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**Objectives/aims**

Social work students as well as professionals barely use scientific evidence in their decision making processes (Ghanem, Kollar, Fischer, Lawson, & Pankofer, 2017). Evidence-based Practice (EBP) describes a process that supports social work professionals with incorporating scientific evidence in their decision making processes (Gambrill, 1999). Yet, social work professionals hardly incorporate EBP in their professional practice (Scurlock-Evans & Upton, 2015), even after receiving educational interventions like a workshop (Beidas & Kendall 2010). Also, social work education struggles to prepare social work students for EBP (e.g. Smith, Hall, Cohen-Callow & Hayward 2007).

Furthermore, while EBP-related publications in social work refer to different EBP conceptualizations, many of them do not provide any definition of or reflection on EBP (Ghanem, Lawson, Pankofer, Maragkos & Kollar 2017). Thus we try to:

1. synthesize research findings that assess the effectiveness of EBP-related educational interventions
2. classify the studies with regards to their educational interventions, their (desired) outcome, their measurement(s) as well as their corresponding EBP conceptualization
3. identify strategies to effectively teach Evidence-Based Practice to social work students and social workers

In order to approach these two objectives, we investigated the following research questions:

1. What kinds of social work studies that apply educational interventions (EI) do exist?

2. How can the applied EI be classified?

3. Which EBP conceptualization is used?

4. Which target audience is supposed to be facilitated with the EI?

5. What is the study´s (desired) outcome?

6. How are outcomes measured?

**Methods**

We conducted a systematic review using the Chochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions and the PRISMA guidelines.

We´ve set up a search term which covers social work\*, evidence based/support\*/inform\* as well as several forms of educational interventions (e.g. train\*, support\*, implement\*, etc.). We´ve searched eight databases (e.g. ERIC, Psychinfo, Social Services Abstracts, SocINDEX, etc.) with the search term. We also hand searched the Journal of Evidence Informed Practice and conducted Snowball Searches. We ended up with 2097 articles. We double-coded the variables ‘empirical’, ‘sample’, ‘intervention’ and Evidence-based Practice’ until we reached a satisfying Interrater Reliability for each variable, thereby reducing the main data base to a final data base of 37 articles.

We developed a coding scheme with 16 Codes and 85 corresponding subcodes in order to classify the studies with regards to our research questions. We double-coded all subcodes until we reached a satisfying Interrater Reliability. Currently, we are coding all 37 articles. Afterwards we will rate the studies methodological quality and finally perform a narrative synthesis.

**Main findings**

Preliminary findings show, that 28 (75,7 %) of the 37 reviewed studies are case studies and 4 (10,8 %) are Randomized Controlled Trials. 17 (45,9 %) studies conceptualize EBP as a process, 15 (40,5 %) as an intervention and 5 (13,5 %) studies imply both, a process as well as an intervention, in their EBP conceptualization. The majority of the studies are carrying out research on MSW students (18,9 %), Social Workers (24,3 %) and Mixed Professionals (27 %). Regarding the age of the participants, the samples of the studies are quite evenly distributed between participants who are less than 30 years old (15,2 %), participants between 30 and less than 40 years (18,9 %) and participants between 40 and less than 50 years (16,2 %). However, 45,9 % of the studies provide no information regarding the age of their participants. Two (5,4 %) studies applied objective measurement instruments, 18 (48,6 %) subjective instruments and 14 (37,8 %) incorporated both measurement strategies. However, three (8,1 %) studies did not measure anything at all. Future coding will target the conceptualization as well as the effects of the educational interventions. The study will be finished in July 2018 and we will be able to present our results at the GEIS 2018.