



AARHUS UNIVERSITY



Coversheet

This is the original manuscript (pre-print version) of the article.

Pre-print is the version that represents the main opportunity for researchers to get input with regard to corrections and additions, before the peer-review process.

How to cite this publication

Please cite the final published version:

Krejsler, J. B. (2013). What Works in Education and Social Welfare? A Mapping of the Evidence Discourse and Reflections upon Consequences for Professionals. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 57(1), 16-32. doi:10.1080/00313831.2011.621141

Publication metadata

Title:	What Works in Education and Social Welfare? A Mapping of the Evidence Discourse and Reflections upon Consequences for Professionals
Author(s):	John Benedicto Krejsler
Journal:	Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research
DOI/Link:	http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2011.621141
Document version:	Original manuscript (pre-print)

General Rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



'What Works' in education and social welfare?

Journal:	<i>Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research</i>
Manuscript ID:	SJER-2011-0123
Manuscript Type:	Original Paper
Keywords:	evidence, discourse, professional development, floating signifier

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Introduction

This article argues that a two-lane strategy is necessary to understand the challenges facing professionals in education and social welfare with the advent of the evidence discourse:

First, the genealogy must be mapped that exhibits the stunning number of threads that have coalesced into making the evidence discourse a compelling challenge not only to medicine, but to education and social welfare as well. This includes demonstrating (i) the very unlike conditions for the rise of 'evidence' within medicine as opposed to social welfare and education. In a stark contrast to its genesis within the medical field, the evidence discourse has thus been launched into the fields of social welfare and education by external stakeholders in top-down moves that have largely by-passed professionals within these fields (Hammersley, 2007; Moos, Krejsler, Hjort, Laursen, & Braad, 2005). (ii) The threads from medicine have coalesced with the larger political trends of knowledge economy discourse, the urgency of internationally comparable standards as espoused by transnational agencies like the OECD, IEA, the EU Lisbon Agenda, the Bologna Process and so forth. (iii) In addition, the inertia as well as contesting voices of professional cultures within the fields of social welfare and education constitute important voices in shaping the particular trajectories that the evidence discourse takes within different fields. I shall primarily use Danish examples to illustrate the argument. The trend, however, can be seen across the Scandinavian countries (e.g. Bergmark & Lundström, 2006; Oscarsson, 2006; Utdanningsforbundet, 2008) and the OECD (Henry, Lingard, Rizvi, & Taylor, 2001; OECD, 2007).

Second, it is argued that new strategies must be developed that enhance professionals' competence in dealing with the evidence discourse in education and social welfare. Such strategies must appreciate the particularity of new external conditions unveiled in the above-mentioned genealogy in order not to turn regressive. I shall argue that our conceptions of evidence should not merely be limited to *external forms of evidence* as is currently predominant within the education and social welfare. It should be expanded to include *internal forms of evidence* as well. Introducing the term internal forms of evidence, I wish to point to the continuous production of knowledge and documentation for *What Works* that professionals engage in on the basis of practice and reflection within each their respective fields.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
Employing an epistemological lens, I shall argue that the evidence discourse mirrors a cultural struggle that currently rages about how key areas within modern societies are to be defined. Such an approach provides the advantage that we may question current truth claims as truths that have been constructed at the expense of other possible regimes of truth. This, in short, will allow us the potential for thinking current conditions differently (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994; Foucault, 1971).

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
The article contributes to existing knowledge by (i) employing a Foucauldian-inspired genealogical approach to understanding evidence discourse in education and social welfare, and (ii) linking this to deliberations on conditions for developing appropriate professional strategies to deal with evidence discourse. It adds to the growing amount of literature that seeks to understand the impact of the evidence discourse on education and social welfare in relation to professions' perspectives and strategies (e.g. Bhatti, Hansen, & Rieper, 2006; Biesta, 2007; Clarke, 2006; Hammersley, 2007; Pawson, 2006; Trinder & Reynolds, 2000).

32 33 34 35 36 **Mapping the evidence discourse, its sources and trajectories**

An epistemological and genealogically informed theoretical approach

37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
From an epistemological point of view, the evidence discourse should be seen as a particular regime of truth that makes some ways of speaking and acting possible and excludes others (Foucault, 1971). As any other discourse, it is constituted as a pattern of interconnected statements that reciprocally refer to one another thereby continually reinforcing the totality of the discourse. The immanent logic thus construed forms a strategic space wherein a number of different subject positions emerge to be occupied by willing individuals. Obviously, one must subject one's self to the discursive regime in question in order to be included as a legitimate subject within this regime.

51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Foucault argued that a regime of truth – a discourse - must be measured by the extent to which it matches and mirrors the dominant configuration of dominant and less dominant discourses that set the boundaries for how individuals can think and act at a given time and space in history (Foucault, 1993, 1997). Foucault thus considered his task to chart, via a genealogical

1
2
3 method, the topological contours of the battlefields within different discursive fields (e.g. the
4 fields of madness, reason, imprisonment, subjectivity, sexuality and so forth).
5
6

7 Drawing on insights from Foucauldian genealogy I shall attempt to unravel major threads
8 that appear to have coalesced into making evidence discourse an increasingly dominant voice that
9 cannot be ignored when considering What Works in education and social welfare. Or formulated
10 as a question in a Foucauldian genealogical vein: *How has it come about that researchers, policy-*
11 *makers and practitioners today make education and social welfare problematic in terms of*
12 *'evidence' and 'What Works'?*
13
14
15
16

17 In this section I shall thus clarify how the evidence discourse became a dominant regime
18 of knowledge by unravelling the major threads of that becoming through the fields of medicine,
19 social welfare and education. Historically, the concept of evidence has been located in a variety
20 of discourses that range from daily common sense discourses to judicial and economy discourses.
21 From the late 1980s and onwards, however, the concept of evidence was targeted for other
22 purposes. It is now mainly – albeit not exclusively - associated with a resurging neo-positivist
23 paradigm and its procedures for producing knowledge about *What Works* in relation to particular
24 interventions. The so-called *evidence ladder* thus privileges knowledge produced in Controlled
25 Randomized Trials (Alvesson & Skjöldberg, 2000; Bhatti, et al., 2006; Hammersley, 2007;
26 Moos, et al., 2005; Rieper & Hansen, 2007; Sackett, Rosenberg, Gray, Haynes, & Richardson,
27 1996).
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 ***The evidence discourse and the medical field***

