A Gap Exists!
(But It Is Smaller And More Specific Than You Might Think)

Report Author:
Lindsay Heger

Additional Contributors:
Kayla Brooks, Christopher Cyr, Emma Luker, and Stacey Smydo

November 2014

A One Earth Future Discussion Paper

one earth FUTURE

A Gap Exists!
(But it is Smaller and More Specific Than You Might Think)

By Lindsay Heger

Additional Contributors:
Kayla Brooks, Christopher Cyr, Emma Luker,
and Stacey Smydo

November 2014

Abstract

In recent decades, many who are involved in international relations and foreign policy have bemoaned the increasing divide between what practitioners do and the issues scholars research. Accusations from both sides have detailed what appear to be entrenched institutional cultures with few possibilities for change. The bridge linking these two communities appears to be broken. Despite myriad attacks, evidence on either side of the divide is desperately lacking. In this report we present a preliminary analysis of original data intended to shed light on the extent and type of gaps between scholars and different types of practitioners. Our examination reveals that the practitioners are, in fact, consuming research and scholarly material. This is consistent for all types of practitioner organizations including non-governmental organizations, intergovernmental organizations, governmental institutions, and business associations. However, a preliminary analysis of scholarly behavior reveals a very different trend whereby scholarly work seems much more isolated to scholarly circles. Thus, we conclude that a one-way bridge is a more accurate characterization of the connection between the practitioner and scholarly communities.

http://dx.doi.org/10.18289/OEF.2014.001

Cover: Sydney Harbour Bridge by gramarye on Flickr
Design & Layout by Andrea Jovanovic

A Gap Exists!
(But it is smaller and more specific than you might think)

In recent decades, many who are involved in international relations and foreign policy have bemoaned the increasing divide between what practitioners do and the issues scholars research. Accusations from both sides have detailed what appear to be entrenched institutional cultures with few possibilities for change. Practitioners have been accused of unethical behavior, bias, and not embracing evidence as a means to guide public policy. Scholars have been characterized as aloof, increasingly theoretical to the point of impracticality, and detached from the "real world." The divide, if you listen to the critics, has put these two communities on divergent paths separated by a chasm that seems to widen each day. In his assessment, Thomas Mahnken characterized the reality as such:

> In a fundamental sense, scholars and policymakers today inhabit two different worlds-the world of ideas and the world of action. These worlds operate according to their own rules, and over time have attracted different types of inhabitants. (Mahnken 2010, 7)[1]

Yet there is broad agreement that the widening divergence is detrimental for both sides. At a minimum, it is unfortunate that those responsible for crafting public policy and those charged with analyzing it effectively ignore each other's viewpoints. At a maximum, this sort of discord leads to ineffective policies, ill-prepared younger generations of practitioners, and inapplicable scientific advances. For those policymakers concerned with international security and conflict, the picture might be particularly grim.

> The international community's approach to [conflict] prevention is too often akin to physicians prescribing treatment without prior diagnosis. Policymakers confront political imperatives to 'do something' about violent conflict, but often have to act without really knowing what will or will not work.[2]

But just how close to a catastrophic state are we? Just how wide is the gap? And most important, if we value empirically informed policymaking, how can we bridge the gap between practitioners and scholars?

Although the related literature and expert commentary suggest a very bleak state of affairs, to the best of our knowledge these accounts are mostly anecdotal.[3] And although many of these anecdotes are informative, they fall well short of being evidence sufficient to verify a larger trend. In effect we have no real sense of where the gaps lie, how large they are, or how to begin conceptualizing a solution.

In an attempt to apply an empirical lens, this paper presents preliminary data about practitioner behavior relevant to the ivory tower/practitioner gap. As a working foundation operating in the areas of peace, conflict, and governance, we collected data to better understand the overlap between what scholars and practitioners are producing and reading in our areas of interest. We focused specifically on the behavior of four types of practitioner institutions: non-governmental organizations (NGOs), governmental institutions, intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), and business associations. Though our analysis confirms some collective concerns about the gap, it also indicates that a significant degree of bridging is going on in several important categories. Notably, a significant portion of IGOs and government institutions are reading and citing academic work. Moreover, the majority of practitioner institutions in our sample are citing academic work. A very preliminary examination of related academic work indicates a more siloed approach whereby almost no academic publications cite non-academic research materials. Thus, a one-way bridge seems to be a better characterization of the current isolation between scholars and practitioners.

