practices. It may be more about empowering people or suggesting possibilities than solving problems or producing useful technologies. Clearly, one’s understanding of knowledge in processes of mobilization is affected by how one views its purpose, and the purpose of its uses.

Acknowledging all of the heterogeneity, Levin (2008) suggests that we focus not on delineating its differences, but in addressing the question: What kinds of efforts to promote knowledge mobilization have what effects under what circumstances, and what infrastructure is needed to support it? The chapters in this book each provide, in some way, a response to this question. And to do so, each has had to define, in the particular circumstances upon which they focus, what is meant by knowledge, by mobilization, and by effect.

## THE CHAPTERS

Ben Levin and Amanda Cooper open the book’s first section *Considering the Issues and the Players* by mapping multiple dimensions and models of research use and impact. They show why some ideas affect practice more than others – and why some practices persist in ways entirely inconsistent with strong research evidence. Research knowledge is distinct, they argue, from scientific evidence, colloquial evidence, practice-based and community knowledges, transnational and other knowledge sources swirling through educational policy and practice. While these knowledges play important roles in communities of practice and policy, a greater use of research knowledge in education could improve educational outcomes, and they present concrete strategies for ways forward in education.

Andrew Pollard, the former director of the UK's Teaching and Learning Research Programme, describes six strategies adopted there to support impact and user engagement and offers illustrations of short-term impact. He argues that there has been a poor alignment of public aspirations for applied, relevant research and academic incentivisation for research assessment, funding and career progression. Nonetheless, he concludes that TLRP succeeded in supporting researchers in 'catching the wave' of public commitment to evidence-informed policy and practice – but like Levin and Cooper, Pollard concurs that there is a long way to go before such practices are fully established.

Anne Edwards draws from her extensive empirical analyses of user engagement to reflect on what happens when the practices of university research come into contact with the practices of those who work in education or use educational services. This intersection can happen in ways that Edwards describes as horizontal and vertical. Her primary focus is on how practitioners outside the academy can work *in* research, alongside university-based researchers, to generate knowledge. A particularly helpful heuristic here identifies five distinct approaches to knowledge exchange among researchers and users, each underpinned by particular assumptions about knowledge. While Edwards is careful not to privilege any one of them, she emphasizes the importance of relational expertise on the part of both researchers and professional practitioners in working across the boundaries of their own knowledge communities.

Opening the second section on *Politics in Knowledge Flows*, Charles Ungerleider draws on his experience as a provincial Deputy Minister in Canada to contrast the different worlds of policy decision-makers and researchers. While highlighting the critical importance to decision-makers of relevant evidence, he shows the difficulties of incorporating research evidence into the fast-moving, high stakes political environment. Decision-makers, argues Ungerleider, seek to resolve conflict and eliminate problems rapidly, need results that their voting constituencies will recognize as valuable, and draw from a wide range of evidence sources of which academic research is only one. In fact, suggests Ungerleider, the call for linking research with policy comes from the researchers, not from the policy world. He concludes that academic research would be better to focus on educational practitioners, beginning with engaging new teachers in research evidence.

In exploring the relationship between governance and knowledge 'stocks and flows', Jenny Ozga traces new governance forms of decentralization and deregulation to argue that data production and management were and are essential to the governance turn. Knowledge and information play a pivotal role both in the pervasiveness of governance and in allowing the development of its dispersed, distributed and disaggregated form. In showing the gap between 'the fluid dream of data-based governance, and the sticky reality', her argument compares the development of data and evaluation systems in England, with attention to the work that data do in both 'hard' and 'soft' governance through performance management and self-evaluation systems.

Margaret Somerville brings us a story of intense politics flowing across an Indigenous partner research initiative to save the Murray-Darling basin, a crisis of water shortage,

competing stakeholder groups, and diverse knowledges of water and water conservation. Using an arts-based research approach that she and her team refer to as ‘enabling place pedagogies’, the initiative seeks to both bridge these knowledges and to mobilize new knowledge. Somerville describes the overall approach as a pedagogical one, working in the space between Indigenous and non-Indigenous knowings to explore how knowledge can travel between them: ‘The artworks as material objects mediate the crossing of the binaries/boundaries between bodies and places that helps the knowledge to flow’.