42 The evidence discourse, which has gained pre-eminence as a dominant discourse about how to
43 produce knowledge that works, is rooted within the medical field (Bhatti, et al., 2006; Browman,
44 1999; Rieper & Hansen, 2007; Sackett, et al., 1996). Randomized Controlled Trials (RCT-tests)
45 as a practice to produce truth about What Works was already introduced in medicine in the 1930s
46 and 1940s in England as well as in psychology, which is interesting in relation to the field of
47 education and its on-going and ambivalent relations to psychometrics and experimental
48 psychology. During the 1960s and 1970s RCT became main-stream in medical research. This
49 constituted the breakthrough of the procedure for producing truth that the evidence movement
50 would later use to construe its so-called evidence ladder. RCT-tests claim to be controlled in the
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 sense that variables not relevant for measuring for instance the effect of a medical substance in
4 relation to a particular ailment are ostensibly reduced to the utmost minimum possible. Ideally,
5 this is achieved by carrying out such tests within clinically isolated environments. Control groups
6 are administered placebo substances in order to ensure with higher probability that measurable
7 effects come about as a result of the substance in question, and not due to irrelevant causes. The
8 tests are ideally carried out among a statistically representative sample of the population relevant
9 for the test in question.
10

11
12 In 1972, Archie Cochrane (1909-1988) published the ground-breaking book
13 "Effectiveness and Efficiency – Random reflections on health services" (Cochrane, 1972). He
14 argued that much medical practice was based on common sense, non-scientifically grounded
15 judgments and other coincidental circumstances, which led to considerable waste of scarce
16 resources. He argued that a systematic and cumulative base of scientifically tested knowledge of
17 *What Works* should be accumulated to further practices that have been proved to be efficient. In
18 particular, he emphasized the importance of bringing in evidence from Randomised Controlled
19 Trials (RCTs). *The Cochrane Collaboration* (www.cochrane.org)¹ was established in 1990, and
20 brought momentum to the efforts to elaborate the so-called *systematic reviews* of international
21 research about *What Works* in relation to particular medical substances and treatments. The
22 procedure, statistic meta-analysis, consists in choosing a topic for review, approving a protocol,
23 appointing a group of researchers, who subsequently gather what primary studies that have been
24 conducted about this given topic, be it treatment against amphetamine psychosis or acupuncture
25 to cure epilepsy (<http://www.cochrane.org/reviews/index.htm>). Hereafter a strict sorting of each
26 particular study is undertaken in order to identify how high they rank on the so-called evidence
27 ladder. The evidence ladder is a methodological device to rank the quality of studies according to
28 an ideal of objectivity, validity and reliability that favours the Randomized Controlled Trial (e.g.
29 <http://www.controlled-trials.com/>). Finally a review article and a summary of the knowledge
30 about *What Works* is elaborated. The Cochrane Collaboration has developed the *Cochrane*
31 *Handbook*, which meticulously accounts for the collaboration's methodology over a span of
32 about 500 pages (Rieper & Hansen, 2007). Denmark was early in joining this movement, and as
33 early as 1993 Nordic Cochrane was established with its headquarters at the Rigshospitalet-

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

¹ NB: All html-links in this article have been retrieved on 2011-07-13.

1
2
3 Copenhagen University Hospital with the assistance of the National Board of Health
4
5 (<http://www.cochrane.dk/>).
6

7 The emergence of the evidence discourse, Cochrane's initiative and its repercussions
8 mainly arrived 'bottom-up', i.e. from the profession of medical doctors themselves.
9
10 Epistemologically, this regime of truth signifies a neo-positivist approach to doing science.
11

12 According to Bhatti et al. (2006) and Moos et al. (2005), the widespread acceptance
13 and success of the evidence discourse within the medical field has several explanations: First,
14 testing of medicine and its effects is universally believed to be relatively independent of context.
15 Similar assumptions apply to a good deal of treatments. This makes the idea of a positivist
16 universally applicable knowledge about What Works across local and national contexts resonate
17 well. Second, a positivist understanding of science is already firmly rooted as a dominant
18 discourse within medical research, which has been conducive to securing support behind methods
19 such as Randomised Controlled Trials and statistic meta-analyses of primary studies based on
20 RCT. Third, medical doctors have a high level of education, they are continuously exposed to
21 research based knowledge, and they subscribe to a relatively mono-paradigmatic view on science.
22 Fourth, they have channels for dissemination of research-based knowledge to the entire
23 profession, in Denmark particularly through 'The Journal of the Danish Medical Association'.
24 Collectively these instances have been largely responsible for the widespread – albeit not
25 univocal - acceptance of the evidence discourse as a tool to produce knowledge about What
26 Works. One should, however, keep in mind the considerable differences in contexts between the
27 specialised researching medical doctor at an urban university hospital and the locally based
28 practising physician. The latter is less exposed to research regimes, and considerably more
29 exposed to the pressure of discourses that dominate in local contexts, i.e. s/he will tend to locate
30 patient ailments within a view of the larger perspective of the patient's life-style, social
31 environment and so forth.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 *Evidence and social welfare*

52
53 In 2000, centrally placed individuals within the Cochrane Collaboration encouraged
54 Robert F. Boruch, a University of Pennsylvania statistician, to initiate the process that led to the
55 establishment of the Campbell Collaboration, which would become instrumental to expand the
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 evidence regime to social welfare, crime and education (Bhatti, et al., 2006; Petrosine, Boruch,
4 Soydan, Duggan, & Sanchez-Meca, 2001). It is thus essential to appreciate the close
5 collaboration between the Cochrane and Campbell collaborations. This includes the fact that
6 methodologically the Campbell Collaboration subscribes closely to the ideals of the 'Cochrane
7 Handbook' (<http://www.campbellcollaboration.org/>)(Rieper & Hansen, 2007). The Campbell
8 Collaboration cherishes basically the same review procedures including the evidence ladder that
9 places at its top systematic reviews conducted as meta-analyses of RCT primary studies. As early
10 as 2002 the Nordic Campbell Centre was established at the Danish National Centre for Social
11 Research (SFI) in Copenhagen, mainly sponsored by targeted means from the Ministry of Social
12 Welfare (<http://www.sfi.dk/Default.aspx?ID=137>).

21 The Campbell Collaboration refers to Donald T. Campbell, an American social
22 scientist, who in the early 1960s argued that the effects of social interventions should be
23 systematically tested by means of an experimental approach. In the 1970s and 1980s
24 bibliographies of intervention studies were elaborated within the social field, not least due to the
25 legacy of Campbell. In 1990 Social Science Research Unit (SSRU) was established at the
26 Institute of Education at the University of London. It was commissioned to develop a programme
27 for policy relevant research in relation to health and education. This initiative turned out to be
28 successful as the New Labour government headed by Tony Blair built up an increasing demand
29 for evidence-based knowledge in order to enable them to prioritize limited public resources with
30 greater effect (Wells, 2007). In 1996 the Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Co-
31 ordinating Centre (EPPI) (<http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/>) was established under the auspices of
32 SSRU. In practice EPPI ended up concentrating on education reviews, and incidentally became a
33 source of inspiration for the Danish Clearinghouse for Educational Research, which was
34 established in 2006 at the School of Education at Aarhus University. EPPI collaborates with and
35 draws inspiration from the Campbell Collaboration. EPPI does, however, adopt a
36 methodologically more pluralist approach (e.g. Jackson & Waters, 2005).