Background

Two factors motivate our efforts to empirically verify the gap. The first is the growing body of work that laments the gap and how policymakers have responded.[4] Though conversations about the gap began years earlier, Joseph Nye's 2009 *Washington Post* article "Scholars on the Sidelines" most recently catalyzed the discussion. Nye, in asserting that the policy process is "...diminished by the withdrawal of the academic community," argues that scholars' self-marginalization is mostly to blame. He contends that academic theory is increasingly in danger of saying "more and more about less and less."[5]

Commentaries from both sides discuss a wide array of reasons for the (growing) gap. For academics, non-academic contributions are given little if any weight in tenure consideration. History, and, in particular, the experiences of some academics during the Vietnam War have generated justifiable anxiety among academics that their work might be used for unintended purposes or misunderstood and inappropriately applied. Practitioners often have short time horizons and are inexperienced with the type of advanced statistics that are frequently taught in Ph.D. programs. These factors make the more technical aspects of empirical analyses both difficult to access and sometimes irrelevant.[6] Moreover, academic jargon, particularistic references, and lengthy prose dominate the pages of many top scholarly journals, making them barely accessible outside of specific subfields, much less outside of the academy. Methodological advances untethered to actual political interactions have left large swaths of public intellectuals scratching their heads in bewilderment. As Andrew Mack (2002) notes:

> The virtues of Bayesian Heteroskedastic Probit models are unlikely to engage the attention of busy officials. Moreover, few if any policymakers have any idea what coefficients are, so even those who skip the technicalities in quantitatively oriented academic articles may still not understand what the results mean.

And although many in the social sciences now routinely write a "practical implications" section into their publications, fewer than 20% of policymakers indicate that academic journals (or books) are very important to their work (Avey and Desch, forthcoming). These attempts seem to lack the specific guidance policymakers need and they miss the mark in creating reasonable contexts from which policymakers can draw useful lessons. Avey and Desch find that this latter point is, indeed, quite important. Based on their survey of government officials they characterize policymakers in the following way:

> They prefer that scholars generate simple and straightforward frameworks that help them make sense of a complex world…They seem not so much to be looking for direct policy advice as for background knowledge to help them put particular events within a more general context."[7]

In response to the gradual distancing of the university system, policymakers have turned elsewhere for intellectual and expert analysis. The influence of NGOs, think tanks, bloggers, private associations, and public intellectuals seems to have increased in recent years. But their influence is not without limitations largely imposed by the political nature of the institutions and/or their funders. Universities offer a type of neutrality that adds significant value to the democratic policymaking process (Nye 2008). Thus, although university professors and their cadres of graduate students may be less engaged, their research and viewpoints still hold enormous potential value. The growing alienation of this community, however, suggests these benefits are falling by the wayside.

The second motivation for this project is much more pragmatic and idiosyncratic. The research department at the One Earth Future Foundation (OEF) is mandated to support empirically informed policymaking. In order to do this OEF needed to better understand what types of materials practitioners were utilizing for research purposes. Although the ivory tower/policymaker divide seems acute, we found nothing concrete available that would shed light on how best to translate existing empirical evidence for those making decisions. Thus, to more concretely develop OEF's strategy, we needed to know more about the gap.

We suspect that this concern is shared among many think tanks, foundations, and NGOs operating in the peace, security, and development fields. Those seeking to provide evidence or analyze policy through an empirical lens undoubtedly wrestle with the gap and its implications. There are a small (but hopefully growing) number of institutions that manage to cross the divide with fantastically innovative products or collaborations. We discuss those in more detail below. Suffice it to say, endeavors thus far suggest it is possible to bridge the gap but provide little guidance on exactly where or how collaboration between these distinct communities ought to proceed.

Our Methods & Data

We collected data on 44 institutional stakeholders working mostly in the areas of peace, conflict, and development (see Appendix A). Each stakeholder was assigned to one of five categories: government institution, peacebuilding NGO, business association, IGO, and other.[8] We gathered data on institutional demographics, the types of products produced, and the types of material cited in stakeholder products.

All data was collected through internet searches focused on stakeholders' institutional websites. For each institution, researchers gathered information about the institution, its products, and citations from the company/personal/vision/goals/mandate/objectives/publications/reports/annual reports tabs listed on the institution's website. All data on products produced and relevant citations were constrained to items dated within the last three years. In cases of organizations younger than three years, data was collected on as much as was available. Each product type, issue area, and organization type was assigned a code in a master key to avoid any discrepancies among the team members collecting the data. Originally, there were 19 product types in the master key, which were then reduced to 5 general categories: research reports, non-academic print, popular media sources, official documents, and discussion activities. (See Appendix B for a detailed description of the products encompassed by each category.) In the analysis below we highlight the research report category because it includes academic journal articles and books published through academic presses.