Individual flows are important to consider, too, in exploring the politics of knowledge and mobility. Phan Le Ha challenges the dominance of the ‘global’ in discussions about research-based knowledge, arguing that locality generally, and the nation state in particular, play a significant role in mobilizing knowledge across political and geographical boundaries. She uses her own biography as a Vietnamese academic working in the West to explore these ideas of nationality and trans-nationality, and the permeability of East/West divides in relation to knowledge. She makes a compelling case that the knowledge she produces as a researcher, while globally relevant, needs to be understood as being produced by a Vietnamese.

Ian Dyck, curator of the Canadian Museum of Civilization, opens the third section, *Languages and Enactments of Knowledge Mobilization*, with a case study of a Canada-Russia collaboration to produce a museum display on the Ancient Nomads of both countries. Most museums work hard on the pedagogy of their exhibits to stimulate active engagement of the public, but of course most must work within constraints of limited resources, public tastes, and competition. Dyck explains the complexities of bridging languages across Russian, Canadian and Indigenous archaeological traditions, museum cultures, systems of representation, and conflicts about what is the most important knowledge. His story traces the many compromises and strategies used by teams of researchers and non-researcher specialists in museum display to mobilize knowledge about ancient prairie peoples in modern museums.

Deirdre Kelly and Michelle Stack take on the issue of educational research reported in the media. Media is an influential site through which policy issues are framed and particular knowledges are recognized to wield influence among policy-makers, educators, and the general public. Kelly and Stack note the relative lack of engagement of many researchers in mainstream media, and argue that a key dimension here is the ‘double divide’ between knowledge traditions in academic research and in journalism. Each field is configured by very different knowledge structures, allegiances, values and priorities. However, far from supporting a two solitudes approach, Kelly and Stack draw from their empirical research to offer examples of successful bridgings across this double divide, using a notion of a musical bridge providing transitions between the two ‘keys’ of journalism and academia. In particular, they promote the academic’s role as mobilizing knowledge through the popular media in ways that can challenge problematic discourses and assumptions circulating about education and learning. Towards strengthening this role, Kelly and Stack provide a substantial list of strategies for academics to engage more fruitfully with journalists in knowledge mobilization.

Fenwick considers issues that emerge when employing art forms in knowledge mobilization. Forms such as film, visual art and drama are figuring as important means ways to represent research and move knowledge into active service (SSHRC 2008). While arts-based educational research has developed strong foundations and credibility as a field, the use of art by social science researchers to simply 'mobilize' knowledge is a rather more glib undertaking that raises troubling questions. These touch the tensions in combining the logics, purposes and processes of art with those of research. Fenwick tells the story of one research team's experiments in using drama to communicate their findings, an attempt whose mixed results invites reflection on the nature of knowledge, mobilities, and ethics in 'using' art for knowledge mobilization.

Chris Chesher and Sarah Howard also address the question of the permeability of boundaries around knowledge, although their focus is on the tension between openness of access to knowledge and the control of intellectual property that is a central concern of contemporary universities. They are especially interested in the challenges that new technologies make to established understandings around the ownership of knowledge. They address this tension through the discussion of three ubiquitous cases: learning management systems; citation management tools; and journal databases.

Opening the final section on *Responsibilities and Rights in Mobilizing Knowledge*, Michael Fraser focuses on the issues of intellectual property in a global knowledge economy. He brings the perspective of a legal scholar to trace the legal lineage of the idea of 'intellectual property' to the foundational communication technology of the printing press, and argues that this notion has made it possible to trade knowledge on a global market. He makes the argument that scholarly publishing is an anomaly in so far as universities and scholars donate their intellectual property to publishers and then buy it back from them in a business model that is already unsustainable in order to ensure that that knowledge is globally available through digital repositories.

Rui Yang takes up the question of responsibilities in scholarly publishing, focusing on the role of scholarly publishing in the Chinese mainland. He argues that scholarly publishing is viewed from within mainland China as a means of 'bringing China to the world, and the world to China'. While indigenous Chinese publishing houses are viewed as a means of breaking the domination of Western scholarly publishing in practice it is difficult for even the best publications to challenge this domination.