51 In social welfare as well as education the evidence discourse is considerably more directed by
52 policy-makers' and administrators' agendas. In part, this can be explained by the fact that these
53 fields differ from the medical field in crucial aspects (e.g. Bhatti, et al., 2006; Hammersley, 2007;
54 Moos, et al., 2005). First, social welfare and education are ramified into a much larger variety of
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 different practice areas and the differentiation among professionals in terms of education levels is
4 considerably larger. Second, tradition among professionals of making reference to research-based
5 knowledge is much less prevalent. Third, training of professionals as well as professional practice
6 are much less explicitly grounded in research-based knowledge. Fourth, social science as well as
7 humanities paradigms are considerably more prevalent within these fields, which make them
8 subject to various competing paradigms due to the inherent plurality of these science areas. Fifth,
9 the issues that social welfare and education professionals are expected to handle are usually
10 closely tied up to national and local aspects of the particular state's population politics. In many
11 instances this makes it complex – if not impossible – to compare social interventions and
12 educational strategies across local, national and regional contexts that often exhibit considerable
13 differences. How you manage interventions targeted towards young males' excessive
14 consumption of alcohol differ considerably from a context of young Chicano gang members in
15 central Los Angeles, to young males in sparsely populated Greenland, to upper-class young
16 males in affluent Northern Copenhagen. Consequently, top-down initiatives from policymakers
17 and administrators to transfer the evidence discourse from medicine to social welfare and
18 education often resonate poorly within the involved professions.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 Nonetheless, a growing number of established traditions among researchers and
33 professionals within social welfare and education have adopted the evidence discourse and
34 engage in the on-going development of what evidence for 'What Works' may mean within these
35 fields (e.g. see discussion of Evidence Network later in this article). The latter often engage in
36 close collaboration with policy-makers' and administrators' efforts to implement evidence-based
37 policy, as is the case, among others, with many researchers adhering to the well-established
38 School Effectiveness and Innovation Movement (e.g. <http://www.icsei.net/>).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 *Evidence and education*

49 One could argue that education constitutes the field that has been hardest hit by the evidence
50 discourse understood as a pressure that has largely come from external stakeholders and regimes
51 of truth that resonate poorly with most existing discourses among professionals in education
52 (Ball, 2007; Bhatti, et al., 2006; Borgnakke, Hauberg Mortensen, Rasmussen, & Salling Olesen,
53 2006; Bridges, 2008; Moos, et al., 2005). As mentioned earlier, the field of education was already
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 an integral part of the evidence reinforcement of social welfare, as exemplified by the EPPI-
4 centre as well as the Campbell Collaboration. In addition in the mid-1990s the OECD intensified
5 its attention to the field of education. This constituted an upgrading of a process which was
6 initiated in the late 1960s, not the least with the establishment in 1968 of the Centre for
7 Educational Research and Innovation (CERI)

8
9
10 (http://www.oecd.org/department/0,3355,en_2649_35845581_1_1_1_1_1,00.html). This
11 intensified attention to education is hardly surprising in a period when national governments and
12 transnational agencies like the OECD, WTO, UNESCO and EU are increasingly occupied by
13 discourses of Knowledge Economies and Life-Long Learning (Boltanski & Chiapello,
14 2007/1999; Burbules & Torres, 2000; Henry, et al., 2001; Nóvoa & Lawn, 2002). By proxy of
15 CERI in particular, the OECD has increased attention to improve the role and efficiency of
16 educational research as a background for policy-makers' decisions as well as practitioners'
17 ongoing efforts to make educational institutions more efficient and, incidentally, more evidence-
18 based (OECD, 2007). A procedure for elaborating country reports has thus been put into practice.

19
20 In 2004 one of these country reports were accomplished at the request of the Danish
21 government (<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/56/21/33888206.pdf>). It came to the main
22 conclusions that the educational field was characterized by too little research capacity, that links
23 were too weak between educational research and the practitioners and policy-makers who were
24 meant to benefit from this research as a background for grounding policy and practice on a
25 sounder scientific base. It is within this context that the OECD makes the recommendation that a
26 Clearinghouse for Educational Research be established drawing on the accomplishments of the
27 EPPI centre as well as the American What Works Clearinghouse (WWC)
28 (<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>). WWC was established in close collaboration with the Campbell
29 Collaboration. This was done in extension of George Walker Bush' School Act *No Child Left
30 Behind* (2001) with the explicit purpose of making school practice more evidence-based.

31
32 As mentioned earlier, the Danish Clearinghouse for Educational Research was established
33 in 2006 (<http://www.dpu.dk/omdpu/dansklclearinghouseforuddannelsesforskning/>). Till April
34 2011 it has published nine systematic reviews: four reviews map and assess Scandinavian
35 research on day care facilities for children aged 0-6, the others assess programs on parent
36 involvement, the use of testing in education, research on effects of education and career
37 mentoring, relations between learning and factors in school, and research concerning student
38

1
2
3 learning and teacher competences. In addition, the clearinghouse gathers links and disseminates
4 systematic reviews from other national and international bodies that publish systematic reviews
5 and participates in debates on what constitutes good evidence. At this stage – five years after its
6 inception - it appears clearly that the Danish Clearinghouse for Educational Research applies a
7 broader definition of evidence than the Campbell Collaboration and the evidence ladder
8 represent. It explicitly mentions EPPI as a key inspiration. And judging from the above-
9 mentioned reviews, the Danish Clearinghouse approach appears to be closer to the more inclusive
10 and multi-paradigmatic approaches to reviews of ‘What Works’ that you meet among scholars
11 like Hilbert Meyer (2004) and Brophy & Good (Brophy & Good, 1986; Good & Brophy, 2003).
12 Further Michael Sjøgaard Larsen, a key clearinghouse employee, writes that very few RCT-
13 primary studies have been carried out in Danish or Scandinavian contexts. This fact alone would
14 make systematic reviews relying on RCT-primary studies suspiciously reliant on particularly
15 American studies² for a considerable period of time. Consequently, Larsen recommends that
16 capacity-building is strengthened internationally to develop diverse approaches to evidence that
17 match the field of research in education (Larsen, 2010).
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 In summary, we thus observe that the evidence discourse is subtly transformed as it travels from
33 a medical context to a social welfare and education context. It enters into other configurations of
34 dominant discourses than you find within the medical field. The professionals appear to have less
35 of a say as opposed to policymakers and administrators. A regime of knowledge that resonates
36 poorly with dominant discourses among the bulk of professionals has to be accommodated
37 (Biesta, 2007; Clarke, 2006; Hammersley, 2007; Moos, et al., 2005; Trinder & Reynolds, 2000;
38 Utdanningsforbundet, 2008).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 *The evidence discourse and dominant trends*