Definitions of potentially ambiguous product types were discussed among the team members. Furthermore, 10% of institutions were double-coded to ensure that coding choices were consistent. This was done throughout the process so that any discrepancies could be identified and adjusted throughout.

The data below is presented by institutional partner type and mandate focus. Recall that institutions are divided into five distinct types: government, peacebuilding NGO, business association, IGO, and other. According to mandate focus, we also categorize practitioner stakeholders by their research (think) or practitioner (do) orientation.

Analysis

Below we present our findings in two subsections. The first describes what the institutions are producing and the second describes what the institutions are citing. As a matter of characterization, of the 44 unique organizations approximately 10% are government institutions, 30% are NGOs, 15% are IGOs, and 10% are business associations. Remaining institutions are classified as other, though most in this category are NGOs associated with prominent individuals and private foundations. The modal source of funding for our universe of institutions is through donations. Most have a staff of fewer than 50 people and are located outside of the U.S.

1. *What are institutions producing?*

Overall, 93.18% of institutional stakeholders are producing research reports, 72.72% are producing non-academic print information sources and popular media products, and 59.09% are producing discussion products. Only 6.18% of all institutions are producing official documents. Table 1 lists the product breakdown by institution type. The percentages indicate how many of a particular institution type are producing any specific product. For instance, we found that of the 12 NGOs in our sample, 8 (or 66.67%) produced non-academic print materials. We did not track the total number of productions, choosing instead to gather preliminary information on the type of material being produced (and, following, read).

Table 1: Percentages Of Institution Types Producing Each Output Type					
	Government (n=5)	Peacebuilding NGO (n=12)	Business Association (n=5)	Intergovernmental Organization (n=6)	None (n=16)
Research Reports	100%	100%	80%	100%	87.5%
Non-Academic Print	80%	66.67%	20%	83.33%	87.5%
Popular Media	60%	83%	20%	66.67%	87.5%
Official Documents	20%	0%	0%	33.33%	6.25%
Discussion Products	20%	58.33%	40%	100%	62.5%

Although research reports were produced frequently across all types of institutions, there was significant variation in the other products by institution type. For example, 80% of peacebuilding NGOs produced popular media sources such as videos or infographics to disseminate their information; only 20% of business associations used this publication outlet. 100% of IGOs produced or hosted discussion reports or forums, while only 58% of peacebuilding NGOs produced products in this category. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the frequency with which government institutions and IGOs produce different types of products is relatively similar except for discussion products, which IGOs produce much more frequently. NGOs and the "other" institutions appear to be relatively more involved in producing products for the popular media, while business associations are much less likely to engage the media in this manner.

Are practitioner institutions producing academic publications? Though research reports are the modal product type, those aimed directly at academic audiences are less frequent. Publications in academic journals by stakeholders, for instance, occur for approximately 18% of all stakeholders. This is not entirely surprising; practitioner institutions are perhaps most intent on influencing policymakers. In this light and if the gap is indeed growing, one would expect a low percentage.

We considered the possibility that groups producing (and below, citing) research would be only those with scholarly mandates (e.g. think tanks). Organizations that are mandated to provide research, for example, might account for an overwhelming share of those producing research reports. On the other hand, those with more field-oriented mandates might produce less research and instead drive most of the non-academic or discussion products. To address this issue, we reclassified stakeholders by their orientation toward specific communities. Research institutions are defined as those affiliated with a university and/or those that possess solely scholarly-oriented goals expressed in their mandate. Practitioner institutions are defined as any organization that works in the field and does not conduct their own research. The "mixed" category is defined as any organization that has aspects of both "think" and "do" in their institutional mandate.

By calculating the frequencies according to the research/practitioner orientation of the stakeholder institution (see Table 2 below) it does not appear that organizational mandate is crucial in driving research. Although all academic and mixed organizations produce research reports, nearly 80% of practitioner institutes do as well. However, only institutions in the research and mixed categories have targeted academic journals with publications. 83.33% of all mixed stakeholders produce non-academic print sources and 77.77% produce products for popular media outlets. Mixed stakeholders are also the only category of stakeholder producing official documents.

