



Editorial

Welcome to the inaugural issue of *Research for All*.

Research for All focuses on the importance and relevance of engagement to research. It offers a space to critically reflect on how research can be conceived, developed, disseminated and applied in partnership with those not formally involved in the research community, and recognizes that the processes of engagement are worthy of reflection, critical analysis and debate.

Research for All upholds the principles of research processes being open to everyone and research products having value in the wider world, being culturally enriching and providing routes to problem-solving and social or technical advancement. *Research for All* provides a platform for new ways of knowledge-creation through creative thinking where academic disciplines meet with real-world problems. This can be achieved in a variety of ways, including: integrating shared values into science and innovation; harnessing the energy, enthusiasm and knowledge of wider society to guide research; strengthening organizational relationships between universities and their local and distant communities; and inspiring the next generation of researchers.

It is these activities that are the focus of this journal. Its pages stimulate critical, reflective debate about working together for research and applying its findings in the wider world; they provide a space to connect theoretical understanding to practice and vice versa; and encourage authors and readers to debate their experiences and visions. Through this, *Research for All* aims to raise the quality of engagement with research. By ensuring that the journal has contributions from a wide range of people with a stake in these ways of working, we hope to offer a rich landscape of knowledge and expertise that will have value to all. At the same time, the editors and peer reviewers – coming from a mixed background – develop the journal in a spirit of inclusiveness and partnership. We are at the start of this journey, and recognize that we all have a lot to learn.

Research for All is supported by:

- UCL Institute of Education, which has a mission rooted in a commitment to social justice, and is a cornerstone of public engagement with research, part of University College London, a diverse intellectual community, engaged with the wider world and committed to changing it for the better
- the National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement (NCCPE), which is internationally recognized for its work supporting and inspiring universities to change perspectives, promote innovation, and nurture and celebrate excellence.

The journal is fully open access, free to write for and free to read.

Given that *Research for All* aims to explore the landscape of ideas and opportunities for public engagement with research, we have chosen to use the language of maps to describe its ambition and its scope. While geographic maps conventionally provide a scaled-down representation of a terrain to make it comprehensible, there exist many other forms of maps. Familiar shapes of countries and continents may be distorted to represent characteristics such as population density; political maps illustrate the reach and boundaries of political systems; and road maps help us navigate between different places on a local, national or global scale.

Different types of map serve different people and different purposes; they enable people to explore new ideas, follow unfamiliar routes and see things with fresh eyes. Critically, they provide an opportunity to make connections and navigate the landscape. They are accessible to a wide range of people, who will find different features fascinating and/or relevant. Maps also capture the romance of starting a new endeavour: the curiosity of charting new landscapes, visiting new places, and inspiring new learning and new connections. Similarly, the journal is pioneering new ideas and connections, and opening up new places for inspiration, challenge and succour. We are delighted that you are joining us on the journey.

The journal originated from culture-change interventions in the UK, aimed at supporting higher education institutions (HEIs) to create the conditions where their engagement with the wider world might flourish (Duncan and Manners, 2014). An influential Royal Society report (2006) uncovered challenging statistics about cultural factors that were inhibiting effective engagement. As a result, research funders in the UK took action, investing £9.1m in the Beacons for Public Engagement initiative, and launching the National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement (NCCPE) (RCUK, 2008).

This was followed by investment in the Catalyst for Public Engagement projects – eight universities given funding to develop their approach to supporting engagement (RCUK, 2012). This work stimulated conversations among the Catalyst leaders about what high-quality public engagement with research looks like, and how it differs in different disciplines.

Sandy Oliver led the Catalyst project at the UCL Institute of Education, which exposed her to the many different traditions, framings and practices of engagement, and provoked in her the wish for a place where such understandings might be explored, analysed and shared. Sophie Duncan led work at the NCCPE, an organization that seeks to spearhead culture-change work in the UK. In this role, she was able to observe how bringing all those interested in engaged research together could catalyse new ways of conceiving of engagement, make new connections and foster improved practice. Importantly, she was part of a project funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) to establish a UK Community Partner Network (UKCPN), which brought into sharp relief the challenges of effective partnership work between universities and community-based organizations (Aumann *et al.*, 2014).

As the idea of public engagement gained traction in the UK, there was increasing need to recognize it as a professional practice, with the potential for rigorous research and reflection. Studying engagement in itself was not new, but considering it from the multiple perspectives of all those involved in engaged research processes was new, as was the need to share this across different disciplinary practices. The UCL Institute of Education and NCCPE joined forces, and the idea of the journal was born.