49 The expansion of the evidence discourse from the medical field to social welfare and education
50 signifies the establishment of a dominant discourse that cannot be ignored. Thus in a Danish
51
52

53
54
55 ² The What Works Clearinghouse only accepts American primary studies to be included in their systematic reviews.
56 They argue that American teachers would not accept studies from non-American context as relevant for their practice
57 (Bhatti, et al., 2006)p.96). The argument appears to be that education is a very context-bound endeavor in the US...
58 and by implication in Denmark and other countries.
59
60

1
2
3 context, Nordic Cochrane, Nordic Campbell Centre as well as the Danish Clearinghouse for
4 Educational Research have all been established in alliance with dominant players in Danish
5 society such as the National Board of Health, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Social
6 Welfare, the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Science, Technology & Innovation
7 (Bhatti, et al., 2006; Moos, et al., 2005). Nordic Cochrane and Nordic Campbell Centre received
8 substantial supplementary funding from the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Social
9 Welfare, which, however, was not the case with the Danish Clearinghouse for Educational
10 Research. The evidence discourse is furthermore closely aligned with dominant players on the
11 global stage such as the OECD, WTO, UNESCO and EU by means of the knowledge economy
12 discourse that encourages strengthened interplay between policy makers, businesses and
13 professional practitioners in order to enhance competitiveness and ensure efficient use of public
14 resources.

15
16 This entails increased demands to research communities for evidence about *What*
17 *Works*. Consequently, the evidence discourse was adopted in Neo-Liberal as well as Third Way
18 inspired restructuring of the public sector that have dominated the health and education services
19 since the 1980s (Burbules & Torres, 2000; Henry, et al., 2001). Here, New Public Management
20 strategies are employed to implement the idea of a market of public services which presupposes a
21 market of competing suppliers of services that are comparable and transparent to consumers. The
22 evidence discourse expediently offers a methodology that makes services measurable and
23 comparable with the explicit purpose of exposing *What Works* (OECD, 2007; Rieper & Hansen,
24 2007). The evidence discourse thus appears as part of a global regime of knowledge that
25 standardises knowledge production across national boundaries and academic disciplines (Larner
26 & Walters, 2004; Nóvoa & Yariv-Mashal, 2003). A seductive imagery of standards and
27 transparency is produced, which comes in handy for policy-makers and practitioners in a world
28 abounding with information and possible choices.

29
30 The restructuring discourses of ‘freedom’, ‘quality’, ‘consumer choice’ and
31 ‘evidence-based policy and practice’ have profoundly influenced the health services; e.g . policy-
32 makers allot tax-financed vouchers to patients to choose the service provider whom they believe
33 will provide the best treatment. Similarly ‘education services’ from primary school to university
34 are under increasing demand to become comparable and interexchangeable in order to allow
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 consumer students – or their parents - to choose the providers they believe to be of best service to
4 their life and career projects.
5
6

7 In light of the battles with positivism in the 1960s and the rise of social
8 constructivism since the 1980s, it appears odd, though, that the evidence discourse, drawing as it
9 does so explicitly on neo-positivist ideals, may be gaining such momentum within the hitherto
10 largely humanities and social science dominated fields of social welfare and education (Alvesson
11 & Skjöldberg, 2000; Habermas, 1971; Lyotard, 1999/1984; Moos, et al., 2005).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 *Contesting voices and discourses*

20 Not surprisingly, nurses were among the first professionals beyond the medical doctors to feel the
21 pressure from the evidence discourse. This evoked the question whether the evidence approach
22 was appropriate beyond testing medical substances and surgical, orthopaedic and similar
23 interventions. Very few will probably raise objections to employing the positivist inspired RCT
24 methods in most such instances. But can the evidence discourse and the RCT-methodology be
25 appropriately applied to wider areas within the nursing field, such as administration of patient
26 files, patient care, dialogue and so forth (e.g. Trinder & Reynolds, 2000)?
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 For years, influential agents within the nursing profession have contested a one-
34 sided subscription to the evidence discourse and struggled to develop phenomenological and
35 other approaches to nursing as well. They have argued that such approaches must be addressed in
36 addition to positivist approaches when it comes to cover the particular ‘nature’ of much of the
37 work that nurses engage in (e.g. Forbes, et al., 1999; Fulbrook, 2003). Here, the notion of *tacit*
38 *knowledge* has been evoked as well as the importance of applying a holistic approach to human
39 beings and their total life situations (e.g. Polanyi, 1967; Schön, 1983). A key criticism of this
40 contestation was the claim that much medical research and treatment was based on an underlying
41 reductionist assumption that humans function more or less like a mechanical apparatus.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Among educational researchers and practitioners, contestation is rising against an
50 evidence discourse that is experienced as largely disregarding the ‘nature’ and particularities of
51 the educational field (e.g. Ball, 2007; Biesta, 2007; Moos, et al., 2005). It is recognized,
52 nonetheless, in a more pragmatic sense that the field of education is under increasing pressure
53 from external stake-holders to document *What Works* as public debate increasingly takes
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 direction from what counts as evidence in large scale international quantitative comparisons. The
4 PISA-surveys on 15 years old students' proficiencies in literacy, numeracy and science across the
5 OECD and additional countries have been particularly conducive to instigate national debates,
6 although the validity of the surveys are still disputed
7
8

9
10 (http://www.pisa.oecd.org/pages/0,2987,en_32252351_32235731_1_1_1_1_1,00.html). Not
11 surprisingly, international comparisons that compare and rank countries according to what is
12 perceived as key indicators gain ground in a global market-place where education and nations'
13 competitiveness are increasingly linked in political and economic discourses (Henry, et al., 2001;
14 Nóvoa & Lawn, 2002; Reich, 1992; Slavin, 2008). However, it is highly disputed among
15 educational researchers and professionals whether breakthrough of the evidence discourse in the
16 form of quantitative measuring, statistics, rankings, bench-marking and so forth actually
17 increases quality in education (Bridges, 2008; Burbules & Torres, 2000; Moos, et al., 2005).
18
19

20
21 This struggle to capture the evidence discourse and the right to determine what should count as
22 evidence when it moves beyond the medical discourse, has, obviously, also sparked off a debate
23 on epistemological implications for humanities and social sciences in a more general sense. And,
24 evidently, social welfare and education research must be located and find its place within this
25 reinvigorated epistemological discourse. It is beyond the scope of this article to delve deep into
26 this fascinating struggle to expand the epistemological foundations for talking about evidence. It
27 will have to do to make brief references to a few key contributors.
28
29

30
31 A central website to mention is the Evidence Network based at the Centre for Evidence and
32 Policy at King's College, University of London
33

34 (<http://www.kcl.ac.uk/schools/sspp/interdisciplinary/evidence/aboutebpp.html>). Embedded
35 within the interests of the evidence movement, this network scrutinizes what good evidence
36 means across disciplinary borders, and presents itself as follows:
37
38