Table 2: Percentages of research, practitioner, and mixed organizations producing each output type				
	Research (n=12)	Mixed (n=18)	Practitioner (n=14)	Total (n=44)
Research Reports	100%	100%	78.57%	93.18%
Non-Academic Print	75%	83.33%	57.14%	72.72%
Popular Media	66.67%	77.77%	71.43%	72.72%
Official Documents	0%	16.66%	0%	6.81%
Discussion Products	58.33%	72.22%	42.85%	59.09%

2. *What are institutions citing?*

Another way of tracking what products are influencing practitioner organizations is looking at what type of material they are citing. Overall, we found that stakeholder institutions were most likely to cite research reports (72.72%), non-academic print sources (54%), official documents (43.18%), and discussion products (15.91%). They were least likely to cite popular media (6.81%). Table 3 shows the breakdown of source type by institution type. 100% of IGOs cite research reports and 80% of government institutions and 75% of NGOs also cite research reports. Many NGOs source non-academic print as well. A small majority (60%) of business associations cite research reports, though not much else.

Table 3: Percentages of institution types citing each output type					
	Government (n=5)	Peacebuilding NGO (n=12)	Business Association (n=5)	Intergovernmental Organization (n=6)	Other (n=16)
Research Reports	80%	75%	60%	100%	62.5%
Non-Academic Print	60%	83.33%	20%	66.67%	43.75%
Popular Media	0%	25%	0%	0%	0%
Official Documents	60%	66.67%	0%	50%	31.25%
Discussion Products	60%	16.67%	0%	16.67%	6.25%

Approximately 54% of all institutional stakeholders cited specifically-academic journal articles in their products. With the exception of business associations, academic citations occur across all institution types. This suggests that a sizeable portion of practitioners are indeed reading academic products.

When we analyzed products cited by the research/practitioner nature of stakeholders, we found that nearly all research organizations cite research reports (91.67%) and non-academic print (83.33%). Most mixed organizations cite research reports (88.89%) as well as official documents (72.22%) and non-academic print sources (66.67%). Only 35.71% of practitioner organizations cite research, and even small portions of these organizations cite other types of products. Citations of academic journals occur in all categories. It is also important to note that seven of the institutions did not cite any sources in their publications and all seven are in the practitioner category.

Table 4: Percentages of research, practitioner, and mixed organizations citing each output type

	Research (n=12)	Mixed (n=18)	Practitioner (n=14)	Total (n=44)
Research Reports	91.67%	88.89%	35.71%	72.73%
Non-Academic Print	83.33%	66.67%	21.43%	56.82%
Popular Media	0%	16.67%	0%	6.81%
Official Documents	41.67%	72.22%	7.14%	43.18%
Discussion Products	25.00%	22.22%	0%	15.91%

A Preliminary Look Across the Gap

Our evidence indicates that policy practitioners are reading research, and specifically academic work. But are scholars reading practitioner literature? Preliminary evidence suggests the answer is no. We analyzed 14 articles in recent issues of two leading international security journals *(the Journal of Peace Research* and *the Journal of Conflict Resolution*), and categorized the works cited in these articles.[9] 80–95% of article citations were drawn from other scholarly journals or academic books. The lowest percentage of citations from these two categories was 63%. It should be noted that these numbers do not include other types of academic works such as working papers, dissertations, manuscripts, and datasets (the most commonly cited product outside of books and journal articles), meaning that the true percentage of products from practitioners is even lower than the above numbers suggest. Citations of the products commonly produced by practitioners, such as popular press books, white papers, and policy briefs, were rare or nonexistent in this sample of articles. In sum, it appears that the lack of crosstalk between academics and practitioners stems largely from the academic community.

Table 5: Sourcing from Academic Journals			
Academic Sources	**Total Cited**	**Non-Academic Sources**	**Total Cited**
Journal Articles	516	Newspaper/Magazine Articles	8
Academic Books	211	Popular Press Books	2
Datasets	31	White Papers	6
Working Papers	25	Policy Briefs	3
Dissertations	3	Official Documents	13
Manuscripts	1	Software	2
	787 (96% of total)	**Total**	**34 (4% of total)**

Discussion

There are a number of potential pitfalls that render this analysis, at best, preliminary. The sample is small and not at all generated through a process of random selection. The data have no way of capturing whether or not practitioners are citing a diverse set of academic work or the same handful of prominent publications. Additionally, we have little way of knowing exactly how practitioners are using the academic material they are citing. Is it used to legitimize arguments, as reference points for additional resources, to justify particular courses of action, or some combination of these uses? Knowing this additional information could go a long way in further narrowing down exactly how to create a better bridge between the academy and practitioner institutions.