The development of this journal has been an engagement process in itself. It has found its direction, scope and focus from conversations, events and discussions with practitioners, researchers and policymakers across a range of organizations, including

universities, research institutes, funders, community-based organizations, charities and cultural organizations. We are supported by an international advisory group and a team of associate editors, who have helped make the journal a reality. We are grateful for the insights, enthusiasm and generosity of the many people who have shaped the journal, and brought it into being. The associate editors involved in this issue are: **Kim Aumann**, Boing Boing, UK; **Hamish Chalmers**, Oxford Brookes University, UK; **Cath Chamberlain**, Baker IDI Heart and Diabetes Institute, UK; **Ceri Davies**, University of Brighton, UK; **Helen Featherstone**, University of Bath, UK; **Jude Fransman**, Open University, UK; **Janet Jull**, University of Ottawa, Canada; **Sarah Lloyd**, University of Hertfordshire, UK; **Paul Manners**, NCCPE, UK; **Norbert Steinhaus**, Living Knowledge – The International Science Shop Network, Germany; **Crystal Tremblay**, University of Victoria, Canada; and **Claire Wood**, NCCPE, UK.

There exists within the *Research for All* landscape a range of different communities, with different cultures and languages, and different experiences of engagement. Each group is well versed in animating research through engagement and realizing the potential of bringing people together to share, develop and do research. However, no one language can capture the full breadth and depth of engagement across the landscape, as terms that seem similar on the surface can refer to quite diverse practices.

To provide a small insight into the complexity of this landscape, consider three examples from the UK. Patient involvement has become a key feature of medical research in the UK, and is recognized as an important part of developing research that makes a difference. There is a range of approaches to involvement, including patient advisory boards who may advise researchers on directions for research or on how to share research findings with those who may benefit from them. Within this community, patient involvement is distinct from public engagement, a term applied here to disseminating information and knowledge about research. Within the arts and humanities, public engagement features quite extensively in the research landscape and can itself be a methodology of research. This breadth of practice includes engaging with the media to stimulate public discourse; community engagement, which describes partnerships between researchers and community groups; and co-production, which focuses on partnership working across all aspects of the research process, including idea development. In the physical sciences, public engagement covers a broad range of activity, including working with schools, which is often termed 'outreach'; citizen science, where people participate in the research process as researchers; and science-communication activity – inspiring and informing people about the research.

All of these activities (and many more not described here) would be equally relevant to *Research for All*, as they seek to explore the interface between research and society. Facer *et al.* (2012) mapped out this landscape for the UK – outlining the different terminology, different traditions, different epistemological framings and different practices of engagement. Our experiences of international engagement practice further complicate this picture. It is by delving into these practices – from media engagement to exhibitions, organizational partnerships to workshops with children, community development to crowdsourcing data – that we begin to uncover the dynamics of engagement and how it can be made to work well.

Recognizing this, the map metaphor helps us describe the nature of the different contributions we have received, and that we seek. There are different types of article, including features that provide an overview of different facets of the engaged research landscape, articles analysing research processes and findings, and practice-

based case studies that explore details of a specific area. There are different types of contributors too – researchers, community advocates, connectors – who work inside and outside of higher education. Each contribution describes features of the map framed from a particular viewpoint, drawing on the contributor's expertise of doing and reflecting on engagement, and on their disciplinary home. With so much richness, the journal provides opportunities to explore new worlds and new perspectives, to make connections between them, and to reflect on and enliven our own work. We hope it will help us all navigate the engagement landscape more effectively – to learn, develop and inspire research for all.

With this in mind, we turn to this first issue and its range of thoughtful contributors, opening up the diversity of engagement theory and practice across the world. This is a bumper issue, as we sought to provide a snapshot of some of the landscape we hope to cover, relevant to the contributors and readers we hope to attract.

Reminding us that research based in and with communities is not new, Hall (an academic) and Tandon (who leads a non-governmental organization (NGO) in India) explore the role of knowledge democracy, drawing on a range of examples to illustrate their thinking, while Oakley reflects on the role research played in the Settlement movement at the turn of the nineteenth century.

The experience of encouraging people to work in partnership for mutual benefit is considered by both Wechsler, whose experiences suggest that being a 'compassionate connector' is key, and Phipps and colleagues, who uncover knowledge-brokering practice across four different countries to explore the similarities and differences in approach, providing useful tips to inform future practice.