39
40 *“The evidence-based approach to public and social policy is built around the belief that better*
41 *quality decisions will be made in public and social policy if the process is informed by a good*
42 *knowledge of the issue in hand. This simple idea has proved to be very complex in practice, and*
43 *EBPP covers a wide range of issues, including: What constitutes good evidence? What part does*
44 *(and could or should) it play in decision making? How best can rigorous new evidence be*
45 *generated? How can existing evidence be found and reviewed for its policy and practice lessons?*
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *How best can evidence be transferred from reviewers to policy makers and practitioners? How*
4 *can we discover whether evidence has made an impact?"*
5
6
7

8
9 The network publishes the journal *Evidence and Policy*, which includes in its editorial board and
10 editorial advisory board a mixture of on the one hand key proponents for evidence review
11 producing organisations such as Ann Oakley, long-time head of EPPI and Scandinavian key
12 figures like Merete Konnerup, former director of Nordic Campbell, and Haluk Soydan, a long
13 time key figure within the Swedish Institute for Evidence-Based Social Work Practice. On the
14 other hand you find figures that are rather critical that the more linear quantitative Cochrane and
15 Campbell inspired approaches are imported uncritically into softer fields like social work and
16 education, such as Ray Pawson, a professor of social research methodology at Leeds University
17 (1989, 2006) and Carol H. Weiss, Whiting Professor at the Harvard School of Education. Even
18 Ann Oakley (2007) and David H. Hargreaves (2007) concede that in softer multi-paradigmatic
19 policy-fields it makes sense to speak more tentatively about *evidence-informed policy and*
20 *practice* instead of employing a more rigid *evidence-based* approach as within the medical field.
21 Representing a far more critical position in the discursive struggle about what should count as
22 evidence you find scholars like Ian Sanderson from the Policy Research Institute, Leeds
23 Metropolitan University (2002). He is highly critical to the predominant use of – in his view –
24 overly instrumental approaches to procure evidence for policy-making and practice purposes, as
25 used by New Labour and others. He argues: “...*the extent to which the increased emphasis on the*
26 *role of evidence in policy making is indicative of ‘technocratic politics’ underpinned by an*
27 *instrumental rationality which erodes the normative basis of policy making and undermines the*
28 *capacity for ‘appropriate’ practice”*. Inspired by an Aristotelian phronesis approach he suggests
29 “...*that we need an expanded notion of ‘practical reason’ to guide ‘appropriate practice’ within*
30 *the context of a broader framework of ‘responsible government.’”* Stephen J. Ball (2007) argues
31 along a similar logic when he warns that educational studies should not be reduced to a mere
32 technician’s approach to finding tools that work, thereby potentially excluding the role of the
33 intellectual’s theoretically informed approach to research.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 How to think professional strategies in light of the evidence discourse
4
5
6

7 Mapping the genealogy of the evidence discourse and its rise to a dominant standing even within
8 education and social welfare has unveiled a number of issues that challenge professionals'
9 authority and autonomy. In addition, highlighting the rise of contesting positions within the
10 evidence discourse has drawn attention to the fact that different academic and professional fields
11 have developed different criteria for what it means that something works. They operate within
12 different regimes of knowledge, they serve different stakeholders, they are consequently expected
13 to deal with different issues. The latter is no argument that one should not continuously scrutinize
14 whether already established criteria for scientific practice are unduly taken for granted. It
15 questions, nonetheless, whether the RCT-based criteria for evidence as espoused by the Cochrane
16 and Campbell Collaborations may be ascribed universal validity across academic and
17 professional boundaries.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 *Evidence as a floating signifier*

29

30 This questioning suggests that a cultural struggle is raging about the rights to define what counts
31 as evidence about What Works within different fields. 'Evidence' potentially turns into what
32 Ernesto Laclau (1993) called a floating signifier, i.e. an open concept that may be employed to
33 generate a variety of different meanings. The current political climate abounds with dominant
34 floating signifiers such as 'quality', 'efficiency' and 'excellence'. These signifiers travel as
35 keywords across countries and disciplinary boundaries. Being instrumental to carrying dominant
36 external stakeholders' interests, they set new agendas and dislocate established truths. A
37 particular feature of the floating signifier, however, is that you cannot disagree until it is made
38 specific. You cannot disagree with 'quality' as such (e.g. Dahler-Larsen, 2008). But when
39 particular stakeholders implement performance related salary as a quality measure to enhance the
40 quality of services by motivating employees to making additional efforts, then many employees
41 may disagree that that represents quality.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Similarly, it is hard to disagree that 'evidence' as such is desirable. As documented
52 in this article, however, the dominant version of 'evidence' is already coded with meaning and
53 woven into powerful genealogies of possible meanings within medicine as well as social welfare
54 and education that link a particular perception of science to the pragmatic powers of dominant
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 stakeholders within politics, administration and business. In a Danish context this has given rise
4 to powerful alliances between the evidence movement and dominant stakeholders like the
5 National Board of Health, the Ministry of Social Welfare, the Ministry of Education and the
6 Ministry of Science, Technology & Innovation. In England EPPI, the Campbell movement and
7 other key positions within the evidence discourse succeeded in elevating this regime of
8 knowledge into a dominant discourse by joining forces with New Labour and its interests in
9 promoting its priorities as being evidence-based or, at least, evidence-informed.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 On the other hand, observing 'evidence' as a floating signifier sensitises you to possible spaces
18 for new interpretations and experimentation in different contexts (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994).
19 This represents opportunities for professional groups within education and social welfare among
20 others to gain broader legitimacy for their practices and claims. It represents potential pitfalls as
21 well in case it means a narrowing scope for what counts as evidence, which may disregard useful
22 knowledge and practices that were built up by professionals over decades.
23
24
25
26
27

28 In a Danish context it will thus be interesting to see in the years to come, which strategies
29 for determining what counts as evidence will be adopted by the Danish Clearinghouse for
30 Educational Research. For the institution was established with explicit attention and support from
31 important players like the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Science, Technology &
32 Innovation to respond to OECD and others' concerns that Danish educational research is not of
33 sufficient utility to policy-makers and practitioners. These important stake-holders joined forces
34 with already existing circles at Danish universities that favoured the establishment of a
35 clearinghouse mandated to produce systematic evidence-based reviews about What Works in
36 education. Five years after its inception it appears that the clearinghouse clearly adopts a multi-
37 paradigmatic and questioning approach to evidence, that it is gaining some – albeit far from
38 univocal – legitimacy among educational researchers as well as more distance to the ministries.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 As argued throughout this article, one must appreciate the complex constitutive process that made
50 the knowledge regime of evidence and understand the impact that its previous trajectories
51 through medicine, the OECD and government discourses has had for its introduction into social
52 welfare and education. Working with evidence as a floating signifier thus requires that one's
53 experimentation carefully appreciates the actual strategic spaces available in given contexts.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Otherwise, they will hardly be taken seriously when grants are allotted or laws and regulations enacted. Nonetheless, by engaging in constantly challenging the limits of what is possible in the actual, one may find spaces and opportunities to expanding and – possibly – loosen bits of meanings of evidence from the currently dominant evidence discourse (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994; Krejsler, 2005, 2006).