One thing that we can tell from the analysis is that practitioner institutions are very clearly in the business of creating and using research material. While not all research material produced is targeted for academic publications, the data strongly suggest that these stakeholders embrace a more informed analysis than stereotypes might otherwise suggest. The vast amount of research material produced also indicates that describing think tanks and private research firms as filling the intellectual void within the policymaking community might indeed be accurate. Yet the academy has not been totally eliminated from discussion; the data show that bridges between practitioner stakeholders and academics exist. Across the board, regardless of the type or orientation of stakeholder, practitioners are citing and producing academic publications. We view this as a very positive finding. It suggests that communication and collaboration are taking place.

However, the bridge appears more broken in some places than others. From the practitioner side, peacebuilding NGOS and especially business associations could potentially benefit from more active engagement with academic work. However, the fact that these stakeholders are not currently engaging this work more frequently could indicate a number of things. It may reflect the sentiment that not much research being done is relevant to these stakeholders, or at least that it is not being communicated in an efficient manner. It may also indicate that there is less crossover between the people employed by the academy and these stakeholders.

What is more striking than there being a few weak spots is that the bridge does appear to be entirely unidirectional. In our preliminary investigation, work coming from the academy is almost entirely insulated; over 95% of citations in our academic sample cite other academic products. There are reasons to suspect that many, perhaps most, citations from these sources should be academic. After all, many reviewers and editors from academic journals require potential contributors to be fully aware of the latest debates and findings from these and similar outlets. Authors may also prefer to cite their academic peers even if other non-academic research (e.g., grey literature) communicates similar findings. Still the sheer preponderance of academic citations suggests an isolated vantage point.

Still, we see reasons for optimism. And we are not alone. Ezra Klein (2014) noted that one of the best things to have happened to political journalism in the last decade is political science, largely because it offers structural explanations for an increasingly complex and misunderstood American political structure.[10] There are also specific reasons to suspect that international affairs and foreign policy will increasingly demand collaboration between these communities. Some of these have been articulated by Thomas Mahnken, a scholar/practitioner who wrote in 2009 that recent geopolitical concerns such as the rise of new world powers and Islamic extremism have given rise of a slew of new questions about contemporary international relations. Moreover, actual points of intersection, at least for the defense and scholarly communities, appear to be on the rise. For instance, the Minerva Grants,[11] a U.S. Department of Defense initiative begun in 2008, have spurred greater collaboration. An early Minerva grant led to the formation of the Empirical Studies of Conflict Program, which explicitly focuses on interdisciplinary approaches to provide "…war fighters and policy makers with greater expert analyses and recommendations for responding to security threats."[12] The Harmony Project, which supplies public data on al Qaeda and is supported by the Combating Terrorism Center at West Point, offers another point of intersection for the scholarly and defense communities.[13] These and certainly many other collaborative efforts have demonstrated successes.

Based on this analysis and our experience in a working foundation with both practitioners and scholars, we have several recommendations:

1. Academics should consider themselves project managers over their ideas and arguments. As such they will need to identify multiple audiences for their ideas and a series of best practices for communicating their ideas. Since practitioners are consuming a wide variety of material, academics should spread their ideas across various media (e.g. blogs, policy briefs, executive summaries, or even infographics).

2. Academics who are not already doing so should track who in non-academic circles is citing their work and then reach out to them. This would be good for a couple reasons. First, in the event that scholarly material is being used inappropriately, it would be a first line of defense. Second, in contexts where material is used appropriately, connecting with practitioner institutions that engage with scholarly arguments has enormous potential to deepen cross-sector connections.

3. Practitioners ought to pay more attention to good social science practices when producing research material. Research that does not consider its relevance in the context of validity or logical consistency is going to be a hard sell to the academic community. To this end practitioners could reach out to

academics for assistance with crafting their reports. Graduate programs are chock full of highly skilled technical folks itching for the opportunity to get some real field experience; it seems like a few quid pro quos might be easy to arrange.

4. Scholars should pay more attention to grey literature. There are numerous insightful pieces produced by practitioners that ought to be included in the academic discourse and on graduate syllabi. Graduate students in any international affairs program, for instance, ought to be familiar with what major international institutions produce on a regular basis.