Several articles explore how researchers are both challenged and changing in light of UK policies for higher education. Burchell *et al.* share the results of a research study looking at how researchers in the UK are currently supported to engage with the public. Holliman and Warren explore the future of scholarship, suggesting that engagement is a critical part of a researcher's identity and professional practice, and Southby considers to what extent participatory practice is compatible with being a research student. Staley argues that the processes of engagement in which researchers participate necessarily change how they think and therefore what they do – making a case for looking at the impacts on researchers practising engaged research.

Complementary changes in who researchers engage with, and how, feature in two studies. Mahony and Stephansen explore what we mean by 'public', and how the very act of engaging the public with research leads to different publics being convened. Hopkins *et al.* explore young people's views about their involvement in research and how they want to be treated by researchers. They present a guide about involving young people in social research and the learning that came from teachers and students co-creating it. The Student Research Committee is acknowledged for their collective co-authorship of the article.

Four papers are devoted to devices that bring research and the public together. Contemporary cinema drew together academics and publics to debate science and society (Lewis *et al.*), while literature offered opportunities for reading groups to discuss and exchange ideas about cultural values and norms (den Toonder *et al.*). Historical artefacts encouraged neutral discussion around sensitive topics (Trickey *et al.*), while visual arts provided the route to celebrate the contribution of stroke survivors to health research, to promote that research to a broader audience and to inspire new directions for research (Cook *et al.*).

In addition to these articles, there is a review of a new report, *Creating Living Knowledge*, which looks at the dynamics of community–university research partnerships, and ‘Who inspired my thinking?’ – a regular feature in which individuals share recollections of the people, resources and experiences that influenced them and their engagement. In this first issue, independent consultant for public involvement in health research, Sally Crowe, reflects on Sherry Arnstein and the ladder of citizen participation.

We have been overwhelmed by the variety of contributions offered for the journal, and are encouraged that *Research for All* provides a needed place for these contributions to be shared, discussed and challenged. We remain committed to finding effective ways to stimulate discussion and reflection between all those involved in engagement with research. We have encouraged authors to write in an accessible way. The top three points being made in each article are highlighted at the start, to help direct readers to the content that will be most relevant for them, while the design of the journal includes contributions from the authors to help explain terminology or methodology that may not be familiar to all of our readers. You can find out more about upcoming issues, calls for contributions and deadlines by visiting the Research for All webpage at UCL IOE Press: www.ucl-ioe-press.com/research-for-all/.

Research for All provides a real opportunity for new thinking about engagement practice, and for more effective outcomes for engaged research for all involved. As we begin to map out the landscape, we will come across new discoveries and rediscover forgotten landscapes. We hope that many others will join us on this journey by contributing to the journal as authors, readers, commentators and peer reviewers. We look forward to your comments and reflections and invite you to share them on the NCCPE website at www.publicengagement.ac.uk. We also hope you will encourage others to participate in the journal by sharing it with your networks, to truly make this research for all.

Sophie Duncan
Deputy Director

National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement

Sandy Oliver
Professor of Public Policy

UCL Institute of Education, University College London

References

- Aumann, K., Hart, A. and Duncan, S. (2014) ‘What have we learnt? A year on from the first UK Community Partner Summit’. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement*, 7 (1), 129–43.
- Duncan, S. and Manners, P. (2014) ‘Research engagement in the UK: Evolving policy and practice’. In Munck, R., McIlrath, L., Hall, B. and Tandon, R. (eds) *Higher Education and Community-based Research: Creating a global vision*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 221–40.
- Facer, K., Manners, P. and Agusita, E. (2012) *Towards a Knowledge Base for University–Public Engagement: Sharing knowledge, building insight, taking action*. Bristol: National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement.
- RCUK (Research Councils UK) (2008) ‘Beacons for public engagement’. Online. www.rcuk.ac.uk/pe/beacons/ (accessed 10 October 2016).
- RCUK (Research Councils UK) (2012) ‘Public engagement with research catalysts’. Online. www.rcuk.ac.uk/pe/catalysts (accessed 10 October 2016).
- Royal Society (2006) *Survey of Factors Affecting Science Communication by Scientists and Engineers*. London: The Royal Society. Online. https://royalsociety.org/~media/Royal_Society_Content/policy/publications/2006/1111111395.pdf (accessed 26 October 2016).