External vs internal forms of evidence – an example of experimentation

In this light I suggest that we introduce an analytical distinction into the evidence discourse between external and internal forms of evidence. *External forms of evidence* refer to demands for evidence that external stakeholders impose upon an academic or a professional field of knowledge and practice. Hitherto the evidence discourse has largely – albeit not exclusively – been identified with external stakeholders’ pressure from above and outside the professions, with the notable exception of the medical field (Bhatti, et al., 2006; Hammersley, 2007; Krejsler, 2005; Moos, et al., 2005). Employing the term *internal forms of evidence* I intend to evoke the resources and the knowledge bases that given professions dispose of in their daily practices and – hopefully – work to qualify continually.

As such, I suggest that an expansion of the meanings of *evidence* and ideas of *What Works* may usefully be linked to the long histories of these terms within different professional languages as well as everyday language. I do this to emphasize the tactical blunder of voluntarily surrendering the right to define this floating signifier too quickly and conclusively to the dominant evidence discourse and its particular staging of how one produces evidence about health, social welfare and learning.

One could thus argue that the issue of evidence about *What Works* about a given issue merits – more often than not - a rigorous appraisal of the impact of the particular context involved. What counts as *evidence* and *What Works* as best practice for a nurse in her care for a particular patient can thus hardly be settled without reference to the particular context: Is it the cancerous patient overwhelmed by fear of death? Is the patient a child, an elderly spouse or a single and lonely patient without relatives? Is the patient religious or an atheist?

In relation to the Danish school, one could argue that two types of demands are currently very dominant when it comes establishing evidence for *What Works*:

1
2
3 On the one hand you will find external demands for more quantitative evidence of
4 best practices. This is usually linked to more testing of students and more attention to schools'
5 grade averages and so forth. In Denmark the latter is displayed on the website of the Ministry of
6 Education in order to make different municipalities' schools comparable
7 ([http://www.uvm.dk/service/Statistik/Folkeskolen%20og%20frie%20skoler/Elever/Karakterer.as](http://www.uvm.dk/service/Statistik/Folkeskolen%20og%20frie%20skoler/Elever/Karakterer.aspx)
8 [px](http://www.uvm.dk/service/Statistik/Folkeskolen%20og%20frie%20skoler/Elever/Karakterer.aspx)). The PISA-surveys show how school systems may be compared on an international scale.
9 These forms of evidence risk contributing to demands that students and schools increasingly fix
10 attention to learning the same, or at least something that is sufficiently identical to be compared
11 across municipalities and nations. The thinking is thus gaining ground that basic knowledge and
12 skills be broken down into partial knowledge and skills corresponding to each successive grade
13 level within each particular subject area. Elaboration at a national level of canonical lists of
14 national literature, historical events and so forth follow along similar lines, in Denmark
15 sponsored by the Ministry of Culture (<http://www.kulturkanon.kum.dk/>).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 On the other hand you will find, simultaneously, a strong individualising discourse
28 in educational practice that highlights a terminology about the academic, social and personal
29 competencies to be developed by students in each their individual way. Here demands for
30 evidence that particular interventions work refer more to professionals' process evaluation within
31 the institution, i.e. internal forms of evidence. The social technologies employed to produce
32 evidence of student achievement would be project work, log books, portfolios, social contracts,
33 formative evaluation and so forth (Krejsler, 2006). Attention is directed at dialogue, supervision
34 and other process technologies that reflect interaction between teacher and students. At an
35 organisational level appraisal interviews with teachers and teams of teachers as well as dialogue
36 with parents are employed (Krejsler, 2007). This individualising discourse permeates public and
37 private organisations alike; think of organisational strategies like the Learning Organisation and
38 the Good Work. When society increasingly demands that individuals learn to document their
39 particular academic, social and personal competencies, obviously school must produce evidence
40 that students acquire such competences (e.g. Krejsler, 2006; Ministry of Education/
41 Undervisningsministeriet, 1996; 2003). And here it may be reasonably assumed that a host of
42 knowledge and practices that the teaching profession has developed and practiced throughout
43 decades may qualify as evidence for best practice, be it project work, log-books, portfolio, self
44 appraisal or social contracts. Concerning educational research, Stephen Kemmis argues that
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 participatory action research, which involves teachers and students, is an indispensable approach
4 to producing knowledge and practices, i.e. an alternative understanding of evidence for what
5 works (Kemmis, 2007).
6
7

8
9 Obviously, even internal forms of evidence should be scrutinised for their potentials
10 and pitfalls as well as we currently demand that the dominant evidence discourse is scrutinised
11 (Krejsler, 2004; Popkewitz, 1998; Rose, 1999/1989).
12
13

14 15 16 17 18 19 **Conclusion**

20
21
22 From an epistemological perspective one may claim that a cultural struggle currently takes place
23 about what constitutes evidence for good practice in relation to professionals' interventions. A
24 dominant discourse from the medical field has been transformed into an approach to conquer the
25 fields of education as well as social welfare. The ensuing changes manifest themselves differently
26 within different affected fields (e.g. Bhatti, et al., 2006; Clarke, 2006; Hammersley, 2007; Moos,
27 et al., 2005). In medicine the evidence discourse has expanded largely as a bottom-up process
28 within the medical profession. Within the more vulnerable fields of social welfare and education,
29 however, the evidence discourse is largely – albeit not exclusively - directed by policy-makers'
30 and administrators' agendas.
31
32

33
34
35 The advent of the evidence discourse appears to be closely related to changes in
36 conditions for how the population politics of states are managed in modern societies. Health,
37 social welfare and education are thus increasingly linked to the so-called knowledge economy
38 discourse that operates globally (e.g. Henry, et al., 2001; Lerner & Walters, 2004; OECD, 2007).
39 Policymakers and administrators demand instruments to enable them to prioritise among an
40 increasing number of possible interventions within a frame of limited tax-resources amidst an
41 exponentially growing mass of research-based knowledge. This breeds a demand for instruments
42 that produce the feeling that it is possible to make comparisons across professional disciplines in
43 order to enable evidence-based choices about *What Works*.
44
45

46
47
48 Recognising this pressure, this article argues that a fruitful strategy for the
49 education and social welfare professions and researchers may be to adopt the concept of evidence
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 as a *floating signifier*. This may prove helpful in their struggle to expand the meanings of
4 evidence to also cover substantial parts of their professional knowledge and experience. In the
5 long run this may prove beneficial even to consumers, policymakers and others, as a considerably
6 broader knowledge and experience base will then inform how health, social welfare and
7 education practices are carried out.
8
9