5. Editors at academic journals should emphasize policy relevance in their editorial processes. One way this might be accomplished is by ensuring that practitioners familiar with the peer review process and scholarly community sit on editorial boards. Another possibility would be for editorial managers to more routinely send practitioners manuscripts for peer review. Changes like these would serve to motivate scholars to push methodological boundaries within policy-relevant contexts.

6. Practitioners and scholars who are currently collaborating ought to document the lessons learned from these collaborations. Perhaps the most effective way to do so would be through blogs or short discussion papers that are accessible to a wide audience.

7. Support should be generated on both sides of the gap to create and support places for mutual exchange. Blogs, for instance, have become one of the most interesting, dynamic, and exciting places for the exchange of ideas between these communities. Institutional webpages could also serve as interesting places for idea exchange. Social media groups are another way to increase communication and exchange. Finally, professional events such as conferences could carve out specific panels dedicated to fostering exchange on particular subjects.

If we are to progress beyond a broken and unidirectional bridge to one that can fully support the weight of empirically informed policymaking, change is necessary. We see much to be positive about but anticipate that the road to a healthy relationship of exchange will require significant pivoting on the part of both sides. Our analysis suggests that academics might have farther to go in order to ensure that they do not become more isolated. In the end we hope that idea entrepreneurs on both sides of the gap continue to push for dialog and policymaking informed by empirical evidence.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Stakeholders by Institution Type

Government Organizations

1. Center for Complex Operations
2. United States Institute of Peace
3. Kenya's Delegation to the African Union
4. USAID-OTI
5. Department of State: Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization Operations

Peacebuilding NGOs

6. Center for Partnership Studies
7. New America Foundation
8. The Roméo Dallaire Child Soldiers Initiative
9. e-Parliament
10. International Campaign to Ban Landmines
11. The Kofi Annan Foundation
12. International Civil Society Action Network
13. International Crisis Group
14. Oxfam International
15. Nobel Women's Initiative
16. Women for Women International
17. Hunt Alternatives Fund

Business Associations

18. Boston Consulting Group
19. ISCAR Metalworking
20. KEPSA
21. The Levi Strauss Foundation
22. PREDA Plus

Inter-Governmental Organizations

23. Organization of American States
24. The World Bank Institute

25. World Bank
26. UN Global Compact
27. African Governance Forum
28. International Monetary Fund

Other

29. Rocky Mountain Institute
30. Sadat Chair for Peace and Development
31. Harvard Law Program on Negotiation
32. Steven Pinker
33. Third Way
34. Development Partners Working Group on Decentralisation and Local Governance
35. Jared Diamond
36. Health Impact Fund
37. George W. Bush Institute
38. Google Ideas
39. Medicines360
40. IDEO.org
41. Centre for Digital Inclusion
42. Sierra Club
43. Save the Children
44. American Red Cross

Appendix B

Product categories

Academic Sources	Total Cited
Research Reports	Academic articles, white papers, policy briefs, self-published reports, technical reports, academic books, polls/surveys
Non-Academic Print	Blogs, news sources, popular press books, handbooks
Popular Media Sources	Videos, podcasts/webcasts/radio, infographics
Official Documents	Constitutions, official mandates, legislations
Discussion Activities	Testimony, hosted events, conference reports, campaigns/petitions

Appendix C

Stakeholders by Location on the Academic Spectrum

Academic

1. Center for Complex Operations
2. United States Institute of Peace
3. Center for Partnership Studies
4. New America Foundation
5. Boston Consulting Group
6. The World Bank Institute
7. Rocky Mountain Institute
8. Sadat Chair for Peace and Development
9. Harvard Law Program on Negotiation
10. Stephen Pinker
11. Third Way
12. Development Partners Working Group on Decentralisation and Local Governance

Mixed

1. Kenya's Delegation to the African Union
2. The Roméo Dallaire Child Soldiers Initiative
3. e-Parliament
4. International Campaign to Ban Landmines
5. Kofi Annan Foundation
13. International Civil Society Action Network
14. International Crisis Group
15. Oxfam International
16. Nobel Women's Initiative
17. Organization of American States
18. World Bank
19. UN Global Compact
20. African Governance Forum
21. International Monetary Fund
22. Jared Diamond
23. Health Impact Fund