Dolores van der Wey challenges educational researchers to take seriously the responsibility of repairing relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people by disrupting dominant western narratives held by those who accept these as given. Her central question is, Whose accumulated knowledge and experience ultimately is considered most valid and worthy of knowing? She argues for collectively building coalitions that move Indigenous knowledge more centrally into post-secondary institutions while addressing the ongoing implications of the colonial legacy for the 'broadest possible good'. Using examples from her own practices of research and pedagogy, van der Wey shows how Aboriginal literature can provide powerful tools for forming new relationships with Indigenous people.

To conclude the volume, Bob Lingard, Ian Hardy and Stephen Heimans address broadly many questions of responsibilities, as well as of politics and languages, by examining the geopolitics of mobilizing knowledge. In particular they highlight themes introduced in Somerville, Phan, Yang and van der Wey's work, that existing research relations are hegemonic in reifying universal knowledge claims and suppressing, for instance, Indigenous, arts-based and non-traditional theory forms. These authors challenge the idea that theory is produced 'only in the high status universities of the north'. They challenge this assumption through three narratives around the nature of educational policy studies, the teaching of educational policy studies and the ranking of journals for Australian Research accountability regimes. They conclude by arguing that educational knowledge needs to emerge and be supported across multiple global sites.

## REFERENCES

- Appardurai, A. (2000) 'Grassroots globalization and the research imagination' in *Globalization*. A. Appardurai, Durham and London, Duke University Press, pp. 1-21.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination*, Austin, University of Texas Press.
- Edwards, Anne, Sebba, Judy, & Rickinson, Mark. (2007) 'Working with users: some implications for educational research', *British Educational Research Journal*, 33 (5): 647-661
- ESRC (Economic and Social Research Council) (2010) *Taking Stock: A Summary of ESRC's Work to Evaluate the Impact of Research on Policy & Practice February 2009* (accessed on 21 October 2010 from [www.esrcsocietytoday.ac.uk/takingstock/](http://www.esrcsocietytoday.ac.uk/takingstock/))
- ESRC (Economic & Social Research Council) (2010) 'What is knowledge exchange?' *ESRC Society Today*, (accessed on 4 January 2011 from [http://www.esrc.ac.uk/ESRCInfoCentre/Support/knowledge\\_transfer/index.aspx](http://www.esrc.ac.uk/ESRCInfoCentre/Support/knowledge_transfer/index.aspx))
- Graham I.D., Logan, J., Harrison, M.B., Straus, S.E., and Tetroe, J. (2006) 'Lost in knowledge translation: time for a map?' *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions* 26(1): 13-24.
- Levin, Ben. (2008) *Thinking about knowledge mobilization*, Toronto, ON: Canadian Council on Learning/ Conseil Canadien sur l'apprentissage.
- Mulcahy, D. (2010) 'Assembling the accomplished teacher: the performativity and politics of professional teaching standards', *Educational Philosophy and Theory*.
- Nutley, S., Walter, I., Davis, H. (2007) 'Using evidence. how research can inform public services', Bristol: Policy Press
- Richards, I (2009) 'Uneasy bedfellows: ethics committees and journalism research', *Australian Journalism Review* 31 (2): 35-46.

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. (SSHRC) (2008). Scholarship in action: Knowledge mobilization and the academic process. *Dialogue*, summer 2008: para. 6.

Smith, D. (1999) *Writing the Social. Critique, theory and investigations*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. (1999) *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*, London: Zed Books.

Verran, H. (2001) *Science and an African Logic*, Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Willinsky, J., (2005). *The Access Principle: The case for Open Access to research and scholarship*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Willinsky, J. (2010, in press) 'The new openness in educational research', in P. Hart, A. Reid and C. Russell (eds), *The Sage Companion to Educational Research*, London: Sage. Online. Available HTTP: <<http://pkp.sfu.ca/node/1391>> (accessed on 2 January 2011)