10
11
12 Working in this way with an epistemological lens on evidence as a cultural struggle
13 is, however, no simple and straightforward endeavour. It demands that thorough research is
14 undertaken that brings your understanding to level with the complex constellations of
15 stakeholders' interests, which is what shapes the regimes of knowledge that no one, who wants to
16 be taken seriously, can bypass or ignore (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994; Foucault, 1993): One must
17 unravel the genealogy of the evidence discourse to comprehend how it became dominant in
18 relation to one's professional field. This requires an understanding of the complex interplay
19 between the OECD, EU, national governments, NGOs, business interests and professional
20 associations that make certain forms of intervention likely in a so-called knowledge economy.
21 One must master the art of making one's stakes appear legitimate in relation to the dominant
22 regime of knowledge if one wants to be taken seriously when resources are distributed and laws
23 enacted.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 In relation to the fields of education and social welfare a conceptual experiment is
35 suggested by means of introducing an analytical distinction between external and internal forms
36 of evidence. This serves the purpose of enabling professionals and others to think differently as
37 they struggle to come to terms with the potentials and pitfalls of the pressure from the evidence
38 discourse.
39
40
41

42
43 Adhering to this distinction, one may say that external forms of evidence tend to
44 impact upon educational practice by enhancing attention to fulfilling the demands that are
45 required. This may produce positive effects in that students know which well-defined demands to
46 achieve. It may even ensure that most students achieve some basic literacy and numeracy skills.
47 Further, it may encourage professionals to become more systematic and stringent in
48 conceptualising and implementing interventions that may previously have been conducted with
49 less reflection, relying more on tradition and customs. This may ensure that systematic methods
50 are applied, that obligations are honoured to measure and compare individuals' behaviour before
51 and after a given intervention in quantitative terms.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

It may, inversely, produce negative effects: Interventions that cannot be fitted into an experimental and quantifiable design are likely to be excluded; not because they do not work, but because their effects cannot be made comparable or measured in Randomised Controlled Trials or similar formats. Interventions based on qualitative methods that seek to adapt approaches to the particular context will not be chosen; e.g. an approach that seeks to involve by means of explorative dialogues the clients whose resources are assumed to be pivotal to engage in order to make real and long-lasting changes in habits and life styles. The external forms of evidence may result in substantial wash-back effects on curricula (e.g. Graham, 2006). If demands are primarily directed at literacy, numeracy and science subjects - as currently in Denmark and in the PISA surveys - it may be at the expense of other subject areas such as music, arts and gymnastics. It may turn much social and educational work unnecessarily instrumental. There is a risk that the cultural heritage may lose some of its features of having a value of its own in contributing to developing 'the good life' and 'the good society' if students experience they come to school mainly to get good grades and do well in testing.

This article thus constitutes an encouragement to engage in the battle about defining *What Works* in professional practice, recognising that this battle has been reconfigured with the advent of *the evidence discourse*.

References:

- Alvesson, M., & Skjöldberg, K. (2000). *Reflexive Methodology: New vistas for qualitative research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Ball, S. J. (2007). Intellectuals or technicians? : the urgent role of theory in educational studies. In M. Hammersley (Ed.), *Educational research and evidence-based practice* (pp. 106-120). London: SAGE (in collaboration with Open University Press).
- Bergmark, A., & Lundström, T. (2006). Mot en evidensbaserad praktik? Om färdriktningen i socialt arbete [Towards an Evidence-Based Practice?]. *Socialvetenskaplig Tidskrift*(2/2006), 99-113.
- Bhatti, Y., Hansen, H. F., & Rieper, O. (2006). *Evidensbevægelsens udvikling, organisering og arbejdsform: En kortlægningsrapport* [The Evidence Movement, Its Development, Organization, and Work Forms]. Copenhagen: AKF-Forlaget.
- Biesta, G. (2007). Why 'What Works' Won't Work: Evidence-based practice and the democratic deficit in educational research. *Educational Theory*, 57(1), 1-22.
- Boltanski, L., & Chiapello, E. (2007/1999). *The New Spirit of Capitalism*. London & New York: Verso.
- Borgnakke, K., Hauberg Mortensen, F., Rasmussen, P., & Salling Olesen, H. (2006). Evidens - hvad kan det bruges til? [Evidence – What is it good for?]. *Forskerforum*, 17-19.
- Bridges, D. (2008). Evidence-Based Reform in Education: a response to Robert Slavin. *European Educational Research Journal*, 7(1), 129 - 133.
- Brophy, J., & Good, T. L. (1986). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In M. C. Wittrok (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (3rd ed. ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Browman, G. P. (1999). Essence of Evidence-Based Medicine: A Case Report. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, 17(7).
- Burbules, N. C., & Torres, C. A. (Eds.). (2000). *Globalization and Education: Critical perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Clarke, A. (2006). Evidence-Based Evaluation in Different Professional Domains: Similarities, Differences and Challenges. In I. F. Shaw, J. C. Greene & M. M. Mark (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Evaluation* (pp. 559 - 581). London: SAGE Publications.
- Cochrane, A. (1972). *Effectiveness and Efficiency - Random Reflections on Health Services*. London: Nuffield Provincial Hospitals Trust.
- Dahler-Larsen, P. (2008). *Kvalitetens beskaffenhed* [The Nature of Quality]. Odense: Syddansk Universitetsforlag.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1994). *What is philosophy?* New York: Columbia University Press.
- Forbes, D. A., King, K. M., Eastlick Kushner, K., Letourneau, N. L., Myrick, A. F., & Profetto-McGrath, J. (1999). Warrantable Evidence in Nursing Science. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 29(2), 373-379.
- Foucault, M. (1971). *L'ordre du discours; leçon inaugurale au Collège de France prononcée le 2 décembre 1970*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Foucault, M. (1993). Qu'est-ce que les Lumières? *Magazine Littéraire*(309, avril 1993), 61 - 74.
- Foucault, M. (1997). On the Genealogy of Ethics - An overview of work in progress. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Foucault - Ethics, subjectivity and truth (Essential Works of Foucault 1954 - 1984)* (Vol. Vol. 1, pp. 253 - 280). New York: The New Press.
- Fulbrook, P. (2003). Developing best practice in critical care nursing: knowledge, evidence and practice. *Nursing in Critical Care*, 8(3), 96-102.