24. George W. Bush Institute
25. Google Ideas

Practitioners

1. USAID-OTI
2. Department of State: Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization Operations
3. Women for Women International
4. Hunt Alternatives Fund
5. ISCAR Metalworking
6. KEPSA
7. The Levi Strauss Foundation
8. PREDA Plus
9. Medicines360
10. IDEO.org
11. Center for Digital Inclusion
12. Sierra Club
13. Save the Children
14. American Red Cross

NOTES

1. Thomas G. Mahnken, "Bridging the Gap Between the Worlds of Ideas and Action," *Orbis* 48(1) (2010): 4–13. doi:10.1016/j.orbis.2009.10.002

2. Andrew Mack, "Civil War: Academic Research and the Policy Community," *Journal of Peace Research* 39(5) (2002): 515–525. doi:10.1177/0022343302039005001

3. One notable is Paul C. Avey and Michael C. Desch, "What Do Policymakers Want From Us? Results of a Survey of Current and Former Senior National Security Decision-makers," *International Studies Quarterly* 58(4) (2014): 34. doi:10.1111/isqu.12111 Avey and Desch survey top U.S government officials to better understand how and what types of scholarship are most utilized amongst policymakers. See also The Institute for the Theory and Practice of International Relations at William & Mary, "Teaching, Research, & International Policy (TRIP)," accessed August 2014, http://www.wm.edu/offices/itpir/trip/.
TRIP surveys gather academic responses to questions about research and policymaking. These surveys provide a good sense of the perceptions scholars have of the policy community, though less concrete evidence about the extent to which scholars work to bridge the gap.

4. Academics seem more focused on writing about the divide, though perhaps this is not surprising. Policymakers may have few incentives to editorialize and their professional responsibilities may make it difficult to express these types of sentiments.

5. See Joseph S. Nye Jr., "Scholars on the Sidelines," *Washington Post*, April 13, 2009, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/04/12/AR2009041202260.html. Many of Nye's ideas are described earlier and in more detail in Joseph S. Nye Jr., "Bridging the Gap between Theory and Policy," *Political Psychology* 29(4) (2008): 593–603. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2008.00651.x

6. There are very obvious exceptions to this, particularly as evidence-based research has made significant inroads into the development and security communities, where many practitioners now often employ assessment protocols using cutting-edge methodological tools.

7. Avey and Desch (2014)

8. The "Other" category consists of 16 organizations that do not fall into any of the other four categories. These include prominent individuals who work in both academic and policymaking fields; private foundations; and NGOs working in areas related to development including health, youth, and disaster relief. See Appendix A for a complete list of stakeholders by partner category.

9. Categories include academic journal articles, academic books, popular press books, newspaper or magazine articles, working papers, datasets, white papers, policy briefs, official documents, dissertations, software, and unpublished manuscripts.

10. Ezra Klein, "How Political Science Conquered Washington," *Vox*, updated September 2, 2014, http://www.vox.com/2014/9/2/6088485/how-political-science-conquered-washington.

11. U.S. Department of Defense, "The Minerva Initiative: Program History and Overview," accessed August 14, 2014, http://minerva.dtic.mil/overview.html.

12. The Empirical Studies of Conflict Project, "About Us," accessed August 14, 2014, https://esoc.princeton.edu/about-us.

13. The Combating Terrorism Center at West Point, "Harmony Program," accessed August 14, 2014, https://www.ctc.usma.edu/programs-resources/harmony-program.

The One Earth Future Foundation was founded in 2007 with the goal of supporting research and practice in the area of peace and governance. OEF provides active operational, research, and strategic support, allowing our programs to focus deeply on complex problems and create constructive alternatives to violent conflict.

Research materials from OEF envision improved governance structures and policy options, analyze and document the performance of existing governance institutions, and provide intellectual support to the field operations of our implementation projects. Our active field projects apply our research outputs to existing governance challenges, particularly those causing threats to peace and security. Our approach is flexible, imaginative, and yet carefully grounded in intellectual and practical analysis that informs policy-oriented applications.

The OEF discussion paper series provides thought-provoking perspectives on contemporary issues related to peace and security. Although we believe that the papers in this series make a valuable contribution to the public discourse, they do not necessarily reflect OEF opinion.

one earth FUTURE

ONE EARTH FUTURE FOUNDATION
525 Zang Street, Suite A
Broomfield, CO 80021 USA
Ph. +1.303.533.1715 Fax +1 303.309.0386