- 1
2
3 Good, T. L., & Brophy, J. (2003). *Looking in Classrooms* (9th ed. ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- 4 Graham, J. (2006). The Drivers of Change. *Professional Voice*, 4(2), 1-10.
- 5 Habermas, J. (1971). *Knowledge and Human Interests*. Boston,: Beacon Press.
- 6 Hammersley, M. (Ed.). (2007). *Educational Research and Evidence-Based Practice*. London:
7 Sage & Open University Press.
- 8 Hargreaves, D. H. (2007). Teaching as a Research-Based Profession : possibilities and prospects.
9 In M. Hammersley (Ed.), *Educational research and evidence-based practice* (pp. 3-17).
10 London: SAGE & Open University Press.
- 11 Henry, M., Lingard, B., Rizvi, F., & Taylor, S. (2001). *The OECD, Globalisation and Education*
12 *Policy*. Oxford (UK): IAU Press & Elsevier Science Ltd.
- 13 Jackson, N., & Waters, E. (2005). Criteria for the Systematic Review of Health Promotion and
14 Public Health interventions. *Health Promotion International* 20(4), 367-374.
- 15 Kemmis, S. (2007). Action research. In M. Hammersley (Ed.), *Educational Research and*
16 *Evidence-Based Practice* (pp. 167-180). London: Sage (In collaboration with Open
17 University Press).
- 18 Krejsler, J. (2005). Professions and their Identities: How to explore professional development
19 among (semi-)professions. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 49(4), 335 -
20 357.
- 21 Krejsler, J. (2006). Education and Individualizing Technologies: Exploring new conditions for
22 producing individuality. In T. S. Popkewitz, U. Olsson, K. Petersson & J. Kowalczyk
23 (Eds.), *The Future Is Not What It Appears To Be - Pedagogy, genealogy and political*
24 *epistemology* (pp. 193 - 212). Stockholm: HLS Förlag.
- 25 Krejsler, J. (2007). Discursive Strategies that Individualize: CVs and appraisal interviews.
26 *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 20(No. 4, July/August), 473 -
27 490.
- 28 Krejsler, J. (Ed.). (2004). *Pædagogikken og kampen om individet - Kritisk pædagogik, ny*
29 *inderlighed og selvets teknikker* [Pedagogy and the Struggle about the Individual].
30 Copenhagen: Hans Reitzel.
- 31 Laclau, E. (1993). Politics and the Limits of Modernity. In T. Docherty (Ed.), *Postmodernism: a*
32 *reader*. New York: Harvester.
- 33 Larner, W., & Walters, W. (Eds.). (2004). *Global Governmentality: Governing international*
34 *spaces*. New York & London: Routledge.
- 35 Larsen, M. S. (2010). *Veje til evidens på uddannelsesområdet* [Ways to Evidence in Education].
36 http://www.dpu.dk/aktuelt/nyheder/nyhed/artikel/veje_til_evidens_paa_uddannelsesomraadet/.
- 37 Lyotard, J.-F. (1999/1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A report on knowledge* (G. Bennington
38 & B. Massumi, Trans. Vol. 10). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- 39 Meyer, H. (2004). *Was ist guter Unterricht?* Berlin: Cornelsen, Scriptor.
- 40 Moos, L., Krejsler, J., Hjort, K., Laursen, P. F., & Braad, K. B. (2005). *Evidens i uddannelse?*
41 [Evidence in Education?]. Copenhagen: Danish University of Education Press.
- 42 N6voa, A., & Lawn, M. (Eds.). (2002). *Fabricating Europe: The formation of an education*
43 *space*. Dordrecht (NL): Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- 44 N6voa, A., & Yariv-Mashal, T. (2003). Comparative Research in Education: a mode of
45 governance or a historical journey? *Comparative Education*, 39(4), 423 - 438.
- 46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Oakley, A. (2007). Evidence-Informed Policy and Practice : challenges for social science. In M.
4 Hammersley (Ed.), *Educational research and evidence-based practice* (pp. 91-105).
5 London: SAGE (in collaboration with Open University Press).
6
7 OECD (2007). *Evidence in Education: Linking Research and Policy*. from
8 [http://www.oecd.org/document/56/0,3343,es_2649_35845581_38796344_1_1_1_1,00.ht](http://www.oecd.org/document/56/0,3343,es_2649_35845581_38796344_1_1_1_1,00.html)
9 [ml](http://www.oecd.org/document/56/0,3343,es_2649_35845581_38796344_1_1_1_1,00.html).
10
11 Oscarsson, L. (2006). Evidenskravet och socialt arbete [Demands for Evidence and Social Work].
12 *Sociologiska Tidskriften*(4/2006).
13
14 Pawson, R. (1989). *A Measure for Measures: A Manifesto for Empirical Sociology*: Routledge.
15
16 Pawson, R. (2006). *Evidence Based Policy: A Realist Perspective*. London: Sage.
17
18 Petrosine, A., Boruch, R. F., Soydan, H., Duggan, L., & Sanchez-Meca, J. (2001). Meeting the
19 Challenges of Evidence-Based Policy: The Campbell Collaboration. *The ANNALS of the*
20 *American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 578(1), 14-34.
21
22 Polanyi, M. (1967). *The Tacit Dimension*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
23
24 Popkewitz, T. S. (1998). *Struggling for the Soul : the politics of schooling and the construction of*
25 *the teacher*. New York ; London: Teachers College Press.
26
27 Reich, R. B. (1992). *The Work of Nations. Preparing Ourselves for 21st Century Capitalism*. New
28 York: Vintage.
29
30 Rieper, O., & Hansen, H. F. (2007). *Metodedebatten om evidens*. København: AKF.
31
32 Rose, N. (1999/1989). *Governing the Soul: The shaping of the private self*. London & New York:
33 Free Association Books.
34
35 Sackett, D. L., Rosenberg, W. M. C., Gray, J. A. M., Haynes, B. R., & Richardson, S. W. (1996).
36 Evidence based medicine: what it is and what it isn't (Editorial). *BMJ*(312), 71-72.
37
38 Sanderson, I. (2002). Making Sense of 'What Works': Evidence Based Policy Making as
39 Instrumental Rationality? *Public Policy and Administration*, 17(3), 61-75.
40
41 Schön, D. A. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. London:
42 Temple Smith.
43
44 Slavin, R. E. (2008). Evidence-Based Reform in Education: what will it take? *European*
45 *Educational Research Journal*, 7(1), 124 - 128.
46
47 The Danish Ministry of Education (1996). *Udvikling af personlige kvalifikationer i*
48 *uddannelsessystemet* [Development of Personal Qualifications in the Education System].
49 Copenhagen.
50
51 The Danish Ministry of Education (2003). *Fælles Mål - herunder "Elevens alsidige personlig*
52 *udvikling* [Common Goals – including “The Student’s Diversified Personal
53 development”]. Copenhagen.
54
55 Trinder, L., & Reynolds, S. (Eds.). (2000). *Evidence-Based Practice: A critical appraisal*:
56 Blackwell Publishing.
57
58 Utdanningsforbundet (2008). *Evidens og evidensdebattens betydning for utdanningssystemet*.
59 Oslo: Utdanningsforbundet, Avdeling for Utredning.
60
61 Wells, P. (2007). New Labour and Evidence Based Policy Making: 1997-2007. *People, Place &*
62 *Policy Online*, 1(1), 22-29.